



3 1761 11635867 2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761116358672>

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, March 14, 1888.

No. 15.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANITOBA LAW.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) respecting the application of certain laws, therein mentioned, to the Province of Manitoba. He said: A question has arisen as to the applicability of a large portion of the modern law of England to the Province of Manitoba. Under a constitutional principle which is well established and widely known, the provisions of the Statute Law of the Mother Country extend to the Colonies as far as they are intended to apply down to the period when a Legislative Assembly is organised in a Colony. The case of the Province of Manitoba has been somewhat peculiar. It existed as a mere territory under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company down to the date of the Order in Council which transferred it to the Dominion of Canada on the 15th July, 1870; and when the Legislature was organised, it was provided by a Statute of that Legislature that the law of England, as far as it was capable of being applied to the colony and as far as it existed on the 15th July, 1870, should be the law of the Province of Manitoba in regard to such matters as were within the control of the Provincial Legislature; but in other matters, such, for example, as the law of interest and the law relating to promissory notes, the Statute of the Province would be ineffectual, and the question has arisen as to what portion of the English law is in force in regard to matters which have not been expressly legislated upon by the Dominion, and are outside of the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. Doubts have arisen as to what portion of the English law is in force subsequent to 1670, the date of the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company. In that charter, the language is substantially that the company is authorised to establish Courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction in its territory, and that these Courts shall administer the laws of England, those being presumably and probably the laws which were then in force, so that the laws of England in regard to subsequent matters, such as promissory notes and interest, have been left without any application to the Province of Manitoba, or, at any rate, in the opinion of the jurists who have had to pronounce on the subject, that is the case. This Bill proposes to make applicable to the Province of Manitoba the English law which existed on the 15th July, 1870,

15-1888-1

and to make special provisions in relation to interest and promissory notes. The 3rd clause of the Bill provides that the 1st clause shall not apply to existing litigation, but, as to matters of interest, the law will apply to existing proceedings as well as to those which have not yet been commenced.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is a very necessary measure. There is no doubt of the correctness of the admissions made by the Minister of Justice that so far as the legislation of the Province of Manitoba is concerned, it could not affect any other rights than those that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. This territory, I have no doubt, was, historically, a portion of the territory ceded by France to Great Britain in 1764. The old maps that the Commissioners at that time had before them, show that the whole country as far west as the Rocky Mountains, was in the possession of France; in fact the later Governors who were sent out by France to govern this country extended their jurisdiction over that territory, and at the time Canada was surrendered to Great Britain, there were French troops as well as French trading posts established in that country. The French Governor of Canada issued licenses for that country; and as soon as Canada was ceded to Great Britain, the whole country as far westward as the Mississippi River, and the whole country north of the Mississippi River, indefinitely westward as far as it was the property of the king of France, became a portion of the territories of the king of England; so that whether the common law of England would extend to that country at all, previous to 1764, is a matter of great doubt. Then the Minister of Justice knows that, according to the recognised rules of public law, whether the English law would be extended to that country, or the law of France, which was in force over the entire country at the time of the surrender, would depend upon the determination of the king himself. If he expressed no opinion upon the subject then, of course, the law which was in force prior to the conquest would continue to be in force after the conquest was consummated. I may say, however, that I believe that territory at the time of the surrender was a part of the territory of the king of France, and that subsequent to the Quebec Act, when Upper Canada was established in 1791, it was intended to be embraced, and was embraced as a part of the Province of Upper Canada. No doubt the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in dealing with the question as to the limits of the Province of Ontario, did not pretend to say that that territory now known as the Province of Ontario and the North-West Territory, was not included in the Province of Upper Canada when it was established; but the subsequent establishment there of a government by the Hudson's Bay Company, as a matter of fact, which was not contested, or actively opposed, by the Government of the Province of Ontario, led to the loss of the territories by the principle of acquiescence. So when they undertook to ascertain what were the western boundaries of Ontario, as they now exist, they declared that as the Province of Assiniboia did not extend eastward of the Winnipeg River, the Province of Ontario continues to hold the territory as far westward as it had been embraced in the old Province of Quebec under the Act of 1774. So that what particular

116727
19/6/11

law is in force in that country, apart from our legislative declaration, would be a matter of extreme doubt, whether it would be the old law of France, or the common law of England; and whether it was the law of England in 1774 or 1791, is also a matter of doubt. Therefore it seems to me that the proposed legislation by the Minister of Justice is highly necessary to remove all doubt, and determine what law does govern the people in that country within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BAR AT PINETTE HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the bar at Pinette Harbor, Prince Edward Island, dredged during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed that there are about 10 feet of water over that bar at Pinette Harbor, in high water; and it is found that the bar is of rock. My chief engineer says that before we undertake this, we must have a survey in order to ascertain all the facts.

WOOD ISLAND HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the dredging at Wood Island Harbor performed this year, so as to make that harbor available for shipping purposes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows that some years ago an attempt was made to dredge Wood Island Harbor, and the work was given up. I understand that it was likely to cost too much money. Since that time there have been many petitions to the same effect, but their request was refused for the same reason. It is not likely we could undertake this work unless stronger reasons are given for it than have yet been presented to us.

OVERLOADING OF VESSELS.

Mr. GUILLET asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure to prevent the overloading of vessels trading on our inland waters?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to that question, I would say that the matter is engaging the attention of the Government at the present time.

COMPENSATION TO GENERAL STRANGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have compensated, or intend to compensate General Strange, for the loss of his pension derived from the British Government during the period while General Strange was engaged in assisting to suppress the rebellion in the North-West?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to state that Major General Strange, from the 28th of March to the 17th September, 1885, 174 days, received \$2,117. It is not the intention of the Government to compensate Major General Strange for the loss of his pension.

QUAI A HADLOW COVE.

M. GUAY: Le gouvernement a-t-il pris en considération, depuis la dernière session, les pétitions des citoyens de Saint-David, de L'Auberivière et de Saint-Télesphore, demandant de faire allonger le quai du gouvernement à Hadlow Cove jusqu'à eau profonde? Si oui, se propose-t-il de faire commencer les travaux prochainement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: M. l'Orateur, j'ai fait examiner cette question par mes officiers afin de savoir si nous

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

avons quelque ouvrage de ce genre à L'Auberivière. Le quai qu'il y a là est la propriété d'un particulier, et les pétitions qui ont été présentées ont pour but de faire allonger le quai afin d'en faire le terminus d'une traverse ou d'un passage d'eau entre les deux rives. Je regrette d'avoir à dire à l'honorable député que ce sujet là est absolument local et ne tombe pas sous la juridiction du gouvernement.

CHARLES LEDUC.

M. TURCOTTE (pour M. DESSAINT): Charles Leduc, écrivain, de Hull, est-il employé dans le service civil? Si oui, depuis quand, dans quel ministère, quelle est la nature de ses fonctions et quel est son salaire?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Ce monsieur n'est pas employé dans le service civil.

PRÉPARATION DU VACCIN.

M. Fiset: Est-ce l'intention du gouvernement d'accorder un subside au Dr Edmond Gauvreau, de Québec, afin de venir en aide à son établissement pour la préparation du vaccin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Je dois informer l'honorable député que ce n'est pas l'intention du gouvernement.

TERMS OF UNION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to submit any proposition to Parliament with the view of meeting the complaints of the Government of Prince Edward Island respecting the alleged non-compliance by the Dominion Government with the Terms of Union respecting steam communication with that Province, or with reference to the suggestions for a settlement of the claims made upon the Dominion by Prince Edward Island, contained in Earl Granville's despatch to His Excellency the Governor General, dated 31st March, 1886?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have another steamer built this season to assist the *Northern Light* in keeping up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland in the winter season? If not, how is it proposed that such communication shall be maintained during next winter, so as to comply with that article of the Terms of Union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, stipulating that an efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers is to be established and maintained between the Island and the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the Railway system of the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. The subject-matter of the hon. gentleman's question is under consideration.

THE LAW OF LIBEL.

Mr. INNES asked, Is it the intention of the Government during the present Session to introduce a Bill to amend the Law of Libel?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot answer the question more definitely to-day than to say that the subject is now being considered.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Were the applicants for the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company re-

quired by the Government to make a deposit prior to the granting thereof? If such deposit was required, what amount was demanded, and was the deposit made? If made, was it in money, in bank deposit receipts or cheques on a charter bank? If in cheques, whose cheques were given, on what bank, and were they duly marked as good or accepted by the bank?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The applicants for this charter were required to make a deposit prior to the granting thereof; \$50,000 were required, and the deposit was made. It was made in bank deposit receipts and cheques; the cheques were given on the Union Bank of Lower Canada and were marked good.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Is the Government aware whether the Great North West Central Railway Company have, since their incorporation on 22nd July, 1886, effected their permanent organisation by subscribing for \$500,000 of stock and paying up 10 per cent. thereof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Have the incorporators named in the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company been changed by resignation or otherwise? And if changes have been made, who have taken the places of those who have gone out?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The incorporators named in the charter of this company have been changed; the name of R. J. Devlin has been submitted for that of C. T. Bate, who resigned.

COST OF CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the nominal cost, as given to 1st January, 1888, of all railways in the Dominion of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask the hon. gentleman to repeat that question on another day.

THE FISHERIES TREATY—PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Government to an omission in the papers furnished to the House in connection with the Fisheries Conference that took place in Washington a short time ago between the two Governments. It will be remembered that a number of questions were asked from this side of the House as to the propositions made by the respective plenipotentiaries of each Government to the other, and after consultation had taken place several times in the House, it was understood that in addition to the papers first submitted there would be other papers containing—as we understood at least—a full account of all the several negotiations and propositions made on either side. Now, in the papers which were circulated and laid on the table of each member the other day I find the only additional memorandum is a letter which Mr. Bayard wrote on 31st May to Sir Charles Tupper, and the answer of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Bayard; but in the propositions which appear to have been made by Sir Charles Tupper on the 3rd December, 1887, and the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries on the 7th December, it appears in the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries that, previous to Sir Charles submitting his proposal, they had submitted a proposal to him, and his proposition was a reply to that which emanated from them in the first instance. The House will see by looking at the papers that the United States plenipotentiaries commenced their reply as follows:

“While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo,—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration.”

Now, the proposal which was submitted by the United States plenipotentiaries, and on which Sir Charles Tupper made his proposition of December 3rd, has never yet been communicated to the House. The House will see how very important it is on the eve of the present discussion, and also in view of the discussion on the Fisheries question, that hon. members should be placed in full possession of the proposals which emanated from the American plenipotentiaries as well as those which emanated from the Canadian Commissioner. I call the attention of the First Minister to this point in the hope that we may have the proposal laid before the House at an early day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret that the absence of the Minister of Finance through illness prevents his giving a full answer to the hon. gentleman. I may say now that it was understood at the meeting of the conference that the results only should be embodied in the protocols. The same arrangement was made, I may say, at the time of the Washington treaty; it was found absolutely necessary, from the political circumstances of the day, that this should be the case. No statement of what occurred during the negotiations can be submitted either to the Congress of the United States or the Parliament of Canada that has not been mutually agreed upon. Sir Charles obtained the consent of Mr. Bayard to the submission of the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If any further papers are wanted, including the papers to which he now refers, Sir Charles, when he is able to resume his place in the House, which will be in a few days, will communicate with the British Ambassador at Washington, and if Mr. Bayard consents, there will be no objection to the papers being brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that this statement is very disappointing and very unsatisfactory. This is contrary to all the precedents on which we have proceeded. I cannot do better than to refer the hon. gentleman to the Treaty of Washington itself, in which case the whole of the proceedings were brought down to the House and full information was communicated, not only to the members of this Legislature, but to all parties concerned and interested. Naturally in this legislation all parties concerned are interested, and it seems to me that the plenipotentiaries have pursued a different course from what has ever been pursued before. We have nothing but a summary of the protocols. It appears, however—and I take the statements of the hon. gentlemen themselves, that it was agreed upon by those plenipotentiaries that nothing but summaries of the protocols should be distributed to accompany the treaty,—the hon. gentleman and his Government were kind enough some time ago to ask the assent of Mr. Bayard to have certain proposals which they made—which, rather, the plenipotentiaries had made—submitted to Parliament. It seems to me they might have asked the assent of Mr. Bayard to submit also the other proposals which were made on the part of the American plenipotentiaries. It certainly seems to me that it is not treating the House with that proper respect to which the House is entitled, to submit one part of those proposals and not the other. I think the House is entitled to everything that occurred, not only the proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, but the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries as well, all the more so because the proposals made by our plenipotentiaries are in answer to the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries. Under such circumstances I hope that the hon. gentleman will follow the precedent which took place not more than three weeks ago, during the illness of Sir Charles Tupper. He, himself, communicated with Mr. Bayard to have his assent to this proposal being submitted to the House, and during the present unfortunate illness of the Minister of Finance I hope he will again ask the assent

of Mr. Bayard to have the proposals of the American plenipotentiaries laid before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that if the doctrine of the hon. gentleman is maintained, it will be impossible ever to make a treaty with any country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister will see, if he looks at the papers brought down, that when we were discussing the Treaty of Washington the various propositions made by the plenipotentiaries or joint high commissioners on each side were given to Parliament. It is true the arguments by which they were supported were not given, but the proposals themselves were given. Now, what objection does the hon. gentleman see to saying what the propositions were which the British commissioners submitted and what were the counter propositions submitted by the commissioners of the United States. To submit the arguments that were presented in support of those propositions is one thing, to submit the propositions themselves is a totally different thing. It does seem to me that the hon. gentleman recognises the principle of responsible government; he admits that he and his Government are responsible to Parliament. Surely in vindication of this it is right that Parliament should know what was done by those acting on its behalf, and supposed to enjoy its confidence. It does seem to me that the proposition which the hon. gentleman now makes is one wholly different from that made in 1872 when we were put in possession of all the propositions and counter propositions submitted before the joint high commission, and when we had also the Order in Council protesting against the course of the Imperial Government brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt, as full information was given in 1871 as could properly be given. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was due discrimination observed at that time as to what was sent to Parliament and what was withheld.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is all very well in the interests of the Government for the gentleman who leads this House to make a statement of that kind and to take upon himself to say that all has been given that can be given in the interests of the Government of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. MITCHELL. But if the treaty is complete and this House is asked, as Congress has been asked, to assent to it, this House as well as Congress has a right to the fullest information as to how those gentlemen arrived at the conclusions at which they have arrived. I find, on looking at the papers distributed to the members of this House the other day, that this proposition in relation to more extended commercial relations did not arise—as the organs of this Government have taken the credit of saying it did—with the representative of the Canadian Government, the present Minister of Finance (Sir Charles Tupper), but that it arose, first, so far as I can find them on the records of the papers, in a letter addressed by Mr. Bayard on the 31st of May to Sir Charles Tupper. This is the first evidence of any correspondence on the point which is laid before the House. One paragraph of this letter reads as follows:—

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to."

In a previous part of this letter he goes on to point out the difficulties in which our colonial position places us in dealing with the neighboring country. He tells us the whole correspondence has to be made to England, and through England to the Governor General of this country and his Council; that all this matter has to be answered,

Mr. LAURIER.

first to England and then to the United States again before an answer can be got, and that unnecessary time and delay is taken up in that way. Mr. Bayard has evidently made a distinct proposition in relation to the manner in which this difficulty about the fishery troubles could be practically settled, and that he points out to be, first, more extended commercial intercourse between the two countries. Now, Sir, when the treaty is complete, and when a Bill has been laid before this House by the Government to ask this House to assent to that treaty, I hold it to be the right of this House—no matter what the convenience of the Cabinet may be to hide what they have done and refused to do—I hold it to be the right of this House that everything in the shape of a proposition which was made, whether from Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, or from Sir Charles Tupper, representing this Government, to the commissioners, should be laid before this House for our action, our consideration, and for the exercise of our judgment as to whether those gentlemen have done their duty or not. This position, I think, this House will sustain. I for one am not prepared to accept the *ipse dixit* of the hon. gentleman opposite, who says in his judgment it is not for the convenience of the Cabinet that only conclusions should be laid before us, and that the propositions upon which conclusions were not based should be ignored. I could understand, Sir, if he refused to lay the arguments before the House, although even there I think common candor to the people of Canada ought to dictate that the arguments, as well as the propositions, should be laid before the House; but without question the propositions ought to be laid on the Table, and I think it is the duty of this House to insist that the Government shall do so.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister does not seem to agree with the Minister of Finance in regard to what ought to be or what ought not to be brought down. He has told us that if those documents asked for were brought down it would be impossible to make a treaty with any country. His Minister of Finance told us, a few days ago, that he hoped and expected and intended that those very papers should be brought down. Here is a difference of opinion between the chief and his first lieutenant. I think the right hon. the Premier should explain that difference, or else he must remain responsible for the utterances of his second in command, who offered and intended to bring those matters before the House. The right hon. gentleman says that even at the time of the Washington Treaty, although there was more brought down than now, that he did not tell us everything even then, and that he used his judgment as to what statements of fact should be brought down and what left behind. I find that a treaty is made specially subject to the action of this House. It is not proper that one party to the case—the Government who are on trial before this House—should be allowed to make their own case, and retain what suits them. It is evident that by submitting certain facts and retaining others a falsehood may practically be told to the House, and that the whole thing may be put in a false shape. In the case of the British Parliament it is quite different. A treaty does not come before that parliament at all; but precedents that apply in England do not apply to this case. It is not necessary to tell the British Parliament everything that the Ministers have done in regard to a treaty, because parliament is not asked to ratify that treaty. Here, by special agreement, we are asked to ratify this treaty, and we ought to know; and if we have respect for ourselves we would know, before we ratify the treaty, what our representatives have done.

Mr. MULOCK. If I correctly understood the First Minister he has stated to the House that nothing further would be presented.

Mr. SPEAKER. If a question of order were raised, it was my intention to call the attention of the House to the irregularity of the proceedings which have now taken place, and to warn the House that if we allowed this kind of proceedings, which has taken place several times already, there will be no use of our having rules of practice to direct the proceedings of this House. The rule is that questions may be asked of Ministers about the production of papers or the conduct or state of the business of the House; but I think it is the duty of the Chair not to allow a question to drift into a discussion, because when it comes to a discussion it is clearly out of order. Therefore, if hon. gentlemen wish to argue against the conduct of the Government or anything else, they must put a motion before the House. I think it would be clearly an inconvenience if these discussions were allowed every time we call the Orders of the Day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. First Minister, if I understood him, has stated to the House that he will not give to the House or the country any further information on this subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to know exactly what the hon. First Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, I shall be glad if you will endeavour to press on the hon. gentleman to attend more to his correspondence.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope no comment will be made on my effort to maintain order.

Mr. MULOCK. I think I am in order now in addressing the House, and in consequence of the low tone in which the hon. First Minister spoke, I desire to know to what extent the House and the country are to be informed as to the proposals and counter-proposals which passed between the plenipotentiaries. I would like to know whether he proposes to live up to the agreement made by the hon. Finance Minister on the 1st of March last. The hon. Minister of Finance then stated, in order to procure an adjournment of a certain debate, that the formal protocols would contain every proposal and counter-proposal made at Washington, and he expressed his great surprise that the communications which had been forwarded by the protocolists did not contain those proposals and counter-proposals. If the hon. First Minister wishes to know what he said, I will refer him to *Hansard*, page 73:

"The question was, as I understood, practically settled when I left Washington, that the arguments were not to be embraced, that is to say, the reasoning upon the two sides would not be necessary; but it was a question as to how far the various papers put in, in support of the proposals or in opposition to the proposals, should form a part of the protocols; and when I was asked the question by telegraph to assent to the protocols being purely formal, I assumed and took it for granted that what was termed a formal protocol would contain the proposals and counter-proposals—that that, at all events, would be a part of it."

Mr. MITCHELL. And the answer.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I assented to it. Yes, the proposals and the answers. A proposal is put in and an answer is put in in relation to it; and I assumed that those protocols, what were termed formal protocols, would, at all events, contain the proposals and the replies on both sides."

That was the attitude taken by Sir Charles Tupper; that was what he considered would be laid before this House, and if the hon. First Minister or any other member of this Administration now proposes to give to the House less than the hon. Minister of Finance proposed to give, then they

must be considering something other than the public interest. There cannot be an honest and full discussion of this question if the Government hold back part of the evidence. It must be clear to the mind of every man who read the letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, that the American Government courted larger trade relations between Canada and the United States, and it is perfectly evident that the failure on the part of our Government to promote those relations has been the outcome of the negotiations and correspondence, and perhaps debates as well. They have had the effect of militating against the highest interest of Canada. If there is nothing to conceal, why not bring down the whole record? If, however, the Government have something to conceal, if they have tied the hands of Sir Charles Tupper, or if the Imperial authorities have interfered with the negotiators, let Canada know it. We have a right to know whose interests were consulted—whether the doctrine of the First Minister of Canada first, Canada for the Canadians, was lived up to, or whether on this occasion, as on others, Imperial interests were preferred to those of Canada. For my part, I am sent here to represent the interests of Canada, and any Government at Ottawa who collude with other statesmen against the interests of Canada, are traitors to the country they represent. For these reasons, in order that this question may be discussed fully and fairly, I think they have a duty to perform, and they can only be trying to burk parliamentary enquiry by withholding what the hon. Finance Minister deemed to be due to Canada.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In withdrawing my motion to adjourn, I think the Premier is altogether in error in not carrying out the promise made by his plenipotentiary in this House. If he would give some good reason, *pro bono publico*, why those papers should be withheld, I would certainly yield, but he has not given any reason to justify the course he has now taken.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the object of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in bringing down these papers is to show what had taken place in regard to the commercial relations between the two countries. Now, we find that whilst Sir Charles Tupper on the 13th December made a proposal, a very important matter is left out. The American reply is not fully before this House, because reference is made to the proposals submitted on the 30th, and it seems to me that in order to complete the papers, that document should be submitted as well as the proposals of Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret that the hon. Minister of Fisheries is not in his place, so that this conversation would not have been called for. Sir Charles Tupper left Washington before the protocols were formally settled. They were settled there in the manner he told us, by agreement between the plenipotentiaries on both sides as to what should go to the public. As those who were not plenipotentiaries are not in the secret, we cannot say what portion has been omitted and what portion has been included in those protocols; but they were sent according to the arrangements made between the representatives of the two nations. Sir Charles Tupper has expressed his disappointment that they were not so full in statement as he thought they would be; and after the discussion which took place here, he telegraphed to Washington for permission to lay the statement and counter-statement, so far as it related to trade, before the House, and he got the consent of the plenipotentiaries on the other side. That was to have been communicated to this House. As regards the point now raised, there is a statement of another proposition. Well, I have no doubt Sir Charles Tupper will communicate and ask permission to get that also, but without permission it cannot be given.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved :

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other, (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).

That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

He said : I am not greatly given to indulging in conventional formalities, but it is not in the spirit of conventionality that I rise on this occasion to address this House, under a sense of grave and weighty responsibility. It is true that I am fortified and encouraged in bringing forward this motion by the knowledge that in so doing I only voice the opinions of the representatives of the Liberal party in this Parliament; and furthermore that I have every reason a man can have for believing that when I give utterance to their opinions, I also give utterance to the opinions of the vast majority of those who support us and of a very important section, to say the least of it, of those who, on other questions, have differed from us very widely. Were I called upon at present to produce evidence of that, I think it might be found in the fact that within a very few months, but not until after this question had been considerably agitated throughout the Dominion, we found the leading statesmen of the several Provincial Governments, who met at Quebec—all, I think, the more important Governments in Canada—uniting, without exception, in approving substantially of the proposition which I now submit to this House. Nevertheless I cannot conceal from myself that this motion is one which is liable to raise issues of very great moment, not only to the people of Canada, but it may well be to other peoples also. There is no doubt that this motion is one which proposes, in some considerable degree, a new departure; there is no doubt whatever that if this proposition were assented to by the two countries chiefly concerned, very important changes would, beyond all question, take place in the mode of administering our public and commercial affairs, and therefore it is equally clear that this is a question which requires the most mature consideration and the utmost discussion at our hands. I am very glad indeed that the Government have recognised the importance of this matter, and I think it is to their credit that they raised no objection to my proposal to set apart a special day for its discussion, and also that the discussion once begun, it be carried on *de die in diem*. Sir, I believe it will be found that this is emphatically a question which will not down; I believe it to be a question which must be faced; I believe that it is a question which possibly, if it suits their purpose, hon. gentlemen opposite may evade or may delay, but on which, sooner or later, and in my judgment rather sooner than later, they will be required to take, and their friends in the House of Commons and out of it will be required to take a distinct and plain stand. This is a case in which nature is too strong for us; and although it is my intention on the present occasion to abstain from a great many things which might theoretically strengthen my argument, but which would undoubtedly open a way to irrelevant discussion, still I think I may be pardoned in taking this opportunity to say that we will all do well to remember that we are now discussing a problem which affects the present interests of Canada to-day. We are not called upon to consider how or in what way we might have dealt with this proposal, had it been submitted to us under totally different conditions, twenty or even ten years ago. The question is, what is best for the people of Canada in the year 1888, and not what may have been thought best for them in 1867 or in 1877. As for the charge of inconsistency, which has been levelled at some of us for supposed

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

previous utterances on this question, I am in no wise concerned to waste time in justifying myself. Were I so disposed, it would be easy for me to show that I, at any rate, have been perfectly consistent to the root idea which underlies this whole proposition. But I do not intend to waste time over that. I may say this, however, that every man who studies the subject, knows that I am speaking simply the truth when I say that within the last twenty years or the last ten years, there have been very great economic and even social changes in the position of Canada, and that therefore it might very well be the case that propositions deserve discussion to-day which we would not have thought it prudent to discuss some ten or twenty years ago. Now, I propose to-day to confine myself chiefly to bringing the attention of this House and, so far as I can, the people of Canada to certain patent and salient facts, which, I think, nobody who studies the matter is able to deny, and also to pointing out what appear to me the inevitable consequences which will result from those facts. I may differ from hon. gentlemen opposite on that point, but it appears to me it is idle to shut our eyes to these plain facts, and equally idle for us to say that our present position is in all respects satisfactory. I will take two facts alone which appear to me, and I think will appear to this House, to be of very great importance in this connection; and of which I have here as absolute evidence as it is possible for any man to have. I will take the movement of the population in this country in the last quarter of a century, beginning in the year 1861 and going down to the year 1886, which is the last moment for which I have absolutely accurate statistical information. What are these facts? Sir, they are facts which I state with pain. But I say that we have here incontestable evidence that in these twenty-five years, one in every four of the native born population of Canada has been compelled to seek a home in a foreign country, and that of all the immigrants whom we have imported at great cost, three out of four have been compelled to follow in the track of that fraction of the native born population. Now I say, no man who properly appreciates what these facts involve can deny that if I make good my case, if I am able to show this House that there is a great deal of substantial and a great deal of presumptive evidence to support it, if I can show this House that I am rather under than above the mark in making those statements, no man who understands what those facts mean, can doubt for one moment that I and those gentlemen who think with me are amply justified in saying this is a case which requires our most earnest and serious consideration. Now, I will take those two statements respectively, and, first of all, I address myself to the statement which I made and to which I think I heard some murmurs of dissent on the other side, that in the last five-and-twenty years Canada has lost one out of every four of her native born population. In the first place, I have here, if any hon. gentlemen desire that the authority be produced, the formal reports of the United States, which show that in the year 1860 there were 249,000 men of Canadian birth in the United States; that in ten years they had grown to 430,000 souls, and that in 1880, there were 707,000 Canadians in the United States. Now, it must be remembered that that by no means represents the total exodus of our people, because, when you come to deal with such large numbers as these, you must allow for the death rate which prevailed in the twenty years from 1860 to 1880. That death rate, after careful examination, I believe to have been about 74,000 in the first decade, and 120,000 in the second, in all equal to 194,000. It is clear therefore, it is clear to demonstration, it is as clear as any fact can be, that between 1860 and 1880, for some cause or other, which it is not my present purpose to analyse, at least 650,000 Canadians found homes in the United States. Now, up to that point, we go upon absolutely certain ground. We have the United States returns

backed in the strongest possible fashion by our own census returns, which I have under my hand. The question is, how many have we lost since then, how many have gone from this country to the United States in the interval between 1880 and 1886? Now, we have here pretty clear evidence of the movement of population at any rate in the great Province of Ontario. We know what the increase in the Province of Ontario, according to natural laws, should have been; we know what the increase in Ontario is. We know from these hon. gentlemen's own returns what a mass of immigrants they alleged to have been poured into this country in those six years to which I have alluded; and we find in brief that, according to our municipal statistics, which are likely rather to err, as experience has shown, in increasing than in diminishing the average population, all Ontario in these six years has to show is an increase of 128,000 souls. We find a huge gap here. We find that in those six years the natural growth alone of Ontario ought to have been 250,000 souls. We find that, even if you take my estimate that out of every four immigrants you pay for and bring to this country, you keep but one, there is the strongest ground for believing that at least 80,000 souls should have been added to the Province from that source alone, and after deducting the 120,000 Ontarions, whom the returns from Manitoba and the North-West show to have settled in that country, you still find 180,000 unaccounted for from that source alone. I need not appeal to this audience as to the fact that Ontario of necessity, putting out of question the North-West and Manitoba, always has and must absorb the vast bulk of our immigration. I think my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, my hon. friends from Nova Scotia, my hon. friends from New Brunswick, and my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec on both sides of this House will all admit that no very large proportion of immigrants have settled in those respective Provinces within the last six years; and, if any of them doubt the statement or think I err in that, it is open to them now and here to correct me, and I challenge the correction. If we admit that, and I see no possible ground on which those positions can be disputed, you have this result, that, allowing a moderate proportion for the emigration that we know is going on of native born Canadians from the other Provinces, at least 900,000 of our population are to-day inhabitants of the United States, and in all probability rather over than under 1,000,000. So I submit that the first statement that I have made is up to the year 1880 absolutely true, and, as regards the period of six years which has since elapsed, is as nearly absolutely proved as it is possible at present for any such statement to be. More than that, you have only to look, if you dispute the United States statistics, to our own statistics, to our own census returns, to see, I regret to say, the strongest possible evidence of the substantial accuracy of my calculations. We find that in 1861 the population in those Provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada was as nearly as possible 3,250,000 souls. We find that in 1871, they had grown to 3,690,000, and in 1881, to 4,324,000 souls; while, if you like to take the four old Provinces, you find that they had in round numbers grown from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 in a period of 20 years. Now, as our returns allege and profess to prove, we imported in those 20 years about 500,000 immigrants. I would like hon. gentlemen on both sides to compare for one moment the rate of progress manifested in those 20 years with the rate of progress manifested in the previous 20 years of our history. From 1841 to 1861, the old Province of Canada grew from 1,129,000 souls to 2,500,000. Thus the House will see that during the first 20 years, the growth of old Canada was at the rate of 115 per cent., while in these later 20 years it has shrunk to 30 per cent. Now I proceed to discuss the other position, I proceed to discuss not our success in what I

deem a vastly more important class, not our success in keeping our own people in our own territory, but our success in keeping the foreign immigration which, at vast cost, we have brought into this country. I made the statement a few minutes ago that, of the foreign population which we have brought in, three out of four have left this country and sought homes in the United States. I now proceed to give you the evidence, as I believe the incontrovertible evidence of the substantial accuracy of that statement, the absolute accuracy for the first period of 20 years and the substantial accuracy for the last period of five or six years. I find that the foreign population in Canada in 1861 amounted to 665,000 souls, and that in 1881 that foreign population had shrunk to 570,000 souls. In other words, we lost 95,000 souls in those 20 years, altogether we had brought into the country during that interval 531,000 immigrants, according to the returns which have been laid on our Table by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. Now, I will allow, as I did in the case of the emigrants to the United States from Canada, for a very large death rate. I will deduct 220,000 from the original foreign born population in Canada in 1861, and it is as clear as anything can be, that deducting 15,000 for settlers in British Columbia and Manitoba, of the 505,000 who remain, who came to this country in that interval, the uttermost who can by possibility have remained in Canada are 125,000, so that 380,000 had made Canada a mere place of transit at our expense. So there again you will find that up to 1881 the case is absolutely proven that three out of four of all the multitude of immigrants that we brought to this country, we were unable to retain. How has it been in the interval between 1881 and 1886? Well, Sir, I find that in that interval 477,168 immigrants are alleged to have come to Canada as settlers. I turn to the census returns of north-western Manitoba, and I find that the uttermost who can be accounted for there, amount to 25,000; so that there remain 452,000 to be accounted for still. I have just pointed out to this House that the great Province of Ontario, which has always absorbed the vast bulk of all the foreign immigrants, not merely does not show that it has absorbed 452,000 immigrants, but it shows that its total increase is barely one-half its natural increase. Again, I ask my hon. friends in the Maritime Provinces, again I ask my hon. friends in Quebec, do they suppose that any considerable proportion of this 452,000 can have strayed into Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Quebec, without their knowledge? Is it not a patent fact that the vast bulk of these, if they are to be found at all, must be found in the Province of Ontario? and is it not a patent fact that if the increase of Ontario be no larger than I have stated, the vast bulk of these immigrants must, as I have said, have sought homes in the United States. There is, Sir, but one alternative to that—let hon. gentlemen take which one they choose. It is, of course, theoretically possible, though practically impossible, that these immigrants may have stayed in Ontario and have displaced an immensely larger number of the native population than I have supposed possible. But I do not think that argument is likely to be advanced in this discussion by any resident of Ontario. Now, Sir, I could bring forward numerous details all tending in a very high degree to corroborate these statements. I confine myself, for the present, to these two: I point out, Sir, that we, who are accused of misrepresenting the number of the people who have left this country, on the contrary, as the *Hansard* record will show, gravely under-estimated the loss of population in Manitoba and the North-West. At the worst, when we were accused of making most pessimistic statements, we never imagined for one moment that the population of the North-West and the population of Manitoba would have sunk to anything like the low ebb which these returns, lately laid on the Table, in 1885 and 1886, prove to have been the case. I will call the attention of the

House to another significant fact. Time and again, knowing, as I well know, that the chiefs of the Roman Catholic clergy in the Province of Quebec were admirably well informed as to the movement of the Catholic population of that Province, time and again I have challenged hon. gentlemen opposite, if they ventured to dispute my statement on that point, to obtain from those gentlemen a statement of what the real facts of the case were in regard to that population. Time and again, that challenge was refused, and I say, therefore, that we have every ground that men can have for believing that in the statement I have made, I am stating but the simple and literal truth. Now, Sir, as regards the bulk of these facts and figures, you may just as well contradict the multiplication table as contradict them. They are there, with the sign-manual of the hon. gentlemen opposite attached to them, and if they be inaccurate, on their heads, and not on mine, the blame must rest. Now, what has been done in this matter, up to the present moment, may be thus defined. First, I am sorry to say, they have attempted to break the force of these arguments by desperate misrepresentations, of which I will give this House a proof, drawn from their own official reports. Sir, I have beside me the returns of the Department of Agriculture, and I call the attention of the House to them. Those returns state that in 1881, 2,200 settled in Manitoba and the North-West. They are particular, you will observe, up to the very last unit. In 1882, there were 58,751; in 1883, 42,722; in 1884, 24,440; in 1885, for reasons which I will not distress hon. gentlemen by referring to, 7,240. Now, Sir, that was the measure of success of the immigration policy of the Government, of their liberal land and railway policy, they only succeeded in inducing, so they state, 155,154 persons to settle in Manitoba between 1881 and 1886. But, Sir, when we come to count noses by actual census, I am very sorry to say the 155,154 settlers, duly certified to us by the Department of Agriculture, had shrunk into 43,000; 16,000 in the North-West, and 27,000 in Manitoba. There, Sir, are their own returns, there are their own facts, there, out of their own mouths, are the proofs that we under-estimated very gravely the extraordinary loss which their misgovernment has brought about in that country. I might add that with respect to the 16,000 souls from Ontario and from foreign countries, whom alone they were able to settle in those magnificent provinces in the North-West, there is clear evidence that at least one-third are supported by Government, are pensioners or employees of the Government, and are paid out of the taxes of the people of this country, and are in no proper sense or shape settlers at all. Then, Sir, beaten at that ground, they dare to tell us that this is of no consequence, that it is of no consequence to the people of Canada that they have lost, in 25 years, well nigh two millions of British subjects, one million of native born Canadians, and three-fourths of a million of British subjects, whom they had induced to come to this country with the intention of settling here. Now, I have no right to put a money value on my own countrymen, or upon the immigrants whom we bring to this country; but I will point to this merely, that if you are to accept the customary standard laid down in the United States, if you can venture to hold that every able-bodied man who comes to North America is worth, when he lands on the dock, \$1,000 to the State, then, Sir, whatever may be the cause, the result of all this is, that in losing these 2,000,000 of people we have lost 500,000 of able-bodied men, or thereabouts, and we have lost an equivalent, according to that calculation, to \$500,000,000. Certainly had they been here, it is clear that both our debt and our taxes would have been substantially reduced, because we would have had so many more valuable settlers to share the burthen with us. But there is another argument brought forward by men who ought to know better. They tell us that we need take no concern of this, because

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

substantially the same thing is going on in the great State of New York alongside of us. Sir, I demur to that argument. In the first place I point out that when an American citizen leaves the State of New York for any reason, he does not leave the United States; he transfers himself from one part of his own country to another. Does the hon. gentleman suppose we are so ignorant as some of those hon. gentlemen appear to be of the history of North America? Do we not know that nearly 200 years ago New York State was settled, that in the days of William and Mary New York was a prosperous and important colony? Sir, the comparison is preposterous. We, when we lose anybody, and we know this to our cost, we lose them, not to go to another part of the Dominion, but to transfer their allegiance to another country. Now, I take issue most strongly with those hon. gentlemen, that is to say, with those of them who, admitting my facts, venture to contend that this is a matter of no consequence. I say that even if we had under our control no territory beyond the four original Provinces of old Canada, this would be a serious calamity to us, because the four Provinces of old Canada, well administered, are abundantly capable of supporting a population two or three times as great as that they now contain. But when we remember that we have well nigh half a continent at our disposal, that the First Minister himself has risen in his place to tell us that we have 400,000 square miles yet unoccupied of the most fertile territory that the sun ever shone on, [what shall I say of the folly of supposing that it is anything but a great misfortune, a great calamity, a great injury to the people of the country that so huge a portion not only of those who come to settle in Canada, but of those who belong to us, of those who are our own flesh and blood, our own kinsmen, have been obliged for lack of opportunity to leave Canada and seek a home elsewhere? I say that this is proof positive that we are in a state of retrogression.] I say that as regards the four old Provinces of Canada our population is either in a stationary condition, relatively speaking, or, at all events, falls vastly short of increasing according to the laws of natural growth. And I say—although I am not going to enlarge on that subject at this present moment—that I have around me, I see on both sides of the House, if only hon. gentlemen will have the courage of their convictions and speak out what they know, many men intimately acquainted with the state of the agricultural population who could and who, before this debate closes, I hope will bear their testimony to the fact, that all over the four Provinces there has been a very large and formidable reduction in the actual selling value of farm lands and a still more formidable reduction in the price which farmers can obtain for the products they raise. Apply another test. If you choose to turn to the report of Trade and Navigation, which the Minister of Customs with commendable promptitude has laid on the Table, there you will find evidence which ought to convince this House that within the last 14 or 15 years, although there has been a considerable increase of population—but far inferior to that we ought to have had—there has been, and it is a noteworthy fact, a very large reduction in the total volume of trade. Here is the hon. gentleman's own blue book laid within these last few days on the Table of the House, and from that I see that in 1873, 15 years ago, the total volume of trade was \$217,500,000, with a population of 3,750,000, that to-day with a population which hon. gentlemen opposite estimate, though incorrectly, at 4,800,000, our total volume of trade and exports is \$202,000,000, being \$15,000,000 less than it was 15 years ago, although we have 1,000,000 of people or thereabouts more. Sir, apply another test. I find in 1873 the average per head of exports and imports amounted to \$38 000; according to the hon. gentleman's own statement the average per head of exports and imports to-day is \$41.50; in

other words, the total volume of trade measured per head, the proper way of measuring, has declined nearly 50 per cent. I will allow for the reduced values of certain of those articles, but no man can contend that there is not proof of very serious retrogression in one of those indexes which, far more than many of those which have been alluded to here, go to mark the progress of a nation's prosperity. But it would be unjust to hon. gentlemen opposite to suppose they have been idle all this time. They could not keep our people here, they could not keep the emigrants they brought here, they could not raise the value of farm lands, nor the prices of farmers' products; but what they could do they did. In these twenty years they have trebled our debt, in these twenty years they have trebled our taxes, and when the Budget comes to be brought down I think the House will find that the liabilities of the people of this country are very far indeed from being fully discharged or measured even by our present enormous debt. Sir, again I say for the moment I suspend my remarks on their failure to create an important inter-provincial trade. That is a question which requires a little more discussion than it suits me to give it at the moment; and here again I ask my friends from the Maritime Provinces, when the time comes, to contribute for the information of the House their views as to the success which has attended our efforts to create a trade in that direction. Nor will I dwell just now further on the lamentable failure, after the expenditure of over \$100,000,000 of public money, to produce or obtain any adequate settlement of the North-West. But I will say a word or two as to the utter failure to obtain any adequate return from our great public works. Sir, the Public Accounts are here, and those Public Accounts show that the people of Canada have expended well nigh \$200,000,000 in the construction of railways and canals and divers other improvements. Time was when we hoped those would give us something like an adequate return directly or indirectly, but the time has now arrived when we find these expectations very bitterly disappointed. How now stands the case? I take the Public Accounts for 1887, and I find, all told, a charge of \$3,970,000 for the expenses of operating those public works, and that is the nominal charge. The real charge, if our accounts were kept as any other country on earth would keep them, would be nearer \$4,500,000, or, at all events, \$4,250,000 than \$3,970,000. Well, Sir, what do we get as a return? We get a total income of \$3,270,000. Not only do we not receive one farthing of interest on the outlay of \$200,000,000, but there is a dead annual loss of \$700,000 a year, not to speak of the various important items which under our most vicious system of book-keeping are charged to capital account. Sir, again I pass to the question of our failure to keep immigrants, and again I pass for the moment from the question of why it is that we in Canada with 400,000 square miles of the most fertile territory, cannot even keep our own people in our own country. But I have the right, the House and the country has the right, to ask, Why is this? Is it because of the severity of our climate? I think not. The climate of Canada is in part most rigorous, but it is eminently healthy and calculated to develop a vigorous and thrifty offspring. Is it the fault of our soil? Why, has not this House echoed and re-echoed again with declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite that no country on earth possesses a region of such unexcelled fertility as we do possess.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I agree with my friends opposite to a very great extent. Then, Sir, I ask, is it the fault of the people? Well, in part it is the fault of our people for being too credulous and too trusting to the promises of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Anybody who knows how our people conduct themselves when they leave

our shores; any one who knows what distinguished positions the immense percentage of that million of Canadians, whose absence I deplore, have obtained in the neighbouring Republic; who knows that they have shown themselves able to fight, and compete with, aye and even to beat our American friends with their own weapons, anybody who knows that will say that it is hardly the fault of the people of Canada if those things are so. But I think we may ask, if it is not the fault of the climate, if it is not the fault of the soil, and if it is not the fault of the people, whose fault then can it be? What am I to say of the threatened collapse of our federal constitution which has become so patent and so manifest in these later days? Have we not seen almost every year and day the very fundamental principles upon which federation depends torn into fragments and afterwards pinned together with bribes, as in the case of Nova Scotia? Do we not know and does not the hon. the First Minister know, if he thinks for a moment, and I trust that he may, and take a second and a wiser thought, that he runs the most imminent risk if he persists in the tyrannical course heretofore pursued by him towards the young and rising Province of Manitoba, that he will have to take the responsibility of that tyranny and that he will have the choice offered to him, to recede from the tyranny or see the Manitobans assert their just rights at any cost.

Mr. MITCHELL. A third rebellion, I suppose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope not too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe and I hope that whatever the faults of the First Minister may be he will avoid that third and most fatal mistake. Sir, to a very great extent, as the enormous increase of our debt shows, we have during all this time been living on our credit, and a most mischievous policy it is. We may get temporary advantage from it, we may get temporary assistance, but every man knows, and more than all men who have studied the early history of the United States know, that a young country in our position cannot pursue a more fatal course than to allow its debt to be increased with unexampled rapidity as ours has been increased during the period to which I have alluded. Now what shall we say of the condition of that great interest upon which all other interests in this country depend? Who is there who does not know that there has been, within the last few years, an immense fall in the profits of our farmers, and at the same time a very great increase in the burdens laid upon them? Who does not know, who has studied the history of the world, that at the self-same moment that you are heaping burdens and burdens upon our farmers, at that self-same moment they are being exposed to a totally unexpected and most intense competition in the market which they have hitherto controlled? Who does not know, Sir, that if this kind of thing goes on our population, at least our farming population, may perhaps exist, but it certainly cannot be said to live, at any rate in anything like the comfort it has hitherto enjoyed. More than that, I say distinctly, that I do not believe, unless we put a speedy check to it, that this system can last very long. In twenty years we have trebled our debt, we have trebled our taxes, and we have added 30 per cent. to our population. Suppose we go on for another twenty years, or even for another ten years—and I can tell the House that there are very serious signs that unless such a check as I spoke of is put we will go on in the same headlong, reckless course—why, Sir, in twenty years at the same rate of increase of population, and the same rate of increase of debt and taxation, we will find ourselves with a population of six millions and an annual taxation of ninety millions of dollars. If we pursue the course in the future we will have done nothing more than we have succeeded in doing in the twenty years between 1867 and 1887.

Mr. MITCHELL. The money would be all gone before that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps so. Unhappily, all history shows that those evil precedents do not of necessity prepare the way for better. Even were the Government honestly disposed to amend their ways it is scarcely possible for them under ordinary circumstances to put a stop to this practice of intense, insane expense. More than that, they will do well to remember that if I am correct in the statement I have made (and I challenge the strictest scrutiny), if I am correct in saying that a million or thereabouts of the native born population of Canada have sought homes elsewhere, they must remember that the tendency of that is altogether to increase. Who are the men who leave us? Everyone who pays attention to the character of that emigration knows that I am stating the simple literal fact when I say that in a most unusual proportion they are the very pick and flower and choicest portion of our population. Everybody knows, Sir, that the men who leave us are just the men whom wise statesmen would desire to retain in Canada. Now were our position such as that which formerly used to obtain between Scotland and England I could not complain so much, because if the same rule applied between ourselves and the United States as between Scotland and England we would still have the satisfaction of knowing that when our friends left us they went to swell the strength of the Empire, or the Dominion, as the case might be, in some other part of it. But, unfortunately, here the case is precisely the reverse. They are a double loss to us, because they go to swell the strength of our nearest neighbor, rival and competitor. Now, Sir, a matter of consideration which perhaps is more important than all, is, what possible available remedies are there for such a state of things? So far as I can see these remedies are four. In the first place I think that a very great improvement might be made by reforming our present most oppressive and unjust system of taxation. I say that an immense improvement might be made by so revising our constitution in the manner which we have pressed from this side of the House time and again, and in the manner which we have seen our friends—not our friends but the friends of the Government—in conference assembled have lately likewise proposed; and by so altering the constitution that this tyrannical conduct on the part of the Federal authorities towards the rights and privileges of the Local Legislatures should be put an end to forever. On the other hand that which is equally important is that this system of bribes, and all those frequent and incessant forays by various Provincial Governments on the Dominion Treasury, whenever they have been extravagant and got into a scrape, may likewise be put a stop to; and for a third remedy, Sir, that this most mischievous railway monopoly which has barred our progress up to the present time, and which has barred the settlement and prosperity of north-western Manitoba, should likewise be put an end to. But most of all and most important of all, do I believe would be the success in the obtaining of the proposition which I ask the Government to try and obtain in the resolution now in your hands, the obtaining of perfect free trade with the people of the United States. I say, Sir, that that is worth all the rest. Give us that and railway monopolies will cease to vex and harass you; give us that, Sir, and the federal relations will speedily adjust themselves as federal relations ought to do and as federal relations were intended to do; give us that, and the sting would be taken out of those tariff combines, more particularly if the United States, as there is now a good hope that it will do, proceeds to emancipate itself from the trade fetters it most foolishly put on. It may be said that this is an heroic remedy. Well, all I can say is that if it be, never in the history of this country, at any rate, was a heroic remedy more needed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Now, I am not disposed to go further with this proposition without being prepared to say that it is in the highest degree advantageous to both countries. I am very sorry for many reasons that the hon. Minister of Finance is not in his place to-day; but I dare say the House will remember how, in a fine glow of patriotic enthusiasm, that hon. gentleman, about a year ago, went the length of declaring that, if we only knew it, we in Canada possess the best half of this continent. Well, I will not venture to go quite that length, but I will say that we are able, man for man, dollar for dollar, to give a full and perfect equivalent to the United States for all we ask them to give us. I desire that it should be so. I do not believe this proposition or any other for mutual trade, can be successfully carried out unless we are able to give as much as we get; and, while I say that, while such trade would undoubtedly, in my judgment, enrich four or five million Canadians, quite as much enrichment would come to four or five million, or it may be to eight or ten million Americans. Sir, the advantages to Canada are very obvious, but I will come to those presently. In the meantime, I take this opportunity to point out that free trade with Canada would give to the United States an extremely valuable market at their very doors—that free trade with Canada would open up to American enterprise vast new areas, equal to at least a dozen new States; and, Sir, in such a case as I suppose, I have no doubt whatever that the growth of Canada would be so rapid that we should become within an extremely short time, in all probability, the most valuable customer the United States possessed.

Mr. HESSON. Hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hewers of wood and drawers of water! Sir, I have a better opinion, and I may say the Americans have a better opinion, of the ability and capacity of our fellow-countrymen than to suppose that they would consent to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. Does not my hon. friend, whose heart is better than his head in these matters—does he not know of his own experience that the Canadians who, unfortunately for us, leave this country, do not subside into hewers of wood and drawers of water on the other side of the border? But, as I have said, they take the highest places amongst the best citizens of the United States. Sir, we have, to say the least of it, enormous stores of raw material of great value to the industries of the United States, and these are very thoroughly appreciated, let me tell the hon. gentleman opposite, by American economists of very high degree. I have quoted the passage before—it may be said to be a hackneyed passage—but, nevertheless I will take the liberty of quoting again in this connection the language in which one of the most eminent living authorities on political economy, in North America, at any rate, and perhaps in the world, has described the advantages which Canada has to offer, if it is allowed to obtain free trade with the United States. This is the passage, Sir, and I make no apology for repeating it to a Canadian audience:

"North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and of the River St. Lawrence, and east of Lake Huron, south of the 45th parallel of latitude, and included mainly in the present Dominion of Canada, there is as fair a country as exists on the American continent, nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal, if not superior, as a whole, to those States in agricultural capability. It is the natural habitation on this continent of the combing-wool sheep. It is the land where grows the finest barley, which the brewing interest of the United States must have if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its annual export of eleven millions sterling of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest cattle, with qualities specially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections, and its climatic conditions, created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit to grow men. Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race; better than bonanzas of silver or rivers whose sands run gold."

Now, Sir, in all that you will find nothing of the vast virgin wheat fields of Manitoba; you will find nothing of

the vast treasure troves which still exist scarcely scratched on the slopes of the Rocky Mountains, west and north of our side of Lake Superior, and within the gorges of British Columbia. And, Sir, I would not duplicate, but I could produce twenty testimonies like this from Americans who know the value of Canada to the American people, in support of my contention that Canada most assuredly will be able to give a fair equivalent for all that, under my proposition, Canada is likely to ask the United States to give her. Does any hon. gentleman opposite choose to gainsay this proposition? Then, Sir, as it is with all the absurdity of two hostile tariffs stretching for two thousand miles between the two countries, let hon. gentlemen consider what we have done already in the way of mutual trade and intercourse. Of the \$202,000,000 which represents our total volume of trade, over \$80,000,000, in spite of all foolish artificial legislation, or nearly one-half, and that the most profitable half, is with the United States. Sir, it is an interesting question, but it is a question on which I hardly dare to offer an opinion, if, with all these obstacles deliberately put in our way, such is the force of nature that it will overleap all these artificial obstacles and secure us a trade of over \$80,000,000, what might we not obtain if perfect unrestricted free trade were obtained? I will venture to say that it is well within the bounds of possibility that with unrestricted intercourse with the United States that \$80,000,000 might within a very few years swell to \$300,000,000; and if any hon. gentleman thinks that an exaggerated or unreasonable statement, I advise him to look carefully at that remarkable portion of Mr. Nimmo's report of the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States of 1884, in which he treats of the value of the United States internal trade, of which, on my hypothesis, Canada would share an equal part *per capita*. Sir, it is an extremely curious thing that Mr. Nimmo, who is a high authority on these matters, estimates the internal or inter-state trade of the United States at six or seven times the total volume of its export and import trade. Mr. Nimmo holds that the inter-state trade amounts to ten thousand millions of dollars. That is his calculation, not mine; and, Sir, if that were the case in 1883, when Mr. Nimmo wrote, you may depend upon it that the inter-state trade is vastly larger to-day; and if there be any sort of foundation for the statement he makes, I, in naming \$300,000,000 as the possible figure to which the trade of Canada with the United States might attain, am vastly within the mark. Sir, it appears to me that the House, in its anxiety to promote certain manufactures at home, has wholly and entirely lost sight of the enormous extent to which, under a better system, export and import trade have grown elsewhere. I took the trouble the other day to see how our export and import trade compared with the trade of Australasia—the Australian Colonies and New Zealand. The facts are worthy the attention of the House, for whereas we have, according to these hon. gentlemen, 4,800,000 souls, and, according to my calculation, 4,600,000 souls, and whereas Australasia has 3,421,000 souls, I find the total export and import trade of Australasia amounted last year to £105,000,000 sterling, equal to \$525,000,000, for a population of three and a half millions, against an export and import trade of \$202,000,000 for our population of 4,600,000 or 4,800,000. Why, if our export and import trade compared *per capita* with that of Australasia, instead of being \$200,000,000 it would be \$730,000,000, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. It is, I believe, scarcely necessary for me to insist on the enormous advantage which unrestricted trade with the United States would be to us. Who does not know that for an immense number of the products of the people of this country, the United States is not merely the best market, but substantially the only market. Now, I do not blame the Government much in that they have tried, at all

hazards, to force trade among the various Provinces of this Dominion. I have always myself regarded it as very uphill work, about as profitable indeed as an attempt to make water run up hill, and the history of the Intercolonial Railway goes very far to show that I have been right in that contention. But I am going to give the House a curious practical test of the results which have attended the efforts made, I do not doubt, in all good faith, to promote inter-provincial trade among the several Provinces of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen know very well that where there is much trade between different States or countries, you have one very good practical test where the climate and conditions of life are the same, and that test is the intermixture which takes place among the various peoples trading together. Now, I have here the census return for 1881, and I have to call the attention of this House to a few very simple facts which these returns expose. I find that in 1881, there were of natives of Ontario, 105 settled in Prince Edward Island, 310 in New Brunswick, and 333 in Nova Scotia; in all 748 natives of Ontario, settled in the Maritime Provinces. I find much the same state of things in Quebec, with the exception of two counties which border on certain counties in New Brunswick, where the population on both sides are essentially of the same origin. I find, and it may interest hon. gentlemen to know it, that at that same hour and day there were, of persons of United States birth, 609 in Prince Edward Island, 5,108 in New Brunswick, 3,004 in Nova Scotia, or, in rough terms, about thirteen times as many natives of the United States in the Maritime Provinces as there are natives of Ontario. Lest any hon. gentleman should say that the natural course of immigration is westward, I took the trouble to go back a few years, and I found that, twenty-five years ago, in 1861, when we were not confederated together, when we had no Intercolonial Railway, 7,600 natives of the Maritime Provinces had taken up their quarters in Ontario; while in 1881, after fifteen years of Confederation, and knowing more about us, I suppose, only 7,200 were found there. The number had positively reduced by several hundred. Take the census returns. Turn to the Province of Lower Canada, and you will see eight or ten large, populous counties with a population of 150,000 or 200,000 souls, and not one representative of my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces is to be found there. It is almost phenomenal, and what is a very curious fact, which appears in the census returns, is that there was far more immigration in the decade from 1851 to 1861 than from 1861 to 1881, in spite of the official connection. Is it not idle to deny such facts as these? Is it not idle to fight against evidence? Must we not admit that, no matter how the Government may strive, no matter how the people may strive, you cannot establish any great inter-provincial trade from which any great profit can redound to the people of this country. What is the history of the Intercolonial Railway? It is contained here in our Public Accounts. We find that on the 30th of June, 1887, the Intercolonial Railway stood as an asset in the books of Canada for \$46,431,000; we find that the total expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for that year were \$2,828,000, and their total receipts \$2,596,000. Not only did the Intercolonial Railway not pay one copper of interest on its cost, but there is an admitted loss of \$231,000 in the running of that road for one single year, and a real loss, if we properly charge up the accounts, of \$400,000 or \$500,000; and in addition to that, every single year since I have had a seat in this House, a million dollars at least of extra expenditure has been charged to the capital account. Take the whole together, the interest and sinking fund, and they represent a dead annual loss of \$2,070,000, and the loss on running it must at least be \$400,000 or \$500,000, while we spend a million dollars on capital account every year besides, which we will continue to do for many years yet to come. Do hon. gentlemen venture to tell us there is any hope of

improvement here? Does the House remember that a few weeks ago I put the question across the floor as to the result of the first seven months' running? And does the House remember that for this current year 1888, the Intercolonial Railway has cost us just \$340,000 in seven months more than we received from it? Just \$340,000 dead loss on seven months running of the Intercolonial Railway, and I may add, as if that were not enough, that we have recently been called on to subsidize a so-called short line for the express purpose of cutting through and destroying the value of the same Intercolonial Railway which has cost us \$50,000,000, thus probably doubling the huge deficit that now exists. I think, Sir, that every hon. gentleman will admit I have shown conclusively that, do what you will, trade will seek, in spite of all your legislation, for its natural market. Who does not know, who dares deny, that the trade of Halifax naturally seeks Boston, that the trade of Toronto naturally seeks New York, that the trade of Winnipeg seeks St. Paul and the country south of it, and that the trade of Victoria naturally seeks San Francisco and the rest of the Pacific coast? There is an old saying, and I think a true saying in part, that trade follows the flag; but I tell this House that it is still more true that trade follows the people, and we have unhappily already sent out about two millions of missionaries to cultivate friendly trade relations with the United States. More than that, it is well to remember that great economic changes are in progress, that there has been a very material alteration in our position as regards the markets of the world. It is quite clear that, in older Canada, at any rate, grain production is on the wane, and that the only cereal which we can depend upon as likely to continue to be raised in large quantities is the article of barley, for which we have practically no market except in the United States. That is also true in a very high degree of the more important of our other agricultural productions, with perhaps the solitary exception of the important article of cheese. Now, I contend that for almost everything which our farmers have to sell, the United States, if only we had free and unrestricted trade with them, would afford us absolutely the best market; and I contend further that, besides being the best market, it is literally the only market for a great many important articles which we produce. See, in spite of all artificial obstacles, how huge a percentage of the total volume of our trade is the volume of our trade with the United States. Out of a total volume of trade of \$202,000,000, the United States supply the trade of \$83,000,000. Out of \$81,000,000 of exports of our own produce, we sell to the United States, or sold last year over \$36,000,000, or very nearly one-half. Out of a total of goods entered for consumption of \$ 05,000,000, we bought \$15,000,000 from the United States. And to come to details, which is necessary in order to lay the case fairly before the House, what do we find as to an enormous number of articles produced by agriculturists in this country? These figures are instructive in a very high degree. We find that, of 18,779 horses which we sold, the United States bought 18,275. We find that, of 443,000 sheep, the United States bought from us 363,000. We find that, of 116,000 cattle, in spite of all tariff restrictions, they bought from us 45,000 head. Of \$107,000 worth of poultry, the United States bought \$99,000 worth. Of about \$2,000,000 worth of eggs—\$1,850,000, to be accurate—the United States bought all. Of \$593,000 worth of hides, the United States bought \$413,000 worth. Of 527,000 tons of coal, the United States bought 404,000. Of 140,000 tons of gypsum, the United States bought all. Of iron ore, the United States bought all. Of salt, all that we sold, the United States bought from us. Of stone and marble, all that we sold, the United States bought from us. In spite of fishery disputes, and taxes I suppose, of \$6,875,000 worth of fish that we sold, the United States was our best customer and

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

bought \$2,717,000 worth. Of \$20,485,000 worth of lumber, the United States bought as nearly as possible one half, \$9,353,000. Of 1,416,000 pounds of wool, the United States bought 1,300,000 pounds. Of 9,456,000 bushels of barley, the United States again bought all. Of \$743,000 worth of hay, the United States bought \$670,000. Of \$439,000 worth of potatoes, the United States bought \$328,000. Of \$83,000 worth of general vegetables, they bought \$75,000 worth. Of \$254,000 worth of miscellaneous agricultural products, the United States bought \$249,000 worth, without speaking of innumerable smaller articles, such as apples, flax and a great variety of other things; and, if the duties were once removed, no one who has ever been in Manitoba and the North-West but knows that the United States would become by all odds our best customer for a great deal of our high class wheat. Why, in the mere article of manufactures, the United States, out of a total of \$3,079,000, bought \$1,289,000 worth, and of miscellaneous articles the United States bought \$559,000 worth out of a total of \$644,000. There are two things to which I want to call the attention of all the members of this House. One is that, for very obvious reasons, our exports to the United States are largely undervalued. They do not at all fairly represent the amount we sell. So long as they maintain a high tariff, it is the obvious interest of every Canadian seller to underestimate the value of the articles he has to sell, and, as everyone knows, the thing is habitually and constantly done. In another respect it is very important that the House should know that in the case of an enormous number of the articles to which I have called specific attention, there is room for well nigh unlimited expansion. Given free trade, given unrestricted intercourse, and that trade might assume nearly unlimited proportions in regard to a great many of those articles; and these are two facts which should be borne in mind when we are considering the possible development of our American trade. Now, not only have I shown that, even fettered and thwarted and hampered as it is, our trade with the United States forms an immense proportion of our total trade with all the world, but I ask the House to consider what sort of a market it is that these resolutions of mine propose to open to the people of Canada. Why, look for one moment at the host of great and growing cities which stud our southern frontier alone—Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Boston and New York. Those cities alone which I have named, with their environs, contain a population of something like five millions of people who are the very best customers on the face of the earth. Consider how conveniently they are situated to our markets. There is hardly one of all those I have named which is more than twelve hours distant from a Canadian market. The Canadian seller might talk over a telephone with the American buyer in almost every one of those cities. Then look at our railway system. I speak more particularly of the railway system of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Look at the huge sums we have expended upon it, and the small returns up to date which that large outlay has brought. The returns show that we have about 12,000 miles of railway all over the Dominion, a very large percentage of which is centred in Ontario and Quebec. These railways are alleged to have cost \$653,000,000, and, although I believe a considerable amount of that is water—as it is technically called—I believe our system of railways represents an outlay, or would be worth at any rate about \$500,000,000. Now, to-day the gross earnings of those roads are put down at about \$33,000,000, the expense of operating them at over \$24,000,000, and it is known that the amount returned as the expense of operating them does not include all that ought properly to be charged to that account. That \$653,000,000 of nominal cost, therefore, does not to-day on the average pay 1½ per cent. on the nominal expenditure. Give us unrestricted intercourse with the

United States, and I tell you that, as far at all events as the central Provinces are concerned, you will double the gross earnings and treble or quadruple the net profits of these railways, and from a very poor property convert these vast amounts, which have been largely supplied from abroad, into a very good, paying, profitable investment, to the great advantage of the people of Canada as well as to that of the men who originally supplied the money. Then another point. Let us consider how our population is distributed. We all know the natural impediments which arise to inter-provincial trade. We all know how conveniently the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia are situated for trade with the United States; and how exceedingly inconveniently they are placed for trade with the central Provinces. I apprehend that no man on either side will dispute my position that to the Maritime Provinces, at any rate, to Manitoba, to the North-West Territory, to British Columbia, free and unrestricted trade with the United States is of the most enormous importance. But, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the country I know best—old Canada, from Quebec to Sarnia—how is the population distributed there? Why, Sir, it is known to every man here that nineteen-twentieths of the population of these two great Provinces is so centred that it is literally within five hours rail, on the average, to the American frontier. Then consider the advantages of such a market. Remember that it is one of the most rapidly growing markets in the world. Within the last twenty-five years the American market has grown from 30,000,000 to over 60,000,000 of consumers, and it has not stopped growing. In all human probability before the next census is taken in 1890, the statisticians of the United States compute that the population will have grown to something like 64,000,000 or 65,000,000. More than that, the population, especially the population of the great cities I have alluded to, is one of the very richest populations on the earth. There is no population in the world, keen bargainers though the Americans are, no doubt, with whom it is so desirable to establish free trade relations for the agriculturists of any country, as it is with the population of the great American cities. It is perfectly well known to all who are familiar with that people, that there is no market, I repeat, on the face of the earth, where the man who has a first-rate article, particularly of food, to sell, is half so sure of obtaining a first-rate price for it, as in the United States. Nowhere have I known men who spend so lavishly on their own personal living and for their own personal comfort, as the great millionaires, and for that matter the great bulk of the population of the great cities of the United States. And these, Sir, are reasons which make it more and more desirable to us that we should obtain free and unrestricted intercourse with them, so that we can take advantage of the very great facilities which our natural position, in Ontario and Quebec more especially, gives for trading with those great centres. They are at our very door. We do not require to make long journeys in order to make the acquaintance of our American customers. As I said before, we can literally talk to them from the telephone. At the worst, a few hours' journey by rail will bring us face to face with them. We have no middlemen to fear in dealing with the United States. We can thoroughly understand the market, or it is our own fault if we do not. Every merchant, every man of business, knows what an enormous advantage it is to any country that the men who sell should understand thoroughly what the purchaser wants to buy. But, Sir, I do not know that it would be necessary for our people to give themselves the slightest trouble. I remember, and I dare say there are plenty of gentlemen who remember, what habitually took place under the old Reciprocity treaty, when Canada prospered more than she has ever done since. Why, Sir, when we had something approaching to free intercourse with the United States there was

this curious peculiarity, that the buyer sought the sellers and not the seller the buyer. It was a matter of everyday occurrence, particularly in the Province of Ontario, that our farmers, during the existence of the Reciprocity treaty, were visited daily, and almost hourly, by American purchasers who were ready to buy the apple off the tree, the crop on the ground, even the ungrown food, if the farmer was willing to sell it. Again, I repeat that there is no market where a man who has got a good article to sell has anything like as good a chance of selling it as the people of Canada, and particularly of Ontario and Quebec, have in dealing with the American people. Sir, I have been taken to task on more than one occasion for venturing to say, what I now repeat, that in my poor judgment, one native born Canadian was worth more to this country than any half-dozen imported immigrants, and I say that without, in the slightest degree, desiring to reflect on the many good, worthy and industrious men who, in time past, have cast in their lot with us. My opinion always has been that as a taxpayer, and as contributing to the development of the country, one native born Canadian is worth half-a-dozen of any other nationality. Sir, in the same way, one United States customer is worth to us in Canada, half-dozen English customers, and half-a-dozen customers of any other nationality. And what is true of them to us, is true of us to them. I say that to the United States the trade of Canada is worth a great deal more than our present numbers would indicate; I say that our trade is worth that of many times such populations as those with which the Americans are now attempting to open up trade relations in Mexico, or in South America, or any other of those countries which extend below them, more especially if we prosper largely. Now, it is a curious thing—I do not know whether it has attracted the attention of any members of this House—that after all we have talked, after all we have said about the desirability of extending our trade with foreign countries, these same trade returns that I have here, go to show in a very remarkable way that we have practically only two customers, after all said and done—one of these customers are the people of England and her colonies, and the other are the people of the United States. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen have considered that fact, but if they will look at the returns for 1887 they will see that of our own produce, Canada, in all, exported \$30,960,000, of which she sent to the United States, \$35,250,000; to Great Britain, \$38,750,000; to the British Colonies, about \$3,000,000, and to all the rest of the world, \$3,800,000—\$77,000,000 to the United States, to Great Britain and her colonies, and less than \$4,000,000 to all the rest of the world put together. In 1873, to show that this is no mere casual accident, I find that an identically similar state of things prevailed. Then our total exports amounted to \$76,500,000. The United States bought \$36,755,000; Great Britain bought \$31,421,000; the British Colonies bought \$3,953,000; all others put together bought \$4,500,000. So when we trace the course of our commerce down for these 15 years, we find that it is literally true, for practical purposes, that we have but two customers, as yet, of any importance in the world, one the United States and the other the people of Great Britain and her colonies. And what is true of exports is true likewise of imports. Take 1887; we imported a total for consumption of \$105,639,000 worth. We bought from the United States, \$45,107,000 worth; we bought from Great Britain, \$44,962,000. Of \$145,000,000 worth, \$90,000,000 were purchased from our two chief customers. In 1873 we purchased \$47,750,000 worth from the United States, from Great Britain \$78,500,000 worth, or \$115,000,000 out of \$127,000,000. That I contend is a matter of first-rate importance, for this reason: I have shown the House, that, say what we will, we have but two great customers, Great Britain and the United States. One admits our productions without

the slightest let or hindrance: we and all the nations of the world in common with us have a perfectly free entrance to British markets; in the other case, partly by our own doings and partly by the action of the United States, the most formidable artificial restrictions are imposed on our commerce. But still the fact remains that we have but those two customers. Which of the two is likely to be more important to us? Well, there is an easy test. Twenty years ago the British population was about 30,000,000; to-day the British population is about 35,000,000. Twenty or twenty-five years ago the American population was 30,000,000; to-day the American population is 60,000,000 or 61,000,000. Judge, then, for yourselves which of those two countries, situated as they are, is likely to afford the greatest possible benefit to Canadian trade.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it will, I do not doubt, be a relief to the House, as it certainly is to myself, to be able to inform them that I do not think I will require to tax their attention with any great array of figures from this time out. I cannot but feel that I am indebted to both sides of the House for the uncommon patience with which they listened to the somewhat protracted array of statistics which it was my necessary duty to inflict upon them before dinner, Sir, when we separated I had just completed explaining to the House upon what grounds I based my statement relative to the movement of the population, on what grounds it was that I held that unrestricted trade with the United States would be likely to develop an enormous volume of trade between this country and that. I had also taken the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the unfortunate failure, from causes which are patent to all of us, of our attempts to create any great inter-provincial trade; and I had pointed out a fact, which, I think, has not always been borne in mind, the great and growing character of the American market, and the plain and obvious fact that we in Canada, from our geographical position, are to a very great extent shut in practically to two markets only, the markets of England and her colonies, and the markets of the United States. Now, Sir, it becomes my duty to consider, first of all, what classes of our population are likely to benefit by free and unrestricted trade with the United States; or possibly I should say, what classes of our population are not likely to be immensely benefited by free and unrestricted trade in that quarter. I will then have to consider the objections which have been urged from time to time in the press and elsewhere against propositions more or less analogous to that which I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and then I may have a few general remarks to make on the position in which we find ourselves to-day; but, as I have said, I trust to be able to spare the House for the most part from a repetition of those necessary but somewhat tedious statistics which occupied the major portion of the previous discussion. Sir, I think all the House will agree with me in saying that, whoever may or may not be benefited by this proposition, there can really be no ground for doubting that the whole great agricultural class from one end of the Dominion to the other will be enormous gainers if the markets of the United States are thrown open to them. I think, Sir, that no man will gainsay, least of all the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, that the fishermen of those Provinces will gain enormously from access to the United States markets. Surely no man will gainsay, and least of all my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Charlton), that the lumbermen of Canada and all the vast interests connected with them will gain enormously from access to the United States markets. The miners will gain enormously, the whole vast

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

number of persons and the whole interests representing, as I have pointed out, \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 of capital, largely connected with the railroad and transportation service generally of this country, will also all gain enormously by free trade with the United States. Not only that but all those great classes collectively representing the great producing classes of this Dominion and including the vast majority of manufacturers who have gained their living practically by ministering to and serving the classes I have named, must of necessity obtain great increase of prosperity if you increase the prosperity of the class I have named. More than that I believe that although a great deal has been said—foolishly, I think—as to the risk the manufacturers of Canada will run in the event of our establishing unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I believe that there is good grounds for saying that all manufacturers who deserve to flourish in Canada on account of pluck, and capital, and energy, will prosper likewise enormously if that great market be opened to them. It is due, I think, to the *Mail* newspaper to say that the energy and enterprise which that newspaper, in common with others, has displayed, in interviewing the great employers of labor throughout this country, has resulted at least in showing that those who are the best and stand highest in the opinion of the people as manufacturers are quite prepared, if you give them the United States market, to take their manufacturing existence in their hands and have no doubt of the successful result. Who do the classes I have named represent, together with the classes who are dependent upon them? They represent nineteen-twentieths of the whole people of this country; I might with truth say ninety-nine-hundredths of the people of this country, and they will, beyond all dispute, be greatly benefited if you can obtain free and unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Now, another side of the question to be considered, is, who are the parties who are likely to lose if we establish free trade with the United States? I do not deny that when you introduce any great measure into this country that there will be considerable economic disturbance and that some industries may be injured which we would like to preserve. That fact I do not deny. No great change ever has occurred or ever will occur without inconvenience in some way. No great change in machinery, for instance, can be introduced without rendering much existing machinery worthless, and without injuring a certain portion of the community, but I doubt if any great measure was ever proposed which was so little likely to injure those classes of the community whom the best minds in the community would desire to save, as this present one. I can see that certain interests will be injured, no doubt. I can see, for instance, that those worthy gentlemen whose proceedings are now being investigated by the committee presided over by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), those gentlemen who are, as I may say, pushing the protective doctrine to its legitimate development and evolution—I can well conceive that the combines and trusts will have their troubles considerably increased, even if they escape the hon. gentleman's committee, by free and unrestricted trade with the United States. I can conceive, I honestly confess, that there are other industries, not very numerous but important, and some of them possibly dear to hon. members of this House, which may be injuriously affected if this policy should be carried into practical effect. There can be no doubt of one thing and that is that if this policy be carried into effect it will mean for a considerable time to come the enforcement of a much needed economy. I see, for instance, that devoted and most industrious band of public servants who act from time to time as missionaries on the Government's behalf in disputed elections, may suffer. They may be dismounted and obliged to go a-foot, and it may be barefoot too. I say also that there is a danger, and I do not wish to

gainsay it, that the electioneering cornucopia may run dry, and that if you adopt the system it will enforce, in your own despite, a rigorous economy. You will have to carry your bye-elections, or not to carry them, as the case may be, without promises of piers, and harbours, and post offices, and railway grants. There is danger, and a serious danger, too, that the subscriptions of the manufacturers' association to certain peculiar funds will grow smaller by degrees and beautifully less and may vanish altogether. It is possible, and it is a serious thing, that the monopolists may find that their occupation is gone, and the worship of the great goddess of monopoly brought to naught. It is possible that the trade profits and emoluments of that valuable class of men, known as practical politicians, may be very greatly interfered with. All those things I see are possible if this measure be put in force, and if, as I stated, strict economy become, as it inevitably will in such a case become, the order of the day. Now, I do not deny—I never have denied—that, looking at the way in which the Government has been administered in this country for many a long day, those are grave and serious charges, almost of a revolutionary character, and I can well understand that the venerable leader and father of this House, like the Duke of Wellington on a similar occasion, may shake his reverend locks and murmur to himself that he does not see how the Queen's Government in Canada is going to be carried on any longer in his own peculiar fashion. Knowing as I do how excellently well affected this House has always shown itself to vested interests, it may be—having regard to the fact that although those interests are few that they are very important and very dear to many hon. and estimable members—that the House may say that it is better that the ninety-nine-hundredths should go on and toil and moil, and, as the reports of the Labor Commission which so lately sat in Montreal show, may starve, and suffer, and die, for the benefit of those righteous men who earn cent per cent. dividends, and who supply the money to keep this best of all possible Governments in power. Those, Sir, are the state of things which exist, as I am enabled, in a hurried analysis, to judge. This, Sir, is a tolerably correct statement of the men, and of the classes, who profit, and who will lose, by unrestricted reciprocity and free trade with the United States. The House will remember, I dare say, how I showed that there is ground for expecting an unprecedented and enormous increase of the whole volume of our trade, from one end of this country to the other, enriching all save the classes that I have excepted. And now comes the question, what is it that forbids the banns? What are the objections? What are the reasons which can fairly be urged by any hon. gentleman against this proposition? If I am correct or even approximately correct in my views as to the benefits which would result to the people of Canada from the adoption of this policy, what are the objections which can be urged for the purpose of keeping asunder two countries which—I say it in no spirit of irreverence—God has joined for purposes of mutual benefit? Sir, I have heard some hon. gentlemen, or the organs of some hon. gentlemen, contend that, forsooth, however desirable this thing may be, the consequences of our own folly during the past ten or twenty years have been such that we cannot afford to have it; we will lose revenue—we have been bled so much that we cannot afford to be cured; for that is the argument. Sir, the case is bad, I grant; but the case is not so bad as that. But briefly their argument is this: they admit, or some of them admit, that this thing in itself, *per se*, would be very desirable; but they tell us that we cannot afford to lose all the income which we derive from the customs duties that we obtain from the American imports. Now, Sir, I do not suppose there is any man in Canada, certainly not one man on the floor of this House, who appreciates more thoroughly than I do, or who has

declared from his place more emphatically than I, how very grievously the whole future of Canada has been injured and damaged and mortgaged by what I have repeatedly called the insane folly that has beset the people and the Government of Canada in heaping up their debt and taxation at the moment when their great rival is reducing both. Sir, I am in the judgment of this House when I say that no man ever strove harder than did my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, when he was Prime Minister of Canada, to put a check to that extravagance and folly, and his efforts were crowned with a good measure of success; and it is well to take this opportunity of reminding this House and the people of Canada that, if this be a desirable thing and if all that stands in our way is the financial difficulty, had Mr. Mackenzie's policy been maintained, and his Administration been continued in office, and had the people of Canada desired to make an alliance with the United States, there would have been no financial difficulty to grapple with. I say, and I speak with knowledge, that I could have done it had I been left in office. I say it would have been an easy task for an honest and intelligent Administration to have kept down the total expenditure of Canada to \$26,000,000 or \$27,000,000 at the uttermost, and the total taxation of Canada to \$20,000,000 at the uttermost, and withal to have placed half a million of the best settlers in the world in Manitoba, to their great profit and ours. Now, Sir, I wish to face this question squarely and fairly. I do not, for my part at all, pretend to tell this House that if we obtain immediately free and unrestricted intercourse with the United States, there might not be some temporary inconvenience accruing to us in the matter of the revenue; but Sir, I have this to point out: This proposition of mine does not involve the addition of one cent or one farthing to the burdens of the people, but much the contrary. We do not purpose, Sir, as some have proposed in discussing schemes for the future of Canada, to add many millions a year to our annual expenditure. We are not talking, Sir, at this present moment of raising \$37,000,000 in place of \$30,000,000. We are simply talking of raising \$30,000,000, by a small alteration in the mode of taxation and by a readjustment of taxation in general. I repeat, it is possible, though not by any manner of means inevitable or necessary, that you may have to alter your mode of collection. It is not necessary in the slightest degree that you should add one penny to the total aggregate burdens of the people, but the contrary. Sir, allow me to say that this dread, whether it be real or pretended, of a possible recourse for our revenue to direct taxation, has always struck me as a most exceedingly weak argument in a case like this. In the first place, Sir, *non constat* that you will require to have any direct taxation at all; let the House remember that. There is enormous room for judicious economy in our present administration of the revenue. I do not say hon. gentlemen opposite can economise; but, Sir, I think I could put my hand on members of this House who could some economy. While we did economise, we got small thanks for it; but perhaps the people are wiser now. Nay, most assuredly the people are wiser now; and could we appeal to the people on a fair division of the constituencies, with honest returning officers and deputy returning officers, without the scale weighted against us with grants for piers, harbors and bridges and railway branches, and every form of political influence, then, Sir, I think hon. gentlemen opposite would find that the results—I speak for my own Province, at least—will be as correctly reflected in the Parliament at Ottawa as they are in the Parliament at Toronto. However, Sir, we will pass over a point on which I can hardly expect those hon. gentlemen to agree with me. I desire to point out that the fundamental fact, for fact it is, on which this whole argument is based, is this: Give us free and unrestricted intercourse with the United States, and by that act you enor-

mously increase the whole income of the vast majority of the people of Canada. You will enable them, and as I believe almost instantaneously, almost within year and day, to buy a great quantity of goods which they cannot now buy, a large proportion of which will be dutiable goods; and by consequence there is good and sound ground, if you admit my preliminary fact to be true, for saying that it is altogether likely that the remaining taxes will yield quite as much as those we now have in our federally restricted system. But bear in mind that no increase whatever is contemplated; all that is required is a simple re-adjustment. It is possible—we will admit for argument's sake—that the hon. gentlemen are right, and that my contention is wrong that the people will grow enormously richer and yet will not consume more dutiable goods, though I know of no case in which that case has occurred. We will suppose, for argument's sake, that we have to face this bugbear of direct taxation—direct taxation, be it remembered, not for all our revenue, but a trifling portion of it alone. Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House in that connection to certain important facts. First of all, no man who has paid any attention to this subject will, I think, dare to deny the fact, which I think is recognised by every political economist, that direct taxation properly levied takes a great deal less out of the pocket of the people than indirect taxation; most of all, indirect taxation, levied as our system of indirect taxation is levied now. Sir, I desire to say that, in my judgment, we ought not, I do not think that Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish, to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fishermen, on the miners, on the lumbermen, on all the great producing classes in this community. I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper place and time, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hard-working, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it, although I doubt greatly whether you need, with proper economy, have recourse to it, that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable, well-to-do, monied classes must be made to pay their fair proportion—no more should be asked—to the burdens of the country. This proportion they most assuredly do not contribute to-day, and never will, under a system of purely indirect taxation. Further, we should bear in mind, as these hon. gentlemen are so intensely desirous of copying English precedents, that it is the system of the mother country in a very high degree; and if that precedent be followed here two very good results will accrue. First of all, Sir, you will remove that crying injustice of which I spoke, and by which the poor man contributes out of all proportion to-day, out of his scanty means, to the support of our Government; and in the next place, you will produce this other admirable result, of giving all these respectable, well-to-do, monied men a keen practical interest in watching the public expenditure and checking extravagance. You will do more, if it must be done by that means—you will create a sound, wholesome, healthy public opinion, the want of which is so great an evil in Canada to-day. I dwell on that particularly, because I am aware that, at this very moment, there are certain gentlemen, presumably in the interest of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are losing no opportunity to impress upon the farmers of this country in particular, that if we get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, the federal revenues will have to be raised by direct taxation, levied in the same way as the municipal taxes are to-day. I for one will protest to the uttermost of my power against any such injustice; I for one declare here, speaking on my

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

responsibility in my place in Parliament, speaking with a knowledge of the subject, that our present system is monstrously unjust to the poor man and too favorable to the rich man, and that injustice ought to be redressed, not by adding to the burden of the farmer, the laborer, the artisan, the mechanic, the fisherman, the miner, the lumberman, but by removing the burdens from these and placing them upon the shoulders on which by right they ought to fall. It is almost too ridiculous. Here we are, here we have been, adding millions a year to the taxes of this country and without the slightest regard to the permanent welfare of the people; and we are told, forsooth, that although we may, without the least injury to the community, add many millions a year to our taxation, we must not alter the mode of collection one hair's breadth under penalty of producing the most terrible results. One is tempted to remember Oxen's old saying: "*Quam parva sapientia mundus gubernatur*"—"With how little wisdom the world is governed." Why, if one-quarter of what I heard be true, the pickings and stealings of half-a-dozen combines from the people would more than equal any sum which it may be necessary to raise by indirect taxation. Our sage economists, forsooth, are not frightened in the least at having run up our taxes in ten years from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 nominally, really to \$40,000,000. I say again if the results were less grave, it would be positively ridiculous that such an argument should be presented to us. What does it mean? We have been so wasteful, forsooth, that we cannot afford to become rich. Now, the argument and the motive of that argument, to my mind, was a very transparent fallacy, a fallacy so transparent that in earlier life I would have thought it impossible for reasonably intelligent men to have been deluded by it. But I have lived and have learned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have learned a good deal. It used to be said: "Surely, in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird;" but as Mr. Lowell remarks in a rather celebrated political ditty of his:

"They did not know everything down in Judee."

And most assuredly when King Solomon penned the remark I have quoted, he never heard of that very remarkable bird *Canadensis anser Conservativus*.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An hon. gentleman asks me, how do I know? Well, I have not certainly had the advantage of living in the days of King Solomon, but I do know well enough the doctrine on which all naturalists agree, and that is, the wild fowl of that particular species always follow their leader; and I think we know that their leader's line of flight is not in the least degree likely to lead him towards the Holy Land; quite the contrary. There is another shaft in these gentlemen's quiver. Having proved to their own advantage, first of all, that Canada positively cannot afford to spend one dollar to gain a pound, having demonstrated that, according to the dictates of Canadian political economy, it is always more expensive to pay two cents cash for an article than four cents on credit—which is about the difference between direct and indirect taxation—these hon. gentlemen, the names of some of whom, to my certain knowledge were appended to a certain remarkable document, bearing date 1849, have been seized in their later days with an extraordinary paroxysm of loyalty; and to back their other startling propositions they lay down this impossible, and still more startling, proposition: If you make the Canadian people rich by free trade with the United States, if you make them more prosperous, happy and con-

tented than they unfortunately are at present, there will be great danger to their loyalty. That is the position, in almost so many words. Has the hon. the First Minister been studying the political testament of that distinguished philanthropist, the late Cardinal Richelieu, and come to the conclusion that there is danger should the people wax fat and sleepy? If he has, he will do well to remember what occurred in France in 1788, after a century and a quarter's application of Cardinal Richelieu's maxims, and I warn him, if he perseveres in his course, he may find that in 1888 he is nearing the beginning of the end. I would not have alluded to this but that already across this House, time and again, there have been flung taunts to hon. gentlemen here, that we, forsooth, are disloyal because we desire to add greatly to the prosperity of Canada. I would have thought that those hon. gentlemen who ten years ago overrode all the protestations of Mr. Mackenzie and myself, when we pointed out to them that what they were doing was to adopt a policy which was a mere servile imitation of the American policy, which was in direct contradiction to the settled policy of the Empire. I say that these men would have done well, recollecting what occurred at that time, to have spared us all these disquisitions on the loyalty of the Opposition. Do we not recollect when we showed there was danger in the policy they adopted, how we were told that, if the so-called and mis-called National Policy was bad for British connection, so much the worse for British connection. These men have not hesitated to carry out a policy which has been responsible in my judgment for driving two millions of Her Majesty's North American subjects into exile, and which had risked the loss of all British North America to the Empire. It is time that we should clear our minds of cant on this subject. I have, and I have as good a right as any hon. gentleman to have, the interest of the Empire as much at heart as any man on that side of the House. I have considered, to the best of my opportunities and to the best of my ability, what policy in this crisis is the best in the real interests of the British Empire. I know that, in what I now say, I am but expressing the views of some of the ablest and highest of British statesmen, when I say that one great peril that threatens the British Empire in this day is the state of most dangerous isolation into which she has come. What is her position to-day in the view of some of the ablest of her statesmen? It is that she has not a friend of a high class power in the world to-day. She is at enmity more or less with France by reason of her occupation of Egypt and her control of the Suez Canal; she cannot hope that Germany will raise her little finger in her behalf; she cannot expect any help from Austro-Hungary; and who does not know that the Indian taxpayer is groaning under the additional burdens imposed upon him for the purpose of checking an anticipated Russian attack on India? That is a dangerous position of isolation, and I say that there is but one first-class power in the world with whom England can make a firm and lasting alliance, and that is her and our kinsmen and friends on the other side of the border. I have always felt and I have not hesitated to express it to English statesmen as well as on the floor of this House, that the real problem which to-day awaits the decision of England is how, in the first place, by fair and honorable means—and no other should be used—to conciliate the good-will of the people of the United States, and to repair that most atrocious blunder which was committed a hundred years ago, and which led to most violent collision between the two great divisions of the English race. That is one problem, and there is another which is most closely connected and interwoven with it, to the solution of which I would desire to lend my humble aid, and that is to add to the conciliation of the good-will of the United States, the conciliation and pacification of Ireland; and those problems are closely woven together. In this project which we are now bringing forward, if you

15-1888-3

take a broad view of the whole situation, if you remember what Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has taken good care to din into our ears and into the ears of the Government opposite during his recent visit, if you remember that the interest of England in maintaining friendly relations with the United States is so vast and so great that it outweighs very many times the comparatively trifling profit which she can derive from our trade, then I think you will see there is good ground for the position which I take, and that is that, by entering into close commercial relations with the United States, by establishing a close and friendly intercourse with them, we will render to the Empire the greatest service that any colony or dependency ever rendered to the parent State. It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to be set up as an insuperable ground of objection, that, when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted trade with the United States, you must thereby, of necessity, discriminate against English manufactures and the manufactures of all other countries except the United States. Now, that is true. I admit that. More than that, I will admit that, *prima facie*, what we propose to-day is a very unusual thing. I will admit—I am in nowise disposed to shrink from any argument which can be fairly advanced—I admit frankly that, when a semi-dependent State, when a colony proposes in one breath to tax the goods of the parent State and admit the goods of a foreign State free, while at the same time the parent State admits our goods and the goods of other countries free, and the foreign State taxes those goods very heavily, it is a very unusual thing indeed. I grant that it is clean against all formulas. I do not deny that. I admit that it appears to be reversing the action of 100 years ago when England lost half of this continent because she endeavored to tax their goods without giving them representation, and I admit that we are going a little far in taxing her goods and not the goods of the people of the United States. I grant that this needs explanation, and I am prepared to say that I can give a full explanation why in the interests of England itself this thing should be done. I think I have stated the case as strongly as hon. gentlemen can well desire. Now, let us first of all look at the material results which will flow to England should this discrimination take place, and here let me say what is obvious to everyone who has given the subject a second thought, that, in our peculiar geographical position towards the United States, it is perfectly apparent that we cannot hope to gain free intercourse and unrestricted reciprocity with them without discriminating against the goods of other countries, unless and until the United States are prepared to go in for free trade with all the world, in which case our proposition would not be necessary. The thing, I grant, is of the essence of the bargain. I am not in the least degree desirous of concealing that fact, but, so far as the material side is concerned, the practical results of assimilating our tariff in certain points to the American tariff as against England have been immensely and I suspect purposely exaggerated. In the first place, the House ought to remember that at this very day our tariff is pretty nearly as hostile to English manufactures as that of the United States—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very nearly if not quite, but let me finish my sentence—and that there is very strong ground indeed, if things remain unchanged, for believing that in two or three years from this date our tariff will be much the more onerous of the two. Then it is well to bear in mind that, the tariff to the contrary notwithstanding, England has always managed to carry on a large trade with the United States, and especially with the northern portion of it. If I had the time at my disposal, I could advance very good reasons for believing that, suppose things remain exactly as they are, notwithstanding that the English would continue to drive a large trade with us

they would have a trade relatively much larger with the people of the United States, and, therefore, the absolute loss to them would be small. But I return again to the fundamental fact on which, as I said, this whole argument rests. There can be no doubt, I think, that if we succeed in getting unrestricted trade, we shall become much richer, and if we become much richer there is no doubt that we shall buy a much larger quantity of English goods than we do at present, though perhaps not in the same line. I believe that the result of England giving us a free hand in this matter, would be simply to make some little alteration in the character but not in the quantity of the goods she sells us, and that practically she would lose nothing in a material point of view. More than that, I know something of English manufacturers. I may say, by-the-by, that that is a difficulty that it will be time enough to face when it arises. Our first business is to ascertain on what terms and conditions we can obtain unrestricted trade with the United States, when we know on what terms and conditions we can trade with them, then, perhaps some difficulty may arise, and that difficulty will have to be met. But I know something, as well as the hon. gentlemen, of English manufacturers, I know they are an eminently practical, hard-headed class of men. I know very well that English manufacturers, so long as their goods are excluded from North American markets, care precious little by whose name the ukase is signed which excludes them, whether it bears the name of Grover Cleveland, or Charles Tupper, or Mackenzie Bowell. Sir, you may depend upon it that English manufacturers, at any rate, are not to be caught with chaff. They understand that 80 per cent. duty on goods is 80 per cent. duty, whether it be imposed by an American Congress or a Canadian House of Commons, and they do not care very much who imposes it, so long as the duty is there. Sir, while I speak of these things as regards the mere material aspect of the case, in relation to English manufacturers, there are other arguments which the people of Canada may very justly use toward English statesmen and the English people. I say that the past history of this country supplies all Canadians who care to study that history, with abundant arguments. Mr. Speaker, the position of Canada is exceptional, in many important respects unique, so far as regards England. I am not going to dwell much on the fact that we are more than a colony, that we are a Dominion, charged with the responsibility of managing the affairs of half a continent, and entitled to claim for herself greater privileges and greater powers than should be granted to any ordinary colony. I do not dwell on that, but I will dwell a little on certain features in our past history which I contend gives us a right to claim to be heard in this matter. Sir, England is the great colonising nation of modern times. England has obtained colonies by exchange, by barter, by conquest, by direct purchase, by voluntary and involuntary settlement, and of all her hundred colonies, England has but one, and that is the Premier Province of this Dominion, which was originally taken possession of, and has since been held by men who did not occupy or settle through any of the ordinary motives that induce men to forsake their native homes and to give up their broad fields and pleasant lands for the purpose of maintaining their allegiance to the English flag. Now, Sir, this question is being argued, to some extent, on the sentimental side, and I am ready for my friends there. To tell you a profound secret, Mr. Speaker, which I trust will not go outside the walls of this House, I have never been able exactly to understand the very deep obligation under which the people of Canada lay to England. In point of fact I rather think that the obligation is the other way. I do not think, Sir, that although we have cherished, I hope we will continue to cherish, the most friendly feeling toward the parent state, I do not

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

think for my part, that we are under any deep debt of gratitude to English statesmen, that we owe them much, unless, perchance, it may be the duty, as Christian men, to forgive them for the atrocious blunders which have marked every treaty, or transaction, or negotiation that they have ever had with the United States where the interest of Canada were concerned, from the days of Benjamin Franklin to this hour, not excepting their first or second treaty of Washington. I say there is no man here who does not know that from the very first hour, that the United Empire Loyalists took possession of Ontario and held it for the British Crown, down to this year 1888, there never has been a time except, perhaps, the short paroxysm of the American Civil War, when the people could not have greatly benefited their material interests by throwing in their lot with the people on the other side. We have not chosen to do so, we do not now want to do so, we desire to maintain our autonomy. On that point, I am quite at one with some hon. gentlemen on the other side. But I say at this moment, a remarkable opportunity has presented itself in which a little skilful statesmanship and common honesty would enable us, at one and the same time, to obtain great benefit for ourselves, and to render a most important service to the whole Empire by aiding to reknit together those two great divisions of one race which were unfortunately sundered by the blunders and incompetence of English statesmen 100 years ago. Sir, if the hon. gentleman chooses, as I have said, to argue this matter on the ground of sentiment, all I can say is that a Canadian who understands and feels what his country's history means, will not find great difficulty on any such grounds. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I think that in this matter, supposing that we dismiss all other considerations, and look on it as a pure matter of right, we have some right to follow the example of England herself. No man knows better than the hon. gentleman opposite that England has always adopted a very different rule and measure, in dealing with the United States, from that which she has adopted in dealing with any country under heaven. I dare say that English statesmen could bring forward good reasons for their departure from their ordinary customs in such cases. Now, I am not here to criticise her right to do what she has done, at any rate, I am not criticising the reasons for doing what she has done, but I say that England has not hesitated, as the English plenipotentiary the other day was good enough to tell us, to give up the admitted legal rights of Canada for the purpose of conciliating the good will of the people of the United States. So be it. We may have to bow, probably we will have to bow. But by every parity of reasoning, we, under these circumstances, are justified in saying to England: We give up at your behest, for your benefit, and for the sake of the Empire, our admitted legal rights, now you make us a little concession of your admitted legal rights in a matter in which we do not deny them, for your benefit and ours, and for the sake of conciliating the good-will of the American people. Sir, I said that was the lowest view. I believe that the great mass of Englishmen who have made investments in Canada, and notably in Canadian railways, would, like ourselves, be entirely satisfied if we carried out this proposition, and I believe that if all English investors in Canada were polled after having the case properly explained to them, they would go with us in saying that it was in the interests of England, that it was in the highest and largest sense for the interests of the Empire, that we should be permitted, if we desire to make such a bargain as this with the people of the United States. Sir, there is a third argument, which requires perhaps a little more consideration. We are asked when we make, or when we suggest such a proposition to be made, not by the hon. gentleman opposite, who has maintained a most judicious reticence so far

on this question, as I have noticed, but we are asked by some of his followers and myrmidons: What grounds have you for believing that, if you make this proposition, the people of the United States will agree? Well, Sir, what I have to say in answer to that is this: When two men are desirous of making a bargain, or when one man is desirous of making a bargain for mutual benefit with another party, the time has come to enquire and negotiate on what terms and conditions a mutually advantageous bargain can be made. I say, moreover, that this is, even in a pre-eminent degree, a matter for the two peoples of the United States and Canada. This is a thing which, if done at all, has got to be done in the broad light of day, not in dim diplomatic twilight. We know how the American Executive is constituted and how the American Congress is constituted. We know that this thing can only be done with the consent of Congress, and, practically, with the consent of the American people, and, therefore, it is that I have ventured to take, as I have said, the responsibility of bringing this matter forward on the floor of Parliament, because I know, and hon. gentlemen know, that it is not in their power to make an agreement behind backs with the American Executive which would be in any degree binding on the American people. More than that: I say the present moment is eminently in our favor for coming to the Americans with some such proposition as this, and I have good and fair proof of what I state. In the first place, everybody knows that an enormous reduction in the American tariff is eminent. Things have come to such a pass there that the people will insist on a very great reduction and alteration in their tariff. In the next place, we have got a very direct and very important invitation, or at all events a very important expression of the good-will of the man who stands in the highest place to-day in the American Republic, and who I trust for their sake will continue to enjoy the confidence of his countrymen for a second term. Sir, I note that President Cleveland in the recommendation which he addressed to Congress respecting the Fisheries Treaty after stating the advantages he thinks he has achieved, goes on to say:

"Our social and commercial intercourse with those populations who have been placed upon our borders and made forever our neighbors is made apparent by a list of the United States' common carriers, marine and inland, connecting their lines with Canada, which was returned by the Secretary-Treasury to the Senate on 7th February, in answer to a resolution of that body; and this is instructive as to the great volume of mutually profitable interchange which has come into existence during the last half century."

And then the President goes on to use these important words, which coming from so high a source at such a time can be taken as nothing less than an invitation by the President of the United States to us to come forward and see on what terms we can negotiate for unrestricted reciprocity with them. Says President Cleveland:

"This intercourse is still but partially developed, and if the amicable enterprises and wholesome rivalry between the two populations be not obstructed, the promise of the future is full of the fruits of an unbounded prosperity on both sides of the border."

Sir, will any gentlemen here or elsewhere dare to maintain that when President Cleveland in an official document of the highest importance uses such terms as these with respect to intercourse with Canada, we, forsooth, should be debarred by any sense of dignity from responding to an invitation like that? I have another, not so formal, and yet more important perhaps. I find that as long as a year ago, at a time when there was a danger of hostile collision between the two countries, Mr. Secretary Bayard, a man, as the First Minister knows, of the highest rank next to the President of the United States, a man who is virtually Premier of the President's Cabinet, a man whose name is honored and deservedly honored by friend and foe from one end of the United States to the other,—I say that Mr.

Bayard, the virtual Premier of the United States, wrote a year ago to Sir Charles Tupper in these terms:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years."

And then comes this important paragraph:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

This is a just, a wise and a statesmanlike proposal from a man of the highest place and highest character in North America. Have we not seen within the last two weeks two distinguished members of Congress, Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Hitt, both Republicans, both opposed to the party of Mr. Bayard and President Cleveland, introducing Bills, one of which is almost substantially on the lines of the resolution I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, the other of which goes further than I think it would be judicious or wise to go, but both in the direction of free trade and unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. Looking at this communication which has been placed in your hands, and as to which something was said to-night, I cannot but fear that a grand opportunity was lost by the delay of the Government in not endeavoring to settle the fishery question a considerable time ago in accordance with Mr. Bayard's suggestion. Their unhappy procrastination and unhappy delay I fear has been the cause why this negotiation was put off till the eleventh hour, to the most unfavorable moment that could by any possibility be selected, just on the eve of a Presidential election, when everybody in arms in the United States almost could have told hon. gentlemen opposite that no Government in the United States was free to deal as it would wish with great commercial questions, but they are all made subservient to the political exigencies of the times. Now, we do not know what passed, we do not know, and we will not know, I am afraid, in time for this debate, really what passed between these negotiators. We have not got the information, but we have got enough to see that there were proposals and counter-proposals, but what followed is concealed from the Parliament of Canada, which has a good right to know. I for one must say that I attach no sort of importance whatever to the fact that when Sir Charles Tupper tabled—I beg pardon for speaking of him by name—the very vague proposition which he did table, he was told by the American negotiators that they were not authorised to deal with it. It was patent and apparent that they were not authorised to deal with it, and I beg to observe that judging of their own action the conduct of the Government had been so indiscreet in various ways as to render it excessively difficult either for President Cleveland or his Cabinet, however favorable disposed they were, and I believe they were very favorably disposed to us, to render it very difficult for them to mix up the fishery question with our commercial relations at that date. You must remember that this matter had been publicly brought to the attention of the United States Congress, and that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, headed by Mr. Belmont, have declared:

"That the motive and purpose have been plainly and openly avowed by Canada to be, first, the punishment of such vessels because the United States levies a duty on Canadian fish, not fresh, for immediate consumption and secondly to coerce the United States to exempt such Canadian fish from all Custom duties, and to enter into other new reciprocal Customs' relations with the Canadian Dominion and Newfoundland."

And the Committee on Foreign Affairs went on to add that this was a policy of threat and coercion, which should be instantly and summarily dealt with. Under those circumstances it was absurd to say that anything could be adduced from the refusal of the American Commissioners to discuss this question of reciprocal relations upon the very bald and brief memorandum furnished us by Sir Charles Tupper. I repeat one thing which I said before but it will bear repetition. It must always be remembered that Canada has a good deal to give as well as a good deal to get, and in making a bargain with the United States I for one would give very fair and full equivalents. I wish that the treaty should be perfectly and mutually beneficial, that for every dollar of profit we make they should make their dollar, and that for every Canadian who is benefited an American should be benefited likewise. It is on such a basis alone that a firm and permanent treaty of reciprocity, or a firm and permanent arrangement for free and unrestricted trade can be carried out. As I have said the people of the United States need new markets as well as we do. I do not contend, for it would be absurd to contend, that the thing is as important to them as it is to us. It is not as important to 60,000,000 to have the market of 5,000,000, as it is for 5,000,000 people to have the market of 60,000,000. That much is clear. But I do contend, Sir, that we have it in our power to give a full equivalent, and benefit quite as many Americans by this arrangement as Canadians will be benefited. I also say that this is emphatically one of those questions in which very nearly everything depends on how the question is presented to the various parties to the negotiation. You may approach this if you will in the spirit of statesmen, or you may approach it in the spirit of flunkies. It is a large question which demands a large treatment. Now, whatever the faults of England or English statesmen may be, I have always felt, and I have always maintained, that England is essentially just, and that when England understands fairly and properly the grounds upon which we make this claim that England will, I believe, be prepared to concede it. As for the United States, I have no doubt that they have got their faults as we have got our faults, but with all their faults no man can have mixed much with the Americans without knowing that they are emphatically a great and a generous nation. I have heard one most foolish complaint and most foolish fear expressed, and I have heard that complaint made by men who ought to know better, the complaint that the people and the Government of the United States, forsooth, are not prepared to gush over or to rush into our arms or those of England at every pretty phrase. I do not blame them for that. As I have said I know something of the history of North America for the past one hundred years and something of the history of the dealings of England with the United States during that interval. Even during the last five and twenty years I say, that we have not always so acted as to warrant us in expecting that the Americans will rush at once into our arms whenever we propose a friendly treaty for arrangement with them, but I do say that if you go to the United States and make fair, just and reasonable propositions to them that there is every reason—and we have the proof of their highest statesmen's assertions that we will be so received—there is every reason to believe that we will be fairly and honorably received, and that it is in our power to make a treaty which shall be mutually advantageous, honorable and profitable to both nations. I do not gush over the United States either. I admire the United States, but I am in no way disposed to cringe to them. I think I may remind the House that the only negotiation during the last one hundred years in which Canada obtained a tolerable equivalent for her concessions was the negotiation conducted at Halifax by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and my lamented

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

friend Sir Albert Smith. I take no shame to admit, and I have said it before, that for many a year I have made it my deliberate purpose that I would do all that one man could do, all that any man honorably could do, to make friends as far as I could or to cause my people and the English people to become friends once more with the people of the United States. Our position towards the people of the United States has been vastly changed within the last five and twenty years, and it is well that this House should remember that. Five and twenty years ago but a small proportion of her population were in the United States. To-day, Sir, the United States, in the most emphatic possible manner, are becoming literally flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. I think my friends from the Maritime Provinces and Quebec probably can affirm my statement, when I say that I know whole counties, I know great regions in Canada where you cannot find one single solitary Canadian family which has not a son, or a daughter, or a brother, or a sister or some very near and dear relative now inhabiting the United States. We will do best honor to the United Empire Loyalist traditions if we in our degree contribute to bring those two great races together, and to repair in this way what I have always looked upon as a great blot in English policy within the last century. Now, there is another side of this question. Suppose the hon. gentlemen entered into those negotiations in good faith, suppose they tried their best, suppose they do their best, and suppose the negotiation fails, well, all I can say is that I would advise the people of Canada in that case to set to work and put their house in order. If we go on as we are going now, our position will soon become intolerable as compared with the United States. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite have at all appreciated what the United States has done during the last dozen years. Sir, I do not think this House is at all aware of the fiscal position in which the United States stand to-day. I have here the last United States Treasury return, and what does it show? It shows, Sir, that the total expenditure of the United States, less sinking fund, was just \$268,000,000, of which \$35,500,000 came from miscellaneous receipts, and \$233,000,000 was all they required to raise by direct taxation. Now, Sir, they collect \$120,000,000 in round numbers by excise, and, therefore, all they require to raise by customs duties is a bare \$114,000,000. Sir, it would be in the power of the United States Secretary of the Treasury, if Congress gave him the authority, to raise either the whole of the customs revenue in either of these three ways. He might maintain the existing tax on sugar and impose a very small income tax indeed, and raise all the revenue he wanted; he might maintain the tax on sugar and impose a very small *ad valorem* duty and raise all the revenue he wanted; or he might maintain the present taxes on a very few articles and make his trade list free. Now, I would like to direct the attention of this House for a few moments to what might befall if the United States adopted such a course. We have no less an authority than Mr. Joseph Chamberlain for saying that if the United States chose to reduce their tariff materially, they would become a most formidable competitor of England in the markets of the world; and if they became a formidable competitor of England, what sort of a competitor would they be with our farmers and manufacturers under such circumstances—we heavily burdened with debt and the United States almost free? What, I should like to know, would the hon. gentlemen do in such a case? And it is a case which is eminent, a case which may occur at any moment? Will they go on and heap further taxes on the people? Do they think they could prevent a much more deplorable exodus than they have? Now, Sir, if the hon. gentlemen refuse to act—this is not a motion of want of confidence; they have not committed themselves, at least the First Minister has not, and I do not think his colleagues have committed

themselves, against this proposition—if they refuse to act, I ask them to consult their own Finance Minister as to whether I am not right, looking at the result of their fisheries negotiation, in saying that a most intense feeling of disappointment will pervade the whole of the Maritime Provinces at any rate. An intense feeling of disappointment, I know, will pervade a vast number of the farmers of Canada from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I think there will be a very great and bitter disappointment on the part of many of the inhabitants of Manitoba and probably also of British Columbia. Now, Sir, it must be borne in mind that our circumstances within a few years, not wholly by our own fault, not wholly by the fault of government, but in consequence of great economic changes which have been taking place of very great importance, have been materially changed. Then, it is notorious that our position, in comparison with that of the United States, has in twenty years been reversed, and reversed enormously to our detriment. Twenty years ago our taxes were one-third of the taxes of the United States; twenty years ago our debt was one-third of the debt of the United States. To-day, by the last returns I have here, our debt is two and a half times, as nearly as may be, greater per head than the debt of the United States; and the necessary taxes which the United States require to raise for the purpose of carrying on their government are one-third less than the necessary taxes the people of Canada require to pay. Then, Sir, the European market, to which we formerly looked, is dwindling for us, so far as we are concerned. We are exposed to intense competition from every part of the world. On the other hand the American market is growing with immense rapidity, and has become vastly richer to-day than it was a short time ago, while we are not able to keep the emigrants we bring here. As I said before, a great change in the United States is eminent, and it is our business to prepare to meet it. Sir, let me recite our course for the last twenty years. Can hon. gentlemen opposite, with the Public Accounts in their hands, venture to deny that within twenty years our debt has trebled, having risen from \$73,000,000 or \$75,000,000 to \$230,000,000, and that our taxes have trebled likewise, having risen from \$11,500,000 to \$30,000,000? And that does not at all represent the real increase of taxation. Can they deny, Sir, that there is proof, absolutely conclusive, over the greater part of the Dominion, that we have lost three emigrants out of every four that we brought here, and one in four of our own people? Can they deny that there has been an enormous reduction in the volume of trade, until the volume of trade to-day is nearly 50 per cent. less than it was in 1873? Can they deny that there has been a very great fall in the prices of the articles produced by our agriculturists, on whom we vainly depend? What shall I say of the immigration for the last six years? I have only got the municipal statistics of Ontario to go upon, but what a sorry story they have to tell us. I have the returns of every rural municipality and of every town and village of Ontario for the last six years, and what do I find? I find that of forty-four counties in Ontario, barely three have increased their rural population more than the natural growth of the population warrants; of the remainder, twenty-two are either stationary or have gained less than their natural growth; and nineteen have absolutely lost population. The total gain in Ontario, from 1881 to 1886, is about 13,000 souls on a rural population of over 1,100,000. In those six years we have gained about one-half of the one per cent., according to the municipal statistics of Ontario. Of 206 towns and villages, 38 have increased in size more than their natural growth of population; 91 are stationary or have less than their natural growth, and 67 have lost population absolutely. 168 out of 206 have either lost absolutely in population or have grown less than the natural growth of population warrants.

I need not go over the list of rural municipalities in detail, because they show precisely the same results; and I am sorry to say that I find from information furnished me within the last few days by my esteemed friend Mr. Blue, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, that the record for the year 1887, is rather worse, if that be possible, than the records for the years that have preceded. What shall I say of the comparison between Manitoba and Dakota? Manitoba and Dakota started seventeen years ago on equal terms. Each had a white population 14,000 strong. In about ten years Dakota had added not a little over 100,000 to its population; Manitoba had added a little over 50,000 to its population. In 1881 Dakota had 130,000; Manitoba had 65,000. Then, Sir, we began to spend the money of the public by tens of millions in making railroads and promoting immigration to Manitoba. In 1886, we find that after spending \$100,000,000 of public money, and perhaps nearly half as much private funds, the population of Manitoba has grown but 30,000, and according to the last statistics I have been able to obtain, in 1886, the population of Dakota considerably exceeds 500,000. They have added nearly 400,000 to their population within the last six years, while Manitoba has added but 30,000 according to the last census, after an expenditure of \$100,000,000. Now, do you call that satisfactory? If you do not, then the time has come to search for some appropriate remedy. I say that, rightly understood and fairly understood, the interests of Canada and the United States and the mother country are really identical, and that the time is come and is not far distant, when, at any rate the best, the wisest and the most intelligent men will realise that, if they do not realize it now. I am no annexationist and I do not propose to become one. I have no desire to see our country merged in the United States, and I can tell the House that after conferences with a good many distinguished Americans, I am well advised they do not particularly desire to add to their heavy responsibilities by seeing us politically incorporated with them. I have always held and declared that I regard annexation as undesirable. I have no more wish to see my country merge her existence in that of the great state to the south of us—although I admire much in the institutions of the latter—than I would have to merge my own individual existence in that of another man's, because I admire his abilities or envy his great estate. We have a plain duty to discharge. We are, some of us, Privy Councillors, and it is our bounden duty to advise Her Majesty the Queen of Canada in the true interests of the people of Canada, whatever those may be. That may carry us far. To a very considerable extent the choice lies with the people of Canada, to decide whether they shall continue to fulfil the somewhat ignoble office that they now fulfil, of being practically, and in fact, a sort of hostage to the United States for the good behavior of England, or whether they will rise equal to the situation and become a link of union and concord between the two great English races. Which is the safer, which is the more honorable, which is the wiser, which is the more statesmanlike policy? I have abstained of set purpose from alluding to the fishery matter, except in a most cursory way. I do not wish to animadvert on the conduct of the English plenipotentiaries in that matter, but I may take this opportunity of pointing out to the House, and the Finance Minister and his friends, that they can produce no argument to warrant them in asking the people of Canada to ratify that treaty, except practically this great argument that it is, in a high degree, the interest of the Empire to conciliate the good-will of the people of the United States by all fair and honorable means. And that very argument which they bring to induce this House to consent to the treaty, applies with equal force to my contention that it is in the highest degree for the interest

of the Empire that we, on our side, should endeavor, through the very proposition I now submit, to knit Canada and the United States together in a closer and more friendly alliance. We must rise above the sole craving for precedents, so dear to a certain order of legal mind. We are in a new world, and we own half a continent of it. It may be that there is no precedent to fit our case. My proposal is new and so is our situation, and, Sir, I have to say if there is no precedent to fit, let us make one. Hon. gentlemen may contend that the views I express are not those held, at least by the majority of the people, at any rate as they are represented on the floor of this House; but if these hon. gentlemen could make up their minds, for once, to depart from their precedents, and if there ever was a case in which we would be warranted in departing from precedents it is this—and would dare to submit this question to the plebiscitum of the people, they know, and I know that the answer would be decisively in its favor. They know that an overwhelming majority of the people would be at our backs in demanding that no reasonable effort should be spared to obtain free trade with the United States; and if it were possible that this plebiscitum should be voted on by every native-born Canadian in North America, we would roll up a larger majority in its favor than has ever yet been recorded in our annals of any kind whatever. I do not say, and it is false to assert that I have ever said, that Canada has not made any progress during the past twenty years. I admit considerable progress has been made in certain directions. But what I contend for now is this, that the progress has been partial, inadequate, far below what the natural resources of our country would warrant. It is also far below what we made ourselves in the twenty years before 1861 and infinitely below what the United States made in the first twenty years of their existence, when their population was equal to ours. I am quite willing to grant that a few towns have grown and prospered within the past few years, but I say it was none the less true that over many wide areas of this country our population is stationary and even retrograde. It is none the less true that from one end of Canada to the other, the value of farm lands is less to-day than it was six, seven or eight years ago; it is none the less true that the value of farm products is enormously lowered, and that our farmers are exposed to a far more intense competition than they hitherto experienced. Great new forces are coming into existence, the full effect of which we are only beginning to feel. There is danger lest Canada, so far as regards our native born population, should sink into a mere residuum, a country from which the best and most intelligent of our people are fleeing, not by hundreds or by thousands, but by millions. Then as to foreign immigrants, if these statistics can be relied upon, it is clear that we are becoming a mere dumping ground for the refuse of those whom we import into this country. It is quite clear we are not growing up towards the light, and I hold it to be a very miserable symptom of our political growth, that there should exist here this craving to hang on to our mother's apron string. Under such circumstances, it is our bounded duty to ascertain at the earliest moment we can what are the views of the people of the United States on this great question. This is not a question of etiquette. We have here, to all intents and purposes, the invitation of the President and virtual Premier of the United States to go and treat with them on fair and equal terms; and if it were a question of etiquette, the hon. gentleman is a Shakesperian student, and he knows that "nice customs courtesy to mighty kings." If two peoples desire to have a great boon like this, they need not stand on little paltry questions as to which shall make the first advance. If we fail, it will then be time to consider the situation anew. But I repeat that our real interests are those of Eng-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

land, and the United States are perfectly identical, and will be substantially furthered by this proposition. I hope that, in this discussion, on both sides of the House, every man who speaks will remember that he is here as a Canadian representative, that he is here as a trustee of a certain section of the Canadian people, that our business here, all that warrants us in being here, is for the purpose of discussing the welfare of Canada, and I hope that we will be spared certain stale and tawdry hypocrisies of which we have heard too much. I have the greatest possible respect for genuine loyalty and for genuine loyalists wherever I have met them. Even if they are sometimes a little wooden-headed and perverse, the thing is good in itself that I can excuse a good deal, but there is a certain class of loyalty, and there is a certain class of loyalists to whom I cannot extend any consideration at all. I must say that I have not much respect for 35 per cent. tariff protection loyalty or for 35 per cent. tariff protection loyalists; and I think, if the right hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, that the First Minister showed that he appreciated correctly that class of loyalty and of loyalists in the famous parable he delivered a few years ago, wherein he compared himself—it is his comparison, not mine—to a monkey who had stolen into a farmer's orchard and was shaking down the apples for the benefit of the herd of swine that were grunting and rooting below. England can take care of herself, as England has shown many a time and oft. If the English Cabinet, when this matter is fully represented to them, as it ought to be, see fit to object, it will be time enough for us to take up the question. In discussing it, I admit that all men who think that this will hurt Canada either morally or materially—because I do not desire to keep the question down to the mere ground of material interest—have good and fair grounds for expressing their views, but I say that none else should be heard on any pretext in this House, and I say that the worst foe of British connection is the man who would attempt to stifle discussion on that ground. More than that, I say what every one who has thought on the subject must know and feel to be true, that, in many important respects, our position is anomalous and transitional. No one supposed, when we came together in this Confederation, stretching over half a continent, that we were to remain semi-dependent forever. We are growing in stature, not as fast as hon. gentlemen say, but still we are growing, and we are entitled to a larger measure of responsibilities and to a larger measure of rights. One thing is clear, that everyone, as I have said, who thinks twice on the subject knows and feels, that things are not satisfactory for us in many ways. Why, even the Imperial Federationists know this. They do not know exactly what they want, I grant; they know less how they are to get it, I grant; but they know that there is a want and a lack in our present relations, and they desire to fill it. I have looked at that question long and often, and, as far as Canada is concerned, I see no way out for them, I see no way of our becoming a valuable member of a British federation save only on one consideration, and that is that you broaden your base and take care that you unite yourselves with the United States in the bonds of a firm and friendly alliance which is not likely to be broken, and there is no way in which that is more likely to be done than by greatly increasing and promoting the trade between the two countries. In mutual advantage and benefit the surest bond of union will be found to exist, and I believe that Mr. Goldwin Smith was eminently right in saying that it was an idle and silly delusion to say that either England or the United States profited by the great struggle of the last century, that it was a thousand pities that the violent collision took place, and I know that not only Goldwin Smith expressed those views, but that they were held by the greatest and best of the Americans of that day, by men like George Washington himself, by men like Alexander

Hamilton, by men even like the Adams, though they had strong republican leanings; that they were held by all the best thinkers of the last century; and that these are the views which are held by the best and wisest Americans of the present time, and those were substantially the views, as their correspondence in certain records exists to prove, which were held by our own United Empire forefathers, who did not desire to see Great Britain tax the colonies for her own benefit, but did not desire to testify to the great and grand idea of a united British Empire and a united British people all over North America. It is idle for any human being to rise up and tell this House that, when we have lost a number equal to half the whole population that now remains, things are satisfactory with us. There is not another country, except perhaps Ireland, that has sustained so heavy a bleeding as we have done during the last few years. I say the time has come when Canada may justly claim the right to make her own commercial treaties. I say it is for the interest of the Empire that she should have that right. These things at any rate are perfectly clear. It is quite clear to any one who will carefully study those trade returns and will study the figures which I submitted before recess, that the United States market, if it were only made free, is worth more than twice over to Canada than all the rest of the world put together. It is perfectly clear that it is the only market open to us for a great amount of our own productions. It is perfectly clear to me—it may not be to hon. gentlemen opposite—that our position relatively to the United States may become intolerable, and that there is need of present action in this regard. If we do nothing, and the United States act wisely, we may prepare—farmers and manufacturers alike—for a very severe competition, for a great and increasing exodus, and for very great and increasing dissatisfaction among our various Provinces. I must not be misunderstood. I do not say that there are no other expedients possible for us, but what I do say is that the expedient I now propose for the consideration of the House is the surest, the simplest, and the easiest expedient open to us; that it commends itself in a very high degree to the instincts of our people, as it has been unmistakably shown; that it is in itself a fair, just and reasonable proposition; that it is best for us, best for the whole Empire, best for our kinsmen and neighbors on the other side of the line; and, believing that that is so, I beg to move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the greater part of the hon. gentleman's speech delivered here this evening, but I confess that on no former occasion have I heard him speak with greater weakness, if he will allow me that expression, than he has spoken to-night. During the earlier part of his speech, the hon. gentleman dwelt almost exclusively upon the statement that this country has not been progressing. The old story of loss of population, the old story of loss of trade, the old story that we are not progressing as we ought, was repeated *ad nauseam*. It appeared so well to please him that, although he dropped it from time to time in order to go on with the subject which is more particularly before us, the House will remember that he invariably fell back upon the same old statement, the same old Jeremiads of ruin and decay for this country. Sir, I cannot do better than give to the hon. gentleman the advice which the leading organ of his own party gave him, and gave to this country—if, indeed, the *Toronto Globe* may now be called the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. Only a few weeks ago the *Globe* said:

"Distrust all figures professing to show that Canada has retrograded instead of advancing. Eschew association with the teachers of despair. Old men who, with worn-out powers, assert that national suicide is the only course to national salvation, may be excused by considerations of their senility, but young men who echo their doleful refrain can never seem otherwise than contemptible."

These, Mr. Speaker, are not the words of a Tory newspaper, or of a Tory public man; they are the advice given to the young men of the country by the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I commend them as the best possible answer to the statements that we have heard to-night. I think we have a right to complain, also, that the hon. gentleman was not as distinct as could be desired in his statement of what his resolution really means—whether it is commercial union that we are to have, or whether it is unrestricted reciprocity, which would leave us free to deal with other nations as we thought proper. That was not very definitely stated by the hon. gentleman, unless, indeed, we take one sentence in which he suggested that the position taken by Mr. Hitt, a member of Congress, embodied principles which went rather further than he would desire to go. But, Sir, what is it that has led to the sudden discovery of this panacea for the ills of Canada? What is it that has brought us, in this session of Parliament, to discuss a question of this kind as the only course which offers to us any assurance for the future well-being of Canada? We can remember that, although the Reciprocity Treaty is not an old one, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, and so far as any public man in Canada, having the responsibility of a public man upon him, is concerned, until the last few months, we never heard of this question of commercial union as a remedy for the ills which are alleged to exist. Sir, all the statements made by the hon. gentleman were made over and over again before the last elections—aye, I may say that before the elections which preceded the last, all these statements were made. When we came to the last election, the two parties faced the electorate, nominally at any rate upon distinct issues. The great leader of the Liberal party went through Ontario and delivered speeches which, for elaborateness of preparation, for devotion to detail, have, perhaps, never been exceeded by the speeches delivered by any other public man in Canada. They form a volume which I hold in my hand. And yet, Mr. Speaker, what will hon. gentlemen say when I tell them that in the whole of these speeches, the only reference to reciprocity is embodied in two single lines of type, delivered, the first at Welland, and the next, if I mistake not, at Malvern. Now, the hon. gentlemen pledged themselves to a particular course in the last elections. I have the pledges here, and it is worth while reading them, delivered by their great leader. He delivered them, remember, not as an ordinary citizen, but as the leader of the party, speaking for the party, declaring himself to be authorised to speak for the party, and what did he say?

"I spoke in 1882, I spoke a few weeks ago in Toronto, I speak now as the leader of the party, expounding on all questions of principle, not merely my individual views, but the common sense, as I understand it, of the great body of the party, the general lines upon which the party, as a whole would act, if entrusted, as they will soon be, with power."

They were not entrusted with power, and they are now acting upon different principles from those which they pledged themselves to the people of this country they would act upon, if they were entrusted with power. He goes on to say:

"What I have said, and am about to say, on all questions of principle, you may then take as authoritative, to whatever extent a leader has authority, and so far from there being divergence, I can assure you that there is, in my belief, a general concurrence of sentiment between us, including Sir Richard Cartwright, whom I name only because our adversaries delight to represent him as holding other views."

Then, Sir, what more did he say?

"We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of. We have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet, and it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any re-adjustment should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, 'all concerned,' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any re-adjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of

expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes; to the lightening of taxation upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of production in cases where, by combination or otherwise, the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbors to the south."

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the only reference in this whole book setting forth the policy of the Liberal party—that is the only reference whatever to the question of reciprocity. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite smile; I notice that they think they have something because the term reciprocity is used here; but how do they reconcile this principle of reciprocity, if it be reciprocity they mean, with the promise that the manufacturers have nothing to fear, with the promise that the tariff cannot be materially reduced, with the promise that our large expenditures will require a high tariff to be maintained, while their policy to-day as announced is that the tariff is to be abolished altogether, in so far as the trade between our neighbors, our great competitors, and ourselves are concerned. I find the hon. gentleman went on further to say:

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of absolutely free trade for Canada he may be, has yet suggested, no man I believe can suggest, a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met, otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make or can make within our bounds; or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada. I have not believed it soluble in my day; and any chance of its solubility, if any chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge, and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

And yet within a little over one year from the day when that speech was delivered and that pledge made as indicating what would be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite if their anticipations had been realised and they had occupied these Treasury benches, we have a three and a-half hours' speech delivered in this House for the purpose of showing us that free trade is not only practical but is absolutely essential if this country is to escape the ruin which threatens it. I might go on quoting other passages from that speech, but I will not detain the House longer. I might point out where the hon. gentleman declared that the idea of direct taxation was absurd, was not even to be thought of, and could not be thought of in connection with our affairs in Canada; but I have read enough to show that in assuming the position which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken to-night they have entirely changed their position from that which they occupied when appealing to the people a little over a year ago, and I think they are bound to show that our condition has so changed since that time as to justify that remarkable change of position on their part. One might speculate, but of course we will not do it, that it is not so much the interests of the country as the necessities of the party that have caused this change. They had been taunted by their own friends, as well as by their political opponents, as being a party without a policy. They had been taunted with being a party of negotiations without any positive idea to submit for the acceptance of the people, and as they were beaten at two elections and as by-election after by-election gave the same record and the people showed their confidence in the policy represented by this Government, hon. gentlemen opposite have made up their minds that something new is required, and they submit a policy, not a policy which this Government could carry out if they would, not a policy which those hon. gentlemen could carry out if they were on this side of the House, but a policy dependent upon the action of a foreign Government without whose consent nothing could be done. So that after nearly ten years of Opposition, after ten years of groping after something

MR. WHITE (Cardwell).

through which they might appeal to the people, hon. gentlemen have come down to a policy which is a safe one for them because they could not adopt it if they were on the Treasury benches, and the adoption of which depends entirely on the action of a foreign Government. They have come with a policy for the United States for the acceptance of the people of Canada. That is the position in which we find hon. gentlemen to-day. Sir, this question of reciprocity is an old question. Both political parties in Canada have been in favor of it—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell). Both parties have been in favor of reciprocal trade in the natural productions of this country; both parties have been in favor of reciprocal trade, in so far as that reciprocal trade can be carried out having regard to the great interests of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. The great combines of the country.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell). This has been the case over and over again. What has been the history of negotiations in the direction of reciprocity? The treaty of 1854, commonly known as the Elgin Treaty, was, if I mistake not, negotiated under the direction of the Liberal Conservative party, the McNabb-Morin Government being in power at that time. The treaty was denounced at the very first moment it could be denounced by the United States. From that day to this, this Government, both parties I may say in Canada, have been ready to enter into negotiations for a fair interchange of the commodities of the two countries. In 1874, the late Government sent Mr. George Brown to Washington, and he and Mr. Fish drafted a treaty, which was going to be, in the opinion of every one who favored it, of great advantage to Canada. What was the fate of it? It dealt not only with the natural productions of the country, but also with a considerable line of manufactures. It went even further than that: it ensured the Americans the use of our great public works. It went further than that: It obliged the people of Canada to build a new canal, commonly known as the Caughnawaga Canal, which would give easy access for the lumber of the west to the American market. And yet, in spite of the great advantages to be given to the United States by that treaty, in spite of the fact that it went as far as the people of this country could possibly go in negotiations of that kind, what was the result of it? Why, it was simply hung up in the Senate, denied even the courtesy of a reference to the ordinary committee, and from that day to this all efforts to get a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States have failed. What was the position of the hon. gentleman at that time? Why, I find that the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House at such great length to-night, when addressing a meeting in Charlottetown, dealt with this subject. He said:

"They say we must have reciprocity, and we cannot live without it as a Dominion. I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships, and 'will carry the war into Africa.' We will find new markets for ourselves, and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

I shall not make other quotations as I might make them to show that this was the current of public opinion in this country at that time. I do not quote this with the object of putting the hon. gentleman in contradiction to himself. I quote it as I might quote extracts from the leading organ of that party at the same time, to show what was the current of public opinion then, and which was that, having made every effort that we possibly could make to secure reciprocal free trade with our friends on the other side of the line, so far as we could do it consistently with the interests, and welfare, and revenue requirement of this

country, that we ought to go on and develop our own interests and our own destiny in our own fashion. Now what did this Government do? Under the Act of 1879—an Act which embodied the mandate of the people at that time—commonly known as the National Policy Act, we incorporated a clause which gave to the Governor General in Council the power practically of entering into a reciprocal treaty for the free interchange of products between this country and the United States. That Act is on the Statute book to day and it remains there an authority to the Government, whenever the United States will show any disposition to meet us, to enter into freer trade relations with them in so far as we can do. I think I may fairly say therefore that our record in the past, at any rate, is such that the people of Canada can say to our friends on the other side of the line: "We are ready to consider the question whenever you shall signify your decision for such consideration; we are ready to consider with you the best means of promoting the free interchange of such products in this country as we can exchange with you, having regard to our great interests," and until the people of the United States are so ready, the history of the past clearly shows that the true policy of Canada is to act upon the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman himself in the extract which I have just quoted, that is, to work out our own destiny in our own way. This question, however, of commercial union or of unrestricted reciprocity—the latter term being apparently a modification of the former principle—is not altogether a new one. In 1871 I had myself the privilege of being present at a meeting of the National Board of Trade of the United States, in the city of St. Louis, and on that occasion the chairman of the Canadian delegation, the late Hon. John Young, consented to a scheme for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. But there is this fact to be remembered in connection with that, Mr. Young, as everyone knows, was in favor of the separation of this country from the mother country, in order that we might enter into such an arrangement. He took the ground at St. Louis, as he did in the city of Montreal and in the press when he discussed this question, that without independence we could not enter into arrangements of this kind, and that there was first and precedent to such an arrangement and for the purpose of bringing about such arrangement, a necessity that the true interests of Canada lay in her separation from the mother country. Did any public man in Canada, having the responsibility of a public man upon him, sanction that view at that time? No. Although Mr. Young was a prominent Liberal, although he was a strong supporter of the Liberal party, although he was a man of great influence who had been a Minister of the Crown, the *Toronto Globe*, then edited by the late Hon. George Brown, denounced him and denounced his proposition as utterly opposed to the best interests of this country and as impossible of fulfilment except on terms of annexation itself. That was the position taken at that time in connection with this question. What is meant by this question of commercial union? I take the opinions of those who may fairly be assumed to be at any rate the best authorities upon that subject. We would never have heard of it, apparently so at any rate, until Mr. Erastus Wiman, a gentleman of great influence and of great ability in the United States, a Canadian by birth and I believe still a Canadian by allegiance, took it into his head, having plenty of leisure on his hands, to come to Canada and carve out a policy for the people of this country. He did the constituency of Cardwell, which I have the honor to represent here, the honor to make his first début on that question there, and from that day to this he has, in the press and in public meetings, said a great deal upon this subject, so that he has come to be recognised, if not the leader of the Liberal party at least the leader of this particular policy of the Liberal

15-1888-4

party. It seems to me that in any discussion of the question in this country we should know precisely what is contemplated by this scheme. Now what does Mr. Wiman say? Writing to the American press on this subject he says:

"That by the operation of a uniform continental tariff equal in height to that always prevailing in the United States, the goods and merchandise of all foreign countries, including Great Britain, would be discriminated against in favor of American manufactures."

Then, Sir, in a letter which he addressed to the *Mail*, or rather in a speech which he delivered in Detroit and reported in the *Mail*, he said:

"That as against all the rest of the world the same rates of duty should be collected by Canada as are now levied by the United States, while between those two countries of North America the Customs line should be completely obliterated, in other words, the proposition is that around the whole continent of North America the Customs line should exist and precisely a uniform height."

Now, what does that involve? I take a leading newspaper of the Western States, and the *Chicago Times* I think may be considered the leading newspaper of the Western States, as giving a statement of what that really involves. Here is what the *Times* says:

"This proposition implies a complete surrender by the Dominion Parliament to the American Congress of all control of the principal source of the Dominion revenue, the tariff. Whatever it may please the American Congress to do regarding the tariff the Dominion must forthwith accept. The people of the Dominion would have neither a vote nor a voice in Washington under the proposed Commercial Union."

Then, Sir, the same paper says further:

"Not only would our Congress prescribe and change at pleasure the taxes exacted from the people of Canada, but our executive officers and our courts would make all the rulings and decisions affecting rates for the Dominion as well as for the United States."

Again I will quote another extract from the same paper:

"If the Dominion will take our tariff laws as they are, and as Congress may choose to modify them, and as our Treasury Department and courts may construe them, well and good. This country may agree to such an arrangement as that, but it will never agree to accept the Dominion laws, or to put the whole business of tariff-making out of Congress, or into the hands of some joint high commission. Unless, therefore, the Dominion is prepared to make a complete and unconditional surrender of all control over its own tariff, and accept whatever tariff our own Congress may choose to enact from time to time, the scheme of Commercial Union, in the sense in which that phrase is used, is entirely out of the question."

But, Mr. Speaker, I have an extract from a speech by a gentleman whose opinion on this subject is, perhaps, to us in this House of still more importance, because he speaks with the responsibility of a Canadian public man and a leading and distinguished member of his own party. I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, at Jarvis, during the Haldimand election, delivered a speech in which he declared for Commercial Union. Now, Sir, I may say, what the hon. gentleman said I will admit, that it differs in some respects from the suggestion or hint of the hon. gentleman who has spoken to us to-night; but I think we have a right to assume that a speech delivered so recently and by a gentleman occupying so distinguished a position as the hon. member for North Norfolk must be held to embody, at any rate, the views of a considerable section of his party. He said:

"It was simply a Customs' union between two or more independent states where a common tariff and excise laws were adopted, and the revenue collected, after deducting expenses of collection, was divided among the participants upon the basis of population, or any other basis that might be agreed upon, while all trade restrictions between them were removed. The application of the principle between Canada and the United States would require that the two countries should have the same excise rates and the same tariff upon imports from all other countries; that the revenue thus collected in both countries should be divided upon conditions hereafter to be arranged; that the Customs line between the two countries from ocean to ocean should be removed, and that trade between Canada and the States should be in every respect as free and untrammelled as trade between the different States of the American Union was at the present moment."

That is a statement of the case as submitted by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and I am bound to say—and

I think this honorable House will agree with me—that in directness and clearness of statement it is far preferable to the speech to which we have listened to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford. Then, Sir, we have a still more important authority in this case—the authority on whose support and assistance hon. gentlemen depend for the realisation of their hopes. What is it that is proposed in Congress to-day. Mr. Butterworth introduced a Bill, and that Bill was submitted to the proper committee of the House of Representatives; but although we are not in the secrets of that committee, although we do not know what was done there or how it happened, what we do know is that Mr. Hitt afterwards introduced a resolution to the House of Representatives which was submitted to the same committee, and that Mr. Butterworth telegraphed a practical abandonment of his own scheme and the adoption of the scheme embodied in the resolution of Mr. Hitt. I have not the resolution itself, but here is a Washington despatch giving the substance of it:—

“WASHINGTON, 5th March.

“In the House of Representatives to-day Congressman Hitt introduced a joint resolution for the promotion of commercial union with Canada. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It provides that when it shall be duly certified to the President that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, and no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts under commercial union, and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress.”

Now, that is the only proposal before the Congress of the United States to-day, and I think we have a right therefore to ask hon. gentlemen whether they are prepared to accept that proposal, or if they are not, why they should, in view of the past history of this question, trifle with the time of Parliament in discussing this matter. Now, Sir, this does not mean unrestricted reciprocity, because Mr. Hitt, in a letter to the press says:

“The tariff would have to be the same in Canada and the United States, or there would be infinite fraud and disturbance of trade.”

So that you will see that upon that question Mr. Hitt speaks with no uncertain sound, and that the only proposition which comes from anybody in the United States is a proposition for a union or a reciprocity different, I take it, from that which is embodied in this resolution, although the same as that which, up to the time the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), wrote his letter to Mr. Wiman, was accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, including the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk. The change came suddenly. The hon. member for West Ontario—the power behind the throne under the late leader, and I assume the power behind the throne under the present leader as well, if we may judge of the wonderful effect of that letter—wrote to Mr. Wiman, to say that the people of Canada were so enamored of the term Custom houses, that they loved the existence of the Custom house so much, that the proposal which suggested the abolition of the Custom houses along the line would not likely meet with general support in Canada; and, therefore, he suggested that we should have all the advantages of Commercial Union plus the expense of keeping up the line of Custom houses between the two countries; and that is the proposal we have here. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this proposition which is submitted to us involve? In the first place, I take it that it involves, as I think I have shown, similar Customs duties to those imposed by the United States against all other countries in the world except the United States; and I take it, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said, that that

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

practically means separation from the mother country. Now, I am not going to raise the loyalty cry in any sense whatever. I accept the suggestion made with the hon. gentleman that we should deal with this question from the standpoint of our own interests, that we should deal with it as it affects Canada; and I do not feel disposed, therefore, at this time to raise the general question of loyalty to the mother country, and the danger and ingratitude involved in the separation from the mother country. But I think it is important, when we are discussing the question that the facts should be stated, and let the people draw their own inference and their conclusion from those facts. For anyone seriously to pretend that this country should remain connected with the mother country after adopting a principle by which we became commercially a portion of a foreign nation and charged against the mother country the same duties that foreign nation, charged, seems to me to ask people to believe that which no reasonable person can very well believe. So that we must take the proposition as meaning separation from the mother country. I doubt very much whether a high spirited people like the people of Canada would be mean enough to accept a continuance of the connection under such conditions as would be involved in that arrangement, even if the mother country were generous enough to consent to it. Then, Sir, it affects our finances seriously; and I think you will agree with me, that, having regard to the fact that the hon. member who has addressed us at so great length to-night is an ex-Finance Minister, whose speciality it is to deal with finances, the House has reason to complain that upon that branch of the subject he was not very distinct nor very clear. Now, Sir, let us look for a moment at how we stand financially to-day. Our expenditure for the fiscal year of 1887, amounted to \$35,658,000.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Of this, the charges on debt amounted to | \$ 9,970,671 |
| Subsidies to Provinces | 4,169,341 |
| Sinking fund..... | 1,592,952 |
| Collection of revenue..... | 8,375,926 |

| | |
|------------|--------------|
| Total..... | \$24,108,890 |
|------------|--------------|

Now, I think, the House will agree with me that these are charges that no commercial union, at any rate no unrestricted reciprocity, would enable us to escape. They are the fixed charges of the country, and cannot be got rid of in any way whatever. Then we have the charges for other expenses, a little over \$11,500,000. How are these met? Civil government, \$1,211,850. It may be, if hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side, they might possibly take a few hundred dollars off that, or they might not. I think it will be found on examination, especially if you look at the estimates, for instance, of this year, where hardly an increase has taken place except the ordinary statutory increase, that the expenditure under this head cannot very well be reduced. Administration of Justice, \$675,114. That is an item which cannot be reduced. Fisheries, the protections and bounties to fishermen, \$415,443. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite will abandon protection to the fisheries or the system of bounties to fishermen; but unless they do so that item cannot be reduced. Then there is the expenditure on the Indians in the North-West Territories, \$1,201,301, and in view of the fact that the only complaint we have from hon. gentlemen opposite is that we permit the Indians to starve, that we do not give them enough food, and therefore do not expend enough on them, I do not think that is an item that can very well be reduced. Legislation costs us \$977,302. That cannot be reduced. Militia, \$1,193,692; lighthouse and coast service, \$542,811; Mounted Police, \$781,644; penitentiaries, \$311,267; and public works rather under \$2,133,315—or in all \$9,395,759. And I think I may fairly say that by no process of economy, even if the hon. gentlemen, with their cheese paring methods, were on this side of the House,

could these amounts be materially reduced, or at any rate so reduced as in the slightest degree to affect the general question of the application of this policy for carrying on the government of the country. How do we meet these expenses to-day? We have a revenue altogether of \$35,754,993, of which the Customs yielded \$21,377,800, leaving a balance from other sources of \$13,375,193. On the imports we get from the United States to-day the duty amounts to \$7,299,591, so that we have a revenue from Customs duties on imports from other countries, of \$15,079,209, and adding to this the revenue from other sources, which, as I have stated, amounts to a little over \$13,250,000, we have a total of \$28,455,402. The deficit, therefore, if we gave up the revenue from the imports from the United States, which we would have, on our present expenditure and present general receipts, would amount to very nearly \$7,250,000. That, I take it, must be made up by direct taxation. It is quite clear, as I have pointed out, that we cannot, if we are to carry on the Government of the country and proceed with the public improvements necessary to develop the country, do with a less expenditure than that which we have to-day; and shall we willingly give up this amount that we receive from Customs duties on the imports from the United States, we will have the large reduction to meet of \$7,300,000. But that is not all. That is assuming that all our imports from other countries would come in as they come in to-day. That is assuming we would still have English goods coming by the St. Lawrence or landing at Boston or New York and coming here in bond. Would anyone pretend to say that would be the result? Immediately we would find the overwhelming proportion of the goods we now receive would be replaced by goods of a similar character manufactured in the United States, and we would find, not that we lost simply the \$7,300,000 which we now derive from Customs duty on imports from the United States, but also at least one-half of the Customs duties that we receive from goods imported from England. I venture to say it would be very much more than one-half, and that practically we would surrender the whole of our Custom revenue. But that is not all. We would find also that the large importing trade of Canada would be transferred from the St. Lawrence, where a great part of it is done to-day, to American ports. We would actually by this process destroy the great trade by the St. Lawrence, which, I believe, both sides in this House desire to see built up. Why should ships come by the St. Lawrence, why should goods take that route and pay us large duties, when they could go to the American ports, pay duties there and be scattered through the United States, while we would receive goods of American manufacture in their place? There would be really no motive for these goods coming by the St. Lawrence at all, and thus we would destroy not only the manufacturing industries of the country, but another trade as well, which is too seldom thought of when we are dealing with the question of the trade interests of the country, and that is the great distributing trade of the country. You would find, Sir, American merchants in their great cities all along the border becoming the distributors to the retailers of the Dominion, thus verifying the statement made by prominent Americans in support of Commercial Union, that the effects would be to place American goods direct from the American warehouse to the retail store all over the Dominion. A great prejudice and injury would thus be done to the importing and distributing trade of Canada. How are we going to make up this revenue? The hon. gentleman does not seem to feel very much alarmed at direct taxation. He thinks direct taxation is more readily collected and costs less and is more equitable in its distribution than the system of taxation which we now have by means of Customs duties.

am not going to burden this discussion by a general discus-

sion of that question, although I think I could show, and that without much difficulty, that the people who would suffer relatively the most from the system of direct taxation are those very poor people whom the hon. gentleman appears to be so much interested in. What did he see a short time ago in the city of Toronto when the publication was made of the incomes assessed of a number of the wealthy people of that city? He saw that the poor man, with his income of \$500 or \$600 a year, was assessed to the full amount, but in regard to the millionaire with his \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year, no assessor would think of putting him down for that, and he was put at \$5,000 or \$6,000 or perhaps \$10,000 a year. And, as with incomes, so with real property. If you go into any of our large cities, you will find that the poor man's house can be easily assessed at its real value; but, if you take the rich man's house, which has cost him \$50,000 or \$100,000, with its almost park-like lawns around it, you will find that it is assessed at one-third or one-fourth of its value, for no assessor would think of putting it down at its real value. That is known to every one who has watched the record of the assessment roll. So this system of direct taxation, instead of being one which would relieve the poor of an excessive burden, would really impose upon the poor far more than their proper proportion of taxation. Under the present system, the poor man can get on practically without any taxation at all. Our taxes are largely upon luxuries. It is the wealthy, under the present system, who pay the large proportion, because it is upon the expensive goods that the larger proportion of the taxation of the country is paid, while a poor man can sit down and look over what he eats and what he wears, and see what he pays for it, and can ascertain the fact for his comfort that the taxation he pays is practically nil in this happy country of ours. But we cannot adopt the principle of Excise duties, because I think, if I read the resolution of the hon. gentleman aright, he proposes a special exception in regard to the Excise duties. We cannot put on extra duties of Excise for this reason, that there is a limit beyond which you cannot go in Excise duties. You have to have regard, in the imposition of Excise duties, particularly in this country where we are alongside our neighbors on the other side, to the duties imposed by them and the general cost of the article in order to know what amount of Excise duty is collectable under any system you may adopt, and therefore we are restricted even in the matter of Excise duties. We would have to adopt direct taxation. No other means could possibly be adopted. Of course, there is one way in which we might reduce our expenditures to some extent. We spend to-day some four million dollars on Provincial subsidies. The hon. gentleman opposite referred to the action of the Quebec Conference, whom, in a lapse of excessive candour, he described as his friends, correcting himself immediately afterwards; and he referred to the resolutions passed by that Conference as if they were the embodiment of the wisdom of this country, as I believe they are to be the embodiment of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But they do not contemplate a reduction in the matter of subsidies. On the contrary, the very thing which will commend them to some of the Provinces is that resolution which proposes largely to increase the subsidies. It is true that the hon. gentleman after speaking of these resolutions as the embodiment of wisdom, said that this commercial union would prevent absolutely an increase of the expenses of the country, but if we are to reduce the expenditure, if we are to resort to direct taxation, I think the people of this country will at once say that it would be little less than absurd that the Dominion Government, the central authority, should impose direct taxation through the machinery of municipal government—because there is hardly any other way in which to do it—in order to distribute a portion of the proceeds back again to the

Provinces. I am not going to say whether we ought to do away with Provincial subsidies or not. The hon. gentleman in a former Session of Parliament, did suggest that he believed it would be for the interests of Canada if the Provincial subsidies were done away with altogether. I leave him on that subject to make his account with his hon. friends on that side from the other Provinces, and I think he will find some difficulty in convincing them that that would be a wise system to adopt in Canada. So you see, by the adoption of this policy, we are to find ourselves reduced to a system of direct taxation by which we are to levy at least \$15,000,000 to make up for the loss in Customs duties which the adoption of this system of so-called unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union would impose upon us. Now, what is Canada to gain as a return for this sacrifice, because, after all, this is a business matter, and ought to be discussed as a business proposition. What are we to gain for this sacrifice? We sacrifice a large portion of our revenue, we sacrifice our distributing trade, we sacrifice or we risk the sacrificing of the manufacturing interests of the country. What are we to get in return for it? Hon. gentlemen tell us we are to get an enlarged market in the United States.—I suppose it is really the enlarged market which is the chief advantage proposed. The market which is to be opened in this country for our friends on the other side is their side of the subject. Our side is that we are to get an enlarged market in the United States. How do we stand in regard to that matter at present? Let us look at our exports to the United States and to Great Britain. Our exports to the United States amount to \$32,273,033, and to Great Britain they amount to \$38,714,331. I will deal simply with the exports to United States. Those of the mine amount to nearly \$3,000,000 those of the fisheries to nearly \$2,250,000, those of the forest to over \$9,250,000, those of animals to over \$7,000,000, the products of the farm to very nearly \$8,000,000, manufactures to a little over \$1,250,000, and miscellaneous to \$569,918, making in all a little over thirty-two and a quarter millions. If we examine these figures, we will find this result: Of the \$9,250,000 worth of the products of the forest, \$1,600,000 enters free under the present system, and the duty on the remaining portion is proposed to be remitted by the Tariff Bill now before Congress. Of the exports of the mine, coal amounts about one million and a quarter, gold quartz to about a million; gypsum crude, to about \$80,000; copper ore, \$181,000; iron ore, \$171,900; stone and marble, \$69,300; making the total of \$2,754,000. Coal, as the hon. gentlemen know, over a million dollars worth of it, in fact nearly the whole export of coal to the United States goes from the coal fields of Vancouver Island to the markets of the United States on the Pacific coast, chiefly to San Francisco. Now, the question of duty on that might be an important matter, but I am inclined to think in that case we may accept the general view which hon. gentlemen opposite, especially in this controversy, have impressed on us, namely, that it is the consumer who pays the duty. Of the fisheries, \$2,717,000, no less than \$1,130,000 worth is already admitted free, so that the advantages of a free market, undoubtedly very great, may be, after all, over estimated. No one who has watched the progress of the fisheries and the fishery trade during the last two years in our Maritime Provinces, does not know that there has never been—I think I am within the mark in saying—there has never been in the history of the Maritime Provinces more profitable fishing than that which occurred during the last year or two. Now we find in regard to the fisheries that new markets are being opened up all the time. Here, for instance, is what the Halifax Chamber of Commerce said upon this subject on 7th March, only a few days ago:

"Now that we have been for a time in sole possession of our fisheries, we are realising more than ever their very great value. The product of
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

our fisheries is stated at about twenty millions of dollars. Of this great industry Nova Scotia is credited with at least one-half of the whole. While the available consuming population is rapidly increasing, a single square mile cannot be added to these productive grounds, the product of which must, in the very nature of things, continue to increase in value. Their accessibility, productiveness and extent place them before us as the most valuable in the world. The markets of the world are wide enough if properly cultivated for all we catch for export, with an ever-increasing demand. Our merchants seem fairly alive to the value of these more distant markets and each year ought to find them more capable of utilising them. Let us then be alive to the great value of this source of wealth and employment, quite satisfied, while in full possession of our own, to allow our neighbors across the line the full possession of their own, and get ready, should they come to a just and equitable view of the whole premises, to meet them in a reciprocity treaty of friendly commerce worthy of the two most advanced nations of the world, and members at the same time of one great family."

Now, Sir, you will see that the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, thoroughly familiar with the position of the fisheries, recognise that they have, under the present conditions, opportunities for the profitable employment of those fisheries, and that they look forward to them as a great source of wealth, and believe that other large markets may be opened for them, even if the United States should, unfortunately, continue the policy which they have adopted in the past. Now, of animals and their produce, we exported \$7,034,455 and of these there were already free of duty \$2,669,628, leaving a little over four millions and a quarter subject to duty. The products of the farm reached \$7,400,777. With a view of ascertaining the duty which we pay on our exports, I take the American trade returns, because they give the exact amount of duty paid upon the exports of Canada into that country. The imports into the United States from Canada in 1887, which were subject to duty amounted to about to \$26,000,000. I have taken the details of 24 millions of this sum; the others were very small amounts, and in the hurry I did not go into them. But upon 24 millions of exports, the duty paid was \$4,715,464, or on the whole exports from Canada into the United States, the duty paid was about \$5,000,000. Unrestricted reciprocity would remove that, so that as a mere matter of bargain, as a mere matter of profit and loss, we would receive about five millions, assuming, of course, that the exporter pays the duty, that the producer pays the duty, which is rather strange doctrine, coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the discussions we have had in the past. But assuming that the producer pays the duty, we save \$5,000,000, and for that we would sacrifice the duties on American goods coming into Canada, amounting to over seven millions and a quarter. It is a new doctrine that we are to give up seven and three quarter million dollars in order that we may get five millions in return. Now, Sir, it is impossible, in the discussion of this question, to avoid some reference of what is going on in the Congress of the United States. A Bill, as hon. gentlemen know, has now been submitted to Congress, putting on the free list a large number of articles which are now subject to duty. The articles that would be exempt from duty, and the amount of duty now collected, are the following:—

| | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Lumber..... | \$7,829,811 |
| Flax | 298,679 |
| Tin plates..... | 222 |
| Copper ore | 188,329 |
| Potatoes | 339,163 |
| Beans and peas | 556,430 |
| Wool..... | 356,284 |

In all, \$9,800,000 worth of exports from Canada to the United States, out of the \$25,000,000 that are paying duty, would be exempt from duties if that Bill passed. Now, the amount of the duty on the articles which would be remitted if that Bill passes, amounts to \$2,778,964. As to the balance of the articles, this fact ought to be remembered, that our trade with the United States is a trade of competition and not a trade of exchange. The articles that would go into the United States are articles which are largely produced by the people of that country. When the hon. gentleman

tells us that we are to give up a market of 5,000,000 for a market of 60,000,000 of people, he ought also in fairness, to tell us that we give up our market of 5,000,000 for a market of 60,000,000 which is already so fully occupied that precisely the same articles we export to them, they actually are importing a larger amount of most of those articles from other countries than they are importing from us. No one, therefore, can say but this is a market open to us in the sense in which hon. gentlemen use that term. The distinction between competition and exchange in matters of trade cannot be too strongly emphasised. We would thus find that the balance which we would receive, supposing that the Bill now before Congress passes, from duty on the balance of the articles, would amount to \$2,780,000, and for the remission of that amount the people of Canada, as I have said, were expected to give up \$7,300,000. We are in addition to risk the transfer of our important trade to United States ports, we are to introduce discriminating rates against Great Britain and to disturb our entire fiscal and industrial system, because the hon. gentleman himself admits that that would be the immediate result at all events, whatever might be the ultimate result of the adoption of this principle of unrestricted reciprocity. A few words as to the question of this large market, because that after all is the one argument produced to induce us to accept this principle. First as to manufactures. I am relieved considerably from the necessity of dealing with this question by the admission of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the effect would be simply to injure many of the manufactures of Canada. Is it in the interests of this country that we should injure those manufactures? What have the manufacturers of this country done that an injury of this kind proposed to be inflicted on them should be treated as a matter not only of no consequence but as a matter that actually should be received with considerable self-complacency by Parliament? True, it is said that the effect would be to induce us to do as is done in the United States, to adopt special classes of manufactures, that with the large market of 65,000,000 to supply instead of 5,000,000, manufacturers would adopt special lines, and having adopted those special lines, on the whole the manufacturing interests of this country would be promoted rather than retarded, after, of course the immediate disturbance has passed away, which the hon. gentleman admits is inevitable. But the adoption of those special lines involves a change of our manufactures altogether, the introduction of new machinery, the introduction of new capital; and I will ask any hon. gentleman whether he thinks any man would be so foolish as to invest large capital in Canada for special lines of manufactures in the hope that we might thereby get a market in the United States as well as in Canada, when by simply crossing the line he could secure for all time a market of 60,000,000 at all events, and for the time being the market of Canada as well. Remember that this reciprocity arrangement is not to be—I do not so understand it—a permanent arrangement, I mean an absolutely permanent arrangement. It will be a time treaty, and everyone knows that in a time treaty there will always be the termination of the treaty in the view of any man who is investing a single dollar in manufacturing industries or commerce in Canada. They will look at the past. They will remember that every treaty that we have had with the United States has been denounced the very moment the terms of the treaty permitted it. More than that. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says we are still to remain an independent community on this continent, that is independent so far as political connection with the United States is concerned, and we are still to remain connected with the mother country. The hon. gentleman disavows

any desire that we should separate from the mother country. There is, however, still the contingency which constantly must arise between nations of disagreement and rupture occurring between these nations, and a rupture as everybody knows ends a treaty and every manufacturer who is going to invest his money having regard to this market of 65,000,000 would stop to consider the contingency of a disagreement arising between the two nations, stopping trade and leaving him with all his investment he had made for a trade with 65,000,000 of people and only a market of 5,000,000 in which he could employ it. He would go, I say, to the other side of the line if he had the business capacity, business foresight and business enterprise which manufacturers are generally acknowledged to possess. So much for the manufacturers and for the wholesale merchants whose distributing trade would be affected by such a treaty. But we are told the farmers are the men who are going to gain largely by this treaty. We are told, and told truthfully, that they are the great majority of the people of Canada, that they are the people whose interests, if we could be shown that they were to be materially affected, ought to govern and supersede all other considerations in connection with the legislation of this Parliament. What is the fact in regard to them? Why not more than ten per cent. of the entire products of Canada go to the United States. I hear an hon. gentleman behind me, who is thoroughly familiar with this subject, say that not more than five per cent. goes to the United States, but I place the quantity at ten per cent.

Mr. WELSH. More than 20 per cent. goes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The overwhelming proportion is consumed in Canada. I think I may fairly say that \$360,000,000 worth is consumed in Canada out of some \$400,000,000 worth, the entire production of the farms in Canada. So that the interests of the farmer are to be advanced, not by improving the market for his 10 per cent., but by improving the market for the overwhelming quantity he sells at home by causing an improvement of the home market. That is the true policy with regard to the interests of the farmer in Canada. How is the home market to be improved? Every one knows that it is by building up urban populations, the home market is improved to the farmer. Has that been going on during the last few years? Look at the city of Toronto. The hon. gentleman says one or two of our towns have made progress. I say that all the important towns of Canada have made progress. Take the city of Toronto, whose assessed value in six years has increased \$42,000,000, and there are very few cities in the United States that can be said to have shown greater relative progress during the same time. Take the city of Montreal. Its assessed value in one single year has increased \$7,500,000, and that increased assessed value represents a largely increased population, a largely increased consuming population, consuming the products of the farmers of the country. The same progress substantially, yet not quite the same, may be said to have characterised the chief great centres of Canada. Now, what is the condition of the farmers at this moment? The hon. gentleman has told us they are in a very desperate condition, that the cost of farm lands has gone down, that the cost of farm produce has gone down; and he proposes to increase the price of farm land and increase the cost of the various products by destroying the manufacturing interests of Canada, by compelling us to resort to direct taxation, by stopping all the public works of every kind, because that is part of the hon. gentleman's policy; he proposes to increase the value of farm lands and of farm products by doing this, in order that he may obtain reciprocal free trade or rather unrestricted reciprocity, with the United States.

Now I will take some figures from an authority which can hardly be said to be an unfavorable authority at any rate to hon. gentlemen opposite. The figures are given in the report of Mr. Blue. Mr. Blue, as is well known, has developed into somewhat of a politician and he is to day I believe an ardent advocate of Commercial Union. Although it is none of my business, and I have no right to interfere with the officer of another Government I am bound to say that I think having regard to the fact that he is the statistician of the Government that he has to give figures and returns on those very important matters to the people of Ontario as a whole irrespective of politics that greater confidence might be reposed in him if it were not known—I do not mean to say recollect that he has misstated any figures—but greater confidence would be bestowed upon him if it were not known that he is interested in a movement which will be promoted by showing that the interests of the farmers are failing, and that their products are failing to realise the prices that they did before. But I take his figures which cannot be regarded as unfavorable figures by hon. gentlemen opposite. Ontario, according to Mr. Blue contains 22,000,000 acres of farm land occupied, of which 10,940,000 are cleared and 8,670,000 woodlands, and acreage in field crops 7,403,000, and orchards and gardens 186,616, and the remainder occupied by barns, buildings and minor crops. The total acreage of the Province in wheat (fall and spring) was 1,464,000 in 1886 and the product that year (it was less last year), was 27,900,000 bushels. The average price of farm land according to Mr. Blue in 1886 was \$9.78 per acre, and that instead of being a reduction of price was actually according to Mr. Blue again 22 cents per acre above the average in the years from 1882 to 1886. That is the statement made by Mr. Blue. The average value of the farm buildings was \$3.44 per acre, and the increase of 69 cents per acre over the average of 1882 and 1886. The average value of farming implements was \$2.32 per acre or 21 cents increase over the average from 1882 to 1886. The value of the live stock was 37 cents per acre above the five years' average. I think that those figures at any rate do not show that the value in the hands of the farmers are decreasing, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have led us to believe in his speech. We have here a very large increase in farm lands, buildings, stock and agricultural implements. We have on those an average increase of \$1.50 an acre in 1886 over the average of the preceding five years, or an aggregate increase of thirty millions of dollars in the pockets of the farmers of Ontario in 1886 over the average of the previous five years. That is not by any means an evidence of that poverty of which we hear so much from hon. gentlemen opposite. But they told us or will probably tell us that those farms are all mortgaged, that the farmers are hopelessly in debt, and that, therefore, on that account they find that the burden of paying the interest on their debt having regard to the prices that they are now getting for their products, is a burden which is intolerable to them although how they are going to get out of that by unrestricted reciprocity I have not yet been able to discover. I think I will be able to show before I get through that this policy would send them to the wrong market to get relief of that kind. Now there are sixty-five loan and building societies who make reports to the Financial Department of Canada. The loans represented by these companies who report to the Finance Department represent between \$30,000,000 and \$85,000,000, and the value of property from 1880 to 1883, according to those reports, in the Provinces of Canada increased \$32,000,000. The value of mortgages on property increased \$18,000,000. Between 1883 and 1886 the value of property again increased, curiously enough, \$32,000,000, while the value of

Mr. WHIME (Cardwell.)

mortgages on property increased \$12,000,000. In 1880 the default through the non-payment of interest or principal was about eight per cent. of the whole. In 1886 the default was reduced to four seven-tenths per cent., and in 1887 the condition of things was even better. I take two companies as an illustration, because recently they have held their meetings and have made their statements. The Canadian Company held its annual meeting in London, England, since the beginning of the present year. From the report of the remarks of the chairman I take the following:—

"The chairman referred to two facts, first that the company had reduced their rate of interest one per cent. because other companies were offering money at reduced rates, and secondly, that the proceeds obtained last year (1887) from the sale of lands in Canada were twenty-five per cent. higher than the value in December, 1886."

Those were the actual sales, forced sales I presume some of them, as well as sales not forced by reason of land falling as the result of foreclosure into the lands of the loan company. The North of Scotland Canadian Mortgage Company also held its meeting since the beginning of the new year:

"The chairman referred to the falling off in interest received in 1887 on mortgages in Canada. That is explained by the fact that a very considerable number of the mortgages made three or four years ago at a higher rate of interest have fallen in and the money has been lent out at the much less rate of interest current now."

They also report:

"The amount of real estate fallen into the hands of the company through foreclosure was but £8,000 out of £800,000 the company had invested, or only about one per cent."

Yet hon. gentlemen, in the face of those facts—facts which ought to be open to them if they were anxious to say something good of the country—tell us that the farmers of Canada have nothing but ruin staring them in the face. The rate of interest has fallen within the last six years at least two per cent., or a saving to the mortgagors in the operations of loan companies of a million and a half of dollars in a year. The value of farms has increased, money is cheaper and defaults are 70 per cent. less than five years ago. The savings of the farmers are increasing rapidly, and the loan companies are vying with each other to make loans on farm land. That is the position of things in Canada in relation to the farmers of the country. Now, hon. gentlemen tell us that the farmers will be better off if they went to the States. Happily for us, we have the record of the farmers in the States. They will be, I have no doubt, interesting. I think I can say this with perfect truth, that on the face of God's earth there are not to-day a body of men, take them on an average who are as well to do as the farmers of Ontario at the present time. Now, Sir, in the March report for the State of New York, right alongside of us, a wealthy state, with a large urban population and great cities which can afford immediate markets for the ordinary products of the land. This report is forwarded to the Washington Department of Agriculture, and the following reference is made to the farmers in New York. It is an official report made to Congress and it says:

"On the whole farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago. There are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged which would not now sell for more than the face of the mortgages, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which on an average is fully 33 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of buildings and other improvements, owing to this shrinkage."

In the United States generally the value of farm stock is declining in exact proportion to the increase in the number. The statistician of the Washington Bureau of Agriculture says:

"The decline of value in horses, mules and cattle has been in progress for two years. It averages 3 per cent. for horses and mules, 8 per cent. in cattle, 11 per cent in sheep and 15 per cent. in swine."

While numbers have increased except of sheep in two years past the aggregate valuation of farm animals is less by something over \$100,000,000."

During the same two years in which in the United States there was a decrease in value of farm stock to the above amount, notwithstanding the increase in numbers, Ontario had an increase in the number, excepting sheep and swine, and in the value of the live stock on her farms to the amount of \$8,250,000. In the United States it is estimated that in ten States, including Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, &c., the total value of the farm products is \$1,000,000,000 and that one-half of the farms are mortgaged. These produce \$500,000,000 in value; of this \$239,000,000 goes to pay interest, leaving \$261,000,000 to support 886,000 farmers and their families, or \$294 a year. These are the official records published at Washington for the information of the American Government and Congress, and I think they go to show that if the farmers of Canada want to improve their condition, it is not to the United States that they will have to go, because these farmers of Michigan and Illinois have all the advantages of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity—all the advantages which hon. gentlemen opposite promise to the people of Canada if they will only accept their panacea for the ills under which we are laboring. Now, what is the condition of the farmers of Canada. I take the statement of Prof. Wm. Brown, of the Ontario Agricultural College, an institution under the control of the Local Government of Ontario. He says:

"The average farmer of the Province of Ontario is doing well, is actually making money. He has by his own admission to our statistical department during the past five years been receiving a total crop value of \$1,925, say \$2,000 from all sources; this is the first proof and admission doubted by no one."

So that I think, Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts and figures, which are official on both sides of the line—from the officers of the Ontario Government, so far as Ontario is concerned, and from the officers of the American Government, so far as the United States is concerned—we may fairly say that the farmers of Canada find nothing to envy in the position of their neighbors on the other side of the line.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do they go there then?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Now, Sir, I will give the hon. gentleman an extract from a newspaper from which I have already quoted, I think the leading newspaper in the Western States, the *Chicago Times*, in regard to the condition of the farmers in those States:

"Farm mortgages are swallowing up millions of acres of land in Southern and Western States and Territories. The syndicates that loan money at from 1 to 3 per cent. per month are mainly made up of Scotch, English and New England capitalists, who have their agents throughout the south and west. These mortgages are falling due, and soon an immense number of southern and western farms will be in the hands of foreign mortgagees. It is said that \$200,000,000 has been loaned on farm mortgages in the south-west; in Kansas, \$20,000,000, and nearly as much in Nebraska. The territories are covered with mortgages on new farms not yet patented. In some of them the law has permitted outrageous interest, so that the farm mortgage business has grown into immense proportions. In many land districts half of the settlers borrow money at high interest to pay the small price required by the Government on proving up. This is leading to widespread disaster. The object of the pre-emption law is perverted. Eastern and foreign capitalists get the land with such improvements as the settler has put upon it. The settler loses all by reason of the exorbitant interest he is compelled to pay."

An hon. gentleman on the other side asks me why farmers leave Canada to go to the Western States. One reason is precisely such speeches as we have heard to-night. The farmers of Canada, listening to the statements of the hon. gentleman, who speaks as an ex-Minister of Finance, and whose statements the public have a right to assume, at any rate, ought to be taken as exact, finding that their condition is bad, and that in the United States everything is *coulour de rose*, have gone, many of them, to the United

States. But I know what is going on in Dakota to-day, and I tell the hon. gentlemen that as they have been compelled to realise that time has been their great enemy in the past, so they will find in the future that Canadians who have been entrapped into going to Dakota by statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, are now beginning to come back to Canada, so that at this moment the movement of population, instead of being from the north to the south, is from the south to the north.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Tell us about Canadians who invest in Texas ranches.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman desires to insult any members of this House, perhaps if enquiries were made into some of his own investments—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have made no investments in the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We are told of this enormous passage of population from Canada to the United States. It is quite true there are Canadians in the United States, just as it is quite true that there are Americans in Canada. It is quite true that in Canada, as in the Eastern States, there has been a movement of population westward. Up to quite recently we had no North-West of our own where those people could go to. They are beginning to go there now. We have in this House to-day representatives from those Territories, who I venture to say will give the hon. gentlemen his answer with regard to them, probably before this debate is ended. But what is the fact with regard to the movement of population? I take the New England States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maine, and what do we find? That in 50 years the increase in the population of those States has been 2,056,309, that is from 1,953,717 to a little over 4,000,000, while in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island during the same period the population has increased from 1,065,215 to 4,142,951, or an increase of 3,087,736. Canada, which started fifty years ago with a population of 1,000,000 less than that of the New England States, which, I think, hon. gentlemen will admit with me stands relatively under very much the same conditions as we do, finds itself at the end of the fifty years with a population of 140,000 more than they. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite contend that the people of this country are leaving because they cannot make money. Now there is another question, and that is the question of the prices which are paid for products in the two countries. Mr. Wiman, as I have said before, did my constituency the honor of visiting it on the 1st July last, and making his first speech there on commercial union in Canada. I regret very much I was not able to be present, not for the purpose of replying to him, but of joining with my constituents in extending to Mr. Wiman and the distinguished American who accompanied him a hearty welcome to the county. In that speech Mr. Wiman, speaking to the farmers, made some statements, of which we have heard the like to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford. He told the farmers of Cardwell that he knew a good many people in the city of New York, who live at the magnificent rate of millionaires, and to whom the question of what they would put on their table was a matter of no consequence. For "broilers," he said, a term which I find a good many people knew nothing about, for broilers they would pay three dollars a pair, and for the finest class of butter 60 cents a pound, and so on with a number of articles, leaving the impression upon the minds of the people he was addressing that if they had only commercial union, they would find themselves supplying broilers to the tables of millionaires and also supplying fancy articles of butter. We have had statements of that kind to-night from the hon. member for South

Oxford. Were they fair statements? Did he take the trouble before making them, to examine the prices of ordinary articles of the farm in the towns of the United States and Canada and make a comparison? I do not think he did. Now what is the fact. Take, for instance, the city of Buffalo and the city of Toronto. After reading Mr. Wiman's speech I had the curiosity to compare the markets on the first of July of Buffalo and Toronto with each other; and curiously enough, as to the majority of these ordinary articles, the price was higher than Toronto, although the farmers of Albany and the surrounding district were in much closer proximity to the wealthy millionaires upon whose tables broilers, &c., were used, than were the farmers of Toronto. On the 9th of this month, taking the prices of ordinary articles upon the market of Buffalo and Toronto, I find they compare as follows:—

| | TORONTO. | | BUFFALO. | |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. |
| Oats, per bushel | 0 44 to | 0 45 | 0 39 to | 0 40 |
| Hay, per ton | 14 00 to | 16 00 | 12 00 to | 14 00 |
| Potatoes, per bag | 1 00 to | 1 10 | 0 85 to | 0 90 |
| Butter, choice, per lb | 0 20 to | 0 21 | 0 22 to | 0 24 |
| do fair to good, per lb | 0 15 to | 0 18 | 0 18 to | 0 20 |
| Turkeys, per lb | 0 12 to | 0 13 | 0 10 to | 0 12 |
| Chickens, per lb | 0 12 to | 0 13 | 0 10 to | 0 12 |
| Geese, per lb | 0 10 to | 0 10½ | 0 07 to | 0 10 |
| Apples, per brl | 1 75 to | 2 60 | 1 25 to | 2 50 |
| Onions, per bag | 1 50 to | 2 00 | 1 25 to | 1 50 |
| Turnips do | 0 40 to | 0 50 | 0 40 to | 0 50 |
| Carrots do | 0 50 to | 0 60 | 0 55 to | 0 65 |

So that hon. gentlemen will see these are the ordinary articles which the farmers produce and carry to the market of Buffalo on the one side and Toronto on the other. The farmer in the vicinity of Toronto is better off on the whole, although the farmer in the vicinity of Albany has unrestricted reciprocity with the other parts of the American Union, although he has in fact commercial union. How do the prices in Toronto and Milwaukee compare? I have not examined the figures myself, but took them from the *New York Witness*, which, I presume, is a good authority. They compare as follows:—

| | TORONTO. | | MILWAUKEE | |
|-----------------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. | \$ cts. |
| Wheat | 0 73 to | 0 83½ | 0 60 to | 0 70 |
| Oats | 0 45 to | 0 47 | 0 32 to | 0 38 |
| Barley | 0 70 to | 0 82 | 0 60 to | 0 68 |
| Live hogs | 5 00 to | 5 50 | 4 00 to | 4 60 |
| Cattle | 2 50 to | 4 50 | 2 50 to | 4 00 |
| Eggs | 0 22 to | 0 30 | 0 17 to | 0 18 |
| Butter | 0 18 to | 0 25 | 0 18 to | 0 20 |

These are simply the ordinary market reports, showing one reason I fancy why the official statistician for the Province of Ontario can report a so much more favorable condition

of affairs to farmers of that Province than the official statistics of the United States can record with reference to the farmers of the latter. I shall not detain the House longer. As I said in commencing, the people of this country have always been and are always ready to enter into the freest commercial relations with our neighbors, consistent with the great policy of developing our own industries. I protest against the character of speeches such as that to which we have listened to-night. If hon. gentlemen opposite have sat on that side for ten years, they owe that fact chiefly to just such speeches as the one we have heard from the hon. member for South Oxford. They mistake the temper of the people of Canada, they mistake the temper of the electors of this country, if they imagine that the electors will tolerate this perpetual depreciation of the country itself, and I cannot in this sense do better than to offer as a heritage to hon. gentlemen opposite and through them to the country the words of a former leader of the Liberal party, a great leader, who, whatever difference of opinion may have existed as to his motives and opinions upon some questions was at least a sincere and devoted Canadian and loyalist. I alluded to the late Hon. George Brown. I cannot do better than give his words as a heritage which, it seems to me, it is well worth our while to hold in memory as the conclusions of the remarks I have just made:

"Neither politically nor commercially does Canada need to change her position to secure a high degree of prosperity. In all that conduces to personal comfort and happiness, in the steady development of home and foreign trade, in the extension of public enterprise, in the flourishing condition of our farmers and in the unlimited scope for the employment of a vast population, Canada has all that a nation can desire."

Mr. DAVIES moved the adjournment of the debate.
Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask what effort the Postmaster General has made to expedite the delivery of mails. From Monday last there has not been a mail which has arrived here from west of Toronto, and this is Wednesday. Has anything been done in this matter?

Mr. McLELAN. There has been a blockade on several of the railways in consequence of the snowstorm.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am aware of that, but what I want to know is whether the Minister has made any effort to get the mails forwarded.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11 55 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, March 15, 1888.

No. 16.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 15th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COST OF RAILWAYS IN CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the nominal cost, as given to 1st January, 1888, of all railways in the Dominion of Canada?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have made enquiries in order to get a return to this question, but I am informed that this information can only be given to the 1st of July, 1887. The figures that are given to me to that date are as follows: The subscribed capital is \$716,970,950, and the paid up capital is \$678,182,769.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The paid up capital?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the House will permit me, I rather think the hon. gentleman has been a little misinformed on that subject. It is scarcely possible that it can amount to as much, because, exclusive of paid up capital, there would be a huge charge for bonds and other matters of that kind. However, it is vastly above the figures I named, so that it does not hurt my argument. But I think the hon. gentleman will find that there has been an error in the statement. It might, probably, be as well to have it correct. I know the details myself pretty well in the railway statistics, and if the hon. gentleman will compare these details, he will see that it is scarcely within the limits of possibility that there should have been \$678,000,000 of capital paid up. The total cost may have amounted to that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I do not know. I communicated with the chief engineer of railways, Mr. Schreiber, and these are the figures he sent me yesterday.

COMMISSION ROYALE DU TRAVAIL.

M. BEAUSOLEIL demande: Le gouvernement a-t-il reçu aucune plainte verbale ou écrite concernant la conduite du président ou d'aucun membre de la Commission Royale du Travail dans l'exercice de ses fonctions officielles; et si oui, quelle est la nature de ces plaintes?

16--1888--1

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: La réponse que j'ai à donner à l'honorable député sur cette question est une réponse négative.

DEPOSITIONS TAKEN BY THE LABOR COMMISSION

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government received from the chairman of the Royal Commission on Labor an application for authority to furnish to parties interested duly certified copies of the depositions taken by the said commission; and if so, what authorisation did they receive?

Mr. BOWELL. Application was made by some parties to the commission for the evidence here mentioned. The Government declined to permit the evidence to be given to any interested party until it had been reported to the Government.

LEGAL TENDER IN GOLD.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, 1. Is it the intention of the Government to compel the banks to keep a requisite reserve—that is, a fixed percentage of circulation and deposit? 2. To abolish the present dual legal tender making American gold the sole legal tender? 3. Is the Government aware that by refusing to redeem the legal tender notes in American gold (whilst holding plenty) a grievous burden is imposed upon the community—exchange on New York being forced to a premium sufficient to recoup for the loss sustained by the remittance of British gold?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole question of banks and the banking system is now under the consideration of the Government, and I presume will also come under the consideration of the House of Commons. Hon. gentlemen know that the bank charters expire in 1890, and in the meantime the whole subject will be fully studied with a view to consider the whole question of our banking and commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman will notice that this enquiry refers more particularly to the action of the Government, than to the banks.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether, in consequence of the discovery of gold on the upper waters of the Yukon River, and the growing importance of having the boundary between Alaska and the Dominion of Canada defined, steps have been taken to secure an early location of the same by joint action and agreement of the United States and Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Communications have been going on between the United States and Her Majesty's Government, and also with Canada, with a view, if possible, of settling by agreement the boundary between Alaska and Canada.

COST OF THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What is the total amount of money disbursed by the Government in consequence of the North-West rebellion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Militia, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the question involves a number of accounts in several departments. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to stand as a notice for a return, the return will be brought down at once, and the same for the next question.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that on this side of the House my hon. friend beside me, and myself in particular, are exposed to a very heavy draught. It is all fair that the Opposition should be kept in the cold shades, but I object to being kept in a draught, and I hope the Minister of Public Works, who is responsible for this building, will endeavor to take some steps so as to prevent this very serious inconvenience. It is not quite fair that a man should be required to make a long speech here with a draught striking on him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and we on this side of the House have felt the draught as well. The attention of the chief architect of the department has been called to this. He has examined the building, and some defects in the windows have been remedied; but the constant opening of the doors in the chamber and the opening of doors leading to the galleries, some of which are occasionally left open, make it very difficult not to have draughts. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite will understand that we do not want to treat them, in that respect at all events, different from ourselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the Minister will take the matter into his consideration, as it is a very serious annoyance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to direct attention to one feature, which is, that it is impossible to get fresh air without having a current of air when it comes in. If we put an end to draughts we will sit in a very injurious atmosphere, and while I admit that the matter is very difficult to regulate, it will be better I think to have the fresh air.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You wish to honor the drafts.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with thanks the loyal Address you have voted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the session.

I receive with satisfaction your assurance that your earnest and careful attention will be given to the important measures which are to be submitted for your consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Ottawa, 13th March, 1888.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD,

the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps, at an early date, to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is felt on both sides of the House that no question of more importance could engage its attention at the present time than that embodied in the resolution submitted by my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a matter of deep regret that upon the present occasion above all others the hon. Minister of Finance is unable, through sickness, to take part in our deliberations. It would have been to those on this side of the House a great pleasure to have heard him in reply to the speech which was delivered by the mover of this resolution. Whether he would have taken the course that the gentleman who took his place adopted or not, I am not prepared to say; but his intimate knowledge of public affairs, his special knowledge of the wants of the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion, and the knowledge he has gained while acting as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries in the late Fisheries conference, would, I am sure, have qualified him to have grappled with the very large and important question before us in a manner in which I may say, without any disrespect to the hon. gentleman opposite, he failed to grapple with it. Sir, the hon. gentleman who opened the debate opened it in a speech which I think is admitted on all sides to have been equal to the occasion. He recognised not only the importance but the gravity of the issues which were contained in the resolution he submitted, and I think it will be admitted that for power, ability and eloquence this House has seldom listened to a more able exposition of the commercial relations of Canada and other countries. I do not think that the hon. gentleman who replied to the hon. member for South Oxford did as fully appreciate the argument which had been advanced by the mover. It struck me that the hon. gentleman delivered a speech which had been prepared for a different occasion. He seemed to me for a long time to be barking up the wrong tree, he seemed, either wilfully or otherwise, not to have recognised the proposition submitted in the resolution, which is in writing and which seems to be very clear and unambiguous, and the hon. gentleman discussed at great length a proposition for commercial union and advanced certain objections to that proposition which to his mind seemed to be insuperable. I should like to know whether the hon. Minister of Finance, if he had been here, would have endorsed the line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman. I am not so sure that the Premier himself, before this debate is over, will be prepared thoroughly to endorse that line of argument. If he does he will have to go back upon his past record in some respects, to go back on it very seriously; and I am rather inclined to think that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) went further, perhaps, than his brief warranted. He started out with the assertion that the resolution embodied a new panacea for the solution of Canada's difficulties. He endeavored to lead the House to believe that the advocacy of freer and better and larger commercial relations with the United States was a new plank in the platform of the Liberal party, forgetting that so long as that party has been a party the desire to obtain freer, better and wider commercial relations with the United States has been one of the principal planks in its platform. Why, he surely could not have remembered that when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, negotiations were entered into between his Government and that of the United States which resulted in a draft treaty being agreed to for enlarged commercial relations with that country, not confined to the natural products of the

country, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) would like our treaties to be confined, but extending far and beyond that, and embracing in addition to our natural productions a large number of manufactured articles. Does he forget, too, that in the years 1884 and 1885 the Liberal party proposed in this House a resolution on each occasion, asking the endorsement of the House to the proposition that it was the duty of the Government for the time being to move in the direction of obtaining extended trade relations with the United States? Does he forget on that occasion, the last occasion, that the resolution declared that:

"In view of the early termination of the fisheries articles of the treaty of Washington, this House is of opinion the negotiations should be opened with the United States of America, as well as for the renewal of reciprocal privileges accorded by that treaty to American citizens and British subjects respectively, as for the opening up of additional reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States; and that in the conduct of negotiations, Canada should be directly represented."

In the face of these propositions how can the hon. gentleman have the hardihood to assert that the proposition now before the House, submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford, is a new proposition and affords a new panacea for the difficulties of Canada? The hon. gentleman referred at some length, at undue and unnecessary length I think, to the speech delivered by Mr. Blake at Malvern, a year ago, and he started out with a declaration that that speech did not lay down any platform such as that which we have embodied in the resolution here. But before the hon. member finished his quotation he was obliged to read the words, "that one of the planks in the platform of the Liberal party was to obtain reciprocal trade with the United States of America." The hon. gentleman objected that Mr. Blake, upon that occasion, did not enlarge upon that plank; did not treat his hearers to three or four pages of arguments in favor of it; but Mr. Blake was then laying down what the platform of the Liberal party was, and it would take, I think, even an abler and more eloquent gentleman than Mr. Blake to exhaust all the arguments in favor of the numerous propositions which he was advancing on behalf of the Liberal party and which he thought the country ought to accept. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman went further. He fairly glorified in the fact that on that occasion Mr. Blake admitted that such had been the extravagance of the Government which had charge of the administration of affairs in this country for the last eight or ten years, and such were the permanent heavy charges that they have added on to Canada, that the taxation and the expenditure which it was once able to reduce very much, now had to be kept up to a very much larger sum than they ought to be. He gloried in that fact, Sir. He, a Minister of the Crown, knew that the expenditure and the taxation had been increased by the political party to which he gave in his adhesion, and that he was one of those who had increased the taxation so enormously by a sum nearly up to \$11,000,000, on account of enormous increased expenditure, bringing the affairs of this country to such a pass that the fixed expenditure was such that Mr. Blake was not able to promise as much reduction in the tariff as he would like to have promised. The hon. gentleman gloried in that state of affairs and said that this showed that the Reform party had gone back on their free trade principles. It shows nothing of the kind. The Reform party have not gone back on their desire for free trade principles, or on their desire to extend to Canada those free trade principles as far as it is possible to extend them. But the Reform party cannot ignore the fact that eight or ten years of reckless misgovernment and extravagance has launched this country into such a financial state that it was impossible to apply their free trade principles as fully and as freely and as strongly as they would like to do. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in his speech—which I may say was more remarkable for its omissions than for what it did contain—did

not grapple or attempt to grapple with the statesmanlike propositions which had been advanced by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman who proposed the motion did not seek to hide the fact that that new departure, if accepted, was surrounded with a great many difficulties. We know, Sir, that you cannot have a change to the large extent that is proposed here without a change in the commercial aspect of the affairs of this country. This, no doubt, would involve us in a great many difficulties; but, Sir, it is the duty of statesmen to meet those difficulties, and my hon. friend, I think, laid down the lines on which he would proceed, and he argued at great length, taking up each difficulty, one after the other, and showed how they could be met. I did not hear the hon. the Minister of Interior attempt to answer any of those arguments. I did not hear him reply to the facts upon which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) based his proposition. Let me recall the attention of the House to a few of those facts. I will not detain the House very long, nor enlarge upon them. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made the assertion here—with all the experience he had gained as a former Finance Minister and in connection with the responsible position which he holds as financial critic of this side of the House—that if the policy pursued by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) when in power had been pursued to this day, there would be at least a saving of \$10,000,000 in the taxation of the country, and instead of the pitiful 40,000 people in Manitoba and the North-West, that country which we looked to a few years ago as the salvation almost of this Dominion, there would be at least half a million people there to-day. Did the Minister of Interior attempt to deny any one of those propositions? He did not. A reference to the Public Accounts will show that to-day the taxation of this country is eleven or twelve million dollars more than it was when Mr. Mackenzie went out of power, and the hon. gentleman knows by the returns which he and his colleagues have brought down that, so far from being one tithe or one-twentieth of the number of people in the North-West that they predicted there would be there, there is a pitiful 40,000 of an increase in population since Mr. Mackenzie went out of power. That proposition was one deserving of serious attention. If the proposition is based on truth it requires an answer, if it is true and the remedy which the hon. gentleman proposes under the circumstances which now exist is not a correct one, the hon. the Minister of the Interior himself ought to have proposed some other remedy. But what is the remedy he proposed? And after a two-hours' speech he has no remedy at all. The policy of increasing taxation and extravagance is to go on year after year until, Sir, in the near future, when the people's backs can bear the burden no longer, some constitutional or unconstitutional change must take place to give them relief. Then, Sir, there was another statement of fact which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) brought to the notice of the House. He had mentioned it before, but it is an important fact and will bear repetition again. It was that between 1881 and 1886, while we had spent \$2,000,000 in bringing emigrants into this country, and while we have brought 477,000 emigrants here, there were but 25,000 of those settlers in the North-West and Manitoba, and that 452,000 of the immigrants brought into this country, at a very large expense to the public exchequer, had left this country after they came here. Why did they leave? The hon. gentleman knows, and his colleagues know, that those emigrants came to a country as fine as the sun shines upon. Whether you go to the Maritime Provinces, possessing the richest fisheries in the world, mines which cannot be surpassed in any part of the world, I believe, agricultural lands capable of feeding thousands and thousands and hundreds of thou-

sands more people than at present occupy them, whether he goes to the fertile region of Ontario, or the great, rich plains of the North-West, he must see that in Canada we have natural advantages which cannot be surpassed by any country on this side of the Atlantic. And when he was asked to say why the hundreds of thousands of people brought here at the public expense, after they had come and surveyed the land, had left the country and joined a foreign power, the hon. gentleman was silent and passed it by in silence. Perhaps he was discreet, Sir, perhaps he would have to acknowledge that the extravagance and the taxation which now bears so heavily on the people of this country had frightened them away; and the only answer he could give was the pitiful, childish answer that those immigrants—whom I will undertake to say not one in a thousand has ever read a political speech—were frightened out of the country through remarks made from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Sir, it is true that the Government, some years ago, when they paid a large sum of money for some wonderful books to circulate among the emigrants who came into this country, circulated books printed in English among Germans and people of other nationalities who could not speak the English language. I do not think, Sir, that they ever took the trouble to submit to any of those foreign emigrants, the speeches of my hon. friend, which was said to be so lugubrious, amongst people whom I undertake to say could not read English at all. What took them away? Was it because the country was not as good a country as they were led to believe? The hon. gentleman knows it is not so. It was not because our country did not possess the advantages which they expected to find when they came here; but it was because the country has been cursed with an extravagant, and I will say it, a corrupt Government—a Government that has not sought primarily to develop the North-West so much as it has sought to maintain itself in power and to line the pockets of its hangers-on. The hon. gentleman, Sir, did not grapple with the statement made with reference to the debt and taxation of this country as compared with the debt and taxation of the country south of us. We know that if immigrants come to this country, whether the hard-headed Scotch from Scotland, or shrewd canny Irish or English people, and begin to compare its advantages with those of the neighboring country, they will at once see that Canada possesses a great many natural advantages over the United States; but, Sir, if they find that while we have been rolling up our debt and taxation at a rate unparalleled in the history of any British colony, the people to the south have been reducing theirs in an inverse ratio, I think those shrewd people will say, We prefer going to the country that is reducing its expenditure and taxation rather than to a new country which is rolling up both at the rate Canada is. We learn that, twenty years ago, our debt per head was not one-third of the debt per head of the United States, whereas to-day it is two and a-half times as great, and that at the same period our necessary taxation was one-third that of the United States, whereas to-day it is 50 per cent. higher than theirs. If these are facts, and if the hon. member for South Oxford overstated them in any way, then it was the duty of the hon. gentleman who replied to him to give any answer that could be given. But the hon. gentleman gave no answer because he knew he could not give it; he gave no answer because he could not question the accuracy of the facts stated. Now, Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford stated as a reason why we should seek to extend our commercial relations with other countries, that we had attempted to build up a large inter-provincial trade, and that this attempt, although it may have been conceived with the best motives, had not been successful. He stated why, but he did not give all the reasons. We have built an

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Intercolonial Railway at a cost of nearly \$50,000,000; we have tried to build up an inter-provincial commerce between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario, and between Ontario and the great West, and yet, after spending many millions of dollars, our attempt has been a comparative failure; and why? For one reason, that the circumstances of the different Provinces are such that there never can be a very large inter-provincial trade between them. The natural market of the group of Provinces, known as the Maritime Provinces, lies to the south of them in the New England States; and you may attempt to fight against geography, you may build all the railroads you like, but the results of a practical experience of twenty years have shown that while you may dam back the trade a little, and prevent the people of the Maritime Provinces from trading with the people with whom they ought to have natural trade relations, you cannot force their trade into an unnatural channel. Have you done so? What trade is there to-day between the Maritime Provinces and the upper Provinces of the Dominion? How much oats, how much fish, how much of any of the natural products of the soil or of the mine, do we send you? You carry the products of the mine almost for nothing over the Intercolonial railway, in order to force this trade, to such an extent that your Intercolonial railway at the present time is sinking, outside of interest, \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year, and you have nothing to carry which will make any return upon the annual cost of the railway. Then, Sir, the hon. gentlemen say, in reply to the statement, that the people are leaving the Maritime Provinces in large numbers every year. Oh, yes, but the people are going west. Well, Sir, we had the statement made yesterday that this is not the fact. The census returns are examined, and we find that there are, practically speaking, none of the Maritime people in the Province of Ontario, or in the Province of Quebec, and a very few in the Province of Manitoba. Where have they gone, then? To a country which hon. gentlemen term a foreign country—to the United States of America; and while the exodus from the eastern part of British North America to the west has been perfectly natural, the people who leave the New England States go to the western states and remain in their own country; but in Canada, owing to the want of the freer trade relations that we ought to possess, our people are driven, not to our own western prairies, where they might and would go, but to the south of the line. Do you suppose if the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories had not been hampered as they have been with the unnatural trade restrictions which you have placed upon them to prevent them dealing with those who are their natural neighbors, and who are prepared to deal with them—to buy what they have to sell and to sell to them what they want to buy—do you suppose the country would not have been filled up with the hardy yeomen of the Maritime Provinces who have gone west during the past few years. These men do not leave British North America because they are disloyal to the flag. They are loyal to the flag, and they would prefer to live in Canada under their Sovereign if they were allowed to remain; but in order to build up monopolies, to create rich colonisation companies, to fill the pockets of political favorites, to make rich a few favorite manufacturers who contribute to their election funds—in order to do this, you place a damper on the trade relations that ought to exist between this country and the United States; and the result is that those people, not being able to find a place in this country where they could farm successfully and live, are driven across the border. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not grapple with one of those statements more than that. This is a very large question, and there are very many points which a gentleman speaking on the Government side might be pardon

ed for overlooking; but there was a point mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford which I think ought to have challenged a moment's attention from the hon. member for Cardwell. Why, Sir, he mentioned a fact, which has been repeated to-day, that over \$800,000,000 has been locked up in railroads in this country. We have spent money with a lavish hand—public monies which we have voted, and private monies which have been invested—in railway enterprises in this country; and all for what? To give us better means of communication, for carrying away the surplus products of the land; and after you have built your railways at such an enormous cost, you place a barrier at the border so that the trade may not be carried to the people who want to buy it. A more insane policy was never conceived. What has the hon. gentleman to say in reply to the natural demand which has gone up from every section of this country—from the farmers, the fishermen, the miners and all the producing classes of the country—for freer trade relations. The answer of the hon. gentleman to-day is the answer he gave this House and this country when I had the honor of first sitting in this House some years ago. But he says we have placed our policy on the Statute-book; the people know, he says, we have made a statutory offer of exchange in natural products with the United States. Why, we know that statutory offer is a farce, and the hon. gentleman knows it was a farce and a blind from the day it was made. How many years has it been on the Statute-book? It has been there ever since the introduction of the National Policy. Has it ever evoked a responsive offer from the other side of the line? Never. The hon. gentleman talks of our offer to export to the United States all our natural products in return for the privilege of purchasing all their natural products. And what do we ever purchase of their products? Outside of the article of Indian corn, we purchase scarcely anything at all. The hon. gentleman knows, and his Government know, that they are merely playing with this question when they tell the people they are willing to establish unrestricted reciprocity in the natural products of the two countries. I say there is no reciprocity in that offer. The hon. gentleman evaded the principle set down in the resolution; he set up a man of straw and then proceeded to knock him down. He discussed the question of commercial union at very great length. I was not aware that the question of commercial union was embodied in this resolution before the House. That question may come up for discussion in this House, and the speech which the hon. gentleman fired off at half-cock may then be appropriate, but it was utterly irrelevant on this occasion, and no answer to the proposition laid down or the arguments advanced in support of that proposition by my hon. friend for South Oxford. The policy of the Liberal party, the policy agreed upon and formulated by the hon. member for South Oxford, is contained in that resolution, and that is not the policy advocated at present by Mr. Erastus Wiman and which the hon. gentleman took such pains to answer yesterday. The policy of Mr. Wiman is not that policy which is propounded here, and the hon. gentleman therefore wasted, in discussing it, a large part of the time of this House that he might profitably have employed in answering the arguments submitted on this side, were he able to do so. He declared that the resolution implied and involved the raising of our tariff as high as that of the United States. When and where did he learn that? It is not in the resolution; it was not declared to be his policy by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution; it cannot be deduced from anything contained in that resolution. It is not the fact. The policy of unrestricted reciprocity does not imply at all that the tariff of this country, as against the world, shall be raised up to the tariff of the United States. The tariff of this country, if unrestricted reciprocity were carried to-morrow, would be just as this

Parliament, which would retain supreme control over it, would choose to adopt. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman started out on his argument with the statement that unrestricted reciprocity involved the assimilation of our tariff with that of the United States, he made a statement which neither the resolution nor the argument advanced in support of the resolution justified. Then the hon. gentleman stated further that this proposition was going to destroy the trade of the St. Lawrence. Why will it destroy the trade of the St. Lawrence? If our tariff remains as it is to-day and the tariff of the United States remains as it is to-day, will not the trade, not only of Canada but the trade of the great western country belonging to the United States, naturally flow by the St. Lawrence. Will not the productions of that great western country flow from there down the St. Lawrence? What will restrict it? What will hamper it? Is not the St. Lawrence the natural channel which Providence intended for the trade of that great western country. The hon. gentleman well knows it is, and therefore to make the bald assertion, without a single vestige of proof to support it, that our proposition will have the effect of destroying the trade of the St. Lawrence, is utterly absurd. But the hon. gentleman stated that we were a happy country, and that if there was one part of the National Policy of which he was more proud than another, it was that which related to the incidents of taxation. In this country, he said, under this unrestricted reciprocity policy, there must be direct taxation. That was also a bugbear of the hon. gentleman's own imagination; that was also a man of straw of his own making. That does not at all necessarily follow our proposition. It was not propounded as part of the policy necessarily by my hon. friend from South Huron. And it does not follow it must necessarily take place. But, he says, if there was one part of the policy he approved of, it was that part of the National Policy by which the incidents of taxation bear almost entirely upon the rich and not upon the poor. Why, the hon. gentleman knows—no man knows better—that the evil underlying the National Policy is that it bears more heavily upon the poor than upon the rich man. The specific duties upon articles imported bear more heavily upon the coarse articles consumed by the poor than upon the fine articles consumed by the rich. If the hon. gentleman will take the articles which enter into the necessary consumption of the ordinary workingman, say a man whose income amounts to \$400 per year, and making first allowance for clothing, boots and shoes, he will find that for sugar, for groceries, for crockery and the little miscellaneous articles alone, the workingman, whose income is \$400, pays not less than \$35 to the revenue upon it.

Mr. BERGIN. Name the articles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the hon. gentleman take the articles, and he will find it is true. When a poor man pays at that rate on the necessities of life, for an hon. Minister of the experience of the hon. member for Cardwell to stand up in this House and say that a poor man's taxation is practically *nil*, is to insult the intelligence of this House and the country. But there is more than that. If the National Policy was intended to have, and if it has any effect at all, it should operate to exclude from this country those manufactures which, the hon. gentleman said, can be made in it. Therefore, the poor man, if he does not practically pay to the exchequer, pays into the pockets of the manufacturers, and the latter have taken the best possible means of establishing that he shall pay to the uttermost farthing. We hear of combines made in every branch of manufacture which is protected by this National Policy. To-day we have these manufacturers combining in all branches of trade—for what? To mulct the poor man still more. But the hon. gentleman reached the climax when he came to speak with reference to what he called the

doleful wail set up by the hon. member for South Oxford. It appears to me that these hon. gentlemen, or a few of them, believe it is the duty of a representative of the people to hide and cover up the truth. I contend, on the contrary, that it is the duty of a representative of the people to discover the truth, to discover the grievance, in order that he may discover the remedy for the grievance, and I say that he is no loyal man to the people or to the country who desires to hide the grievances or the evils under which the country labors. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out that for the last few years there had been a wonderful depression in the agricultural interests of this country; that in this young country, whose agricultural prosperity ought to proceed, not by slow degrees but by leaps and bounds as it did years ago, the agricultural industry appeared now to be stricken by paralysis, and that stagnation appeared to be the order of the day; that, while a few years ago our agricultural population were able to hold their own to a marvellous degree, to-day the wheels of progress have been turned aside and we are retrograding rather than progressing. The hon. member, for Cardwell (Mr. White) replied to the hon. member, and, with that jaunty air which he assumes when he wants the House to imagine that he knows everything on every subject, he said the House need not be alarmed, that all this was wrong, and this new Daniel who had come to judgment said he had in his hands the proof of the position he took. He said that if there was one thing which he admitted, it was the statistics prepared by his friend, Mr. Blue, of Ontario, and he commended the enterprise of the Ontario Government in the preparation of those statistics, and he said, I am going to destroy the Goliath of the other side with a single stone from my sling. I, the young David of the House. How did he do that? He asked us to place, as he said he was prepared to place, the most implicit confidence in the statistics of Mr. Blue. He told us that they showed it was not true that Canada was not progressing, and that he would show from those statistics that, during a certain number of years which he mentioned, the agricultural wealth of Ontario had developed, and he rolled it under his tongue as a sweet morsel, to the extent of some thirty millions of dollars, and he asked us to fall down and worship the statement he had set up. The hon. gentleman has acquired, perhaps from his having been a writer upon the daily press, a habit of jumping too hastily to too hastily formed conclusions. He takes a bird's-eye view of certain statistics in the same way as he would if he were writing an article for the *Montreal Gazette*. But let us take the very statistics the hon. gentleman has referred to. I am prepared for the nonce to assume that they are accurate, and that they point out correctly the relative increase in the agricultural wealth of the Province of Ontario during the time when my hon. friend from East York presided over the destinies of this country, and when the policy promoted by him and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was in force, and I am willing to compare that with the time during which the Government of which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who has his panacea for all the evils of the country, has been in power. What do I find by this blue book which he vouches for?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yellow book.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yellow book, if you like. What do I find from this yellow book? What do I find as the result of the stone which he has slung to destroy the effect of the Goliath opposite to him? We find that in the year 1873, when the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) took charge of the administration of affairs in this country, the average value of real estate in Ontario amounted to \$10.02 per acre. I ask, as a favor, the attention of my hon.

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.)

friend the member for Cardwell to this statement. In the year 1873 the average acreable value of land in the rural district of Ontario was \$10.02 per acre. I find that under the system of economy and prudence in the management of affairs, and keeping down the taxes of the country, and developing the resources of the country, on the part of the Government of that day, the value of real estate in the country districts rose until, in 1878, it had reached the enormous sum of \$18.14 per acre. Does the hon. gentleman know what that means? It means that in that period of time, about five years, the increase in value of the rural lands in the Province of Ontario amounted to \$160,000,000. There are about 120,000,000 acres of land in Ontario, and, according to the statements contained in this book to which the hon. gentleman gives his adhesion, the increase has been that which I have stated, which cannot be paralleled in the history of any country on this side of the Atlantic. It is a record of which the Government of Ontario ought to be proud, and of which any Government which had the direction of the affairs of the country would have a right to be proud. Then we had the National Policy brought into operation, putting taxes on all the consumers. While the value was \$18.14 per acre in 1878, nearly eight years go by, and in 1885, the last year I find recorded in this book which the hon. gentleman presents to the House as being undoubtedly true, I find that the acreable value had only gone up to \$19.71, or an increase per acre of \$1.57 in the seven years as against an increase of \$8.12 per acre in the previous five years. There you see that \$1.57 per acre represents the wonderful increase of \$30,000,000 that the hon. gentleman speaks of, while \$160,000,000 of increase took place in the five years when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. The hon. gentleman could take his pencil and see how much the ratio per cent. under the old *régime* was over the increase under the National Policy. I think it is just about 700 per cent., or that as nearly as possible. I have not a blackboard on which to make the calculation accurately, but if I am wrong he can correct it. I say that, in that statement, I have given an answer to the hour-and-a-half speech of the hon. gentleman. The statements which have been made from time to time by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as to the lamentable fact that progress has been stayed by this policy in the greatest Province in this Dominion, are proved by the figures for the accuracy of which he himself has vouched; but, if that is the case in the Province of Ontario, it is ten times more the case in the Province, or in the part of the Dominion from which I come. Go back to 1873 or to a few years before that, and, although we have no statistics which reduce it to a certainty of mathematical accuracy as we have here, I will appeal to the knowledge of fact of every man from the Province from which I come and from the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and what do they tell you? What will they tell you? Will they tell you that the agricultural interests have become wealthy during the past eight or nine years under the aegis and protection of the National Policy? Oh no! Our agricultural industry is depressed, our farmers are living without hope; our young men, the bone and sinew of the country—

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who says "no" must be speaking without any practical knowledge whatever. I think he comes from the Province of Nova Scotia. I can take him through county after county of Cape Breton from which the young men have fled, as from a plague, almost. I can take him to the Province of Prince Edward Island, and he will go through large districts where the young men, who ought to have remained at home to till the soil, and enrich the community, and make new homes for themselves, have abandoned that land and gone off to the United States; and I tell the hon. gentleman, that if it had

not been for the returns which these young men make yearly to their parents and their friends, the sad tale, as it stands to-day, would be ten times worse. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman wanted to show, to confirm his argument, that things are not so bad in Ontario as gentlemen on this side of the House have stated. I am not acquainted, personally, with the facts in Ontario, the actual condition of affairs, but I am acquainted with them in the Maritime Provinces. I give you my version; the deductions I draw from what I have seen, and know, and felt, and I give you from the blue book the truth of what takes place there. The hon. gentleman says: "I will prove to you, from figures from the United States, that the farmers are much more heavily mortgaged there than they are in Ontario; that the condition of the Ontario farmer, in respect to mortgages, is not half so bad as in some parts of the United States; that the exodus from Ontario is not so bad as it is from some of the States." How does he do it? The hon. gentleman takes the loan companies of Ontario and the lists of their mortgages, and he assumes that they form a fair statement of the mortgage debt upon the farms of Ontario. Well, I am informed by those who are conversant with the facts, that in a number of the largest counties of Ontario, the company's mortgage list does not show one-tenth of the mortgages that really exist upon the farms of the country. But with what does the hon. gentleman compare the great Province of Ontario? He takes the State of Vermont and the State of New Hampshire, and one or two other States, that do not possess one-tenth of the fertility, that do not possess one-tenth of the natural resources of the great and rich Province of Ontario—not one-hundredth, as an hon. friend beside me says—the sterile, rocky districts of Vermont and New Hampshire, and he says that they have only progressed in a certain ratio, and if Ontario has kept up, she ought to be satisfied. Sir, is that the way for an hon. gentleman to talk who wants to hold up his country properly in the eyes of the world? He could not use more depreciatory language than to compare the progress of Vermont and New Hampshire, in the same ratio, with the progress of Ontario, or even of the Maritime Provinces, if those Provinces had any thing like fair play. The natural resources of those States are not one-twentieth as great; and therefore while it is perfectly natural that young men should go from the rocks and the poor soil of Vermont and New Hampshire, to the richer soil of the western country, it is unnatural, and it is wrong, and it is owing to man's bad fiscal regulations, that the young men are driven from Ontario. What is natural in one case is artificial and unnatural in the other. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the hon. gentleman's speech at greater length, perhaps, than its importance justifies; but I think I have been enabled to show that one or two, at any rate, of his main propositions are utterly untenable. Now, I want to call the attention of the House for a very short time to the record of the Trade and Navigation Returns of this country, to ascertain whether the people should be satisfied with the continuance of the existing state of affairs. Is it true, or is it not true, that the people are satisfied? Is it true, or is it not true, that the people of the Maritime Provinces, or the people of Quebec, or the people of Ontario, or the people of the North-West, are satisfied that the present state of affairs should continue? The hon. member for Cardwell says they are. He says, I have nothing to offer you, we must go on as we are going, doubling the taxation, doubling the expenditure in so many years. We must depend on our own resources, and keep the present Government in power, and adopt no new-fangled schemes for the relief of the great mass of the people. There are just one or two prominent facts that I want to notice. I am aware they have been noticed before, but they are so important, in my opinion, that they will bear repeating. Sir, we

were told a few years ago that there were few countries on the face of the globe that were increasing in prosperity in the same ratio as Canada; we were told that the best index to that increase of prosperity was to be found in our navigation returns; that a country which from year to year added tens of thousands to its exports, and consequently tens of thousands to its wealth, was an improving country, a country that would afford a welcome asylum to the over-taxed and over-burdened people of other parts of the world. Sir, it is true that for years and years the export trade of Canada did increase largely, did go up by leaps and bounds, but what do we find to-day under the blighting influence of the National Policy? We find, Sir, that while, in the year 1873, the exports of this country reached the sum of \$89,789,000, in the year 1887 ought we not to look for an increase away beyond the hundreds? On the contrary, we find that the export trade has remained stationary, hardly a dollar of increase in the surplus exports of our products—89 millions in 1873, and 89 millions only in 1887. I say that fact, bold and bald as it is, ought to open our eyes, and call for more serious treatment than it has received at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. It shows us that our affairs are not in the satisfactory condition, they would lead us to believe. It shows us we must find some remedy other than that we now possess. What have we been doing during all this time? Why have we reason to expect that our surplus products for export should be largely increased? Not only because of the richness of our soil, not only because of the inexhaustible nature of our fisheries and our mines and our forests, but because we have been borrowing for a number of years past largely in the money markets of the world and bringing millions of dollars here and spending them in developing the resources of the country. This policy of rapid construction of railways, of rapid construction of public works, and the expenditure of millions of borrowed money, has gone on from year to year, and it has circulated an enormous amount of money among the people and has created in some places an apparent prosperity. But this expenditure is about ceasing now. I think the more prudent on the Government side have long ago come to the conclusion that we cannot go on borrowing forever, unless we can show that our wealth is increasing in such a degree as to justify us in believing we will be able to bear equally the burdens which increased borrowing places upon us. Let us look at our great wealth producing interests and see how we can develop and promote them. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated, in his address yesterday, that we should not be so concerned about foreign markets. He said: You must remember that after all is said and done, the home market is the great market for the people; he said that while the whole exports reached \$400,000,000—I think those are the correct figures, although I am only speaking from memory—only about 10 per cent. of the products were exported. Assuming his statement to be true, does it at all follow from it that the foreign market which purchases the ten millions or forty millions of surplus products we export is not of vital importance to us? Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know, the hon. gentleman does know, I venture to say—if he does not he has not learned one of the elementary principles of political economy—that it is the foreign market which controls the price we get for our products. Sir, if you want to know the price of oats or wheat or any of the products, a surplus of which we send abroad, you must look at the foreign markets which determine the price. It is the English market that determines the price of oats and the price of wheat, and, in fact, it is the market abroad which receives the surplus that determines the price of our products. The hon. gentleman knows that, and therefore, the price we obtain for the surplus of our products we export depends on the foreign market. The quantity we keep

at home and sell in the home market is regulated entirely by the price we get abroad, and the price we get abroad is, therefore, of vital importance. Now, let us compare the exports of to-day; and what do we find them to be? We find that out of total exports of \$80,000,000 from this country there were \$3,805,000 products of the soil, \$6,875,000 of the fisheries, \$20,484,000 of the forest, \$24,247,000 animals and their products, \$3,000,000 odd for manufactures, and \$644,000 for miscellaneous, which, together with some other items, makes a total of \$80,000,000. What fact does this convey to any thinking man? Compare the wonderful amount of exports of surplus products from the farm, from the forest, from the fisheries and from the mines, with the tawdry and paltry amount of manufactures we export, and then you can judge of the real relative importance of those industries to our people. A paltry \$3,000,000 worth of manufactures are exported from Canada, a sum less by hundreds of thousands than we exported from the country before the National Policy ever was introduced; and yet we are asked to sacrifice the interests of the people, who produce and export \$75,000,000 worth of products, in order to bolster and build up and make wealthy that class which exported \$3,000,000 worth. I hold that the farming community and those interested in the lumber interest, and the other interests I have mentioned, deserve more serious attention at the hands of this Parliament than the handful of people who are engaged in manufactures here, of which they export only \$3,000,000 worth. We cannot consume these products. Those \$80,000,000 worth of products we export we cannot consume here, that is evident. We must have a market for those products. You have developed as far as you can our trade by building the Intercolonial and other railways. You have endeavoured to force on the Maritime Provinces as much of the surplus products as you can. You have forced upon the Province of Quebec all the coal from the Maritime Provinces you can force by carrying it almost for nothing. You have forced trade wherever possible, and after all is said and done you have \$77,000,000 worth of the products of the mine, forest, land and sea to export abroad. Now, where does it go? We find there are two great countries which consume it all. We can almost put out of sight, in considering this question, those other countries of the world which, a few years ago, some of the statesmen supposed would become great purchasers of our surplus products. We find that Great Britain took \$38,000,000 of our surplus products, and the United States took \$35,000,000 worth. So, then, it is to those two countries that we must look for the sale of those products. Let us analyse just a little further those surplus products and find where they go. We find that of the products of the mine, of the value of \$3,800,000, the United States took over \$3,000,000 worth. It is true you have restricted the trade as much as possible. It is true that by building up barriers on this side and maintaining barriers on that, the statesmen of both countries have prevented the trade from reaching one-half of what it might have been; but even to-day, with all the restrictions, with all that men can do to stop the flow of traffic between the two countries, the surplus products of the mine are practically purchased by our neighbors in the great American Republic. So it is with regard to our fisheries. Of a total value of \$6,806,000 exported, the United States took nearly \$3,000,000 worth; and be it remembered that is the only market to which we are able to send those \$3,000,000 worth of products. We have no other market in the world for our mackerel except the United States, and we have no other market for our fresh fish. That is our market and our sole market, and it is well known to all who have studied the question, that you are hampering and destroying, as far as it is in the power of man to do, those great industries to which I have referred, by unnatural restrictions. Why, Sir, of the exports of our forests the United States takes \$9,000,000; of animals

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

and their products, \$7,291,000; agricultural products outside of that, \$7,966,248; and manufactures, \$1,250,000. Therefore, without wearying the House and going into some details,—details which have been given by my hon. friend, but which I have looked up and which are unnecessary to repeat:—we find, Sir, that to the south of us lies one country which, next to Great Britain, takes all the surplus products we have to sell. Now, Sir, the question is whether it is desirable or whether it is not desirable that we should remove all artificial barriers which intercept all the freest interchange of the surplus products of this country with the surplus products of the country south of us. What would be the effect if we did this? Why, Sir, the effects of the old reciprocity treaty, all confined as they were to natural products, have never been forgotten by the people of the Maritime Provinces. I do not know whether they were as profitable to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Well, then, if they were, the people of Quebec and Ontario must have as warm a heart for the return of those good old times as we have in the Maritime Provinces. It is true that under that old reciprocity treaty, to which I wish to call attention, that the amount of profits and benefits, and advantages were not confined to the Dominion of Canada. I do not claim that we possessed greater advantages under it than the United States. I mean to say that under the treaty the United States benefitted largely, and I mean to say that the figures show that, so far as the balance of trade is concerned, it points to the fact that the balance of trade was largely in their favor. We bought some from them and they bought from us during the period the reciprocity treaty was in force. And, Sir, I would just call the attention of the House for a few moments to the marvellous strides which the trade of this country received at the time when the annual products of both countries were allowed to flow free between the Dominion of Canada and the nation to the south of us. I find, Sir, on looking up the returns, that before the reciprocity treaty came into force the entire traffic between Canada and the United States was very small. In 1845 it was \$8,000,000, in 1846 \$9,000,000, in 1847 it increased to \$10,000,000, in 1848 to \$12,000,000, in 1850 to \$15,000,000, and in 1851 to \$18,000,000—slow, up-hill progress, but all the progress that could be made under the system of government and under the restrictions to trade which then existed. I find that in the year last before the reciprocity treaty, 1853, that the entire trade between the Provinces that now comprise the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America was \$20,000,000. I find, Sir, the first year after that treaty took place that the trade bounded up from \$20,000,000 to \$33,000,000, that two years afterwards it had gone up to \$42,000,000, that two years after that, in 1857, to \$46,000,000, in 1859 it had gone up to \$48,000,000, in 1863 to \$55,000,000, in 1864 to \$67,000,000, in 1865 to \$71,000,000, and in 1866 it had reached the tremendous figures of \$84,000,000. There is no stop, there is no halt. The producing power of this country was tested to its utmost and it was equal to the demand made upon it; and our fishermen, our farmers, and our lumbermen poured out their surplus products to the American market, and wealth rolled back upon them. I see opposite to me men who know the truth of what I am speaking. I would recall their attention to the time when in every creek in the Maritime Provinces the smaller vessels came there laden with the products we required from the farms and the looms of the United States and returned again with everything that our farmers, from their surplus products, had to sell. We had not one article to sell which they were not willing to buy, and to buy at a profitable rate. Wealth rolled in upon the country, as can be seen from the figures which the total trade returns of the country shows during that time. What has been the

consequence since, Sir? During that period of time the figures are large, the total interchange of traffic between the Dominion of Canada and the United States reached the immense and unparalleled figures of \$670,000,000. It is almost inconceivable—an amount which one can hardly grasp—but such are the facts as shown by the trade and navigation returns, and what was it that we purchased from the United States during that time? We purchased \$150,000,000 worth of farm products, \$3,500,000 worth of timber, \$21,000,000 worth miscellaneous goods and \$151,000,000 worth of general merchandise. We purchased it because it was for our advantage to purchase it, and we would not have purchased it unless it were so. We made money by the purchase, and we made money by the sale to the people of the United States of the millions of dollars I have mentioned bringing back those millions in return. What is the consequence of the repeal of that treaty? It had no sooner been repealed than the traffic fell from \$84,000,000 to \$57,000,000, a falling off in one year of nearly \$30,000,000. In the year following it was \$56,000,000. In 1869, two years afterwards, it remained at \$56,000,000. It struggled up and ascended steadily from that time until in the year 1878 it reached \$89,000,000, but to-day, Sir, we find it has gone back again to \$82,000,000. We find that during the period of the reciprocity treaty, that not only by the personal experience which every gentleman who remembers can bring to bear upon it, but by the statistics contained in our blue books as well, that it is proved beyond a doubt that the period of the reciprocity treaty was a period of unparalleled prosperity for Canada, whilst at the same time it was a period during which the United States reaped great gain from traffic with us. It was not a one-sided treaty. As hon. gentlemen opposite say, we are not going as beggars to the United States, we are not a poor country, we are a great country with great capabilities.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes think that they possess all the loyalty and all the love of country on their side of the House. I can tell them that we are as proud of our country and have as great a knowledge of its capabilities as they have, but we want to make it a country fit for us to live in ourselves and for our sons afterwards. We want to see its capabilities developed and not dwarfed by the politicians of the country; we want to see the restrictions upon that development removed; we want to see the trade of the country untrammelled; we do not want to see the whole interests of this great and growing Dominion sacrificed to the interests of a few who have put their money in the manufactures of the country. Do you say in answer to that, as the hon. gentleman said yesterday, "I am perfectly willing that there should be a return to that old system." I dare say you may be, I dare that you are, but the hon. gentleman knows that it is baying the moon. He has eight or ten years' experience of his offer, and he knows it will never be granted. I have already dwelt on that question. He knows he may keep the statutory offer there for ever and it will evoke no response from the people of the United States, because it is not, and we have no hesitation in saying it is not, a fair offer of reciprocal trade. It is asking too much from them and giving too little from us. The hon. gentleman introduced the National Policy in this country. He boasts that it received the endorsement of the majority of the people of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, "hear, hear," says my hon. friend; does he know why?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell him why. Does he know the ground upon which the people of the Maritime Pro-

vinces were asked, by the man who possesses as much power in the Government, if not more, than its chief, to adopt that policy? Do you think of the trade which came to the Maritime Provinces eight years ago? The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) got a rebuke yesterday which I think he had better take to heart. I will repeat the question, and, before he laughs, he had better hear what I say. I was going to ask, does he dare to think that a people trained up in the principle of free trade as the people of the Maritime Provinces have been, a people knowing and believing in the benefits of free trade, could be got to listen to a proposal to reverse the system under which they had grown prosperous and introduce a protective system alone because it was protective? No, you could not; you would not have polled a corporal's guard. But you came to them under false pretences; you said to them, We ask you to adopt the National Policy—in order that it may give benefits to you? Not at all. Did you try to prove that it would be in itself a benefit? No, but you told them it would be a means of obtaining that which you are all striving for—it would be a means of obtaining reciprocal trade with the United States. That is why you carried your National Policy in 1878. You carried it under false pretences. Sir Charles Tupper came to the city of Charlottetown, which I have now the honor to represent, and in the most emphatic terms pledged his word that what he was seeking was not an increase of taxation to build up manufactures, but it was to obtain that which was the greatest blessing the Maritime Provinces would ever have—it was to obtain reciprocity, and that was the only way they could get it. The people took him at his word, they voted for the National Policy, and they were sold; and to-day they are farther off from reciprocity than ever.) The less the hon. gentleman says about the election the better. We know how it was carried. Take the Province where they did not spend money, where they did not pour it out in bribery—take the Province from which I come, and what is your answer? What was the issue on which my hon. friend and myself appealed to the people of that Province? The issue was reciprocity with the United States and the best means to obtain it; and we appealed to them to return a party to power who were in sympathy with that policy, and who were determined to do all that lay in their power to obtain it, and the people answered by sending a unanimous delegation for that purpose. It is true, Sir, in some of the other Provinces where you poured out the Government money like water, where you bought the people with their own money, the results were not the same as with us; but you know that if you had not made the promises with regard to railways in the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia, if you had not poured out the money as you did for the construction of public works, you would hardly have had a corporal's guard to back up the hon. Finance Minister. His own personal qualities and his long public life might possibly have insured his return, but I doubt that he would have had a corporal's guard to back him in the House. Why do I believe it? Because the interests of the people of Nova Scotia are identical with those of the people of Prince Edward Island, and the untrammelled vote in the one Province shows what the untrammelled vote would have been in the other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What a corrupt lot the people must be to be bought up in this way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, our Public Accounts show it. Why, they offered themselves to us, but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, we are not singular—it would be unnatural if we were—in feeling and predicting the great benefits which would accrue to this country from reciprocal trade with the United States. I do not know what the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government

may say to-day; I do not know what his views are now; but I know, Sir, that he shares the general belief that the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty was a great calamity to this country. In 1865, when he was negotiating for a renewal of that treaty, he put into a State document which he forwarded to the English Government a declaration of his own that the repeal of that treaty was a great calamity to Canada; and he went further—further, I think, than was necessary. He almost warned the British Government that unless that treaty was renewed in some form or other the loyalty of the people might be undermined. The hon. gentleman said at that time in a Minute of Council:

“Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty, of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the provinces has wholly disappeared.”

There had been dissatisfaction among some of those politically associated with the right hon. gentleman until we obtained access to our natural markets in the United States; but the dissatisfaction, he says, has ceased.

“Although the Commissioners would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government, of mere commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed; they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen—the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people.”

Statesmanlike words, those, Sir! The hon. gentleman tells the Home Government: I do not want to say that our loyalty depends altogether upon our obtaining and maintaining free commercial relations with the people of the United States, but such is always the case, and unless the people are contented, and unless the people are prosperous, you may look out for some disloyalty. He warns the British Government that unless some steps are taken the loyalty of the people will be undermined. And the hon. gentleman at that time, I have no doubt, was honest in his desire to bring about a renewal of that treaty under which we have prospered so much. But, Sir, at that time, if I am not incorrect, the hon. gentleman caused propositions to be made to the States which would have horror-stricken the hon. member for Cardwell—not propositions for an exchange of natural products alone, but propositions for the assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries. If the Hon. George Brown was correct in a statement he made in a speech delivered by him in 1865, negotiations were then on foot for a renewal of reciprocity with the United States. I wonder if the hon. gentleman will leave the Government when he discovers that his leader is heterodox on that point. We have not yet heard from the hon. the First Minister, but perhaps he may yet throw over the hon. member for Cardwell. He may yet approve of the resolution introduced, because, as I have shown, it does not go any further than the right hon. gentleman was willing to go when he was seeking a renewal of those treaty relations in 1865, when he declared that the abrogation of the treaty would be a great national calamity.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he make a treaty?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). But I find that these negotiations went still further. In 1879, the hon. gentleman again opened negotiations with the people of the United States for a renewal of that treaty; and I hope the hon. member for Cardwell will not be horror-stricken when he learns that again, in 1869,—I state this on the authority of

Mr. DAVIES, (P.E.I.)

the late Hon. George Brown—propositions were made a second time for the assimilation of the tariff of the two countries. I refer to the speech which the Hon. George Brown delivered in the Senate in 1875, in which he stated:

“In 1869, formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government, and the project of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. The project included the cession for a term of years of our fisheries to the United States, the enlargement and enjoyment of our canals, the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the assimilation of our customs and excise duties, and some other propositions.”

Is the hon. member for Cardwell willing to resign and leave a gentleman who has proved himself so disloyal as the First Minister did when he made those propositions? I have here the speech of the Hon. Mr. Huntington, who is now dead and gone, and whose silvery voice used to ring through this Chamber. In that speech Mr. Huntington stated he was aware from a person who could give him authoritative information, that such a project of treaty had been signed by the Hon. John Rose and the Secretary of the United States Treasury. That statement will be found in Mr. Huntington's speech of March 16th, 1870. Mr. Huntington said:

“I know something about the memorandum entered into by the contracting parties in regard to the preliminary negotiations, and I have my information from sources which I believe to be reliable and trustworthy. And I say that in the preliminary negotiations between Hon. Mr. Rose and Mr. Secretary Fish, it was agreed that the manufactures of both countries should be admitted duty free, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it.”

There is the statement, Sir, and I will go further. I will challenge the right hon. the First Minister to bring down the documents, if he dares deny the authoritative statement made by Mr. Huntington and by the Hon. Geo. Brown, who were both members of the Privy Council, and who both stated they had their information from the highest source. The hon. member for Cardwell has said that this proposition of ours involves an assimilation of the customs and excise duties, and is, therefore, a disloyal proposition. But the same proposition was made by his leader. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to justify his leader or to denounce him as disloyal?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would say that, several times in his speech, he has put words into my mouth which I never uttered. What I said was that a differential duty against England was disloyal to the mother country and inconsistent with our position.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask the hon. gentleman: Is not the proposition for differential duties just as much involved in the proposal of his leader, which I have just stated? If the hon. gentleman doubts what I say, let him turn his attention to the Order in Council which was adopted, and which was signed by Sir John Rose. On the 3rd September, 1868, at the very time when the right for the Dominion of Canada was discriminated in any way against the mother country was challenged, and when Sir John Rose penned a Minute of Council which was approved by the other members of the Cabinet, affirming our right to discriminate whenever we pleased against the mother land, why was that document signed? Why did the Government of that day contend that the Dominion of Canada had the right, if it chose, to discriminate against the manufactures of the mother country? Simply because the Government were then engaged in endeavoring to carry out a treaty which had that discrimination for one of its objects. I am not going to read this document at length, but I call the attention of those that wish to peruse it, to the document itself. It is to be found in No. 47 of the Sessional Papers for 1869. Sir John Rose, after devoting the first part of the minute to the assertion of the right of one Province to discriminate in favor of another Province against English goods, because Prince Edward Island was not then part of the Dominion, and the question was raised whether the Dominion had the

right to discriminate in favor of Prince Edward Island as against Great Britain—after disposing of that minor question, Sir John Rose then grappled with the second objection. He said:

"The second point as stated by His Grace, viz: 'The exclusive favor which substantially or, at all events, apparently might be conferred on the United States, if the clause providing for the admission of certain products of that country, in the event of certain contingencies, should come into operation,' and which His Grace is pleased to say: 'he fears could not be acceded to,' raises a question of such deep import to the people of this Dominion, that the undersigned deems it in his duty to advert to the course which has hitherto been pursued by Her Majesty's Government with reference to it, in the conviction that further consideration will lead His Grace to withdraw the objections which by anticipation have been advanced."

He then goes on to discuss the peculiar position in which Canada and the United States stand with regard to each other, and shows that it is for their mutual interest to exchange certain articles on reciprocal terms:

"The truth of this proposition has never been denied by Her Majesty's Government, but, on the contrary, their influence has been invariably exercised in furtherance of such reciprocal arrangements."

He then goes on to say:

"In 1885, the delegates from Canada, who visited England for the purpose of conferring with Her Majesty's Government on various important matters affecting the interests of the Dominion, were again assured that Sir Frederick Bruce, Her Majesty's Representative at Washington, had received instructions to negotiate for a renewal of the treaty, and to act in concert with the Government of Canada to that end."

It thus appears that the principle of establishing special trade relations on reciprocal terms between Canada and the United States has been formally recognised and approved by Her Majesty's Government since 1848. And having thus successfully, as he thinks, refuted the objection taken by His Grace, we have the subsequent statement made by the gentleman to whom I have referred, that they endeavored to negotiate with the United States for the assimilation of the duties of the two countries, which involved differential duties against the mother country. I think I have fairly proved that proposition. Then we had a new departure in 1878. We had the National Policy introduced, and there was an end of all propositions of that kind. Hon. gentlemen will see that it is not only in the statements made by leading and eloquent members of the then Opposition, which afterwards became the Government, that they were enabled to carry out that proposition of the National Policy, but that they placed upon the face of their proposition a statement which was not of any intrinsic value in the proposition itself, but might have had great value in regard to the trade with the United States, and it was on that ground that they asked the people to adopt it. Let me read the proposition which was made by the hon. the First Minister at that time. After reciting that it is desirable to adopt a national policy, he goes on:

"That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the various interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country—"

What?

"Eventually a reciprocity of trade."

That is what you were leading up to, or what you said you were leading up to, and what you deluded the people of the country into believing you were leading up to, and that is why you carried your National Policy. But I contend that that proposition has been a failure. It has not led to reciprocity of trade. On the contrary, it has had a most unfortunate effect on our commercial connection with the United States. It can hardly be believed that four and a half millions of people in this country can convert sixty

millions of people in the great country to the south of us to our views by any threat of forcing them into trade relations. The proposition was absurd from the start, and now you are further away than you were at the time the National Policy was first instituted from the end you proposed to gain. What do we find now? Bringing the matter down to the present day, we find that the fishery embargo has brought together the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain and the United States to try and solve the disputes which have been so serious that, as Mr. Bayard expresses it, unless they are satisfactorily solved, they may result in war. No other meaning can be attached to this language. What do we find to-day? We find that the leader of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who spoke yesterday, the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper), goes to Washington, and does he tell Mr. Bayard, or does he, in answer to his proposition, use the language of the hon. member for Cardwell, and say offensively to the people of the United States, "You have our proposition and we can go no further than we have expressed in the Statute?" Sir Charles Tupper, I hope, is too great a lover of his country to take that course; and he says, I will treat this question of trade relations in a different way. We are not the suppliants in this case. We are not sacrificing any question of honor. Mr. Bayard, that great statesman, comes to us and says:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

I think this Parliament may thank its stars that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was not sent to Washington to answer that proposition of Mr. Bayard, and to tell him that the one way of settling the matter by a liberal and statesmanlike plan of dealing with the commercial relations of the two countries was, only, that the Government would not go beyond the statutory provision they had already made. Sir Charles Tupper tells Mr. Bayard that he coincides fully with him:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

None of your pettifogging propositions as included in the resolution of 1878, but a broad and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries, or, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) puts it, unrestricted interchange of the natural and manufactured articles of the two countries. That is paraphrasing the language used by Secretary Bayard and re-echoed by Sir Charles Tupper, and we are not going further to-day than Sir Charles Tupper has gone in his reply to the note of Secretary Bayard. Now we have that great country holding out the right hand of fellowship, and, through its Secretary of State, inviting us to declare what we believe to be the broad and liberal and comprehensive measures we should adopt. It is known that the American commissioners refused to accept the offer Sir Charles Tupper made to treat in regard to the commercial relations of the two countries, and it is known why they refused. Those commissioners had not the power to deal with that matter, and it is known that the Congress of the United States is most jealous of interference by the representatives of the President with its supreme control over the commercial relations of that country, it is well known that they desire to maintain intact their right to regulate the tariff of the country as they see best; and so we see to-day in that great body members proposing, one a scheme known as Commercial Union, and another a proposition known as Unrestricted Reciprocity, which is as akin to ours as it can be. Thus, we have the leading men on both sides, in their respective Legislatures, taking a common-sense view of this great question which is being talked over at

every fireside on both sides of the line, and is of the utmost importance to the people of this Dominion. We have now an opportunity of declaring whether we are in earnest in desiring broad, liberal and comprehensive measures with the United States, or whether we are dangling this before the eyes of the people for political purposes. It has come down to that, and those who to-day vote a negative to the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will be voting against the proposition which I believe a very large majority of the people of the United States are prepared to make, if they see a desire on this side of the line to meet them half-way. There have been a few objections raised to this proposition, and my hon. friend has answered some of them. I will not touch upon the ground he has occupied. The hon. gentleman opposite says this will discriminate against Great Britain. Necessarily it must to some extent, but we cannot help that. It necessarily must discriminate against Great Britain somehow. We cannot help that. But this discrimination is not half as great as it is generally supposed. In fact we have a right to discriminate; the question is, is it in our interest to discriminate or not?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the point.

Mr. DAVIES. That is the point. I say while we are loyal to England and loyal to the English flag, we are here representing the Canadian people in our Legislature. We are not now in waddling clothes. The time has gone by when the legislation of this country is to be moulded to suit the interests of the English manufacturer. The legislation of this country must be moulded to suit the interest of the Canadian producer and the Canadian consumer. I remember well reading the other day that in 1859 objections were taken by the Colonial Secretary to the financial scheme introduced by Sir Alexander T. Galt, then Finance Minister of Canada, on the ground that it worked injuriously to the interest of the British manufacturer, and in that far-off time, Sir Alexander Galt, with the prescience of a true statesman, recognising the importance of Canadian interests, told him he was sorry it was so, but the interests of the Canadian people must be paramount to the interests of the British manufacturer. Sir, the words of that statesman—for I think I may fairly call him a statesman, I think he is entitled to that name—may be quoted by me on this occasion. Sir Alexander Galt, in reply to the dispatch from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, protesting against the enactment of the new Canadian tariff, moved to that protest by certain manufacturers of Sheffield, wrote:

"I must distinctly affirm the right of the Canadian Legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best, even if it should unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial Ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such acts unless the advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of the inhabitants."

That was the language of Sir Alexander T. Galt. We are a free people, we have control over our fiscal legislation, we know what is best for our own interests, we have power to deal with them, and if that power is to be superseded by some other persons, they must come here and take the responsibility of governing this country. But, Sir, having the power, how are we going to discriminate? As a matter of fact we have exercised that power already. Hon. gentlemen may say that they did not intend to do it, but I say that the practical effect of the incidence of taxation as it bears upon English goods and upon American goods, is to discriminate largely against the English. What do we find to-day? We find that there are \$25,766,273 of dutiable goods imported from Great Britain, and \$9,195,960 of free goods, making the total imports from Great Britain, \$14,962,233. Upon that sum you charge a duty of \$9,318,920, or as nearly as possible, 21 per cent. upon English imported goods. I find, Sir, that in the same year

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

—I am now speaking of 1887—we imported \$30,570,609 of dutiable goods from the States, and \$14,536,457 of free goods from the same country, making a total of \$45,107,066 from the United States. Upon those goods you exacted a duty of \$7,268,194, or a shade over 16 per cent. So that while you are levying upon the total English importations a duty of 21 per cent., you are levying upon the total imports from the United States a duty of only 16 per cent.: you have discriminated, practically, to the extent of nearly 4 per cent. I am not complaining about it; it may be in the interests of Canada that you should do so, and if it is in the interests of Canada, I am prepared to defend the discrimination. But, Sir, no question has ever been raised on this side of the House, no question has ever been raised outside, that that involved the loyalty of the Administration. You are legislating in the interests of those you represent, and you would be false and recreant to the people you represent if you did not do so. Whether it bears harshly or not upon a particular class at home, is not the question which we ought to have in view. But I say that, practically, the effect will not amount to much. We will continue to buy largely from Great Britain of those classes of goods we now buy. I say we will do more. I say that no man who recollects the prosperity of the people of Canada under the old treaty, does not know what the prosperity of the people will be if a new treaty is made, based upon the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford. We know that the people will be in a position to purchase two dollars for one dollar they now purchase of English goods, and if that is so, I would like to see the man who will have the hardihood to deny that the only result will be rather beneficial than otherwise to the English manufacturer. There is a very large class of goods you buy from England that you must continue to buy, even if trade becomes free between us and the States. England does not enter in competition with the United States in those classes of goods. Why, you see the United States to-day, with a tariff 10 per cent. higher than ours, and they purchase in the English market over \$150,000,000 yearly of English manufactured goods. Sir, if we had our tariff to-day and free trade with the States, we would still continue to import from England all those classes of goods which the Americans now find it to be their interest to import in spite of their high tariff. I believe myself that our importation of English goods under the new era of prosperity which would be inaugurated, would be largely in excess of what it is to-day, and I believe, therefore, that, practically, the English manufacturer would be benefitted instead of injured. I acknowledge that it has on the face of it an element of discrimination, but I say that if it is in favor of the Canadian people that it should be so, I, for one, am prepared to accept the responsibility of my vote. It may be said that there will be a loss of revenue. We know there will be a loss of revenue, and I think my hon. friend pointed out pretty clearly how he proposes to meet that loss of revenue. He proposes to meet it by following on the lines, in one respect, that have been advocated in this House for a number of years back. We say the pruning-knife must be applied to the expenditure, this matter must be dealt with vigorously, heroic measures of retrenchment must be adopted; and I think this side of the House, if entrusted with the administration of affairs, is prepared to adopt heroic measures of retrenchment. If this country could be governed as it was by my hon. friend from East York, when 23 millions sufficed to carry on the affairs of the country, instead of 36 millions that are now required, I think we would have no difficulty in meeting the loss of revenue. I say the first article in our creed is heroic retrenchment in the public expenditure. I say more than that: if our importations from England are, as I believe they will be, largely in excess of what they are now, your

revenue will proportionately increase, and if there is a small deficiency, we will be prepared, I have no doubt, to meet it, and the people will be prepared to make it up cheerfully when the time comes. Now, Sir, there is an element in this question which affects the people of the Maritime Provinces more than it does the people of western Canada. When the treaty negotiated by the late George Brown was presented to the country, it was found that he had obtained a very great boon for the people of the Maritime Provinces—the right to register colonial built ships in the United States. That, Sir, is a very great boon, and coupled with that, I venture to express the hope that one of the conditions referred to in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford—if his proposition is ever formulated into a treaty—will be that, in addition to the right to register our vessels in the United States and the reciprocal right of the United States to register their vessels in our country, we shall also have the privilege of the coasting trade of the United States. Sir, unrestricted reciprocity will be a boon to the whole country—it will be a great boon to Ontario, a great boon to Quebec, a great boon to Manitoba, a great boon to the Maritime Provinces; but if, along with it, we can have the coasting trade and the right to register our colonial built ships in the United States, why, Sir, who will dare to fix bounds to the prosperity which will encircle those Maritime Provinces. Our shipping trade, which at one time was a very prosperous trade, has gone down; it is melancholy to look at the figures. I find away back in 1877 we built 100,000 tons of shipping in the Maritime Provinces of the Dominion; to-day we are building but 27,000. Give us the right to register our ships in the United States, and in the Provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we can build hundreds of ships suitable for the coasting trade which will then go into service between the Provinces and the United States. We can do it, and we can do it profitably, for we have the money, the timber, the brawny arms, and intelligence and experience gained by many years of ship building, and we have the cheap labor and the sailors to man the ships afterwards. I doubt if there is any condition you can attach to this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity which will be of greater advantage to the whole Maritime Provinces, and to the Province of Quebec in addition, than this which I have mentioned, and which I venture to hope will form one of the conditions of reciprocity, conferring upon both countries respectively the right to register their ships in the other country, the right to register Canadian vessels in the United States and the right to register American vessels in Canada. Sir, we now have arrived, as it were, at the parting of the waves. We must make our choice between two policies. We have, on the one hand, the National Policy, with a statutory offer which we know has not been accepted, and will not be accepted and never can be accepted; we have, on the other hand, a broad, statesmanlike proposition submitted here for throwing down the barriers of trade and opening up unrestricted reciprocity between two countries. We have offered to us the choice between stagnation in our trade, as I am sorry to say it at present exists, and that prosperity which advanced by leaps and bounds under the old treaty and which will be renewed under the new. We have a controversy here, and we have to make our choice between legislation, on the one hand, for the classes and legislation, on the other hand, for the masses—legislation which has built up, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) pointed out, two or three large cities, which is making the assessed value of Toronto and Montreal very much larger than it was years ago, but which is doing so at the expense of other portions of the same Provinces. You are building up the cities at the expense of the country. The totality of your wealth is not increasing. Sir, we are as loyal as you are; but we are not loyal in one

quarter only, but we are loyal to the flag, loyal to the Canadian flag, loyal to the people we represent. Sir, I say it is not loyalty but disloyalty on the part of any member of this House if he shrinks from adopting measures which will be for our own interest and the interests of our people, for fear they would be disapproved by a small section of manufacturers. Sir, I am not afraid our manufacturers will go to the wall. There are certain classes of manufacturers which will go to the wall—those manufactures which exist only because they are bolstered up by this false system of the National Policy. Some of them may go; but when I see such men as millionaire Gibson, who owns one of the largest cotton factories in the Dominion of Canada, declaring openly, "I court unrestricted reciprocity because it will give me a large market, and I am not afraid to compete with manufacturers to the south of us." "I believe," he says, "I have money enough and brains enough, and our people are intelligent enough to enable us to compete successfully with those who are manufacturing cotton to the south. Give me the market—that is what I want." And hundreds are echoing the same cry. You cannot take up a copy of the *Mail* newspaper, which has devoted itself to this particular branch of the subject, without seeing that in all parts of the Dominion manufacturers are coming forward and declaring—what? Declaring they are going to be ruined, as the hon. member for Cardwell says? No. They are declaring they are ready to accept the situation, to join hands with the great agricultural, mining and lumbering interests of the Dominion and go in for this unrestricted reciprocity of trade, which will make prosperity follow over this Dominion like a sunbeam. Sir, I tell hon. gentlemen that this question has eaten too deeply into the hearts of the people to be disposed of with a single speech or a single phrase. The people have learned by experience. Time is on our side. Time the hon. member for Cardwell spoke about last night, and I tell him that time is on our side. The social conditions of the country are on our side, they are working for us, and all of our debates here will not stop the onward flow of public opinion which is being created at every fireside in this Dominion, based as it is upon the best interests of the people. Sir, we tender the people a flag of which we are not ashamed, a flag upon which is inscribed, "Unrestricted Trade with the United States—Freedom of Trade." Hon. gentlemen know that this sentiment will find an echo in the heart of every man who has attained manhood's estate and remembers what reciprocity brought us in the past; it will find an echo in the heart of every young man who to-day is in despair whether he should remain in this country or go abroad; it will find an echo in the heart of the bread-winner who finds it hard enough to earn sufficient to buy his daily bread, much less to put by a little for a rainy day; and we throw this flag to the breeze, confident that it will be carried by the united hands of the people of the several Provinces of the Dominion to a glorious, if not to a speedy victory.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the course of his speech last night, made use of an expression something like this: That in the discussion of this question we should approach it as statesmen and not as flunkies. I have been a little curious to know if the hon. gentleman were to undertake to put himself and his lieutenant, who has so bravely spoken just now, in one or other of these categories, in which he would place them. It would not be in harmony with his own self-respect that he should put himself or his friend in the second, and it would not be for me certainly to attempt to make the classification. It is for this House, and it is for this country after the House, by the speeches that were made and the arguments with which the proposition was attempted to be furthered, to say as to whether the proposition that was made was, in the first place, a statesman-

like proposition, and in the second place, whether it was furthered by statesmanlike arguments. I quite appreciate what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat as to the importance of this question. I do not think the House has yet got hold of the tremendously grave nature of the issue, if it be really a serious issue which is embodied in this proposition, and I think the House and the country may be a little excused for doubting at the present time whether it is really a serious issue or not. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had within the last ten years so many issues, they have gone from one to the other with such an amount of versatility, and such an amount of celerity, that they have become a sort of Chinese puzzle to the community at large, and when they spring a grand new issue within a few months upon Parliament and upon the people, Parliament and the people are quite excusable if they hold their breath for a little and watch in patience as to whether those gentlemen are in earnest, and whether it is worth while taking up the fight in a real spirit or not. If this issue be a real and serious issue, it is a tremendous one, because it implies a very great deal. It involves in the first place the almost complete diversion of the trade of this country, and of the methods of transport with reference to the trade of this country; I speak particularly with reference to the import trade. Hon. gentlemen may say as they please, but there will be a diversion of the trade outside of the United States which comes into this country, if such a proposition as this were carried. It seems to me to be plain, and to go without reasoning—to go by the very fact of looking at it, that there will be a very large and almost complete diversion of trade if this proposition be carried. It involves, also, a commercial severance between Canada and Great Britain, as well as outside countries with which we have been carrying on trade. But, in speaking of this commercial severance, I speak of it particularly with reference to our mother country. I think it goes without saying that, if this proposition be accepted, it involves a separation—a commercial separation—at first large, and tending to become continually larger and wider, between this country and Great Britain, and it involves, in the very wake and current of that commercial severance, a political severance as well. It may be a longer time or a shorter time in coming, but I hold it is a fact, indisputable, that the warmest and the fullest current of blood to-day that flows through the country is its commercial blood, and that along the current of its commercial life will flow the social current, will flow the sympathy of feeling, will flow, also, the political current of the people. If we commence to-day by opening a channel which involves, in the first, a commercial severance between us and the mother country, as that channel broadens and widens—and if the rosy and imaginative pictures that have been drawn here of the great extension of commerce which would take place between us and the United States be true, it must grow and widen—I say, in proportion as it does so grow and widen there must inevitably come a wider and deeper severance, politically, between us and the mother country. More than that, it involves an almost total loss of our customs revenue. That point has been disputed, and it is a question which we may dispute. I hold that no person in this House will pretend to deny that it involves a considerable disturbance of our customs duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not necessarily one cent.

Mr. FOSTER. On the very item of woods that we bring into the United States we drop at one bound seven millions of dollars, and a little better, of duty. We will buy from the United States in the main, and if the proposition of my hon. friend works itself out as it is supposed by him it will, we will buy more increasingly from the United States, and in

Mr. FOSTER.

proportion as the current of trade sets in that way we shall buy less and less from outside countries when we have those discriminating duties between ourselves and outside countries. This, therefore, would involve a continual diminution in the customs contribution, which is now so very large a part of our revenue. It involves also the establishment of a new method of taxation, a method of taxation which is totally at variance with the wants of this people of Canada, and which, I believe, will be found to be at variance with the wishes of the people of Canada. It is totally impossible for the government of this country to be carried on without a very large annual increment in the way of duties of some kind. As my hon. friend last night showed, it is impossible to take excise duties beyond a certain amount, and the bulk of that which is necessary to carry on the wants of the services of this country, with its increased and its constant extension, must be got from customs duties; or if not from customs duties, it must be raised by this new method of taxation of which I have spoken—direct taxation. Again, and lastly, this proposition involves the probable destruction of a large proportion of our industries, which, in Canada, since 1878 until to-day, by the mandate of the people three times given and never revoked, it has been the sacred trust and duty of this Government and this Parliament to see carried on and established and kept firm. Since the election of 1887 hon. gentlemen have sprung this new proposition upon the House and upon the country. How dare they, in the light of responsible members to the constituencies that sent them here, spring such a proposition as that, and demand for it any other weight than their own individual opinions? They, Sir, have offered to the country a proposition which would, in a great measure, disturb the existing taxation and the purposes for which that taxation largely existed, namely, to raise a revenue with a view towards the establishment and maintenance of the great industries of this country. If ever a party went to the country pledged not to make any great disturbance in this respect, it was the party opposite. If they owe any fealty to their leader of the time gone by; if they had any respect for him as their acknowledged and most applauded leader, they should remember that they went to the country pledged not to disturb this to any large extent, and with the echoes of their own leader running in their ears and with his own words echoed by themselves upon every platform, they said: "If you intend, gentleman electors, to return us to power, if you wish the manufacturing interests fairly conserved, very well, we will not disturb them, at least, to any great extent, nor will we disturb the existing taxation." Those are the things which appear to me open to argument, and, of course, they are involved in this proposition which has been made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, Sir, when an acknowledged and idolized finance leader of a great party in this country comes before the country and before Parliament under those peculiar conditions with the mandate of the people behind him and against the verdict of the people which was freshly given only a few months before, and puts before the country and before Parliament so bold, so revolutionary and so new a proposition as the one put before this Parliament and country, he should have good reasons for it. And not only put before the country which it will most probably affect, but put in all its nakedness before the country which must be a party to the carrying of this proposition, if ever it is successfully carried out. When a man comes with such a proposition, so bold and revolutionary, it is necessary that he should give us the closest possible reasoning, the most irrefragable proofs and lead us irresistibly to the most irrefutable conclusion before he can demand that the people who are sent here by their constituents should give him their adhesion to this change and to this proposition. Now, Sir, I leave the hon. gentleman with his speech of

three or four hours in length to the calm judgment of this Parliament, and to the calmer judgment of this country beyond this Parliament. I do not propose that his speech shall be judged, it cannot be judged, in the laudatory manner in which it was referred to by his lieutenant who spoke this afternoon, but in cold blood. When the people sit down with intelligence, coolness and calmness in their own homes, coming as they do from a country which they have been proud to own as their mother land, finding stretching between them and the old Islands beyond the sea, the invisible but strong cords that patriotism and love of ancestry and love of national expansion become, which they find twining about their hearts, and causing them to look at it in the light of a country that they have been led to believe has become great and will become greater—that they have been led to believe has a great future before it—if in the spirit of union and patriotism they knit themselves together, when the people of Canada, so intelligent, and under these circumstances come to read and consider and weigh that speech, I am willing to abide by the verdict, and I think the verdict will be that the case is not proven. The hon. gentleman's speech had something in it. It was full of a plentiful assumption of personal superiority, and had running through it a constant current of sneering contempt for anyone who should be unfortunate enough to disagree with him. It was full of such expressions as this: "It is perfectly clear that," "no man who thinks twice but what knows," "any person who is not wilfully ignorant must confess," and all that; and yet at the very heels of such assertions came statements which were perfectly involved and absurd—statements which any man who thought twice would indignantly and instantly reject and the only ground for hoping that they would be ever entertained is because they come into some person's head who never thinks twice or never thinks at all. His speech was full of a wealth of assertion which was only equalled by the conspicuous poverty of fact that was found in it; and it had in it what I may call an immense vagueness, which offered a delightful excursion ground for the political adventure, but which the silent, staid and level-headed people of Canada, when they think it over, will, I venture to believe, lay it aside to be taken in infinitesimally small doses along with their well-worn Gulliver's Travels and Baron Munchausen's exploits.

Mr. MITCHELL. Amen.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that on this point my hon. friend from Northumberland piously agreed with me. But, Sir, while the speech of my hon. friend from South Oxford most inefficiently did that, it most efficiently did another thing. In that speech my hon. friend entirely eclipsed his hitherto unrivalled record as the murky-fingered pointer of Canadian retrogression, hopelessness and despair. On the canvas upon which he drew he placed a picture which, honestly, if I believed it to be true, would make me turn my back at once and forever upon Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. It would actually, much as my hon. friend might regret it, lead me to turn my back on Canada and to write upon its portals, "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here." The only alleviation that there is to that side of the subject is this, that my hon. friend has established so wide a notoriety as a prophet of unrealised disaster and woe, that even under the very hues of his canvas and under the very sound of his lamentations. I have no doubt Canadians will still marry and be given in marriage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And go to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. They will build up homes, and continue to live happily together, and they will not be turned aside in the main from laying broad and deep the foundations of a future prosperity.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for South Oxford, in the introduction of his resolution, and the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I., who spoke this afternoon, both agreed that the proposition before the House is an important one. They both agreed that it proposed a very considerable disturbance of the existing relations; they agreed that it was, in fact, a heroic remedy. Now, I think, before the House or the country is justified in accepting such a proposition, so denominated by its mover and its supporters, the burden of proof is placed upon those who introduced it and support it. The burden of proof is placed upon them to show clearly that at the present time a heroic remedy is necessary; that, taking the condition of the country now, in 1888, as compared with its condition in 1877, or in any year previous to 1877, a set of circumstances has arisen, almost suddenly arisen, which makes it necessary now to take a step that was never deemed necessary before, and that, therefore, this heroic remedy should be applied. Now, if the burden of proof must fall upon the hon. gentleman who introduced, and the hon. gentlemen who support the resolution, let us examine for a few moments the proofs by that test and the facts brought forward in support of the contention that a heroic remedy is at the present time necessary. The first proof adduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford was this: He says nature is too strong for us. Now, I suppose, by that expression he meant that the different Provinces of the Dominion are so constituted; first, with relation to themselves, and, secondly, with relation to other countries in their vicinity, that it is impossible to combine them into a united country having satisfactory trade relations among the different Provinces which compose it. I understand him to mean that the geographical conditions of these different component parts of the Dominion are such that they fight continually against a unity of commerce and a unity of spirit in the Confederation, and that, in this fight, these geographical difficulties, that is nature, will prove too strong, and these component parts can, therefore, never be welded into a united whole. In the first place, I wish, in reference to that, to make this remark: I believe the hon. member for South Oxford is not a tyro in politics, I believe he is not unknown to the political history of this country, I believe he has been a more or less central figure in the party to which he has belonged for some fifteen or sixteen years. If to-day, nature is too strong for us, as the hon. gentleman says, what must nature then have been in 1868? What must nature have been in 1873? And what must nature have been from 1873 to 1879? And what, in a less degree, must nature have been from 1879 up to the present? But we never have heard of the hon. gentleman introducing such a resolution as this or anything akin to this; we have never heard of his proposing such a remedy as this or anything akin to it, until this present year of grace of 1888, when the difficulties which nature has placed in our way have been, to a large extent, overcome by the energy and enterprise and wealth of this country. In 1868, the bald proposition was made to knit these different dependencies into a united country. The hon. member for South Oxford was a supporter of that idea; he was a supporter of that plan; he has continued to support it from 1868 to 1873.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From 1864.

Mr. FOSTER. From 1864, then. He was in the Government, and a central figure in it, from 1873 to 1879. Has

he just now arrived at this conclusion? What new light has been thrown that has brought him to the conclusion that nature is too strong for us? Why, Sir, it is the triumph of man to overcome the disabilities which nature throws in his way. It is the triumph of modern science, than which nothing has been more wonderful in the history of the world, to overcome geographical difficulties, to overcome the disabilities of distance, to overcome the obstructions of physical difficulties, and to overcome them in the interest of the unity of countries and in the interest of the spread of commerce. And it appears to me that if, in 1868, if in 1873, if in the years since then, the hon. gentleman did not feel that nature was so strong as to drive him to propose a heroic remedy, there is all the less reason to-day to adduce that as an argument, and an argument, as it seems to me, of an extraordinarily weak character. For between 1868 and this time, we have done what? We have introduced Provinces that had no knowledge of each other to each other, and they have become acquainted. We have made great lines of water communication, than which no country possesses longer and better; we have built great lines of railway communication, which are channels and arteries for the commerce of this country, and which now extend from one side of the continent to the other, and in all these ways we have put nature at a minimum of disadvantage, compared to the maximum of disadvantage that she put us to in 1868. If it be true that we must never contend against nature, and that we must seek for our commerce channels that run in geographical lines, then the history of the world has been teaching us a wrong lesson. Nature was strong between the eastern and the southern and western parts of the United States, by means of the almost illimitable distances that separated them. Man triumphed over nature, and spanned the prairies of the United States with constantly extending lines of commerce. Nature stood strong, and vast, and rugged against the two slopes of the United States, the western and the eastern slope, in the shape of a line of mountains that run down between these two sections. Modern science and modern enterprise tunnelled those mountains, modern science and modern enterprise overcame those difficulties, and has introduced a strict and intimate relation of commerce between the east and middle States of the United States and the western States, and between the eastern slope and the western slope. Science and enterprise have been at work in our own Dominion of Canada, and, whereas, the Pacific slope and the Pacific range stood there as an impassable barrier for many and many a year between our eastern and our western slope, to-day it has been tunnelled and science has surmounted the difficulty, to the wonder of the world, and to-day the life-blood of commerce flows not only from our Atlantic to our Pacific slope, but over that line which we have built, overcoming nature, the great east and the great west speak to each other and give to each other the message of increasing commerce. Time was when the Alps formed an impassable barrier between Italy and the rest of Europe, but they have been tunnelled, and German and Italian and European life flow together along that line which has been constructed by engineering skill. It is no argument to say that a country shall give over its attempt to build up a nationality because geographical difficulties and geographical distances are in the way. If there is one thing more than another which brings out and shows to the full the innate energy and power of a people, it is action which is not only the proof of their present greatness, but the guarantee of their future greatness. It is that they will set themselves together in a united effort to overcome and to vanquish nature, and to rise in spite of that to national greatness and prosperity. That argument, therefore, is not a sufficient one to show why we should introduce this heroic method. The next argument which

Mr. FOSTER,

the hon. gentleman introduced was this; that we had no other natural market, and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) reiterated that idea. What do they mean by a natural market? Is it not quite possible that this phrase should be used without meaning? What is the natural market for a country? Is it a geographical market? By no means. If that were true, the natural market for Great Britain would be France, which lies closest to it, as we all know, but we also know that there is not the same traffic between Great Britain and France as there is between Great Britain and countries which lie thousands and thousands of miles away. If that statement were true, Great Britain's trade would not have extended, as it has done, to India, to China, to Japan and to every country in the wide world. A natural market, it seems to me, is a market in which you can place things which are demanded by that country and which are not produced, or are not produced in sufficient quantity by that country. That is the natural market for your country, and so it came to pass that the West Indies are more of a natural market for Halifax or for Nova Scotia than the Province of New Brunswick, which lies close beside them; and so it happens that countries which are the diameter of the world apart are more of a natural market than those which lie contiguous to each other. So it is not a sufficient proof that we should adopt this heroic remedy because the phrase expression is given vent to that we have no natural market, and that we need the United States for a natural market. Again, the loss of population was an argument advanced by the hon. gentleman. We must revolutionise the condition of this country, we must step out on an unknown plank, we must leave the ground upon which we have stood for years, we must burn the bridges and cut the connections which are dear to us, because there has been a movement of population in this country. I do not deny that there has been a movement of population. I do not deny that there is always a movement of population from older countries to new countries, and from the older parts of new countries to the newer parts. That is a world-wide fact, especially as far as the movement of population from Europe to America is concerned, and more especially in regard to the Anglo-Saxon race. My hon. friend was mathematically precise in his proofs. He brought it down to an exact statement that one out of four of the Canadian people is, as he unfortunately said, exiled to a foreign country, and that three out of four of the foreign people who come to this country land themselves in the country which lies to the south and west of us. Will you think of what followed that statement which was so precise, so mathematically certain, so definite in its proportions of one to four and three to four, in the way of argument to prove that that was so? It needs simply for me to say, and the hon. gentlemen who heard the speech, or, if they did not hear it, who will read the speech will bear me out, that the argument was totally inadequate to the assertion and that the assertion remains unproved. But the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has more than that to do. He has to prove not only that there has been this movement of population, but that the heroic remedy which he proposes will stop that movement. The larger portion of the argument of last night and of to-day was totally irrelevant, and I shall not attempt to deal with it. Let those hon. gentlemen beat upon it until the anvil is beaten out by the hammer. It has nothing to do with the question unless you establish, in addition to that, that, if we adopt this proposal, that movement of population will cease. Will hon. gentlemen think for a moment of why the movement of population takes place from older countries to newer? Will my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) think a little more on that question, a little hard thinking would not hurt him, will he ask himself why people leave Prince Edward Island for the west? He says

it is not on account of the soil—granted; that it is not on account of the climate—granted; that it is not on account of the laws under which we live and the flag under which we live—granted. Why, then, do they leave? They leave mainly for two reasons: one, because they seek industrial employment which shall bring them in a larger amount for their earnings, and the other, to get on lands broader and freer so that they may be able to try their agricultural capacities on these larger lands. Those are the principal reasons why they leave the older portions of the country. Unfortunately there was a long period when Canada had no North-West, when she had no broad prairie country to which her children could go, but the United States of America had a broad prairie country which was opened up by lines of railways and into which the surplus population and the adventurous population of the older States of America, looking for broader and freer privileges in regards to land, went and gradually settled. The people of Western New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois went further west as the lines of communication were opened up, and many of our own people went there, impelled by the same considerations and settled in the Western States, and the seed always brings the accumulation, and the nucleus which was planted there drew upon those who remain. And, Sir, if Canada ever wished to keep her independent and prosperous course, it was of the first importance that she should have and open out for herself a country of broad lands, a country of prairie freedom, a country of those new conditions. Sir, it was eminently wise that the North-West should be added, and wiser still that it should be opened up, and all the wiser because of the keen competition which that country and Canada had to face in comparison with the United States of America. Now, Sir, we are in the position that when our people from the older Provinces wish broader and freer lands, they can go out into our own North-West, where the great body of the people who go from our older sections to-day are turning their steps, and where they will make their homes under the same flag and will still remain citizens of Canada. My honorable and philosophical friend shakes his head as though it were not so. Is it not more so than it was twenty years ago? Is it not more so than it was five years ago? Is it not more and more so each year? Let time have its sway, let the country open up, let the prosperous years repeat themselves, let the nucleus of population go in there from different countries, each calling back to its own home for a part of its own to come and join it under new conditions, and this country's future with reference to that part of the subject, is as assured as the United States are assured with reference to themselves. The other section of the people went away because they wished to earn ready money, they went into the industrial centres in order to earn it. They found no industrial centres in Prince Edward Island. If after the farming season had passed, and they wanted to earn something for the crowded family, the quickest way they could find to earn it was to take boat and rail and go down to the manufacturing towns of Maine, to the manufacturing towns of New England, and earn their wages during the winter, coming back in the summer to work upon their farms. Canada was at a disadvantage in that respect, and the National Policy has nothing better to commend it to these people, and nothing better to give a strong hold among these people, than the fact that it is meeting successfully that need. Here and there in the different centres of our country, industrial institutions are springing up, manufacturing establishments are opening up, into which the young people of our own country who wish to earn ready money all the year, or at odd times, find a chance for employment, and a wage for their earning hour. These are the two reasons that take people away, these are the two reasons that are being cured, and I hold that we are curing them in our country. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon.

16—1888—3

gentlemen here: Has there been a shadow of proof to substantiate the position that the moment you have unrestricted reciprocity, all this current of population will cease, and we will have no more people going out of Canada into the Western States? Not one jot or tittle of proof to that end has been furnished. I hold that it will be opposite. To-day there are many things that keep us here, when a man thinks about going from his own country and making his home in another. There are sentimental conditions that bind him, and which he breaks before he goes. One of the strongest sentimental conditions is the change from flag to flag. You may call it sentiment, and you may say what you like about mock patriotism, and mock loyalty, but it is a feeling down in the heart of every man that is worthy the name of man. Sir, the very moment you weaken those ties by the current of commercial inter-communication, by that consensus of feeling and tendency which follows the channel of commercial communication, leading one to believe that there is no difference between the countries, that one flag is about the same as the other, that it is to the interests of these people that they shall so look upon it, that moment you weaken those ties and you thereby leave the drift towards the other country easier, more certain and more frequent than it otherwise would be. That, I believe, will commend itself to the sober second thought of those who look carefully into this matter. Therefore, I conclude, in the first place, the hon. gentleman is utterly wanting in proof that if this heroic remedy is adopted it will stop the egress of population. Sir, it is not susceptible of proof, either, that this country is not taking the best possible means to stop that egress of population, and is not successful in the means it has taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has increased double.

Mr. FOSTER. That reminds me of something. When the hon. gentleman from South Oxford and the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were in the Government of this country, from 1873 to 1879, was there no egress of population?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There were, on the average, 22,000 a year, and since then there have been, in some years, four times that number.

Mr. FOSTER. How wonderfully and mathematically precise my hon. friend is. He will not allow the palm to be taken from him by the mathematical precision of the hon. member for South Oxford. Though the hon. member for South Oxford is well inclined to put up with small things and make his figure 1 and 4, and 3 and 4, my hon. friend from Bothwell has a broader and wider mind, and runs up into the thousands. Was there not an egress of population from 1873 to 1879? Does not the country know that there was a heavy egress of population in those years? Does not all our records teach it? The fact is, Sir, and I challenge proof to the contrary, that in those disastrous years the population that went out from this country was driven from it, and a larger population went out then than has gone out in as many years since. When my hon. friend from South Oxford was in the Government, when my hon. friend from Bothwell was in the Government, was there no need of a heroic remedy when the population was leaving us more rapidly than it is to-day? But to-day a heroic remedy is trotted out when hon. gentlemen, having failed on all other cries, wanted another fad to buoy them up. Now, Sir, the next argument that is given us why this heroic remedy should be brought in is that there is a diminution in the valuation of farm lands and farm produce. Now, you will notice that my hon. friend from South Oxford last night adduced no proof to show that farm land was decreasing in value in this country more rapidly than in the country to the south of us. He adduced

not a single tittle of proof to show that farm produce was bringing less in this country than in the United States. He simply made the bald and bold assertion that farm property and farm produce in this country were decreasing in value. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) flatly and explicitly contradicted that statement of the depreciation in farm land in the Province of Ontario. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) said: Well, but they have not increased much. We are not on the point now as to how much they have increased. My hon. friend from South Oxford says that they were positively decreasing in value for a series of years, although the statistical record beside him went to show that they were not decreasing, but there was an increase, though slight, in the value. Will my hon. friend maintain the proposition that there are not causes, wider and broader than any he has mentioned here, to account for the depreciation in value—or, put it in another way, for the not so rapid increase in the value of farm produce in this age of the world compared with ten years ago, fifteen years ago, or twenty years ago? Can you find me an old country in the world in which farm lands are not in more or less difficulty from various causes? The difficulty is brought about by wide and varied economic forces at work now which were not at work before. But, Sir, will my friend maintain the proposition that the countries of the United States, situated as to age, situated as to geographical latitude and longitude much the same as we are situated, have not a greater diminution in values and a greater augmentation in difficulties by the way of debts and mortgages which surround them? Why, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Connecticut have enjoyed the whole freedom of the United States, have had the whole advantage of commercial union, of unrestricted reciprocity, and yet you have only to take the records to show that the difficulties existing there, with respect to those lands, are greater, by far, than those which exist with regard to our own lands. Suppose my hon. friend proves that there is not a rapid rise in the values of lands in this country, does that prove that they would be more rapid if unrestricted reciprocity were the rule? Does that prove they would be more rapid if we had a wider channel of commercial intercourse, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? That is what they have got to prove before they establish the proposition that the heroic remedy should be applied, founded upon this as a reason for its being applied. I desire in the next place to notice the statement which was made, that there has been a total reduction in the volume of trade and that there is no inter-provincial trade in this country and there cannot possibly be any. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not ingenuous in that argument or in that statement. He did not state the whole truth, and he did not state it in the way it should be stated in order to convey the impression that ought to be conveyed. He took the year 1873, an abnormal year, and he made the statement that the volume of trade is to-day less than it was in 1873, and he proves it by what? By simply taking the amount of foreign trade, the exports and imports. He said nothing with regard to the great decrease in the volume of that trade when he was in power from 1873 to 1879, when it went from \$127,000,000 of imports for home consumption down to \$72,000,000, when it went from \$217,000,000 of total trade down to \$153,000,000; and yet although there was a constant and fearful diminution of the volume of trade, measured as he measured it, there was no need then for the heroic remedy! There was no resolution then, embodied as a principle of Government and carried out in practice, that we must have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. No, wiser counsels prevailed then. Even though these hon. gentlemen in their position as being in the Government had wished for anything like that the solid common sense of the Premier at that time intervened

Mr. FOSTER.

between his party and such absurd nonsense as they seemed to be guilty of when once his leadership was taken from them. He made, as the Government which preceded him made, honest, straightforward and self-respecting proposals to the United States over and over again, and when he exhausted all that honorable proposal could make with reference to the country in this matter of trade, and when some of his followers foolishly pressed on the hon. gentleman to enter into negotiations again and again, Mr. Mackenzie rose in his place in Parliament and said: No, I have made proposals, Canada has taken the initiative again and again, our proposals have been refused; now we will wait until the power to the south of us makes some proposition to us, which we will be prepared to consider and to entertain. Yes, there is this diminution in trade. But let me say something in support of my proposition that the whole truth was not stated. Does not my hon. friend know that the trade of a country is not to be measured by the sum of its imports plus the sum of its exports? Does he not know that it is not a fair comparative measurement to simply give the sum total of the exports and imports without going into the quality of the imports? My hon. friend knows that the great difference between the imports in his period and the imports since 1878 has been this: that while the imports then consisted of articles, not only natural articles but articles upon which all labor had been expended to make them perfect and complete in a foreign country, the cost of which was added to the natural cost and this went to swell the sum total of the imports, to-day the exact opposite is the case in several of the most important particulars, and to-day a large quantity is brought in in the rough, in the less costly form, and it is worked up for the consumption of this people by the labor of own people here. Sir, in the former time ships went to the country for raw sugar. The raw product was taken to Great Britain, and British ships took the freights upon it. That sugar was carried on British railways to British refineries, and British railways had their profits. British workmen worked up the sugar, and the wages were paid to British people. Then it was put in cars and steamships and sent to St. John, Halifax or Montreal with the maximum of cost; and that, Sir, went into the figures upon which the total imports were based. That was the case with 95 per cent, if I mistake not, of the sugar consumed here. To-day of the whole sugar consumed in this country 96 per cent, if I mistake not, comes raw from the places where it is grown; it is brought into our own country, it is carried upon our own railways, worked up in our own refineries, and all the added cost put upon it goes into the pockets of our own people. That, of course, makes a vast difference. So it is with the cotton trade and the woollen trade and with a hundred and one other products, though in a less degree, but yet in some degree. The hon. member for South Oxford took care not to state this fact, but the people will take care to remember it and to ponder it well before they adopt the heroic remedy. Well, Sir, there is another question that is necessary to be put: If our trade is decreasing, how do you explain this fact? In 1875 the total registered tonnage entering into and out of the ports of this country, excluding coasting vessels always, was 9,537,000 tons, in 1876 it was 9,911,000 tons, in 1887 it was a little more than 14,000,000 tons. Did the vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves making port now and then for the purpose of getting entered and cleared; or were they here on business and to carry on the commerce of the country? The latter evidently. From 1875 to 1879 the average tonnage of Canada, as I have explained, was 10,700,000 tons, the average tonnage from 1880 to 1887 was 13,700,000 tons, an increase of 3,000,000 a year on an average. What is all this doing? Take the railways. They are far more in number now than they were then; they have far

more carrying capacity now than they had formerly, and the records as given in the railway statistics show an immense increase in the freight carried. That increase is something like this: In 1879 the tons of freight carried by railways in Canada were 8,000,000 odd, in 1883 they were nearly 16,000,000, almost double the amount of freight that was carried by our railways in 1879. What does this mean? Is this freight which is being carried down to one terminus put on board some train and carried back to another terminus to show the amount of freight carried or is it real trade? Evidently the latter. My hon. friends premises were wrong and his contention was utterly futile when he strove to make us believe that we should adopt a heroic remedy because of this alleged falling off in the volume of trade. He also says that we have no inter-provincial trade. Why, in relation to this I can refer my Nova Scotia friends to one of their organs—I mean one of their manly organs and not a newspaper organ. If there is any man who has raised a noise about himself in the Maritime Provinces within the last three or four years it has been Attorney General Longley, and Attorney General Longley's great fight with the Confederation, his great fight against "inter-continentalism" as he calls it is, that Nova Scotia for instance, is sending \$12,000,000 a year to Ontario to pay for goods which come down to her. What does that mean—inter-provincial trade I think. I will allow my friend to settle that with his friend Attorney General Longley. Well, Sir, is there no other proof of inter-provincial trade than that statement, because if there were none other I should not consider it altogether satisfactory; but I think there is. I find that the Intercolonial Railway carried 175,512 tons of coal in 1887, but that is by no means all the coal which comes from Nova Scotia to Quebec and to the edges of Ontario. Every steamer the season through, as my hon. friend knows, that goes down to Cape Breton, to Sydney and other places there carries coal in this direction. I think there is some inter-provincial trade here. Well, Sir, look again at the sugar trade. There was no inter-provincial trade in sugar in the olden times. I find that last year the Intercolonial Railway carried 143,998 barrels of sugar from the Halifax and Moncton refineries into those upper Provinces. I find that over three-quarters of a million of barrels of flour were carried on the Intercolonial Railway last year, a large proportion of which went to the Maritime Provinces. Why, Sir, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island is aware of that when the Prince Edward Island Government presented a case against this Government on account of what they thought was a fair claim for compensation, because the communication with the main land had not been satisfactorily carried out, and when it was shown by a report to the Council, which has found its way into the public records, that the amount contributed in Customs by Prince Edward Island was not very much, that statement was met by the counter-statement that Prince Edward Island buys very largely from the other Provinces of Canada and consequently that her import figures are no criterion of the Customs upon the imports or of the amount she contributes in this way to the general revenue. To-day Prince Edward Island buys from Halifax, St. John and Montreal, and there is a large and increasing inter-provincial trade in that direction. I might carry this argument further and further, but I think I have stated enough to show that there is a volume of trade far and above what was spoken of or what is shown by the simple addition of imports and exports which was relied upon by my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Again I state he has failed to show the necessity for a heroic remedy by that argument which he has adduced. Those were mainly the arguments he placed before the House. He spoke about debts and taxes. Will he get rid of our debts if we become immersed in this unrestricted reciprocity

arrangement? Shall we not have to pay our municipal debts as before? Shall we not have to pay our city debts as before, and shall we not have to pay our Provincial and Dominion debts as before? Shall we not have the costs and charges for government and improvements the same as before? It does not seem to me that there is any prospect of getting rid of them on account of bringing into operation this heroic remedy. Then, Sir, he states that there is no adequate return for public works. What does he mean by "adequate return?" Does he mean that because the great public works in Canada have not paid, in dollars and cents, a revenue, that, therefore, they have not made any adequate return to this great country in its development and extension? If he does, he means something with which I venture to think the majority of this House will not agree. I could quote to him a speech made by the Hon. G. W. Ross not more than two months ago, at a dinner in Toronto, when that gentleman most eloquently portrayed the prosperity of Canada before our illustrious visitor, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, at a banquet given in that city, and in which Mr. Ross pointed out with pride those great public works, our canals and our railways, which he declared were necessary to and a most invaluable factor in the prosperity and growth of this country, and which he was inclined to believe were a signal success. So much with reference to that. The last argument of all is that the federal constitution is about to collapse, but it is said that if you open up the channel of commerce and take commodities free across the border it will have some sort of a magic, subtle, decisive, and healthy effect, that the threatened collapse will be stayed off, and the members which now appear to be disjointed will be healed and made sane and sound for all time to come. I venture to say, Sir, while reviewing all the arguments adduced by the hon. gentleman that he has not proved necessity for his heroic remedy. On the contrary let hon. gentlemen look at the state of the country as it exists to-day. Was it ever in a sounder state in every way? If you look at its position you will see that the credit of Canada was never higher than it is to-day, when our four per cents reach the overtopping figure of 111, 111½ or 111¾.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 113 now.

Mr. FOSTER. 113 now my hon. friend informs me. Yes, Sir, if there was something radically wrong which needs that terrible heroic remedy, which needs that revolutionary plaster applied to it in the body politic of the Dominion of Canada, how is it that the wide awake financiers of the great money centres of the world consider the credit of Canada so good that her consols are constantly appreciated in value and constantly sought after by them as collaterals, as stock and securities. There is another important feature in the case. The revenue of this country is improving. A few years ago when, because of certain reasons, there was a deficit for one or two years, there might have been some grounds for saying we needed a remedy. That has passed away and to-day the revenue is more than meeting the ordinary expenditure of the country. Then again, Sir, the extraordinary public works are well provided for. Our canals and our great lines of railway which have cost the country so many millions of dollars are now completed. They are as good for fifty millions of people as they are for five millions, and it will not be necessary to undertake the extra expense of building those public works again. They need not be duplicated. Once built they stand for the use of the people of this country though they be never so numerous or never so prosperous. The trade of this country has improved and is increasing daily; not only the foreign trade but the inter-provincial trade as well, and after all the true prosperity of the country depends more upon the variety and extent of this inter-provincial trade than it does on its foreign trade. The United States of

America is one of the best examples of what I say. Again, the manufacturing interests of this country are in a better condition than they have ever been in the history of Canada. Time was four or five years ago when disasters were overtaking our manufacturing industries to a greater or less extent, and when there might have been some ground for claiming on that behalf the need of a heroic remedy. To-day our manufacturing industries are stable and sound, paying fair dividends to those who put money into them, as they should, and giving out their produce to the people at low prices, owing to the competition, as is right and natural, and as they should as well. There is nothing, then, in the state of the manufacturing industries of the country to call for heroic treatment. What about the business of the country? Have you watched the payments at the banks within the past few days? Have they not been satisfactory from Halifax to Victoria? Have you read the reports of the bank managers? Have they not given a good account of the business of the country? But appeal to your own experience: Is it not true that throughout Canada, from one end to the other, though there may be cases of difficulty here and there, as there always will be, the business of the country is on a stable, firm and sound foundation, and the people are satisfied with the prospects from a business point of view. Our soil is giving forth its good crops—abundant crops in some parts of the country—and the crop of this year has brought a fair average return. Taking all these things into consideration as the reverse of the picture which has been shown to us from the other side of the House, have we not good ground for saying that not only is the case of my hon. friend from South Oxford not proven, but that a strong case stands apparent before every hon. member for not disturbing the present relations, on the ground that under present conditions the country is fairly prosperous, and its future seems fairly well assured? Then, Sir, why this cry? I have noted the reason before: It is because hon. gentlemen opposite, having attempted to climb into power, by attaching themselves to this issue and that issue, to this fad and that fad, having made their bids to the people from unworthy motives and on unworthy grounds in many instances, have been shaken off from the skirts of the garments of the country, and find themselves to-day without a cry; and so they ring about again the old gospel of discontent, and appeal to the widest and strongest class we have in this country, hoping to raise and rouse the farming community into discontent, and thinking thereby that they may gain votes in this House, and possibly become a majority instead of a minority in this country. But I have full faith in the intelligence of the farming community, that, if this question comes to be a serious question, to be fought out before them, and both sides of it are fully ventilated, the farmers of this country will hold themselves aloof from the bait held out to them, and will keep themselves to the connections they have to-day, well assured that by so doing their future will not be prejudiced, but, on the contrary, will be prosperous. Now, Sir, the next question that comes is this: The first thing my hon. friend and his supporters had to prove was this, that a heroic remedy of some kind is necessary. The next thing they would have to prove, if they had successfully proved that (which they have not), is that this is the remedy. Now, will hon. gentlemen follow me for a single moment while I deal with the arguments which have been adduced to show that this remedy is the only remedy. What are they? The hon. member for South Oxford said that this was the remedy and the only remedy. How long has he been of that opinion? As a political physician, how long has he been conducting his diagnosis, and at what particular period of time did it terminate in the conclusion that the remedy was unrestricted reciprocity, and not commercial union or free trade? Well, Sir, not long; for speeches are on record, delivered not many months ago, scarcely yet

Mr. FOSTER.

cold, in which hon. gentlemen opposite, not a few, but many of them, were out full fledge and in full blast in favor of commercial union and commercial union alone as the panacea. However, the diagnosis has gone on; different physicians have consulted; they came to a conclusion a few days ago, and they believe now that this is the sole and sovereign remedy. What are the reasons given? The first reason is that it will help everybody and hurt nobody. That would be a very good reason if it were proved; but after the assertion should come proof, and so, although my hon. friend glibly asserted that it would help the fishermen, the miners, the lumbermen and the agriculturists of pluck and brains, he utterly failed to give details of any kind to show the House and the country wherein it would help them or be a special benefit to them. The hon. gentleman said the only classes hurt by it would be: first, the combines; second, the civil service; third, the promoters of elections; and fourth, those who were anxious for piers and wharves and harbors. Now, was my hon. friend really serious? It is such advocacy as that which makes me doubt still whether they intend to make this a real issue, or whether they are not only playing with it to keep themselves in practice until the next eligible thing comes up. The hon. gentleman who says this question should be approached by us as by philosophers and statesmen and not flunkies, makes the bold assertion that everybody in Canada would be helped except these four classes by this proposition being accepted; and yet a breath or two before he stated that it was a grave question, that it would cause great disturbance, that it was a large change of policy that would be grave in its consequences. Combines! If we have a combination in this Dominion of Canada, it is a Lilliput compared with one of the combinations on the other side, for instance the Standard oil combination. Why, Sir, I can just fancy, if it was this side of the House that was asking for a measure to stop combinations and we proposed as a remedy a union in commerce with the United States, how every file of papers published in the United States would be flashed around these seats, and editorial after editorial read to show that combinations in this country bore no comparison with those in the United States. If you wish to remedy combinations, this proposition would indeed be a case of the big fish eating up the little fish, for the small combinations we have here would be swallowed *holus bolus* by the large combinations on the other side; and what would happen? We to-day have in our hands a remedy for combinations in our own country in this Parliament, if a parliamentary remedy can be got. But if we put ourselves into the hands of a combination which octopus-like stretches its arms over a country, where we have no legislative jurisdiction, where is the remedy so far as we are concerned? And yet the hon. gentleman thinks fewer combinations would be had under unrestricted reciprocity. Does he propose to blot out the Civil Service if we have unrestricted reciprocity? Will we not need the public service of the country to be carried on, and so have a civil service? I say it seems to me the hon. gentleman is not yet really serious in his advocacy of this question. But if he were serious when he introduced it, something intervened between the time of the introduction of the measure and the time when, towards the end of his speech, he made that trivial assertion which took the seriousness out of him and out of his subject. Well, he says, as an additional reason in favor of his proposition, that the poor man in this country pays the highest taxation and that when we get reciprocity he will pay less taxation. Now the hon. gentleman attacks as monstrously unjust, and the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) reiterated the same argument, and challenged proof to the contrary, the statement that the poor man does not pay the heavy weight of taxation in this country. But when the hon. gentleman was asked on this side to point out the articles on which the poor man paid his heavy tax, he let

off an extra edition of the fireworks he always keeps on hand, and took great care to aim no straight bullet at the mark which was put before him. I challenge him now or any hon. gentleman on that side to go into particulars, and to prove, in the first place, that the poor man pays the weight of taxation; and to prove, in the second place, that if he does, unrestricted reciprocity will remove that weight in any measure. Look at the question as it stands. What does the poor man buy on which he pays this heavy taxation? Take, first, the fairly well-to-do class. Take, for instance, the farmer. On what does he pay taxes? Every article that goes into the food of his family, so far as their daily wants are concerned, is raised on his own farm, and on these articles he does not pay a cent of taxation. Then the large proportion of the clothing he and his family wear is also paid for out of the products of his own farm and no taxes paid. With him the luxuries he buys are the minimum whilst with the wealthy man the luxuries rise to the maximum, and in this country the practice is followed of putting the weight of taxation on the luxuries and taking it off the necessities. Oh, but my hon. friend says, there is the tariff on coarse woollens, and consequently the man who wears these woollens pays a heavy tax on every yard he uses. Does he? The farmer has sheep on his own farm, which he often shears himself, and whose wool he has often made up in the mill of his own locality, and his family wear the clothes thus manufactured. Where is the tax that is paid on these? The statement that the tax is paid in this case can only be affirmed on two grounds: First, that all the woollen clothing worn in this country is manufactured in large establishments, or else is imported; and second, that that which is manufactured in the large manufactories, notwithstanding the competition of imported goods, pays the tariff that is put on the imported articles. But will that be remedied by unrestricted reciprocity, which is to open up a channel of trade between this country and the United States? How will the tax be taken off the woollens worn by the farmers, or the other materials he uses for his wear, since in the United States a heavier tax is imposed on these articles than is imposed here? We are asked to enter into commercial relations with a country which has a higher tariff than we have, and in the name of common sense I would ask how then are the taxes here to be lowered? The proposition falls to the ground of its own weight: first ~~that the poor man pays the tax~~; and second, ~~that the tax will be taken off if unrestricted reciprocity be the rule~~. But the hon. gentleman says it will suit Great Britain and the United States, and my hon. friend was not content with drawing a picture of this country in hues of the very blackness of despair, but he must needs have his fling at the mother country as well. And in these days of troublous times, when forces are at work which at any time may create a great conflagration, the outcome of which no man can at present see, and when even the utterances of men in a Parliament of this kind, have their effect more or less in the wide world in which they are read, the hon. gentleman must go out of his way to taunt Great Britain with having no ally on the continent of Europe among the first-class powers. Sir, the position of Great Britain has been well-taken and well-maintained in the past. The institutions of Britain are, to-day, stronger than ever they were before; the power of the Anglo-Saxon race the wide world over, is as great as ever, while the spirit of enterprise of our race displayed around this whole globe of ours, and which strengthens and enobles the British power, taken collectively as a whole, has never been manifested to greater perfection than it is to-day. Great Britain will take good care to hold her proud position, and it was not manly or statesmanlike in the hon. gentleman, occupying the position he does, to question in this House her ability to retain the great influence she has always exercised in European affairs. But supposing Great

Britain has no ally among the first-class powers in Europe, does the hon. gentleman propose to make for her an ally of the United States, and to embroil the United States in the European entanglements which affect Great Britain alone? Does he think that the United States, which have kept themselves religiously aloof from European entanglements, will make an alliance with Great Britain, and thus run the risk of involving themselves with Great Britain, in all the European complications that are liable to rise at any moment? What influence the great powers of reasoning of the hon. gentleman may have on the government of the United States in this respect, I cannot say, but judging from the specimens of his logic we have heard here within the last twenty-four hours, I am inclined to think his arguments will not stir the United States from the position they have hitherto maintained. What a fine method that would be of making an ally for the mother country, by putting ourselves in commercial union with the United States and raising a discriminating tariff wall against our mother land. The proposal does seem odd. There may be some abstruse meaning in it that we cannot seize, but of which the hon. member for South Oxford is fully aware. But he says, we will not discriminate largely against Great Britain, and this afternoon, I think I heard him say that our trade with Great Britain would be actually improved. Just analyse that for a moment. Here are 5,000,000 of Canadians, here is an open channel of trade between Canada and the United States, and here is an hon. gentleman asserting that the trade between the two countries will grow to \$300,000,000 a year. Now what will happen? Between the United States and this country, there is no tariff, while between this country and Great Britain there is a tariff of fairly good proportions, say 22 or 25 per cent. We enter this commercial alliance. We create a trade between the two countries that will reach \$300,000,000 a year; and then, when we grow rich and wax fat and sleek, the hon. gentleman says he will turn to our own mother country and import goods from her, on which we will pay the extra Customs duty, just for the sake of showing that in the long run our trade with Great Britain will not suffer. That is a most unreasonable proposition. The currents of trade, if they be free and advantageous to ourselves, will be kept for the sake of the advantages they offer, and it would be proved by the experiment, if the experiment should be ever unfortunately made, that our trade with Great Britain would dwindle to almost nothing, because the odds are against our trading with the country on whose goods we put a tariff of 25 per cent. as compared with a country between which and ourselves there is no tariff. But the hon. gentleman says, if we consider advisable to discriminate against Great Britain, we have the right to do so. We have our own interests and they are paramount, and that assertion was made still stronger to-day by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), and it was echoed by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, I have two or three links in a chain of reasoning that I would like the hon. gentlemen to follow, if I can clearly express it. The hon. member for South Oxford says: If it does discriminate against Great Britain, we have a right to do it, our own interests are paramount, which is equivalent to saying, on a fair interpretation, that, whenever the time comes that it is better for us to do thus, and so in commercial matters, we have a right to do so, and it is our duty to do so in our own interests; and that is made stronger by a second assertion that we owe nothing to Great Britain but charity for the atrocious blundering she has been guilty of in regard to our interests. There is first the statement that we have nothing but our own interests to regard because they are paramount, and secondly, there is another link which would make us understand that the paramount idea of our own interests has been overridden by Great Britain. And then the

hon. gentleman goes on to clench all that by saying that there never was a time in her own history when Canada could not have bettered her condition by linking her interests with the United States of America. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon. gentlemen around these boards to tell me which is the most honorable position, that occupied by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or that occupied by my hon. friend from the City of St. John, N.B. (Mr. Ellis). I can imagine a colloquy in the corridors between my friend from St. John and my friend from South Oxford. My friend from St. John says: Sir Knight, you tell me that our own interests should be paramount? Yes. You tell me that we owe Great Britain nothing but charity, and very little of that? Yes. You tell me that there never was any time when Canada's interests would not have been better served by linking them with the United States of America? Yes. Then, why do you not say at once: Let us link our fortunes with the United States of America, and why do you not be as brave and honest about it as I am? The only difference between these two hon. gentlemen is—and it is to the credit of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis)—that he believes thus and so, and has the courage to express it, even though it may be unpalatable to the gentlemen around him and to the people among whom he lives, while my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) contends and works in the same line, but he is afraid of outside opinion and gilds it over and says: Oh, no, I am not an annexationist, I do not believe in annexation. That is the only difference between them, and I think it is in favor of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) and I willingly give it to him. Then we are told as a reason why this is the peculiar and only remedy, that it will give the United States a great home market in Canada. The hon. gentleman believes in the doctrine of equivalents. He is superlatively honest, and he would not take anything without giving something in return, and he is perforce driven by his own innate spirit of right to maintain the argument that there will be equivalents, and one of those is that the United States will get a large home market in Canada. Let us reason that out. There are five millions of people in Canada. They buy all they are able to now. They buy that from certain persons now. My hon. friend from South Oxford says to the people of the United States. Adopt this scheme, and you will get a largely extended home market in Canada. What will happen? If they get that home market, the people of Canada cannot buy more than they are able to. It will be simply a displacement, and the people of the United States, the merchants of the United States, will get what our merchants and our industrial centres now get. In what will they find a home market in this country? For their coal, in Nova Scotia. If they do, I ask my hon. friend whether he can find a market for American coal in Nova Scotia, without displacing an equal quantity of coal brought up from the mines in Nova Scotia, and, if he displaces Nova Scotia coal by American coal, I ask him what becomes of the men who, with drill, pick and lamp, earn that which supports their families and builds up their villages by mining the coal in the depths under the sea in the Province of Nova Scotia. They will only be able to obtain a market by displacing what is now provided by our own people, and, if they get a market in regard to manufactures, in regard to agricultural produce, in regard to sugar, they can only do it by displacing those who are now carrying on these trades as Canadians, who are improving Canadian industries, with profits to the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman should adopt the *dictum* of Attorney General Longley, who says that, instead of getting ten or twelve million dollars' worth from Upper Canada, they will get it from the United States. The importers from Boston and New York will gain, but what about the merchants and manufacturers of Halifax and the Lower Provinces, and Mr. FOSTER.

what about the millers and wheat growers in the other Provinces? I have not the time to carry out this reasoning, but hon. gentlemen can carry it out for themselves, and they will come to the conclusion that in nearly every case every dollar's worth of goods obtained from the United States in the way of an increased home market in Canada will displace an equal amount which has come generally through Canadian channels. That is what the apostle of commercial union declares. Mr. Wiman lets out a great deal of the truth, and sometimes he lets out the truth where it gets all over. Speaking in Newark, N. J., he says:

"If new markets for relief of over-production, created by the stimulant of protection, can be made accessible"—

What does that mean? It means simply that the producing power of the United States is over and above what is necessary to furnish its own market, and can easily have a surplus to send into other countries and other markets. Where would it be sent? Into Canada, says he. To do what? To displace an equal amount now furnished by the woollen and cotton manufacturers of Canada—

—"without disturbing in the slightest the perfect equilibrium of existing taxation, clearly it is the duty of the protectionist to secure these markets, not only because of the immediate outlet which they afford, but as an illustration of the benefits of his favorite policy. Further, if these new markets, secured by the protectionist without sacrifice, are got at the expense of a free trade nation, so much the better. This would be one of the results of commercial union. The total trade of Canada, a portion of the British Empire, is about \$200,000,000. Two-thirds of it, it is supposed, can be secured by the United States, by simply lifting up the Customs line that now runs through the middle of the continent, and stretching it right around the continent. This would not only admit to more than half the continent all American manufacturers, but it would create in their favor, in one part of the British Empire, a discrimination against the manufacturers of another part of the British Empire. Can anything be more attractive to the average American protectionist than this advantage over the pauper labor of Europe?"

And Mr. Hitt, who has been glorified as one of the joint laborers in this heroic remedy which is to be applied by the hon. gentleman, states this a little more fully. In speaking to western men—and he is a western man—at a great banquet, he declared:

"We in the west would like you manufacturers of New England to have access to that great market of Canada. With a Reciprocity Treaty or, better still, Commercial Union, you will have the preference over English, French and German goods, and in two years' time after its adoption, goods from Yankee manufacturers will be in every retail store from Montreal to Victoria."

Well, that is perfectly right as a matter to be striven after by our friends in the United States. But it remains for us seriously to consider whether it is for our interest, as a country, that we should lay our industries at this particular time, open to that competition. But again he says that it would give us the United States market. Now, that was pretty well ventilated by my colleague last night, and I shall not traverse the ground made by him. I simply draw your attention to one of the sportively imaginative statements of the hon. member for South Oxford. He talked about our railways. He said we had long lines but they were not carrying much, but just let unrestricted reciprocity come into force, and our railways might carry more to the borders and less to the seaboard, and they would speedily quadruple freights and quadruple their earnings. Well, that is a rosy statement. Did he give one iota of proof which would lead us to believe that this would be the case? Has he not stated to this House as one of the attractive points of his programme that there are large American cities along the border, that our provinces lie contiguous to these cities. But remark that if this project were carried out, you would only have a constant stream of traffic along our lines of railway from one of these countries into another. To-day, Sir, the great traffic of our railway consists in what it carries from points distant far in the west to points distant far in the east, from one Province to another Province; by this proposition you would cut off, a large extent, that great long

line of traffic, you would have a criss cross traffic in which the lines of intercommunication would be changed out of their present course by running between this country and the United States in order to get to these great cities. So much for the rosy idea of quadrupling freights and earnings of the railways of this country. With these remarks I leave that branch of my subject, thinking that I have fairly well proved that this remedy which has been proposed is not the best thing for the people of Canada. There remains one question which I shall state briefly, and that is: Is this a favorable time in which to make a proposition for closer relations between us and the United States? My hon. friend says yes, it is the happy, happy now? And he goes on to give his reasons why it is the happy now by saying that now is the time when tariff reductions are imminent. How far are tariff reductions imminent, so far as we can see? They are imminent only so far as the Tariff Bill brought down by Mr. Mills of Texas is concerned. That, Sir, is the extreme limit to which the people of the United States who are most favorable to the reduction in the tariff, dare to go, thinking to carry with them the support of Congress and the Senate which is necessary for the measure. If you scan that measure carefully you will find that, though on some few things the tariff is reduced, on others it is left far above the present average tariff of the Dominion of Canada, so that the reduction of the tariff, imminent as he says, is not a very great reduction of the tariff at the best. But he says the President, in his message, invited to these negotiations. Now, that is not a sufficient statement to go to the country. It is a sufficient statement to go to Parliament, because this Parliament is well conversant with the difference in powers between the Executive in the United States and the Executive in this country. If the Cabinet of this country, through any one of its members, or through the Governor General, made a proposition, it would be bound to carry that proposition through, and the people would consider that the country was pledged because the Government staked its life upon it. But in the United States it is very different. The President and his executive officers are, in a measure, totally distinct and outside of the Congress and Senate of the United States. They may make suggestions, they may send down messages, as they do from time to time, to be entirely ignored by the Congress and Senate, unless the feeling in those bodies is in their favor. Why, we had a President's message with reference to the fishery question, asking the United States' Senate to appoint a commission. It was sent down to that body, and the Senate rejected it by a vote of 35 to 10. So it is not indubitable proof that the United States is ready to meet this proposition, because an invitation happens to be put in the President's message. Again, it was stated that Mr. Bayard's invitation to Sir Charles Tupper showed that they were ready for it. Mr. Bayard's invitation to Sir Charles Tupper was previous to the conference. When the conference came together then they were treating in a closer capacity, and the proposition was made by Sir Charles Tupper on behalf of the British Commissioners that they should approach this matter on the basis of a general commercial adjustment between the two countries, and to that Mr. Bayard and his co-plenipotentiaries gave a decisive and categorical answer in the negative, and did it, why? Because, they said, in the present condition of affairs, it would be impossible to carry it through Congress and the Senate, which is necessary to give it life. Could anything more clearly show that the public opinion of the United States is not ripe for a proposition of this kind? The hon. gentleman again says that another indication is Mr. Butterworth's Bill, and Mr. Hitt's Bill. I have not time to lay before you the documents that I have to show you the fact that, for years, Bills and resolutions like Mr. Hitt's and Mr. Butterworth's, in all essential particulars, have been introduced over and over again in the Congress and in

the Senate, and have never got further than a committee, or an adverse report from a committee. So these indications are not strong ones. He blames the Government, however, for having delayed to adjust the fishery question on Mr. Bayard's proposition until the presidential year. The Government of Canada delayed nothing. In 1855 they made a proposition, and the British Government made a proposition in their behalf, looking to a speedy conference between the two countries to undertake negotiations and settle this matter. That was pressed over and over again by Great Britain, and just so soon as the United States accepted this proposition, just so soon that proposition was taken advantage of by the British Government. But it was not delayed a single moment so far as Canada and Great Britain was concerned. It did happen to come off in the presidential year, and for that, my hon. friend finds fault with the Government. Yet he brings down a proposition asking Parliament to affirm a resolution in favor of a certain course, and instructing the Government, in this presidential year, here and now, to undertake negotiations with the United States in reference to that proposition. If a presidential year is bad in one respect for the negotiation of the treaty, why it is not bad in another respect? Now, I would rather liken my hon. friend to Homer than to do him the discourtesy of likening him, as one of his supporters did this afternoon, to Goliath.

An hon. MEMBER. Not Goliath, but Jove.

Mr. FOSTER. The Jove of his party. But, likening him to Homer, we may well say that for once he has been found nodding. Now, Sir, having gone over these points, I beg simply to conclude by making one or two remarks with reference to a point which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) brought up this afternoon. I am sorry he is not in his place in the House to hear my criticism. My hon. friend thought that the Minister of the Interior was somewhat confused last night in his speech, and that he forgot he was talking about unrestricted reciprocity, and broke off into saying something about commercial union. I think there was great excuse for some such confusion, if any such confusion existed. My hon. friend, no doubt, had two or three hon. gentlemen in his eye, and among them he had probably the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and he was thinking about an utterance delivered by the hon. gentleman. Speaking at Charlotte-town before the Board of Trade, not many weeks ago, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made this statement:

"Under commercial union trade would flow freely between this country and the United States, as it now flows between the several States; while, as against the rest of the world there would be a uniform tariff, to be mutually agreed upon by the two countries comprised in the union. 'Unrestricted reciprocity' would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would retain the right to frame its own tariff as against the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent. tariff, while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent. The immediate consequence would be that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the States by way of Montreal. To this the States, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent. An unrestricted reciprocity, although it would suit us as well as commercial union, was, therefore, impracticable."

Now, in what position does the hon. gentleman place himself? Is he an honest man, is he putting this question for honest purposes before this Parliament, or is he doing as he accuses us of doing, dangling a spangle before the eyes of the people? I will believe, in the first place, that he is an honest man, and that, when he took up the two lines of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, he believed what he said, and he had good grounds for the belief, that the people of the United States, unless they were arrant fools, would never accept unrestricted reciprocity. Well, Sir, in what position, if he was an honest man at that time, is he placing himself now? He comes here and argues

before this Parliament and asks this Parliament to adopt a measure, to show its whole hand, to go, as it were, the whole figure to keep nothing back, to state out and out to the people of the United States: We will give you everything in exchange, if you will let us take everything into your country as an exchange; and yet, in the face of that, he says—to himself of course—the United States will not accept such a proposition as that, they are not such arrant fools, and unless they were arrant fools, they would never take unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Sir, do you find any fault with any hon. gentleman on this side being slightly confused when he was looking into the eye of the hon. member who, not many weeks ago, made that statement, and has never disclaimed that statement until to-day? Or, if it is true that he believes what he said here, is it not a reprehensible proceeding for a public man to attempt to put before Parliament and the country, and press to a solution a proposition, all the time believing that the neighboring power will never accept the proposition, but will certainly reject it unless they are arrant fools, which we know the people of the United States are not? There were one or two other statements made by the hon. member for Queen's to which I desire to refer, especially to one of those strong generalisations in which he is apt to indulge respecting the poverty of the people of Prince Edward Island. He goes on, turn by turn, till he reaches the climax, and the climax is this: That the people of Prince Edward Island, the farmers there especially, are living without hope—not only in Prince Edward Island, but in the Maritime Provinces—they are becoming poorer and poorer, losing hope and falling into despair. And yet I turn up the blue books of the Dominion and look at the list which shows the earnings put into the Savings Bank of Prince Edward Island and what do I find? In 1874 they had a balance of \$336,000 to their credit there, in 1879 it had climbed up to \$420,000, to-day it is \$2,200,000. There is a paltry increase of \$84,000, in that halcyon period measured by the time when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in this country, and there is a massive saving of \$1,750,000 which had been placed there by the poor people of Prince Edward Island in the time covered from 1880 to 1887; and yet they are living without hope, ready to plunge over into the fatal gulf of despair, they are entirely without aspiration and entirely without prospects for the future. Looking at these things it seems to me that the position which this Parliament may well take is something like this: The measure which has been proposed is a heroic measure according to the statement of the hon. gentleman who introduced it into this House. He has already failed to prove, in the first place, that a necessity for a heroic measure exists; in the second place, he has failed to prove that this is a measure which would be beneficial to Canada; and yet he asks this Government to leave the old and beaten policy and take this bantling of his own. On the other side you have the policy of the Government which from the first has been stable and has been proved. It has been this: To cultivate the most friendly relations between this country and the kindred people who live to the south of us, to seek in every way to have as fair and as free commercial relations as it is possible for the two peoples honorably to agree upon. There has not been a time since 1848 till to-day when the proposition has not stood out freely and fairly before the people of the United States something like this: Come and let us reason together and place our commercial and reciprocal relations on a fair and honorable basis for both of us. If ever those relations once established for a period have been broken, it has never been at the instance and wish of the Government or this Parliament but always at the instance and wish of our cousins on the south of the border. Hon. gentlemen tell us that it is nothing, that an Act of Parliament stands on the Statute-book offering

Mr. FOSTER.

reciprocal trade between this country and the United States the moment the United States is willing to accept it. I take that statement and I say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Suppose the United States had put a clause in their Tariff Act saying, the very moment Canada makes natural products free the United States will make them free, would we not have a pressure which it would be totally impossible for us to resist? What can be a stronger expression of opinion than an Act of Parliament voicing the opinion of the people, which has stood before the people of the United States for some time? This stood before the people of the United States, and in all our relations there has been dominant in this Parliament and with this Government since it has been in power, the desire to have as free and extended and cordial relations as are possible in the interests of both countries. On the other hand we have felt, and the Government has introduced the policy which they carry out, that failing that and if we cannot have extended reciprocal relations with the United States, the thing for us to do is to carve out a policy of our own which will stimulate industries in our own country, which will build up inter-provincial trade, which will give us a national standard of independence of our own, and which will put us on our feet in the future as it has contributed to our self-respect in the past. That policy is dear to the heart of the country. The fireworks let off about corruption and the way in which elections are carried on are very good for a slight blaze, but they go out soon and a perfume remains which is not of the sweetest or most pleasant kind. The real facts of the case about the elections are that the people after the most thorough discussion were roused to look into this question, and after giving to the Government a mandate in 1878 to foster the industries of this country by reason of a protective tariff they enjoyed the benefits for four years and when this Government went back to the people, the people renewed that mandate and enjoyed the benefits for another four years. The same people who in 1873 returned us into power, in 1887 sent this Government and the party which is with the Government back, with a strong staple majority, asking them and pledging them to preserve the interests which they had confided in their charge and the trust with which they had commissioned them in 1878 and in 1882. The Government feels, and the party feels, and the country in the main feels that this is the policy which is staple, fair, and honest. While at the same time, we look after our own industries we are willing to meet every fair proposition that is made for extended trade relations with the people to the south of us. In this regard then and with those remarks I beg leave to move the following amendment:

That Canada in the future as in the past is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and which has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of the people.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Mr. Speaker, this I consider to be the most important question that has come before the people of the Dominion of Canada for many a day, and, Sir, as I belong to the agricultural community and as I have always been opposed to the policy that has been adopted by the Government of this country, as a policy that has borne hard on the laboring classes, which I represent, than any other policy in the Dominion, I would not be performing my duty to my constituents were I to listen to this debate without lifting my voice in favor of the resolution which has been offered in this House by the Hon. Sir Richard John Cartwright, member of Parliament for the south riding of Oxford. I believe, Sir, that this resolution if carried into effect will do more to quieten the discontent that exists in Canada to-day than all the National Policies in existence. We have been asked, Sir, to show on this side of the House that the remedy we offer will put an end to the large

amount of emigration going out of the country into the United States. I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite if the hon. leader of the Government in his famous speech at Parkhill did not attempt to prove this would be the remedy when he stated as one of the reasons why the policy should be enforced, that he wanted the 500,000 of our own people in the workshops of the United States, in Canada, and that by adopting a policy that would re-adjust the tariff and foster the industries that object would be attained, and the agricultural industry would be benefited as we would be able to keep our own people at home to consume our own products. The hon. gentleman referred to a great many other blessings which would ensue in case of a reform of the tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see before this time that the National Policy has entirely failed to confer the blessings which were promised to the people of this country. I would just say this in relation to what the First Minister has said: "That what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Since one policy has failed, since it has taken out of this country a great many more people than the policy that was followed by the Government of which the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was the head, I hold that it is time we ought to have some change. We have been asked the reason why we bring up such a measure as this, and why we ask for this redress under the present circumstances? My answer to this would be that the agricultural industry in this country is now in a very languishing condition, that the prices of our products are very low indeed, and that we are not receiving prices equal to what we had before the National Policy was adopted, when compared with the prices received by the people on the other side of the line. We are paying a greater amount for the goods we consume than we ought to pay if it were not for this policy, and the agricultural community one might say is cut at both ends. The prices of their produce is reduced and whatever they have to purchase they have to pay a larger price for. I will pass on very rapidly over a few of the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He tried to show that there was no danger of nature being too slow and he went on to show how nature had been overcome between this Province and our Pacific Provinces, how it had been overcome between the United States and her Pacific provinces, and he argued that trade was not a geographical matter. But, Sir, in that trade between the United States and her Pacific Provinces there was no iron wall of protection between the Eastern and Western States, neither was there between the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion of Canada and her Pacific Provinces. I venture the statement that if Great Britain enforced such a policy towards the East Indies as the Government of Canada has adopted here, that the trade of Great Britain in that country would never have attained to the position it has attained to at the present day. It was by such a course as we now ask for in the proposition laid before this House that the trade of that country has been promoted. I would just say that the very fact that Canada sends less than \$5,000,000 annually into the British market to-day, while it sends \$22,000,000 into the markets of the United States, although a tariff of over 16 per cent. against us in the one case and a free market in the other, is proof positive that natural channels will be followed in spite of all the tariffs that can be framed. Another argument, which I was sorry to see the hon. Minister of Marine pass over as he did, was that relating to inter-provincial trade. I think the hon. member for South Oxford stated yesterday that \$340,000 more had been spent on the Intercolonial Railway within the last seven months than the earnings of the railway amounted to, and I think I saw about a year ago the statement that the Intercolonial Railway cost in 12 months \$160,000 more than it had earned, showing that the inter-provincial trade is not growing, but has decreased; and I

was astonished that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not apply himself to this argument. He dealt a great deal more in what I may term blustering statements than in arguing the question. Now, Sir, we were told that there was as great a diminution in the population of some of the United States as there has been in this country. I do not believe any hon. gentlemen opposite can rise and mention any State in the Union, similarly situated to Ontario, in which there has been as small a gain in population, as there has been in that Province. I have a statement here showing that in 1880 the population of Ontario was 1,683,283, and in 1884 1,754,044, a gain of 70,161, while the State of Michigan, situated similarly to Ontario, but not having as many natural advantages, during the same period gained 219,163. That State and the Province of Ontario are nearly equal in population, while in area and fertility the Province of Ontario far surpasses the State of Michigan. Then, Sir, we were told that the volume of trade was less in 1883 than it was in 1887. I have here a statement of the volume of trade between the United States and Canada between the years of the Reciprocity Treaty. I find that in 1873 the total volume of trade between the United States and Canada amounted to \$93,915,716, while in 1886 it only amounted to \$84,027,223. But going back to the year 1866, the year in which the Reciprocity Treaty ended, I find that the volume of trade between Canada and the United States in that year amounted to \$84,685,361, or \$600,000 more than it did in 1886, showing clearly that the trade of this country with the United States is not growing as it ought to. The farmers of this country can look back to the time of that Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866, and we can remember the great strides the country made at that time, and the prosperity that was enjoyed by every household in Canada, especially among the agricultural population; and we believe, Sir, that unless there is a remedy found for the present state of affairs in Canada there will be a severe strain put upon Confederation. To show what the feeling is in the County of Huron, to which I belong, I will just read a letter which I received yesterday from a friend in that county:

"I am pleased to learn that the Opposition are making unrestricted reciprocity with the United States one of the planks in their platform. I think it will be very popular. I also think that if we do not get something in that line before many years there will be a strong annexation party in this country, and I fear your correspondent will be added to that number."

Such is the feeling that pervades not merely the eastern and western Provinces of this country, but that is spreading rapidly among the agricultural population of the Province of Ontario. We are told that we pay no taxes on our own wool from which we make our own cloth. I can remember the statement by the hon. First Minister in his famous Parkhill speech, that if we had the National Policy all our own cloth would be made out of wool of our own raising. But I can tell him his prophecy has not been fulfilled, for whereas we imported in 1878 \$8,000,000 worth of wool, we imported in 1886 \$11,000,000. The effect of this on the agricultural population is, that we have to pay the whole duty even on the goods manufactured in Canada. In conversation a few days before I came to Ottawa with a large importer of dry goods from the British market, I put the question to him: "What is the effect of the tariff on goods manufactured in this country, and at what percentage can goods manufactured in Canada be purchased below goods manufactured in the English market?" His reply was that on goods purchased in Canada similar to the goods purchased in Scotland he had to pay the whole duty, that is, an average of 27 per cent. on round lot of dry goods, which amounted to 33 per cent. to the consumer, and that the only margin left over the cost of the Canadian manufactured goods compared with the cost of the goods manufactured in

Britain was something like 2 per cent., that is the cost of freight and insurance; so that the statement cannot be contradicted that we have to pay the duty, and that what we pay goes into the pockets of the manufacturer. Yet I do not believe that even the manufacturers have benefited to the extent that they might, because I believe very large amounts of money have been sunk in manufacturing industries for which there is not sufficient demand in this country. I will venture the statement that no large capitalist will ever come into this country and invest any large sum of money unless we have a larger market. Then the question comes, where are we to find this larger market? Because we find that our export of manufactured goods was some \$1,300,000 less last year than it was in 1878. This shows that our manufactures are not keeping pace with the improvements which are going on in manufacturing in other countries, and that the National Policy has had the effect of destroying the market in other countries for Canadian manufactured goods. There has been a good deal said with respect to the decreased value of land in the Province of Ontario. I will say, as a farmer, that this is, perhaps, a subject with which I am better acquainted than many others, as I have had an opportunity of testing the value of lands in the County of Huron and in the County of Perth which very few farmers have had. I had the honor to be appointed twelve months ago to value the whole County of Perth for equalisation purposes. I went over it along with another gentleman and put a value on every lot of land there, and I can assure you, Sir, that the reduction in the value of land in that county amounts to 10 and 15, and in some cases more, per cent. I am certain that the same reduction has taken place in the County of Huron, to which I have the honor to belong. In that county we had in 1886, according to the latest reports, 2,600 people less than in 1878, showing plainly that the country is not prosperous. There are eight counties in Ontario which have 3,000 less population than they had in 1878; yet we are told that the country is in a healthy, prosperous and thriving condition. I would ask what is the cause of the hard times we have in Canada? I need not go further back than 1882, to show the decrease in the value of crops in the Province of Ontario. In Ontario, in 1882, the value of the crops of wheat, barley, oats, rye and peas was \$39,682,065, but when we come to 1886 we find the value is but \$58,000,683. Now, this is a very large reduction indeed, and a reduction for which we cannot entirely blame the Government, because there is no government in the world, in my opinion, that can remedy this, although we have been told by the First Minister in one of his famous speeches that the clerk of the weather was a good Conservative. In 1878 the right hon. gentleman said the clerk of the weather was on their side, and would give a good crop, because he knew the Conservatives were going into power. But if he was a good Conservative, he must, as all Conservatives have, overdone the matter, and has not since given us the fine sunshine and the great crops which it was predicted he would supply. If the right hon. gentleman had the power of obtaining all those blessings for us, what is the reason he has forgotten at this time to give the good crops, the clear skies, the good prices, the abundance of employment and the high wages, which, in 1878, he predicted would follow the advent of his party to power. Why has he allowed hundreds of thousands of our most promising youths of our native-born population to go and settle across the lines? There is another statement which the hon. gentleman made in that famous speech to which I have alluded, and that is, that it would not pay at that time to build mills in Canada, and the reason he gave was that they had a very small amount of customers on this side, but that on the other side of the line they would have 40,000,000 of consumers. If that argument held good then, it must hold doubly good to-day. Not only that, but we

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.)

find that under the influence of the National Policy flour which has fallen, since 1881, only 90 cents per barrel in the United States, has fallen in the Dominion over \$2 a barrel, so that no miller present would be wise in building a mill in this country as long as the present condition of things, under which the value of produce and of labor has fallen so considerably, continues. Now, I will address myself a little further to the question of the crops. In 1886, the value of the crops was \$31,361,982, and these sums that I have mentioned are less than it was in 1882. But I will go further and state that the crop of 1887 is less too. According to the quarterly report of the Bureau of Industries issued in the month of August, we had 10,000,000 less bushels of wheat in 1887 than in 1886. We had 5,000,000 less oats, 2,136,000 less barley and 3,000,000 less peas, and if you take these at the market prices, you will find a loss of \$30,000,000 on the grain crop of 1887 as compared with that of 1882. That taken from the sum of \$58,000,000, which was the value of the crop of 1882, reduces the crop of 1887 to a little over \$45,000,000, or very little more than one-half the crop of 1882. Yet we are told we are prosperous; yet we are told that the most prosperous people in the world are the farmers of Ontario to-day. The hon. the Minister of the Interior told us that, but I can well remember that this gentleman's sympathies are not to any great extent with the farmers of the Dominion. I think he made a speech in Montreal at a banquet there, and I was a little astonished at the statements he then made. He said he had always considered that the prosperity of the Dominion lay with the merchants of Canada, and the commercial travellers, the future merchants. Hon. gentlemen opposite ignore the great wealth producers of the Dominion, the agriculturists and the laborers. They ignore them entirely, and it appears this class is only here for the purpose of having a large amount of taxation imposed on it, without receiving in any shape whatever any corresponding benefit. But our loss does not stop there. We were told by the hon. the Minister of the Interior that the horses and cattle in Ontario were on the increase. But in the report I received last August, we have 70,682 fewer horses and cattle than in 1883, 214,788 fewer sheep, 25,305 fewer hogs, and yet we are the most prosperous people in the Dominion. But the effects of the National Policy do not stop here. I do not hold it responsible in every case, but I say it has reduced the prices of produce. In 1881, the price of flour in the United States was \$3.66 per barrel, but when we come to 1886, we find it was then \$4.69, while in Montreal, it was \$5.64 in 1881, a difference of 21 cents per barrel compared with the United States; but when we come to 1886, we find it is only worth in Montreal \$3.56 a barrel, or over \$2 less than what it was in the United States in 1881. Take wheat, and you find that in 1881, wheat in the United States was \$1.11 per bushel, in 1886, it was 87 cents, showing a reduction in value of 24 cents, while flour in Canada had fallen 97 cents. Corn had fallen 6 cents per bushel from 1881 to 1886. Then, when we come to Canada, we find that flour had fallen from \$5.64 to \$3.56, or \$2.08 against 97 cents in the United States, while wheat had fallen 48 cents in Canada against 24 cents in the United States, and corn had fallen 17 cents in Canada against 6 cents in the United States. If hon. gentlemen ask where I got this information, I can tell them that it was not from any wicked Grit or falsifying Reformer, but that the information is contained in a record which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has put into the hands of every member of this House, and from that statement hon. gentlemen can see that we, the farmers of Ontario, have been robbed to a great extent by the National Policy. I was very happy to hear the Minister of the Interior state yesterday that in 1886 we raised 27,500,000 bushels of wheat in the Province of Ontario. It was a statement I had intended to make myself, and I now corroborate it.

For what reason do I corroborate it? I corroborate it for the purpose of showing that half of that wheat would be consumed by the farmer and the other half would be put on the market, and that, as the price of the home market is regulated by the amount we get for what we export, and as we were reduced 24 cents per bushel more than the wheat was reduced in the United States, if we take the half of that wheat at 13,500,000 bushels, we find that the Province of Ontario lost \$3,310,763 on the price of that wheat during that season. Taking all this into consideration, is it to be wondered at that the farmers of Ontario are in a languishing condition. What is it that gives value to farming property? What is it that gives value to land? Is it not the value of what we raise, and, as that has sunk 50 per cent. since 1882, is it not reasonable to say that the value of land has shrunk also? I was surprised to hear the hon. Minister say that the value of land had increased by \$13,000,000 over 1886 in the Province of Ontario. His statement was in reality correct, but the hon. gentleman did not treat the subject fairly. He ought to have taken an average of a few years, and, if he had done that, he would have gone back to 1883 and would have shown that in that year the land in the Province of Ontario was worth \$654,693,035, and when he came to 1886 he would have found that the land was worth \$648,009,828, or a reduction of \$6,783,197 in the value of the land during that time. He would also have shown that after 1883, 300,000 acres of land had been brought under the assessment rolls in the older counties of Ontario and 400,000 acres of land had been cleared. If you take the 300,000 acres at \$29 of value you have \$7,688,000, and if you take the 100,000 acres besides, which were cleared at \$20 an acre, which would not be an extravagant price, you find that would be \$2,000,000, making a total of \$9,688,000. This brings the reduction in the value of the land from the year 1883 to the year 1886 to \$15,471,197, and that is exclusive of all the improvements that have gone on in all the other parts of the Province except upon these 400,000 acres cleared since 1883, and the 300,000 acres which have been placed upon the assessment roll. I hold, therefore, that we have suffered to a very large extent. Although it may be shown that in buildings we have increased the value to the amount of \$30,717,637, I think I can show that that amount and the implements for which we have paid to the extent of \$7,000,000, are not really, though they may be nominally, the property of the farmer, as he is indebted for them, and is getting rapidly further in debt. Even now, I have not told the whole tale in regard to the farmers of Ontario and the burdens to which they are subjected, though some of them are of their own imposing. We have heard a good deal in respect to mortgages, and we had a very glowing account from the hon. Minister of the Interior, who told us what a great many companies had reported, but anyone who knows anything about borrowed money and mortgages in Ontario knows that there is a great deal of private funds lent among the farmers on first class mortgages, the farmers preferring to take private moneys to borrowing from the companies; and these are amounts of which the Government cannot know anything, and I know that this practice exists to a great extent in the County of Huron and all over the Province of Ontario. *The Insurance and Finance Chronicle* of Montreal, in its January issue, values the land very much as the Bureau of Industries values it, at \$300,000,000, but says that the land is mortgaged to the extent of \$275,000,000, that 30 per cent. of the farms in Ontario are encumbered, and are encumbered to the extent of 43 per cent. of their value, that they have loans at 6 per cent. on that amount, which would amount to \$16,500,000 that the farmers of Ontario had to pay on mortgages this last year. We are told that money has been getting cheaper. I know nothing about that. I know that I act as a valuator for a number of individuals who are lending money and for one company

that lends money in the locality from which I come, and I know that, while last fall I could get money easily for 5½ per cent., to-day I cannot get it for less than 7 per cent. Money is going up rapidly in price, and I have never known such a large amount of money placed on farms during the last 44 years of my residence in Ontario as was placed during the last fall, which shows that the farmers are not in the same condition to-day as they have been since I came to the Province of Ontario, and that is a long time indeed. I would just state this with respect to the reduction in the number of cattle, that it shows the farmers had not crops enough to support their cattle. In 1885, they sold an enormous number of cattle, more than they had been accustomed to sell—they sold 143,000 cattle during that year. Now, Sir, in 1887 there were 70,000 head less cattle in Ontario than there were two years previously. The farmers are in a very bad condition indeed. I think the farmers are in the worst condition of any class of the population in the Province of Ontario. Now, let us examine the cost of running a farm of 100 acres in the Province of Ontario, and the revenue that can be got out of it. Sir, I have a statement by me which shows that the condition of the farmer is but little better, if any, than that of the day laborer who works for his daily bread. The total value of crops in 1886 was, of cereals \$15,800,683; crops of corn, buckwheat, beans, hay, clover, potatoes and carrots, \$52,763,943,—in all \$110,764,626. Then I estimate at 53 millions the products of animals and all other sources of revenue that goes into the hands of the farmer. It is a sum almost equal to the value of the crops. I find that the exact sum is \$53,878,483, which includes root crops, grain crops, and everything except straw; so that the total revenue derived from farms in the Province of Ontario is \$164,643,109. Now, how many farms are there in the Province of Ontario of 100 acres each, which is the average number of acres? We find there are 208,615. What is the revenue derived from one of those farms? I find that it will amount on the average to about \$790, and no practical farmer who knows anything about the business will venture to say that an average farm in Ontario will produce any more revenue than that. Now, this average farm has about 50 acres of wood land and 50 acres cleared. In estimating the expense of carrying on this farm we must have two men to do the work the year round. These have to board themselves, and they both receive about \$500. Then there must be a team kept with hay and grain at the market price. I put that at the low rate of 33 cents a day, or \$120 a year. Then for seed, threshing, taxes, and for all the other incidental expenses in connection with the farm, I have reckoned the low sum of \$100. These sums together amount to \$720, only leaving a balance of \$50 to come into the hands of the farmer. This sum only gives him an interest on his capital of 1⅓ per cent. He has nothing except that very small amount to keep up buildings and fences, to meet the wear and tear of his machinery, harnesses and implements. Now, that is a bad condition for the farmers of Ontario to be in. The hon. gentleman has taken his report from the Bureau of Industries, and I challenge him to go over the whole report and show that my statement is not correct. I have no fear that any hon. gentleman will be able to show anything of the kind. Now, Sir, what is the position of the manufacturers when compared with the farmers in the Province of Ontario? I have taken the figures from the census of 1881. I was happy to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon say that the manufacturers of Canada were never in a better condition than they are to-day. If that is true, the statement I am about to make is one that is more than too favorable for them. I find that in the Dominion of Canada the capital invested in manufacturing industries in 1881 was \$165,302,623; I find that the raw material amounted to \$179,918,593, and

the total produce from all these establishments amounted to \$309,676,068. That sum had been increased in value by labor to the amount of \$129,757,475. The sum that is to be deducted from this as having been paid for labor is \$59,429,002. Now, the question comes: How many workmen were engaged in all the different industries of Canada in 1881? I find, first, that the number of manufacturing establishments was 2,229, and the number of workmen was 254,935. I find that the average salary paid to men, women, boys and girls, was \$233 a year. Next: How much did the manufacturer draw from each individual workman? The nice little sum of \$276. In reality the manufacturers of Canada, after counting 10 per cent. for insurance and management, and 6 per cent. on capital invested, have left $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the total cost of product over materials. And yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stands up in this House and declares that the farmers of the Province of Ontario are the most prosperous class in the Dominion. I state that there is no other class in this country which devotes the same amount of energy, industry and perseverance, and exercises the same amount of economy that receives such a small remuneration for their labor. And I warn the hon. gentleman opposite that the farmers of the Dominion have found that the promises made to them in 1878 have not been fulfilled that we have a home market created, that we have not had better prices, that we have not had our population kept at home and that we have not had our produce consumed at home. There are certain things, however, that their policy has succeeded in doing. It has succeeded in driving the very best of our young men from the Dominion to seek homes across the line, it has succeeded in building up "rings" and "trusts" to an extent never known before, it has succeeded in compelling us to pay higher prices than in any country I know of for our manufactured goods, and although we are told that goods are cheaper to-day than they ever were in the history of the world, this same National Policy has deprived the farmers of the benefit of lower prices which should be secured them by improved machinery and improved methods of manufacture. The National Policy has also succeeded in taking a very large amount of money out of the pockets of the farmers in the shape of taxation, much more than was promised before the Government went into power. They, in fact, promised that there would not be an increase of taxation, only a readjustment of taxation. Let us see what this readjustment of taxation, which the Government promised the farmers, together with all other classes of the community, has amounted to, and what effect it has had on the agricultural class. We were told by the hon. Finance Minister before hon. gentlemen opposite assumed the reins of power, that they would not require those large amounts of taxation needed by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. His language was: "In as much as we have ruled the country with smaller taxation in the past, we are prepared to rule it with smaller taxation in the future." The hon. First Minister said time and again there would not be an increase of taxation, only a readjustment of the tariff. What effect has that readjustment had? During the five years Mr. Mackenzie's Government was in power there was collected \$93,555,768 in taxation, or \$18,713,153 a year. During the last five years the present Government have collected \$134,030,883, or an average of \$26,810,176. This amounts to \$8,097,023 per annum more than was collected by the Mackenzie Government, that is to say, that in the five years an additional sum of \$40,485,115 was taken out of the pockets of the ratepayers. I hold that \$30,000,000 of that should never have been collected, and if the Government had increased the annual expenditure by only ten millions there would not have been a great deal of cause for complaint. But the evil has not ended there. In addition to that amount taken for taxation there has been a

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.)

large amount taken out of the pockets of the people and placed in the hands of the manufacturers. Is it a wonder, under these circumstances, that there are stringent times in the Dominion, when there is such increase of taxation and burdens placed upon the people, because probably from twenty to thirty millions taken out of the taxpayers do not find their way into the public treasury. These are all causes of grave complaint against the present Government, and if the present condition of affairs continues for any length of time, such a sentiment will spring up that hon. gentlemen opposite will find it very difficult indeed to rule the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the speeches of hon. members on this side of the House have driven the best of our population to a foreign country; but I tell them that if the advice given by hon. gentlemen on this side had been followed we would have had thousands of our own population at home more than we have to-day. We would have had the North-West more fully settled. What folly it is for the Government to spend \$500,000 a year to bring immigrants into the country, and when they get them in the North-West impose 35 per cent. taxes on the agricultural implements they use. That was a detriment to every farmer who went there with means to get a fair start, for it meant that he had to pay nearly \$200 of duty on his implements. Let me repeat briefly a conversation I had during the summer with an implement agent at Brandon. He said he could go to the other side and purchase Deering binders for \$100 each, but when he brought them to the Custom house they were valued at \$130, the agent stating that he had received order from Ottawa to value them at that sum. This brought their cost up to \$200 to the actual settler. When a farmer is compelled to pay \$200 for an implement which he can purchase for \$100 on the other side of the line, and when he has to pay 10 cents per bushel extra for the carriage of his wheat to market, a farmer comes to think that loyalty should begin at home. When a man has to move, what difference does it make to him whether he goes across the line or not, whether he goes to the United States and lives among people of our own flesh and blood whose traditions are our traditions and whose ancestors were our ancestors, so long as he is going to place himself and his family in a better condition, which I hold they have done in many cases. It is not the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side, but the actions of one of the most extravagant Governments ever known that have caused this emigration. It is also owing to the Government granting a railway monopoly in the North-West, and granting Government lands in such a manner that every alternate section is owned by a wealthy company. I was one of the first settlers in the County of Huron, and I know the hardships we endured in making roads and building schools, and I can, therefore, judge of the great hardships that people must endure in the North-West when every alternate block is held by speculators, and especially when such land is not subject to taxation. These are the causes that have led to the depopulation of Canada. These are the causes that have sent our young men across the lines. Within a week of my leaving home to attend Parliament, a young man residing in the North-West came to my place and remained all night. He has been long enough there to perform his settlement duties, and he told me that unless the Government removed the restrictions both on implements and competition of railways at the present time, he would never go back to that country to settle, because he was not going to spend his life and energy to put money in the pockets of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Such, Sir, has been the experience of almost every individual who went to that North-West. I could name individual after individual, and family after family from my own township and county who went to the North-West to settle, but when they found the conditions under which

they were to be placed they stepped across the lives. Hence the State of Dakota has gained in population over 300,000 people, while the Province of Manitoba has only gained some 43,000. I hold that the Province of Manitoba is superior land and superior in every shape to any of the States, and if they had but the same advantages under the Government of getting goods into that country the people would be more prosperous and successful. I hold, Sir, that the Province of Ontario to-day is one of the fairest spots upon the face of the earth, and I do not see what is the reason that Province cannot succeed better and why her population has not increased more rapidly than it has. Let me read a statement from a gentleman who is well known to any person who has paid much attention to the public men on the other side. The statement is made by David A. Wells, and he says:

"North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and the River St. Lawrence, east of Lake Huron, south of the 45th parallel, and included mainly within the present Province of Ontario there is as fair a country as exists on the North American continent; nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal if not superior to those States as a whole in its agricultural capacity. It is the natural habitation this continent of the combing-wool sheep without a full, cheap and reliable supply of the wool, of which species the great worsted manufacturing industries of the country cannot prosper, or, we should rather say, exist. It is the land where grows the finest barley, which the brewing interests of the United States must have if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its present annual export of over eleven millions of dollars worth of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest of cattle, with qualities especially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections; and its climatic conditions created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit to grow men. Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race; better than the bonanzas of silver or rivers whose sands contain gold."

I would ask, Sir, why the Province of Ontario, when it is the most fertile of all the Provinces, nay, when it is more fertile than any State in the Union, has not progressed more than it has? I think, Sir, I have a statement somewhere which shows the average products of some of the best grain-growing States in the United States of America, and compares them with the Province of Ontario. I would just say, Sir, that this comparison has been made for the United States' records. Of fall wheat per acre, in nine of the best wheat growing States in the Union, the highest produce is in the State of Kansas, which is $15\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre; in the Province of Ontario the produce was 21 bushels per acre, $5\frac{1}{2}$ bushels more than in the best State of the Union. In spring wheat, out of five of the best producing States in the Union, the highest was Dakota, and it produced 14 bushels per acre; the produce of spring wheat in Ontario was 16 bushels per acre, or 2 bushels of spring wheat in advance of the best State on the other side. In barley, out of six States in the Union, the highest is $24\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre in Wisconsin, and in Ontario the produce was $26\frac{2}{10}$ bushels, or $2\frac{7}{10}$ bushels more than in the best State of the Union. In oats, out of twelve States Minnesota was the highest. The produce was $34\frac{3}{10}$ bushels per acre; while in Ontario the produce was $37\frac{1}{10}$ bushels, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ more than in any State of the Union. Now, Sir, we have a more fertile soil, we have a better agricultural and grazing country, and we are situated on the line of commerce on the seaboard; we have all the national advantages that a Province could boast of and there must be some cause why the Province of Ontario is not growing more rapidly than it does grow. I think the causes have been plainly pointed out to the Government of the day. They have been pointed out in this manner, that it is impossible for a country to prosper when we are taking such large sums of money out of the pockets of the people and placing them in the hands of a few favorites. Unless the Government adopt a different policy to that which they have adopted with the Province of Ontario there will be developed such a sentiment of discontent that I cannot see where it will end. I believe myself that if a plebiscite were taken by ballot

to-day in the Province of Ontario, as to whether or not we should remain a part and parcel of Confederation, or whether or not we should become independent or throw in our lot with the United States, the result might be different from what some people would think. I would not like to throw in my lot with the United States if I could help it. I left the land of my birth and I look back to that country with feelings of respect. Canada is the land of my adoption. I spent my youth and manhood here, and I would not like to leave this country, but if the Government continue to treat the country as they have done they will create such a spirit among the people that they will come to the conclusion that if we cannot get the markets of the United States to come and accept our produce we will either have to go to the United States ourselves or ask admission to the Union. That is the sentiment I believe which prevails to-day. Hon. gentlemen may clap their hands or laugh, but they will find later on perhaps that that sentiment will be too strong for them as the sentiment is too strong that has been developed in Manitoba. I was just thinking, Sir, when I saw two gentlemen sitting in this Chamber—a deputation from Manitoba to the Government—to see if they could arrange terms of peace in that Province with the Government at Ottawa, that the impression prevails that the Government has imposed on that Province, and upon the North-West such conditions as it has become a question whether or not the Province of Manitoba is about to rise in its might and assert its right to manage its own business in its own way, that perhaps Manitoba is not the only Province that will have to do that. Thanking the House very cordially for their kind and courteous attention to me while speaking I now beg leave to resume my seat.

Mr. PORTER. The question now before the House, and embraced in the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), is certainly one of the greatest consequence and of the utmost importance. It is a subject, Sir, large with our national life and wide as our future in all the ages to come. And, Sir, when we consider that question and when we approach that question, we ought certainly to approach it as the hon. gentleman has recommended us to do, in the spirit of statesmen and philosophers. Sir, this question has been argued before this House in very many different ways, and all the different speeches bearing on this question have been presented to this House in eloquent and strenuous terms. For me, Sir, to go over the nature of the argument of the gentlemen who have preceded me, would certainly be futile and useless. However, I would crave the attention of this House while I address a few remarks in reference, more particularly, to the special subject of the last gentleman's discourse. It is claimed, Sir, that in this country the National Policy, which was indeed the great object of his attack, has been a detriment and injury to the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman has presented that subject in every variety of view, and every form and every manner of way, in which it could be placed before this House, and the conclusion of all his arguments and the summing up of all his speaking, was that the National Policy introduced in 1879 was detrimental to the farmers of this country. Sir, what does he propose to do in order to relieve the farmers of this country from the burdens they are bearing under this National Policy? He proposes the heroic remedy contained in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. He proposes that we should be relieved from the sufferings we experience from the National Policy by transferring us to a country where a higher National Policy prevails. Sir, that is a most extraordinary remedy; it is scarcely such a remedy as any reasonable man would think for a moment of prescribing. We are also reminded by hon. gentlemen opposite how very necessary it is in any discussion of this kind that we should know precisely

the meaning of the terms we are using, so that there will be no danger of confounding or misunderstanding them. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., took to task members on this side of the House because, as he said, they were opposed to reciprocity. Sir, we are not opposed to reciprocity; we never have been; but unrestricted reciprocity and reciprocity are entirely different things. Reciprocity may mean a certain exchange of goods to such an extent as may be agreed upon, while unrestricted reciprocity means nothing more nor less than absolute free trade, without any restrictions of any sort, with the country with which we propose to enter into relations. It is just as well that that distinction should be borne in mind. We have been reminded by the hon. member for Queen's and by the hon. gentleman who last spoke of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; and it is very strange that when hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the period from 1854 to 1866 they forget some important events which occurred during that period, and which undoubtedly had great influence on the prosperity enjoyed in this country at that time. They forget that in 1854, when the treaty was about to come into operation, a great European war was going on; and I am old enough to remember, and I think the hon. gentleman who preceded me is also old enough to remember, that at that time the prices of the products of Canada were raised to a higher pitch than they have ever been since, and why? Because of reciprocity with the United States? No, Sir, it was simply because a great war was raging in a foreign land, and that that land required that we should raise the products necessary for its sustenance. More than that, to prove conclusively the truth of my statement, let me remind hon. gentlemen that at the conclusion of that great war there was such a tumble in prices, such wreck of fortunes, such a loss of gains in Canada, as is remembered to the present hour; and did the reciprocity of which we have heard so much prevent that dire evil falling on the people of Canada? No, Sir, it did not. There were other laws and other economic forces governing us besides the Reciprocity Treaty. Then, Sir, let me also call the attention of this House to another fact in reference to this question, that at that time Canada was awakening like a giant from slumber, and was beginning to put forth her natural energies and to realise the great possessions God had given her to develop and to transmit to posterity. She was beginning to construct long lines of railway; the Grand Trunk Railway was undertaken; and we know that millions of dollars were spent in the settled portions of the country. All that was an element in the prosperity of which we hear so much during reciprocity times. There was still another element in that prosperity which hon. gentlemen opposite leave out of consideration. We remember that in the year 1860, there were ominous sounds of conflict in the land to the south of us, and during the four years ensuing there waged in that great republic a war, fierce, lasting and desolating, and during that period the people, instead of being employed in the pursuits of peace and in the arts of industry and agriculture, were grasping each other's throat, and thrusting their bayonets through each other's hearts. What was the effect of that strife upon Canada? It was that we who were at peace with all the world, whose industries and trade were not disturbed or interrupted, were able to supply them with all the necessities they required. So that when these gentlemen speak of the reciprocity treaty, I think in all fairness to the people of this country they should have stated these facts; because they are not at present on public platforms attempting to get votes; but as men in council, desiring to arrive at the truth, they should neither express a false thing nor suppress a true thing, but they should give all the facts and all the reasons they know of bearing on the subject under discussion. I say these hon. gentlemen should bear in mind all

Mr. PORTER.

these facts when they come to speak of the period from 1854 to 1866. Now, I have no doubt I have wearied the House with these remarks, because the facts I mention have no doubt often been heard before, but I think it is very necessary that they should be heard again in a discussion of this kind. Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, made the National Policy the principal point of attack, and, I must confess, the figures he brought before us were so numerous and so conflicting that it was almost impossible to follow him. I will therefore take a few points only. If the hon. gentleman had listened to the arguments of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon, he would have omitted one point at least which he brought before the House. He says we pay the whole duty on every article we consume. Now, the hon. gentleman is a farmer like myself. He knows that the greater part of the wools he and his children wear are shorn from the sheep's backs, are taken to the mill and spun, and brought home and made up into clothing for himself and his family; and he knows that not one cent of taxation is paid on those goods. It was therefore not ingenuous in him to make the farmers believe that they had to pay duty on every article they wear. The hon. gentleman also said that goods manufactured in Canada are affected in their price by the price of the goods imported from foreign countries, and that the manufacturers charge more than they ought to do, and that the difference goes into their pockets. It is well known, Sir, that competition in trade undoubtedly reduces the prices of all articles, and it is only a short time ago, indeed, that the manufacturers in this country complained that over-production was causing them to sell at a great loss, so that articles could be bought for actually less than real cost price. But without dwelling on that subject at any length, I will simply touch on another point to which the hon. gentleman referred. In the course of his remarks he read a letter from a farmer in the County of Huron. The farmer congratulated the Liberal party, which has introduced this resolution, upon their policy, and declared that if such a policy as that was not embraced by this House, he would very probably become a citizen of the United States. Let me say this much: We have been asked to discuss this question without sentiment, and I am willing also to discuss it without sentiment. I believe it is a question of material progress to a very large extent; I believe it to be a question of material wealth to a very large extent; still, I am not ashamed to own that that sentiment has a certain influence over all my actions and thoughts. I believe in the fiber of every man, who is a manly man, sentiment certainly has a place, and we know from the world's history, we know from the history of the countries around us that sentiment has made nations brave and men successful. If we were to discuss this subject without sentiment, I believe we would discuss it without considering a most important element in the nation's welfare. I believe that we ought not to make sentiment the most prominent question, yet, after all, in the back ground of discussion there will remain always a something that will influence our decisions in a most important direction. However, I am willing to discuss this question without sentiment, and if the hon. member for South Huron is altogether devoid of sentiment, and for the sake of a few dollars would sell his allegiance to the United States, I believe that Canada is better without him. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has spoken of depreciation in the value of land. He has told us he was a valuator for a company, and that he had an opportunity of examining lands in the County of Perth and some other adjacent counties, and that values had decreased lately owing to the National Policy. In answer to that statement, I have here statistics taken from Mr. Blue's report and from the report of the Agricultural Commission

of 1880, of which I believe the hon. gentleman was a member. From Mr. Blue's statistics, we learn that the average value of land per acre in the County of Huron, which I select as being the hon. gentleman's own county and it is better to particularise—from Mr. Blue's report, we learn that the average value of land per acre in the county of Huron was in 1886, \$51.49, with buildings thereon, the land being worth \$41.28, and the buildings \$10.21. From the report of the Agricultural Commission of 1880, I find the value of 100 acres of farm land in the County of Huron, taking the three classes, the first, second and third into which the commission divide the land and making an average price,—I find from the report that for the whole County of Huron, the value of the farming land was in 1880 estimated to be worth \$36.16 per acre, so that from 1880 to 1886 the land in question had increased \$15.32 per acre in value. These facts and figures are taken from the statistics of hon. gentlemen's friends in Ontario, and I ask you, Sir, if they show any sign of depreciation in the value of landed property. Suppose we admit for the sake of argument that the land has depreciated, or rather that it has not risen in value, what do we find Mr. Blue saying? In his report of 1885, he says that the value of the land depends upon the value of the crops, and that when prices are low land is low. That is but a reasonable statement of facts in the mind of all impartial men. There is another test of the value of land, and that is the increase in the assessment values, as they appear from year to year in the reports of the municipalities. The assessed values of land in the County of Huron was:—

| | |
|---------|---------|
| In 1875 | \$37 91 |
| 1876 | 28 76 |
| 1877 | 29 43 |
| 1878 | 29 54 |
| 1879 | 30 02 |
| 1880 | 30 01 |
| 1881 | 30 22 |
| 1882 | 31 07 |
| 1883 | 30 94 |
| 1884 | 31 42 |
| 1885 | 32 71 |

During the series of years, from 1875 to 1885, eleven years, the land was rising steadily in value, and it was rising steadily in value under the care and supervision of men who were interested in not going beyond its true value, lest the township would have to pay a little more taxes than it did before. These two facts show conclusively that the statement of the hon. gentleman and his friends as to the depreciation of land in the County of Huron, is not substantiated by the facts. It has been said to us repeatedly that the farmers are on the verge of starvation, that some of them are bereft of all hope in this world, whatever they will have in the world beyond. Other gentlemen may think that, although their condition is not so deplorable as this, their earnings are very trifling, indeed, compared with what they should be. Hon. gentlemen sometimes should remember that it is always well, in discussing a great question, to state exactly the facts, because when they do that there is no fear that any man can trip their statement. I find that an hon. gentleman on the Opposition benches last year, discussing the condition of the farmer, who in his blind fury was anxious to make a point against the Government in regard to the National Policy, adduced certain facts and statements to show how much the farmers had lost under the National Policy. In that statement I find a very healthy state of affairs indeed, and I think it shows that there is no necessity for the lamentations which the hon. gentlemen are making in regard to the terrible state of the farmers. I find that, in that discussion, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said that the average farmer in the County of Huron sold 200 bushels of wheat at 99 cents, \$198; 150 bushels of barley at 68 cents, \$102;

150 bushels of oats at 40 cents, \$60; 75 bushels of peas at 67 cents, \$50.75; 10 cwt. of dressed hogs at \$7, \$70; 10 dressed turkeys at \$1.50, \$15; 200 lbs. of butter at 19 cents, \$38; 15 barrels of apples at \$2.30 a barrel, \$34.50; 50 dozen of eggs at 19 cents, \$9.50; five tons of hay at \$11, \$55; 5 tons of straw at \$8, \$40; 50 lbs. of wool at 22 cents, \$11; so that the whole of the articles which the average farmer sold, according to this hon. gentleman, on an average year from 1879 to 1887, was over \$620 worth. I ask you to consider whether that is not a fair showing for the profits of a farm on an average number of years from 1879 to 1887. But the hon. gentleman did not complete his statement. If he undertook to state all the products from the farm, he should have gone further, and many hon. gentlemen are aware that the farmers in that county sell excellent horses, excellent cattle and excellent sheep, but the hon. gentleman never enumerated a single horse or a single sheep or a single fat beast. If we add these products to the others which he has given, we will then find that the average farmer in the County of Huron derives an income of nearly \$900 per annum. I ask this House, or any hon. gentleman, if that is not a very fair showing indeed for an average farmer in the County of Huron to make. Perhaps I have not paid as much attention to the statements of the hon. gentleman opposite as they might deserve. I remember that in the County of Renfrew, when I was assisting in the election of an hon. gentleman who is now in this House, I quoted these statistics to show that the state of the country and the condition of the farmers in my own county was not as desperate as it might be. The hon. gentleman who replied to me said: "Why, it is absurd." I said: "My dear sir, the gentleman who uttered these words is the member for East Huron, a Reformer." He said: "I do not care what he is; the Reformers of East Huron have chosen a fool, and I think the people of West Huron have chosen another." Not only have I quoted this to show the condition of the farmers, but I may quote the words of Professor Brown in reference to the condition of the farmer. It is well known that that gentleman is in a position to understand the condition of the farmers of this country as well as any other man. His profession brings him into contact with them, his studies and his pursuits bring him in touch with them, and no doubt anything that affects their condition is known to him by a sort of magnetic or sympathetic influence, and this gentleman, drawing his facts and figures from Mr. Blue's report, sums up a letter, a long and able dissertation upon the condition of the farmer in these words, that he has no hesitation, after giving all the facts and combining them and showing the relation in which they stand to one another, in repeating: "That you, the farmers of Ontario, are not only doing well and making money, whether placed in the bank or in improvements or in mortgage, but you are all actually wealthy." That letter was attempted to be contradicted by men whose views it did not suit, and the professor again, on 3rd January, 1888, answered the statements, and in concluding he says: "If debiting and crediting can be stated on an average, I am of opinion that no class of farmers is so well off as those of Ontario." That is independent and professional evidence, and it is evidence given by a man who is thoroughly competent to understand what he speaks of. Another point to which I shall also direct the attention of hon. gentlemen for a short time is that of the mortgages on farm property. We heard a very doleful statement from the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) as to the burdens the farmers bear and the large amounts they pay to mortgage companies, and we are told that almost every farm in this country was burdened with a mortgage; but, before the hon. gentleman sat down, almost before he completed his sentence, he told us that the loan companies did not exactly show the amount of mortgages because many farmers took first-class mortgages as good security. Is it not ex-

traordinary that ruined farmers are able to lend money on mortgages? Where do they get the money? If they are ruined in order to keep up the pomp and splendour of manufacturers, where do they get the money? I think the farmers of Huron are well able to hold their own, and if there is a shiftless or thriftless or intemperate or lazy man among them who cannot hold his own, they are quite willing to put their money upon his land. I may give a few moments also to a further consideration of some of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made. Amongst other things, he claims that unrestricted reciprocity would be of great benefit to the farmers of Canada—as all the others claim—by opening up a larger market, by placing within their reach the privilege of supplying the larger cities and populous communities along our southern border, and that thereby they might make a readier sale and receive a larger price. But, Sir, we know that Canada and many of the States south of us, produce agricultural products of the same class, and these latter to such an extent as to more than supply their own market. Therefore our products must seek the markets of the world where they may be disposed of at the best advantage. To assert that New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or any other State to the south of us, require for their own use our wheat, our oats, our peas, corn, beef or pork, is to mock the intelligence of our farmers. Now, let me call attention to a statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also made in answer to the hon. gentleman, about our natural market. The hon. gentleman says that the United States is the natural market for the agricultural products of Canada. A natural market, as I take it may be defined as one that is either contiguous, co-terminus or adjacent. But it is one in which nature supplies either not at all, or to a very limited extent, the goods therein offered, and which are demanded and required by the people. Now, in which of these categories shall we place the United States? Shall we say that they do not produce breadstuffs, meats, and such like products at all; or shall we say that they do not produce them in such a rich abundance as to supply their own people? Sir, to make either assertion, in the face of the evidence that we only send to that country fifteen million dollars of agricultural products, and in face of the evidence of the commercial records of the United States, I say an assertion of that sort would be as absurd as it is false. We learn from the returns of the United States that the agricultural exports for the year ending 30th June, 1887, amounted to \$484,500,000. Of this sum about 161 million dollars were breadstuff, ninety-two million dollars, beef, pork, butter and cheese, and nine millions were cattle and other products. Sir, I ask you is it possible that a country that produces these large quantities of agricultural products, really requires the products of Canada. Let me ask you to reflect on the innumerable bushels of grain and barrels of flour that leave the Atlantic ports of the United States for the hungry nations of Europe. Think also of the mountains of beef and pork which accompany this bread, and then how can any intelligent man say that the United States is a natural market for our surplus agricultural produce? No Sir, if we wish to dispose of these things we must go where they are required, and we shall find a market among these people who have outgrown the limits of their own food supply. To those countries must we look for the best customers of Canada. When the time comes, which is undoubtedly remote when the United States shall no longer export agricultural produce, or but to a very limited extent, then I acknowledge that we who live upon their borders may supply their wants with benefit to themselves and with profit to us. Until that time comes we must look to the populous nations of Europe, to them we must send our products, and from them receive the money or its equivalent, and in any case we must regard them as by nature destined to consume the fruits of our soil.

Mr. PORTER.

The hon. gentleman also spoke of the movement of population, and this seems to be not only a stock argument, but a never failing source of melancholy regret on their part. The hon. member for South Oxford last night quoted the Scriptures, apparently for the sake of making a joke, but I thought he was very unfortunately placed, because the copy of the sacred book he possesses must be a mutilated copy; it begins with Exodus and ends with the lamentations of Jeremiah. Sir, in that book of his there is no gospel for Canada, there are no beatitudes for Canada, and it would seem that he was born, like the prophet of old, not to bless, but to curse. Sir, the exodus of Canada has been very well explained, and I think if men will lay aside party spirit and political bias, which sway their judgments oft-times, unintentionally, they must acknowledge that a movement of population is going on the world over. Some of these hon. gentlemen know well that in the old settled townships of the county I represent, there is a movement, not on account of the poverty of the people, not on account of the want of enterprise of the people, not on account of the sterility of the soil, but on account of the ambition of the younger men to go where they can find homes for themselves, free and untrammelled, where they can find an opportunity to commence the world in a life of adventure, like their fathers before them. It is nothing to be regretted as has been well remarked, heretofore we have not been able to utilise that spirit of adventure in our young men because we had not in our possession the territory we required, and they drifted off, unfortunately for us, to the land of the Stars and Stripes. But while we regret the exodus of our young men, it is certainly a source of pride to every Canadian to know that though they have gone across the border, they have maintained the reputation of Canada for intelligence and trustworthiness. If we cannot keep them at home, we need not be ashamed of our export. If we raise the best wheat and the best horses in the world, we can also raise as good men, at least, as the United States. Sir, a remedy has been proposed for all the evils that afflict our country, more especially that afflict agriculture. It is a very drastic remedy, it is heroic treatment indeed. We were told, for example, the remedy would have the result of diminishing our revenue, and that by some possibility, although not admitted, direct taxation might be the consequence. The physician examined the patient, he made a diagnosis and found she was very ill, and in order to save her he bled her to death and then killed her by starvation. That is certainly most heroic treatment. If our revenues are to be taken from us, and then the little we have remaining is to go in the form of taxation that is heroic treatment unquestionably. I need not dwell on the question of manufacturing industries. I think it will be admitted by every hon. member, as it will be by every intelligent man in the Dominion, that no country can ever be a great country that is purely an agricultural one, but that every country to attain to the highest civilisation must possess a great variety of all the elements which occupy and employ the mind and intellect of man, every art, science and industrial pursuit. The finest, the most complete, the most artistic industries must be carried on before a country can attain to the eminence of a highly civilized country. I think, therefore, the importance and the necessity will be admitted of establishing industrial pursuits in this Canada of ours. Years ago we were nothing more than the clearers of the forest, then we were the pioneers who were clearing away the obstructions of nature; but now that these results have been accomplished and we have overcome the first difficulties in our way and we are about to lay the foundations of a great and, as I hope, a mighty empire, we should consider well and consider wisely by what possible means we can introduce all the varied branches of art, science and literature into the country, because by these means and these means alone shall we ever

become a great nation. Wealth alone will not make us great, but wealth, arts, science and industry, and all the mechanical skill and enterprise which characterise the most advanced nations of men, they and they alone will make us great. I say, therefore, that these statesmen, especially the venerable leader of this House who nine years ago introduced a policy which had for its object that view and purpose, deserve the gratitude of the country not only now but for all time to come. If one could suppose that his wise scheme could miscarry and the people of Canada declined to follow the plan which he had laid down for them and the lines on which he desired them to go, yet I believe the time would come, if in a moment of excitement they were led away by the seductions of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they would recoil to the position they had already taken and reaffirm the verdict already made. If they were to do away with all those protections to the industries of the country and starve out our young industries, then I believe not many years would pass before they would be sorry they had so far forgotten themselves and would recall the memories of those days of 1879, and wish again for one hour with the venerable statesman who now leads this House. We are told that the introduction of the National Policy has been the means of establishing large institutions in this country which derive vast sums of money from the people. If it be unwise and unjust, if it be dangerous to the State to form an establishment in this country which by its command of an enormous capital is able to exercise its power to crush out its feebler rivals, I contend it is ten times more dangerous to the State to build up an institution of that kind in a foreign land over which we can have no control. No good can the people of Canada by any possibility derive, no compensation for the sense of injustice which our people will feel can be obtained for the insuperable obstacles which must be placed in the way of men equally as enterprising and energetic but not as wealthy under an arrangement such as is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. When we contemplate what the present policy has done for us we have every reason to be assured that we are working upon the right lines, we have every reason to be confirmed in our opinion that the time is not far distant when we certainly shall reap the benefits of all our labors and planning and scheming for the welfare of Canada. But suppose we admit that we are led aside by the seductive tones of the gloomy knight from Oxford, that the darkness of the shadows overcloud the intellect and we are led to vote for the resolution before the House, what then will take place? I contend that the passage of this resolution would retard Canada in mid-career, would have a tendency to destroy her industries, would reduce her capital, and would make us, although we aim to be something better, only producers of those raw materials which would be used in the manufactories and workshops of a foreign country, and Canada would be famed for her soil and the stupidity of her men. What true-hearted, patriotic Canadian can contemplate the melancholy picture of his country under the auspices of the scheme which those gentlemen propose? He must hang his head in deep humiliation, he must feel the glow of shame burning in his face at the result which must inevitably happen. But to that proud and worthy nation over the border into whose hands this resolution would certainly deliver us bound in brazen fetters, to those men I say our abject whining and cringing must be loathsome and disgusting. They themselves formulated a treaty of commerce between us which existed for twelve years, and which we were anxious to renew, and for twenty-two years they have refused to listen to the repeated requests of the Canadian people and Canadian Government. Canada wishes to trade upon fair terms and on a mutual basis with all the world, and when the people of the United States intimate their

willingness to meet with us and discuss these matters, then we will meet them and discuss the whole question; but until that time comes, Canada must refuse to stand like a beggar cap in hand at the door of the American Republic. For these reasons, which I have imperfectly recounted, and because I believe that Canada's future depends upon her own efforts and her own wisdom and not another's favor, I will vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford.

M. DESSAINT: M. l'Orateur, je regrette d'être obligé de prendre la parole à cette heure avancée de la soirée. Je prie mes honorables collègues de vouloir bien me pardonner si je me permets de prendre la parole au début d'une question aussi importante que celle qui est maintenant soumise à l'appréciation de cette Chambre. Ce n'est pas par ostentation que je le fais, mais étant obligé de m'absenter demain pour affaires urgentes, je serai privé de l'avantage de voter sur la proposition qui nous est maintenant soumise. C'est pourquoi je saisis cette occasion pour exprimer ma manière de voir sur cette question.

Comme représentant un comté essentiellement agricole je crois de mon devoir d'exprimer mon opinion, opinion que je crois être celle de la grande majorité des électeurs de ma division, sur la question qui agite maintenant l'opinion publique. Je tâcherai, M. l'Orateur, de le faire en aussi peu de mots que possible.

La proposition qui nous est maintenant soumise par l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright), est une proposition capitale qui intéresse hautement les intérêts de ce pays. Cette proposition a un retentissement immense dans le pays, et peut avoir des conséquences très considérables. Cette proposition, qui du reste n'est pas nouvelle, et dont le principe a déjà été admis dans ce pays, tend à demander une réciprocité complète de nos produits manufacturiers et des produits naturels du pays avec les Etats-Unis.

D'un côté, on vante la réciprocité comme devant donner de grands avantages au Canada au sujet des rapports commerciaux avec les Etats-Unis. D'un autre côté, on s'en défend de deux manières. Le premier moyen de défense que l'on invoque est celui-ci: on dit que le traité de réciprocité est impossible parce que les Etats-Unis n'en veulent point, et on nous donne comme preuve la demande faite par sir Charles Tupper, comme plénipotentiaire, lors de la dernière conférence des pêcheries à Washington. De plus, j'ai entendu dire devant cette chambre, et on le voit dans les journaux, que la réciprocité n'est pas dans l'intérêt du pays.

Eh bien! M. l'Orateur, je considère que ce sont là deux contradictions. Si la réciprocité n'est pas avantageuse pour notre pays, pourquoi sir Charles Tupper la demande-t-il? Si, d'un autre côté, ce traité de réciprocité est avantageux pour le Canada, alors pourquoi des hommes autorisés, des ministres de la Couronne, dans des discours savamment élaborés et respirant une bonne foi plus ou moins grande, viennent-ils nous dire que nous sommes dans le meilleur pays du monde, que nous sommes dans la prospérité, qu'avec le système protecteur actuel, nous n'avons plus rien à désirer? Je constate une contradiction flagrante et un défaut de conséquence entre ces deux moyens de défense.

Je crois que pour tous ceux qui ont suivi un peu ce qui s'est passé dans notre pays et qui connaissent les rapports qui ont existé et qui existent actuellement entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis, il faudrait être aveugle pour dire qu'une population comme la nôtre de cinq millions d'habitants n'aurait pas d'intérêt à avoir des rapports commerciaux avec un peuple comme celui des Etats-Unis qui se chiffre par soixante millions d'âmes. La géographie des deux pays démontre au contraire que nous sommes destinés à avoir des rapports continuels. Et naturellement le Canada a plus d'intérêt à avoir des rapports avec les Etats-Unis que les Etats-Unis n'ont d'intérêt d'en avoir avec nous. Nous

sommes voisins ; il n'y a qu'une ligne imaginaire qui nous sépare depuis l'Océan Atlantique jusqu'à l'Océan Pacifique. Eh bien ! allons-nous dire que parce que nous ne sommes pas de la même nation, bien que nous ayons des intérêts identiques, allons-nous dire que nous devons maintenir une barrière entre nous et n'avoir aucun commerce quelconque ensemble ? Je crois que ceci ne serait pas dans l'intérêt de la nation canadienne. Je crois surtout que cela ne serait pas dans l'intérêt du plus grand nombre, c'est-à-dire de la classe pauvre. Ceux qui viennent dire que nous n'avons pas d'intérêt à avoir de relations commerciales avec les Etats-Unis, je crois pour ma part, qu'ils ne sont pas sincères et qu'ils font tout simplement de la politique. Les rapports commerciaux sont là pour nous démontrer les avantages qu'aurait le Canada à avoir un traité de réciprocité avec nos voisins.

Prenons les fluctuations du commerce depuis un certain nombre d'années. Je vais le faire aussi succinctement que possible et je prendrai trois périodes. Je placerai la première période de 1821 à 1846. A cette époque, nous étions sous le joug de l'Angleterre sous le rapport du commerce ; nous étions sous la tutelle complète de la Grande-Bretagne, et nous n'avions pas le droit, comme colonie, de faire des traités ou même de faire un tarif.

Eh bien ! quel a été notre commerce pendant cette période ? Dans ce temps-là, nous n'avons eu aucuns rapports ou presque pas de rapports avec les Etats-Unis. Il est vrai que la nation canadienne n'était pas aussi considérable qu'elle l'est aujourd'hui, mais en égard au nombre, voyons les rapports commerciaux qui existaient alors : de 1821 à 1846, le total des importations des Etats-Unis dans les provinces de l'Amérique du Nord, y compris Terre-Neuve, s'élevait à \$90,124,195, et les exportations à \$31,040,834. Donc, pendant vingt-cinq années que nous avons fait des affaires avec les Etats-Unis, nous avons exporté en moyenne pour une valeur annuelle d'un million et un quart par année, et, comme je l'ai dit, à cette époque nous n'avions pas de réciprocité et nous étions sous la tutelle commerciale de la mère-patrie.

En 1846, les liens qui nous rattachaient à la mère-patrie ont été relâchés un peu, et nous avons pu avoir des rapports commerciaux avec les Etats-Unis d'une manière plus directe. De ce moment-là, il a été question entre les hommes d'Etat des deux pays de nouer des relations commerciales plus intimes, et c'est de là qu'a surgi l'idée du premier traité de réciprocité qui a été fait en 1854. Dès 1847, les hommes d'Etat des deux pays se sont occupés de ces relations commerciales ; on en ressentait alors l'importance ; on comprenait les profits réciproques que les deux pays en retireraient. Malgré cela, ces propositions sont restées en suspens jusqu'en 1854.

Examinons maintenant la période qui s'est écoulée depuis 1854 jusqu'en 1866, c'est-à-dire pendant que le traité de réciprocité a été en force entre les deux pays. Prenons d'abord depuis 1850. Quelles ont été les importations et les exportations en 1850 ? Les importations ont été de \$6,594,860, et les exportations ont été de \$4,951,159. En 1866, à l'expiration du traité de réciprocité, les importations ont été de \$20,424,692, et les exportations ont été de \$34,770,261.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, quelle est la réflexion naturelle que nous devons faire en face de chiffres semblables ? Ceci nous démontre que pendant cette période de réciprocité, nous avons prospéré d'une manière étonnante, et la conséquence que nous avons tirée de ces chiffres, c'est que si nous avions encore la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis, l'augmentation de notre commerce serait proportionnée à celle qui a eu lieu pendant la période que je viens de mentionner.

Le traité de réciprocité a pris fin le 17 mars 1866.

Voyons maintenant si la progression du commerce a été dans la même proportion en 1867. En 1867, les importations ont été de \$20,271,907 et les exportations de \$25,553,800.

M. DESSAINT.

En 1886, vingt ans après, les importations ont été de \$35,770,150 et les exportations de \$26,997,914. Je ferai remarquer ici que les exportations de 1886 ont été moins considérables que les exportations de 1866. C'est-à-dire que vingt ans auparavant, lorsque nous étions sous l'empire du traité de réciprocité nous avons exporté pour au delà de \$34,000,000, et vingt ans après, malgré la grande prospérité de notre pays que l'on vante tant, nous n'avons exporté que pour \$26,000,000, c'est-à-dire \$8,000,000 de moins après vingt ans que nous exportions sous le régime de la réciprocité.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, ceux qui nous vantent le système actuel, qui disent que nous sommes dans le meilleur des mondes possibles, et qu'il est impossible en quelque sorte d'avoir une plus grande prospérité que celle que nous avons, se mettent plus au point de vue des grands capitalistes qui semblent travailler non pas pour le plus grand nombre, mais pour le plus petit nombre, pour les manufacturiers. Or, nous, comme représentants du peuple, ce n'est pas seulement le petit nombre que nous devons protéger, mais c'est la masse de la population ; et pour ma part, je dis que si nous avions un traité de réciprocité aussi général que possible avec les Etats-Unis, la classe agricole y trouverait le plus grand avantage, parce qu'à l'heure qu'il est, M. l'Orateur, il y a des désavantages que nos cultivateurs ne peuvent surmonter. Ainsi, en vertu du tarif qui existe actuellement aux Etats-Unis,—un tarif de représailles,—nos cultivateurs ne peuvent vendre leurs produits sans payer des droits considérables que tous les honorables membres de cette Chambre connaissent comme moi. Je citerai quelques items pour démontrer que nos cultivateurs ont besoin que cette barrière qui existe entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis disparaisse afin que nous puissions avoir des relations plus faciles avec les Etats-Unis. Je parle plus particulièrement au point de vue de la classe agricole, et du comté que j'ai l'honneur de représenter, qui est un comté presque exclusivement agricole.

Le comté de Kamouraska en particulier récolte tous les ans une grande quantité de foin, de patates, et de grains de toutes sortes ; il s'y fait aussi un grand commerce de chevaux, de bestiaux, de moutons, et d'autres animaux. Je n'apprendrai rien à personne, et ce sont des choses qu'il est inutile de vouloir se cacher, en disant que nous sommes obligés de payer à la frontière américaine un droit de 20 pour cent sur les chevaux que nous vendons. Ainsi, un cultivateur vend un cheval à un commerçant pour \$100, le commerçant qui le transporte aux Etats-Unis est obligé de payer 20 pour cent de droits. Or, s'il n'avait pas ce droit de 20 pour cent à payer, au lieu de ne payer que \$100 au cultivateur pour son cheval, il lui paierait la somme de \$120. C'est donc \$20.00 dont bénéficieraient nos cultivateurs si nous avions un traité de réciprocité avec nos voisins.

Eh, bien ! M. l'Orateur, il en est de même pour tous les produits de la ferme, et, dans mon comté principalement, pour le foin et les patates. Ainsi on impose un droit de 15 cents par minot sur les patates, ou un pourcentage de 39.58 pour cent. Il en est de même pour le fromage sur lequel nous payons quatre cents par livre, c'est-à-dire 30.14 pour cent. Nous payons aussi sur le foin \$2 par tonne, c'est-à-dire \$2 par 130 bottes de foin, soit un pourcentage de 18.98 pour cent.

Si les commerçants n'avaient pas ces droits à payer à leur entrée sur le territoire américain, ils pourraient payer davantage aux cultivateurs canadiens, et ce sont les cultivateurs qui en profiteraient.

Je crois donc que nous devons premièrement protéger la classe agricole. D'ailleurs, il me semble que les manufacturiers y trouveraient eux-mêmes leur avantage. On a demandé beaucoup de protection pour les manufacturiers. Or, M. l'Orateur, depuis plusieurs années déjà que ces messieurs exploitent leurs industries, ils doivent être en position de pouvoir lutter avec les manufacturiers étrangers.

On vante beaucoup la prospérité de notre pays, on dit que nous augmentons sous tous les rapports ; cependant, je constate que s'il y a eu augmentation c'est seulement dans les grandes villes, parce que malheureusement, dans nos districts ruraux il n'y a presque pas eu de progrès sous aucun rapport.

Que voyons nous quant à l'augmentation de la population ? Le comté de Kamouraska en 1871 avait une population de 21,254 habitants, et en 1881 sa population n'était que de 22,181, c'est-à-dire une augmentation, pendant toute une décade, que de 927 habitants.

Prenons maintenant toute la population de la province de Québec pendant la même décade. En 1871 la population était de 1,191,116 habitants, et en 1881, elle était de 1,359,027, soit une augmentation de 167,511 habitants seulement. Eh bien ! va-t-on dire que c'est là une augmentation naturelle, que c'est là une augmentation qui donne pleine et entière satisfaction ? Je dis que non. Et quelle est la raison de ce défaut d'augmentation dans notre population ? C'est parce que nos campagnes se dépeuplent tous les jours ; tous les ans nous voyons un quart, ou peut-être un tiers de nos concitoyens prendre le chemin de l'exil et se diriger vers les États-Unis. Et pourquoi ? Parce qu'ils ne trouvent pas dans leur pays la protection suffisante ; parce qu'ils n'y trouvent pas des manufactures suffisantes pour leur fournir leur subsistance. Ceci est un fait qui est connu de tout le monde. Maintenant, qu'on vante tant que l'on voudra la richesse de ce pays, la preuve contraire est démontrée par le fait que nous avons aux États-Unis à l'heure qu'il est, au delà de un million de Canadiens. Eh bien ! je crois que si nous avons l'avantage de renouer des liens commerciaux avec les États-Unis, il s'établirait dans notre pays des manufactures avec les capitaux américains, et au lieu d'avoir à émigrer aux États-Unis, nous verrions nos frères qui sont là-bas dans l'exil revenir dans leurs foyers, y trouver de l'ouvrage et de quoi faire vivre leurs familles.

Pendant le discours qu'a fait l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (Sir Richard Cartwright), j'ai entendu une remarque faite par un honorable député de l'autre côté de la Chambre, ou plutôt une insulte a été lancée à la face de tous les Canadiens qui sont de l'autre côté de la ligne 45ème. On a dit que ceux qui avaient émigré aux États-Unis, n'étaient pas autre chose que des porteurs d'eau et des scieurs de bois. C'est là une injure gratuite, un injure qui ne fait pas honneur à celui qui l'a lancée, et qui démontre bien les sentiments qui existent, — je ne dirai pas chez tous les membres de l'autre côté de la Chambre, — mais chez quelques-uns d'eux à l'égard des Canadiens qui sont aux États-Unis. Ceci démontre bien qu'ils ne sont pas décidés à les encourager à revenir au pays, mais qu'ils préfèrent plutôt leur lancer l'injure à la face. Ceci est regrettable. Mais au nom de ceux qui sont là-bas je dois dire qu'on a eu tort de les qualifier ainsi ; car ceux de nos compatriotes qui sont aux États-Unis y sont là par nécessité, et s'ils ont été obligés de s'expatrier, c'est parce que nous avons une administration au pays qui ne leur a pas permis d'y gagner leur vie honorablement.

Je dis, M. l'Orateur, que non-seulement la réciprocité serait avantageuse à la classe agricole, mais qu'elle serait aussi avantageuse pour le développement de toutes les ressources que nous possédons. On dit avec beaucoup de raison que notre pays possède de grandes ressources. En effet, nous avons des mines très riches de toute sorte. Mais il faut avouer aussi, M. l'Orateur, que nous avons bien peu de capitaux dans la Puissance du Canada, et si nous avions des relations commerciales plus étendues avec les États-Unis, je crois que les capitaux qui y abondent viendraient dans le pays servir à l'exploitation de nos forêts, de nos mines et de toutes les autres ressources que nous possédons.

Un fait qui est arrivé dans mon comté démontre bien que c'est le défaut pécuniaire qui fait que nous ne pouvons pas

toujours réussir, et que ce n'est qu'au moyen de relations constantes avec un peuple aussi riche que nos voisins que nous arriverons à la prospérité que nous désirons tous. Nous avons dans le comté de Kamouraska des montagnes de silex propres à faire du verre et nous avons aussi des couches considérables de sable employé dans la fabrication du verre ? Il y a quelques années à peine il s'est formé dans le comté une compagnie pour l'exploitation de cette industrie. Mais comme pour la plupart des entreprises qui se sont faites dans le pays, nous n'avons pu réussir faute de moyens.

Eh bien ! je crois que si nous avions un traité de réciprocité, si le marché américain nous était ouvert, si nous avions l'avantage de voir les Américains exploiter nos industries, ce serait une source de richesse pour le pays et pour le comté que je représente en particulier.

Maintenant, les grandes objections que l'on fait à la réciprocité sont d'abord que ce programme aurait dû être soumis aux électeurs avant d'être soumis à la Chambre. Je ne crois pas que cette objection soit sérieuse, parce qu'il ne s'agit ici que de la manifestation d'une opinion. D'ailleurs, les honorables membres de cette Chambre qui siègent de l'autre côté n'ont pas été aussi scrupuleux dans leur carrière politique. On se rappelle que lorsqu'ils ont formé la Confédération, ils n'ont pas consulté le peuple, et ils l'ont fait malgré les protestations des honorables membres de la gauche dans le temps.

Et plus tard, qu'ont-ils fait de leur programme de protection ? Quand l'honorable chef du gouvernement a commencé à soumettre son programme de politique nationale dans cette Chambre, était-ce après l'avoir soumis au peuple ? Non, M. l'Orateur. C'est durant la première ou la seconde session après les élections générales que l'on a adopté ce programme. Par conséquent, cette objection n'est pas sérieuse ; et si elle était sérieuse, ces honorables messieurs devraient faire un retour sur eux-mêmes et se rappeler qu'ils ont eu tort dans le passé ou que nous avons raison aujourd'hui.

La seconde objection que l'on fait, c'est que ce serait un manque d'allégeance, presque un cas de lèse-majesté que de nouer un traité de réciprocité avec les États-Unis au grand détriment de la Grande-Bretagne. Je crois que cette objection n'est pas sérieuse non plus. Quand les honorables messieurs de l'autre côté de la chambre ont mis en pratique leur tarif protecteur, leur grande question de politique nationale, ils n'ont pas alors consulté les intérêts de la Grande-Bretagne ; ils ont proclamé dans la presse, dans la chambre et partout, que leur programme était "le Canada pour les Canadiens." C'est-à-dire qu'il s'agissait de faire un tarif protecteur pour protéger les Canadiens et non pas les Anglais.

Eh bien, nous sommes aujourd'hui dans le même cas. Il s'agit de faire un traité de réciprocité, non pas pour protéger l'Angleterre, mais pour nous protéger nous-mêmes, et pour avoir des relations commerciales avec nos voisins.

La troisième objection que l'on fait, est une objection très sérieuse qui a été traitée particulièrement par l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright) et par les autres députés de ce côté-ci de cette chambre qui l'ont suivi.

Réellement, après le cours d'économie politique que nous a donné l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright) je crois qu'il me serait imprudent d'entrer sur un terrain aussi difficile. Mais le discours qu'a fait l'honorable député restera comme un monument dans les annales parlementaires de cette Chambre et je crois que les raisons qu'il a données pour répondre à cette objection sont tout-à-fait victorieuses. Je ne me permettrai que d'ajouter quelques mots.

On nous dit : mais où prendrez-vous des revenus pour remplacer les droits de douanes que vous allez abolir entre le Canada et les États-Unis ? D'abord, comme il a été dit devant cette Chambre, il faudrait de toute nécessité diminuer les dépenses que nous avons actuellement, lesquelles

dépenses sont excessives. Nous dépensons de \$37,000,000 à \$38,000,000 par année lorsqu'avec une dépense de \$26,000,000 je crois que nous pourrions satisfaire à tous les besoins de l'administration. Je me rappelle qu'en 1878, l'honorable M. Tilley qui était alors membre de la Chambre, critiquait particulièrement le gouvernement Mackenzie parce qu'il dépensait au delà de \$23,000,000, et l'honorable M. Tilley disait qu'avec cette somme il se faisait fort d'administrer les affaires du pays et de rencontrer toutes les dépenses nécessaires avec un revenu de \$26,000,000.

Et bien, quelles sont les raisons d'augmentation depuis ce temps-là ? Je crois, pour ma part, que si les affaires du pays étaient bien administrées au lieu d'engouffrer des millions pour encourager des compagnies qui veulent contrôler le pays, on pourrait pourvoir à tous les besoins de l'administration du pays avec une somme de \$26,000,000.

Maintenant en ayant un traité de réciprocité, nous aurions évidemment une augmentation de commerce considérable ; les droits d'accise seraient augmentés par là même, et nos droits de douane avec l'Angleterre et tous les autres pays resteraient les mêmes qu'il sont actuellement.

Mais supposons pour un instant que les revenus de la douane seraient insuffisants pour rencontrer les dépenses nécessaires et indispensables. Je crois pour ma part, — malgré que je n'aie que peu d'expérience sur la matière, — qu'il y aurait moyen encore de rencontrer les dépenses, non pas en imposant une taxe indirecte sur le pauvre, mais en imposant des droits qui seraient supportés par le riche. Ainsi, nous avons des chemins de fer, nous avons des compagnies de télégraphe, nous avons des compagnies de navigation et d'autres qui font des affaires dans le pays. Eh bien, quels sont ceux qui profiteraient les premiers de la réciprocité, de l'augmentation du commerce ? Ce sont évidemment ces compagnies de chemin de fer, de navigation et de télégraphe. Or, à tout seigneur tout honneur ; et je crois qu'il serait à propos alors, si toutefois cela devenait nécessaire, d'imposer un droit ou une taxe sur ces corporations comme la chose se fait actuellement dans la Province de Québec. On se récrierait peut être contre une taxe comme celle-là. Mais à qui l'idée en est-elle due ? Elle est due aux conservateurs de la Province de Québec, qui ont passé la loi imposant une taxe sur toutes les corporations commerciales de la province. Et si je suis bien informé, cette idée a originé ici, à Ottawa ; car le gouvernement de Québec n'était alors que la succursale du gouvernement d'Ottawa. Je crois que ce serait un moyen d'équilibrer nos finances et en même temps de protéger la classe agricole que de faire payer ceux qui retirent les plus grands revenus.

Mais on nous dit que cela ferait un bouleversement complet dans le commerce si on mettait immédiatement en pratique le traité de réciprocité. Eh bien ! cela pourrait se faire graduellement, comme la chose a eu lieu lors du traité de 1854, et comme la chose devait avoir lieu en 1874, quand il y a eu des relations entre George Brown et le gouvernement des Etats-Unis pour le renouvellement du traité. On ne met pas un traité de cette nature en force immédiatement, mais on accorde un certain nombre d'années, un an, deux ans, ou trois ans, avant de le mettre en opération afin qu'il n'y ait pas une perturbation financière.

Maintenant on nous dit : mais les Etats-Unis ne veulent pas de traité de réciprocité. Eh bien ! je crois que ce serait à nous à faire le premier pas. Il ne faut pas se draper dans notre dignité et dire : "Nous, peuple de cinq millions, nous n'avons pas d'affaire à aller tendre la main aux Etats-Unis qui comptent soixante millions. Nous sommes trop fiers pour cela." C'est à nous à faire le premier pas pour la bonne raison que nous avons le plus d'intérêt à la conclusion de ce traité. En effet qui a retiré les plus grands profits des relations commerciales pendant l'existence du traité de 1854 ? Evidemment, ce sont les Canadiens. Et la preuve que les Etats-Unis n'y ont pas trouvé de profit, c'est qu'ils ont demandé qu'il soit abrogé. Je crois que c'est là une

M. DESSAINT.

preuve suffisante pour démontrer que nous avons plus besoin du traité de réciprocité que les Etats-Unis. Et, par conséquent, si cela est plus avantageux pour nous que pour eux, c'est à nous à faire le premier pas.

Je crois que ceux qui prétendent que nous ne devrions pas faire les premières démarches ne sont pas sérieux et ne sont pas sincères. On a dit dans cette Chambre que nous n'avons pas plus d'avantage avec un traité de réciprocité qu'avec le système actuel. Alors, que l'on soit donc sincère. Si l'on ne trouve pas qu'un traité de réciprocité soit assez avantageux pour le Canada qu'on le dise franchement, et alors on saura à quoi s'en tenir. Je crois que les intérêts du pays devraient être discutés avec plus de loyauté et plus de sincérité. Ce serait le moyen de se renseigner les uns les autres et d'en arriver à une entente.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, j'ai prolongé mes remarques plus longtemps que je ne voulais le faire. Je n'avais pas l'intention de faire de discussion sur ce point. C'était plutôt une expression d'opinion que je voulais donner. Ainsi que je l'ai dit en commençant, comme représentant un comté essentiellement agricole, je crois qu'il est dans l'intérêt général de la grande masse de la population que nous faisons tous nos efforts pour en arriver à une entente avec les Etats-Unis. Et si nous arrivons à cette fin de pouvoir avoir des relations commerciales complètes avec les Etats-Unis, je crois que nous aurons une ère de prospérité générale dans tout le pays et surtout pour la classe agricole.

Comme je l'ai dit, je n'aurai pas l'occasion de voter sur cette proposition, étant obligé de m'absenter pour des causes absolument urgentes ; mais j'ai cru de mon devoir d'exprimer mon opinion sur cette question qui recevra de ma part et de la part des électeurs que j'ai l'honneur de représenter l'approbation la plus chaleureuse.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the adjournment of the debate I would wish to ask the leader of the opposition whether there is any likelihood that the debate will be brought to an end to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. No, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see there is no likelihood for the debate to be concluded to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is there any chance to have the debate end on Monday night ?

Mr. LAURIER. Hardly so, I think.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Can we come to some agreement on both sides about closing the debate say on Tuesday if that would be convenient for members on both sides. We can then go on with the debate as we have done during the last few days until it be finished.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we can agree that there will be no division on Monday. A great many of the members are going home to-morrow to pass the Saturday and Sunday at home and we can say that there will be no division on Monday, but as early as possible afterwards.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Friday.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Friday, March 16, 1888.

No. 17.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 16th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting bonds of branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Lobster and Oyster Commission.—(Mr. Foster.)

THE EMPEROR OF GERMANY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to take the opportunity of enquiring of the First Minister if there is truth in the report which is circulated that the Crown Prince, the present Emperor of Germany, is deceased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no information on that point. I am happy to believe that it is an error.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought probably it was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report arose, I fancy, from the flags being hoisted half-mast high. They were so hoisted on the reception of a communication from the Home Government, to honor the obsequies of the late Emperor.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, and on the proposed amendment of Mr. Foster.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of the question now before the House is a matter of great importance to this country, and it may truly be said, Sir, that no

17—1888—1

question has been debated in this Chamber since the date of Confederation of as great importance as that now under consideration. It is a question, Sir, which has recently attracted a very large amount of attention in the country; it is a question which to-day occupies in the public mind a more prominent place than any other public question. It is also a question, Sir, which has been discussed and considered for some months past not as a party question; it has been a political question indeed, but it was not a party question. Either of the great parties in this country were at liberty at any time to make this proposition a plank in their platform, or both of the great parties were at liberty to act in concert on this matter for the purpose of procuring what we believe would prove a very great boon to Canada. It is a question, Sir, that can only be said to have assumed the position of a party question, yesterday. It only assumed that position, Sir, when the Minister of Marine introduced his amendment to the motion made by my hon. friend at my right, declaring that in the opinion of this House reciprocity with the United States ought only be sought for upon conditions which would permit us to retain unimpaired the features of the National Policy, or, in other words, that it should only be sought for upon conditions that we are certain would be refused. That, Sir, makes a plain, square issue and makes the question a party question. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has introduced his motion, declaring that unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States would prove to be a boon that we are warranted in seeking to obtain; and the Government meets that proposal by a counter-proposition declaring that we will not seek for it—that we will not accept reciprocity with the United States except upon conditions which the Government and the people of that country have distinctly informed us, time and time again and for years past, were inadmissible, and conditions upon which they would not grant it. It now, Sir, becomes a party question, and it is the party question of the day. It will be a party question in all probability for some years in the future, and, Sir, in my belief it is a principle that is bound to triumph in this country. In my belief, Sir, the hope of this country is intimately connected with the triumph of this principle. In considering this question it is well at all times to bear in mind our peculiar position, our peculiar environments and our surroundings upon this continent at the same time. No less than 65,000,000 of people speak the English tongue on this continent to-day, and that is at this moment North America is the great seat of Anglo-Saxon power. Some weeks ago I stood upon the plains of Abraham and looked upon the inscription on that simple shaft erected to the memory of General Wolfe:

“Here died Wolfe victorious, September 17, 1759.”

Well, Sir, 129 years have passed away since then, and the two and a half millions of English-speaking people that then dwelt upon this continent have increased to 65,000,000. When we come to make computations as to the probable increase in numbers and wealth of English speaking people on this continent and are guided in these computations by the experience of the past, the result of such computations would lead one to doubt whether

he is waking or dreaming. It is certain, Sir, that in the near future there will be 100,000,000 of English-speaking people on the continent of North America, and in all human probability that number will be living on this continent when we reach the year 1910. It is morally certain that there will be 65,000,000 people in the United States at the next census in 1891, as certain almost is it that there will be 80,000,000 people there in 1900, and that there will be 100,000,000 in 1910. Now, Sir, this being the case, and the fact being apparent that this continent is to be the grandest theatre of Anglo-Saxon achievements and development of Anglo-Saxon power, it becomes us to consider our position as Anglo-Saxons living upon the continent of North America. We should approach the consideration of this question not in a partisan spirit; we should approach the consideration of this question with a view to the promotion of the best interests of this country. It is a question which, above all other questions, requires in its treatment and in its consideration the exercise of patriotic impulses and motives.

Mr. LANDRY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I hope, Sir, he will never lose sight of this sentiment when treating this question. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have forty-five Anglo-Saxon commonwealths and fifteen territorial organisations, besides the commonwealths upon this continent. Part of these are under one flag and part of them are under another, but they are to-day, and they will be in all the days of the future, intimately bound together. The fate of one will influence the fate of the other and it is inevitable such will be the case. Their geographical situation is such that they must necessarily have commercial and social relations of the most intimate character, the one with the other. Now, Sir, in dealing with the question of a proposed commercial treaty with the United States, we have to take into consideration—and we shall find that at every turn of the argument that view of the case will crop up—the relative public burdens resting on the two countries, the amount of the necessary taxation in one and in the other, the burden of debt resting on one and on the other, and the expenditure of one and of the other. We shall have to enter into a process of self-examination to ascertain exactly what our position relatively to that of the United States is. To state the case briefly, we commenced in 1867 with a net debt of \$75,000,000; on the 1st of March last our debt amounted to \$229,000,000, an increase of \$153,600,000 in round numbers, or 203 per cent., while our population did not increase more than 40 per cent. The increase of our debt in that time has been five times more rapid than the increase of our population. We commenced in 1868 with an expenditure of \$13,486,000, and last year our expenditure was \$35,658,000—that of the preceding year was much higher. That was an increase of \$2,000,000, or 164 per cent., an increase of expenditure four times more rapid than the increase of population. Our taxation from Customs in 1868 was \$8,578,000, and in 1887 it was \$22,378,000, an increase of \$13,800,000 or 160 per cent., an increase four times more rapid than the increase of population. Now, you will see that the increase in debt has outstripped the increase of population in a five-fold ratio, the increase of expenditure has outstripped the increase of population in a four-fold ratio, and the increase of taxation has outstripped the increase of population in a four-fold ratio; and the only period in the history of Canada when this course of things has not marked the administration of the affairs of this country, was during the administration of my hon. and most highly esteemed friend at my right (Mr. Mackenzie). Under his administration, though he was compelled, in order to carry out obligations incurred by his predecessors, to increase the debt of this country from 1874-5 to 1878-9, so that the burden of

Mr. CHARLTON.

interest was increased \$604,000, he diminished the taxation from customs from \$15,351,000 in 1874-5 to \$12,900,000 in 1878-9, a decrease in taxation of \$2,451,000. Although the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund increased in the same period, by a careful computation, almost exactly \$352,000, the controllable expenditure was diminished by \$1,782,000. I say, Sir, that period furnished the only instance in the history of Canada since 1867 when the affairs of this country have been administered in other than a reckless manner and a manner contrary to the dictates of economy and prudence. Now, Sir, one result of this extravagance, and of other circumstances to which I shall shortly allude, is to be seen in the exodus of the population of this country. I am aware, Sir, that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House seek to belittle this loss. I am aware that the accuracy of the statistics furnished by the United States is impugned by them. I am aware that they deny that any unusual movement in that direction has taken place in late years. The hon. Minister of Marine stated yesterday that no unusual movement of late had taken place. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) stated that there was a movement to a certain extent, and that the movement from his section was of young men who went to find homes free and untrammelled and cheaper than they could find them in Ontario. While they do go for that purpose, the fact is capable of demonstration that the exodus from this country has been of an alarming character. No person can visit the United States and travel with his eyes open without becoming aware that in the northern States a great percentage of the population is native Canadian. The statistics furnished at Washington show that the immigration from British America to the United States amounted in 1870 to 490,000 souls. The census of 1880 returned 700,000 souls, and 930,000 odd children born in the United States of Canadian parents; so that it is demonstrable that not less than 2,000,000 people are living in the United States who would have had their homes in Canada but for the exodus which has taken place from this country to theirs. This exodus is intimately connected with the administration of affairs of this country. It is caused to a large extent by the serious burdens imposed on the people of the country. It is caused to a still larger extent by the delusive promises made on behalf of the National Policy, which the people of this country are aware have not been and cannot be fulfilled. That National Policy, which was adopted in 1879, promised to the farmers of Canada a market for all their productions. They have not secured it; but on the contrary, instead of receiving higher prices, prices have continued steadily, and year by year, to decline. It promised to the farmers of Canada that American productions should be prevented from coming into competition with Canadian productions, by the duties imposed on the former. That also was a delusion and a snare. It promised that competition between manufacturers in Canada would lower the price of goods, and the truth is that to-day there is no civilised country in the world where the producer buys dearer and sells cheaper than he does in Canada.

Mr. HICKEY. It is not so; you cannot prove it either.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is so. In some cases goods may be absolutely somewhat lower in price than they were ten years ago; but there is no case in which goods are not relatively higher in consequence of the National Policy than they were then. There is no class of goods that it will not pay to smuggle into this country. There are no goods that are not sold in this country almost up to the limit at which similar goods could be imported; and I repeat that Canada is of all civilised countries the one where the great producing classes buy dear and sell cheap. That is the result of the National Policy, and one of the fruits of that policy

is to drive from this country hundreds of thousands of its citizens. The hon. Minister of the Interior assured us the other night that the farmers of Ontario were in a happy condition. Well, Sir, I leave the farmers of Ontario to judge, and to say whether that is not entirely destitute of every element of truth, and whether it is not a cruel insult to that class of people. He proceeded to make a comparison between the prices obtainable for certain productions of the soil in Buffalo and in Toronto, and he succeeded in making a comparison in some articles that was favorable to Canada. Now, since the year 1879, when the National Policy went into operation, there never has been a time, in my opinion, after consulting the market reports, when agricultural productions of all kinds were not rated higher in price in the United States markets than in the corresponding Canadian markets, until the past summer; and during the past summer, for the first time since the National Policy was adopted. It has been possible to make a comparison that would be favorable to Canada in a few lines of agricultural productions. And what was the cause of this. It was because last year we had an unprecedented drought in Ontario, which dried up our pastures and caused the country to have a deficient crop; and as a result of that disaster, potatoes were imported from Manitoba, and Ontario became, instead of a producing country, with a surplus to sell, a consuming country which had to purchase supplies in order to meet its wants. Under these conditions, for a short time in the history of Ontario, prices were higher in some lines there than in the corresponding markets of the United States, and the hon. gentleman paraded before this House certain facts which were due solely to a great agricultural disaster, and upon these facts he felicitated himself on the unduly prosperous condition of the country. Well, although perhaps it is not exactly germane to the case, I will allude to the statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior with regard to the burdens resting upon the farmers in the western States. The hon. gentleman seems to have conceived that the *Chicago Times* is an authority of greater value than any statistical report in the country, and he quoted an extract from that paper stating that mortgages in the western States were placed at from 1 to 3 per cent. per month, and that the land in that country was rapidly being swallowed up by capitalists through the foreclosure of mortgages. Now, whether the hon. gentleman was aware of it or not, no statement could have been wider of the truth, and so far as it may have any bearing upon the question under discussion now, I pronounce it to be entirely unfounded. I know from personal experience and observation that 6 per cent. per annum on good mortgage security is considered a satisfactory rate in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Missouri, and that only do high rates prevail in some of the newer territories, where the security to be considered is of a less solid character. The fact is, there is a plethora of capital in the United States which is seeking investment, at low rates, in any portion of the country where satisfactory security can be obtained, and the statement of the hon. gentleman that 3 per cent. a month is charged on good mortgage security, is utterly unfounded, even if it does emanate from that paper which has been called the *Satanic press* of Chicago, the *Chicago Times*. Another result of the policy of this Government is found at the present moment in the condition of our North-West. My hon. friend told us the other night that many Canadians had been entrapped into going to Dakota. Well, I do not know of any individual in this Dominion who has more effectually aided in entrapping Canadians into Dakota than the Minister of the Interior. I do not know of any cause that has operated more effectually to produce immigration to Dakota than the regulations of the Department of the Interior. True, they have been modified somewhat, and for the better, under

the administration of my hon. friend. True, they were very much worse under his predecessor, but still those regulations to-day—and I wish that I may be able to impress this fact on the mind of my hon. friend—are of a character to aid most efficiently in entrapping Canadians into Dakota, because they are less liberal than the land regulations of the United States. They are less liberal with reference to homestead grants; they are less liberal as regards the prices of land. They charge as much again for land south of the Canadian Pacific Railway as is charged in the United States for land similarly situated. They charge 75 cents per acre more for land north of the Canadian Pacific Railway than is charged for similar lands in the United States; and these charges have operated most powerfully in diverting emigration from the Canadian North-West to the new territories of the American Union. Another influence that has operated to entrap Canadians into Dakota is the National Policy, which bears with unjust severity upon the people of our North-West. It is a policy which imposes upon them heavy taxation on the implements they introduce into that country, it is a policy which, while on the one hand taxing them mercilessly, denies them on the other hand the means for securing the transmission of the grain that lies piled up in millions of bushels along the Canadian Pacific Railway at the present moment. I visited Manitoba lately, and was informed there that the duty on agricultural implements amounted to over 50 per cent. of their actual cost, under the regulations of the department. Steam threshers and mowing machines introduced at the boundary line at their actual cost, are revalued; their value is increased, and the purchaser obliged to pay a duty of 50 per cent. or more on their cost. These things—these regulations with regard to land, the operation of the National Policy in the North-West, it is that have driven Canadians into Dakota and Minnesota, and that have led to there being more Canadians to-day in the single territory of Dakota than there are in Manitoba and all the territories in the North-West. So much for this diagnosis of the Canadian case. Now, to come to a direct consideration of the question under discussion, I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite to one most significant fact. The question of commercial or unrestricted reciprocity has been under consideration in the country for some time, and a great number of the farmers' institutes of Ontario, forty out of sixty, have pronounced unequivocally and by overwhelming majorities in favor of this principle embodied in the resolution now before the House. I hold a list in my hand of these institutes, but it is hardly necessary for me to take up the time of the House by reading it at the present moment. I have attended the meetings of some of those institutes, and have found that, in all cases, the sentiment in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was of a most pronounced character, and I have found that this sentiment is by no means confined within party lines. The president of one of the institutes, at a meeting of which I attended, was a Reformer. He took the platform in opposition to the principle of unrestricted reciprocity, in reply to the arguments I made in its behalf. I had the privilege of the closing reply, and the vote that was taken showed there were only three present, in the whole meeting, who were opposed to the principle of unrestricted reciprocity. The people feel instinctively that a change is required. They feel that our interests require us to obtain closer trade relations with the United States, and that every impediment placed in the way of trade with that country is an impediment that reacts upon all the great producing classes of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago; our relative position in the matter of taxation, our relative position in the matter of expenditure and in the matter of debt, to that of the United States is a practical question of the utmost importance to the people of this

country. It is a question that will become more and more important to us. It is a question which has a most important bearing upon the welfare of this country, because we have an intelligent people in this Dominion from whom it is impossible to conceal the true condition of affairs, a people who can come to a conclusion themselves as to the meaning of our debt burdens, which is two and a-half times greater than that of the United States, *per capita*, a people who can calculate for themselves what the increase of expenditure four times more rapidly than the increase of population means, a people who know, in fact, that the course the country is pursuing is one which threatens the gravest disaster; and when they compare the condition of this country with that of the United States, they are induced in a thousand cases to abandon Canada and go to that country. In view of that condition of affairs, I want to point out what the disparity in the burdens of the two countries is, and I do that in order to enforce the argument which I wish to impress upon the House, that the time has come for retrenchment and economy. On the 1st March, this present month, the gross debt of the United States amounted to \$1,202,454,714. The net debt amounted to \$1,092,927,581, deducting from the gross debt the principal and interest due from the Pacific roads, less their sinking funds. The gross *per capita* charge in the United States was \$20.04, and the net *per capita* charge \$18.22. But the argument which will probably be advanced is that this is not a fair comparison, and that it is necessary, in order to make the comparison a fair one, to add to the debt of the United States the debt of the various States, because, while we grant subsidies to our Provinces, the general Government of the United States does not. If we accept that as a correct statement, and include the debts of the States, funded and unfunded, which amounted in 1887 to \$228,347,462, less \$50,753,312 sinking funds and assets convertible into cash, or net debt amounting to \$177,589,150, we find that the net debt, Federal and State all included, on the 1st March last, was \$1,270,516,446, or a *per capita* charge of \$21.18. Now, what is ours? On the basis of four and three-quarter millions of inhabitants, which, I presume, are as many as will be claimed, we find that our net debt of \$229,409,430 is equal to a *per capita* charge of \$48.29, or two and one-third times as much as the total indebtedness of the United States, Federal and State. That is a grave state of affairs. It involves taxing this people two and one-third times as much as the people of the United States are taxed. No, it is even heavier, because, while the 3 per cents. in that country are at a high premium, in this country the 3 per cents. are at a discount. Our credit is not as good, and the relative ability to meet the indebtedness is in the ratio of about two and one-third in Canada to one in the United States. Last year, the Government of the United States reduced the national debt by \$103,471,097, and the State debts were reduced by \$15,260,986, while we increased our indebtedness and made our position worse than it had been at the opening of the year. If we come to the question of customs, we find that last year we raised by customs duties to the amount of \$22,469,705, which is a *per capita* charge of \$4.73. In the United States they raised the amount of \$217,286,893, or \$3.62 *per capita*. But of that \$217,000,000 they applied \$103,471,097 towards the extinguishment of their national debt, leaving a net taxation from customs applicable to expenditure of \$113,815,796, or a *per capita* charge of \$1.90 against a charge of \$4.73 a head in Canada. Under that condition of things, with an actual taxation from customs three times as great as that in the neighboring country, what is likely to be the inevitable result? Is it not time to call a halt in this country and to cease this reckless course of extravagance, this piling up of our debt mountains high, this rushing the country at railroad speed into expenditure, which must lead to financial de-

Mr. CHARLTON.

struction. The expenditure of the United States did not reach the present expenditure of Canada till that country had more than 20,000,000 inhabitants. The United States never owed more than half of our present debt until it had 32,000,000 inhabitants, except during two years, 1816 and 1817, just after the conclusion of the war with England, when its debt was a trifle more than half our present debt. The practical difficulty between any commissioners appointed between this country and the United States to arrange for reciprocal trade would be this very question, that to arrange an assimilation of our tariffs it would be necessary to do away with the disparity which exists between the two countries as to the revenue required from taxation to meet the expenditure of the two countries. We need to-day to raise almost as much again per head as they do meet our current expenses, and the disparity in this respect is growing every year as we drift wider and wider apart in the matter of debt burden which is resting upon the people. It is undeniable that our progress for the last twenty years has been slow. It is undeniable that it has been slow as compared with the progress of the United States during that period of their national existence which corresponds with ours during the last twenty years. In 1790, that country had a population of 3,900,000. In 1810, twenty years later, its population had increased to 7,250,000. During all that time, it is estimated that the accession to the population from immigration did not reach 140,000 souls. Now, have we as satisfactory an exhibit to present as that? We would have had, if we had not lost two million people—one million who left us and their progeny who would have been with us if we had not lost that population. We do not present so favorable a record as that by two or three million souls. Is this progress, this unsatisfactory rate of progress that we have made, due to inferiority of race? No, it is not. The hon. member from Huron (Mr. Porter) very truthfully said last night that our emigrants to the United States maintained the reputation of Canada wherever they went. So they do. There is not an element in the population of the United States more progressive, more highly esteemed, more successful than the native Canadians who are in that country. We are losing the life-blood of this young country, we are losing the most energetic of our population, who are going to swell the resources, to swell the wealth and increase the might of that great power which has already some 60,000,000 of a population. We can only regret that we have not those men here. We can only deplore the circumstances which have led them away from our soil, but we can seek to arrest the course which has led to this. Is it due to lack of natural resources? There is scarcely a country in the world which is more abundantly blessed by Providence and nature than ours. Its fisheries, its timber, its minerals, its agricultural lands, the boundless prairies of the west, show that this country was designed by Providence to be the home of millions of men and to become a great and wealthy power, and it is failing to reach the destiny which Providence and nature designed to give it, not because of a lack of natural resources, but through the lack of men to develop those resources, who have been driven from the country by the stupidity of the Government of the day. What is the remedy for this state of things? We require various things—honesty in the administration of the country, economy, retrenchment, and we require access to our natural markets; we require continental free trade, and without continental free trade, without access to the markets of 60,000,000 of people to the south of us, we cannot progress satisfactorily. Our geographical affinities are not with the nations across the Atlantic, but with the kindred commonwealth to the south of us. The Maritime Provinces have followed the dictates of nature and geography; they export their potatoes, their fish, their lumber, their coal and their various other productions to the sea-

boards of the Atlantic, and they bring back from those seaboards such articles as they may be able to buy at advantage in that country. It is their natural trade. Geographical affinities say they shall trade in that direction, and it is only artificial barriers that prevent their carrying on a lucrative trade with those seaboard cities. Ontario and Quebec, that lie right alongside the great markets of the American Union, the great centres of population and wealth; alongside the State of New York, with nearly 6,000,000 of inhabitants within its borders, and the great metropolis of this continent, possessing three times the wealth of the whole Dominion of Canada,—there is our natural market. Geographical affinities say we should trade there. Our railway lines lead to that country, everything invites us to trade there except tariffs, which prevent our availing ourselves of the advantage that nature designed we should reap. Manitoba is naturally a portion of the Mississippi, and would naturally trade with St. Paul, and Minneapolis, and Chicago, and St. Louis, and to debar Manitoba and the North-West from access to those great markets, and the shortest routes to the great markets of the east, is burdening them with restrictions not calculated to promote their interests. British Columbia, with its timber, its fish and its coal, finds her natural markets down on the Pacific coast, in Oregon, in California, the most natural markets that province can seek or obtain; but the hostile tariffs between the two countries forbid British Columbia to enjoy the advantages that nature designs she should reap from commercial transactions with those Pacific States. What is the character, Mr. Speaker, of the United States domestic commerce? It is a commerce enormous in its magnitude and varied in its character. The country possesses almost every kind of climate, almost every kind of soil, almost every production of nature, and the commercial transactions between the several States of that nation are so enormous that they would be scarcely credited, if they were stated in detail. Now, we are shut out from that commerce, we are debarred from participating in that trade which has contributed to the so rapid advancement of that country. In order to participate in that trade, we must have access to those markets, and when we do have access to those markets, then we will move along side by side in the steps of progress, abreast of these American States, progressing as rapidly as they do, and unless we do obtain that access to our natural markets, we shall be cribbed, cabined and confined by the restrictions placed upon us here. Now, as I stated a few moments ago, we have 5,000,000 of people, in round numbers, in the Dominion; there are, speaking within limits, 60,000,000 in the United States. There will be 65,000,000 in a few years hence, and 80,000,000 before the end of this century. Now, this people, who will amount to 100,000,000 in 1910, this nation is to-day the richest nation in the world. The actual value of its property is \$58,000,000,000; that of Great Britain, \$48,000,000,000. The wealth of the United States is \$10,000,000,000 greater than that of the United Kingdom. The earnings of the people of the United States last year were \$1,050,000,000; the earnings of the people of the United Kingdom were \$280,000,000 less; the earnings of the people of France \$350,000,000 less, and the earnings of the people of the German Empire over \$400,000,000 less than the people of the United States. Well, if this great nation, right at our doors, with more wealth than any other nation, with nearly twice the population of the United Kingdom, with its prospective growth—if there is anything that can compensate us for the loss of access to the markets of that nation, I would like to be informed what that thing is. I do not believe anything can compensate this country for the loss of access to the markets of that country. Now, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter) told us, last night, that we should be sorry if we proceeded to starve our infant

industries. I suppose the hon. gentleman proceeded upon the assertion that we are creating those infant industries in order to furnish a home market for the produce of the soil in this country. Well, if that is his object, I can explain to him how he can obtain a short road to that result. The United States have been engaged for twenty-five years in developing a home market. They have now a greater manufacturing interest than any other nation in the world. The United States is the great manufacturing nation of the world; it exceeds England. According to the census of 1880, the productions of the manufactures of the United States were \$5,369,000,000; in 1882, the productions of the manufactures of England were \$4,092,000,000. The United States, in 1880, produced \$1,279,000,000 more manufactures than Great Britain did in 1882. Now, if it is desirable to have a market, if it is desirable to foster our infant industries at a great cost for the time being in order to create a market for the future, is it not more desirable to take a short cut to a market already created, created at a great cost, and created through the operation, if my hon. friend's theory is correct, of a protective tariff during twenty-five years, a market which produces more goods in a year than the manufactures of England do. I say it is not desirable to obtain access to that market by a short cut, rather than to spend years in a futile endeavor to create a market here which never can equal in importance the market already created and opened to us there? Now, Sir, the practical question is, how shall we reach this market? The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us last night that we had given the United States the strongest invitation to reciprocity that could be given. He asks, what can be a stronger invitation to reciprocity than our standing offer of 1879? Now, the hon. gentleman is Minister of Fisheries, and I wonder, Sir, if he is not sufficiently astute as a fisherman to change his bait when he is fishing for nine years without getting a nibble. This offer has been standing since 1879—an inducement so strong, he says, that we could not make it stronger; and yet, time and again, the Americans have spurned the offer, they have told us they would not consider it, that they would not 'bite,' and we may keep the offer standing until doomsday without their ever considering it. Sir, the hon. gentleman is attempting to mislead the country when he asserts that we have made an offer as strong as can be made, inviting the American people to reciprocal trade relations. They know that our offer is not a desirable one; we have made an offer that we know they will not accept; and the hon. gentleman is not—well, I won't use the word I was going to use—the hon. gentleman is taking a course in this matter that is not calculated to give the country a proper impression as to the course this Government is pursuing. This Government is not seeking reciprocity, this Government does not want reciprocity, except on inadmissible terms; it will not take reciprocity on such terms as it can be obtained, and that is made perfectly apparent by the motion made by the hon. gentleman, pitting the National Policy against unrestricted reciprocity. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the gauntlet thrown down we have taken up, the challenge given we accept, and we will fight the issue out before the people of this country upon that line alone.

Mr. HESSON. You will have a good time of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, we will have a good time of it, and the hon. gentleman from Perth may have a little participation in that good time. Now, Sir, this is a matter that requires careful consideration. If this celebrated standing offer that we have had on our Statute-book for nine years is not acceptable to the United States, it is our duty to ascertain what the Americans demand. Will they grant reciprocity on any terms whatever? It is our duty to ascertain how that case is, how we are to meet them. What probability is there of achieving success under any

circumstances whatever? We have indications which point most unmistakably to the conclusion that reciprocal trade with the United States can be obtained. We have the letter of Mr. Bayard, we have the declarations of several public men in the United States. We have the introduction of two Bills, one by Mr. Butterworth and one by Mr. Hitt, the one corresponding in its essential features with the proposal we have under discussion now; the other, that by Mr. Hitt, proposing an arrangement equal to commercial union. We have the fact that the last named Bill was reported yesterday unanimously. I am led to believe that the great mass of American public men will look favorably upon the consideration of any proposal that involves the granting of reciprocal trade arrangements with Canada upon a basis which will not be, like the old Reciprocity Treaty, only advantageous to one side. They simply ask in this arrangement that their own interests should be considered as well as ours, that the arrangements should not be exclusively advantageous to one side but mutually advantageous to both, and as honest men I do not think we would feel disposed to ask more. In his speech the other night the Minister of Interior was good enough to quote a certain statement made by myself in Haldimand in definition of what constitutes commercial union. I do not know that I would have alluded to the subject but for that reference made by the Minister of Interior. He told us that commercial union meant—and the hon. gentleman will correct me if I do injustice to him in the statement—the same duties to be collected against the outside world in Canada as were now collected in the United States. That was the distinct statement made by the Minister of Interior—that commercial union simply meant the adoption by Canada of the present tariff of the United States. If the hon. gentleman made that statement deliberately understanding what he did mean, he either did not understand what commercial union meant or he made a statement calculated to mislead the country. No advocate of commercial union either in Canada or the United States assumes or proposes that the present tariff of the United States is to be adopted by either one country or the other. No advocate of commercial union assumes that an arrangement will be made that does not involve a re-arrangement of the tariff, an arrangement satisfactory to both powers and consented to by both powers, and neither one power or the other is obliged to enter into an arrangement for commercial union unless the arrangement is satisfactory—it must be made satisfactory, and it does not imply that the present tariff of the United States will be adopted as the tariff to be levied under commercial union.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman allow me. I understand him to say that I implied that the proposition was that the present tariff of the United States was to be adopted as commercial union. I did not so state and did not so imply. What I did state was this: I inferred from the statement of the hon. gentleman that whatever was the tariff of the United States, that would be the tariff of Canada; that is to say, we would have the same tariff, whatever that tariff might be, against all other countries, with free trade as between these two countries. Is that the proposition now before the House by hon. gentlemen?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is not. I was led to discuss that question from the fact that the hon. Minister had alluded to it; and if he would add that the tariff would be one consented to by Canada and acceptable to Canada, then he would have made a fair statement of the case.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be against the rest of the world, would it not?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By mutual agreement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might as well define what I understand commercial union to mean. The definition read by the Minister of Interior, quoted from the speech made by me in Haldimand, is exactly what I do understand commercial union to mean. I understand commercial union to mean an arrangement between two or more powers or as many more as choose to join—for in the commercial union of Germany there were all the German States—an arrangement made between two or more countries whereby they adopt a common tariff and common excise laws, abolish all commercial restrictions between themselves, abolish all customs lines between themselves, collect a revenue at any point where the goods may be entered from any material, throw that whole revenue into one common fund, divide that fund, after taking out the cost of collection, either upon the basis of a *per capita* division or upon such other division or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon by the contracting parties.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not desire to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but perhaps he will go further and state whether that is the proposition now before the House by the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has been told most distinctly, and it has been stated a dozen times on this side of the House, that it is not the proposition. I can add that the hon. gentleman and his followers must have been even more stupid, if that is possible, than is usually the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not so uncharitable as my hon. friend. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of stupidity, but he evidently believes that the country is considerably stupid and that he can mislead the people upon this question by dragging a red herring across the trail. So much for the question of commercial union arising indirectly on this question, owing to the remarks made by the Minister of Interior.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon. gentlemen say "Oh, oh," as if this was a question we would not dare to discuss. I am ready to discuss this question, I am not afraid of it. It is not, however, the question under discussion. The resolution under the consideration of the House is a resolution with regard to unrestricted reciprocity; but that is only a means of arriving at commercial relations between two countries that may be arrived at in some other way. We have adopted that because we consider it preferable to the others simply for that and for no other reason. With respect to unrestricted reciprocity, let us define what we understand that to mean. We understand—at least I understand by unrestricted reciprocity—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not profess to speak for the world and for all men, I speak for myself. I understand by unrestricted reciprocity an arrangement that would admit into the United States all the natural productions of Canada, all the manufactured productions of Canada, all the productions of Canada of any nature, character or name whatever, free of duty; an arrangement which would reciprocally admit into Canada all the productions of the United States of the same character; that we leave the United States free to impose such duties as they choose upon the productions of other countries imported into that country; that we leave Canada free to do the same thing, and raise its revenue from importation duties in such a way as it may choose, on such scale of duties as it may choose to impose, leaving both countries perfectly free to carry out its own arrangements except in so far as reciprocal trade between the two countries is concerned in the productions of the two coun-

tries. I do not know whether that is sufficiently definite for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. (Cardwell). Is that your proposition?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, as I understand it.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you include articles produced in the United States and not produced in Canada *vice versa*.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly. The United States produces a good many articles that we do not, and we produce some that they do not. The arrangement contemplates a perfect reciprocal trade, a reciprocal trade that admits all the products of one country into the other. Now, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, can reciprocity, the question which we are discussing, be considered a mere theoretical question? Do we know anything about the operation of this system? We know that in 1787 thirteen States comprising then the American Union entered into an arrangement which was practically equivalent to reciprocal trade between those States. Those States, it is true, existed under a Federal Union, but each one of those States, and all the States subsequently admitted to the American Union, retained their distinct dominion. Each State retained control over its criminal code and its civil code, and, in fact, the jurisdiction of their Legislatures is much more wide than the jurisdiction of the Legislatures of the Provinces of this Dominion. They were thirteen nations then—they are thirty-eight nations now, banded together for certain common purposes; and those thirty-eight nations, commencing with thirteen, have existed and progressed since 1787 with unrestricted trade existing between all these States. What is the result of that unrestricted reciprocity? In 1884, as my hon. friend at my right informed the House, the internal commerce of that country, according to Mr. Nimmo, amounted to \$10,000,000,000. Last year the internal commerce amounted to \$11,500,000,000, based upon the increase of tonnage transported upon the railways of that country. Now, Sir, how does that compare with the total commerce carried by the total shipping of the world exclusive of the United States? Do you suppose it equals the commercial transactions of England, France, Germany and all the Maritime States of Christendom, excluding, of course, the United States? Yet, Sir, the commerce of all those countries last year amounted to \$4,213,000,000 as against \$11,500,000,000 in the United States. The internal commerce of the United States in reality had two and a-half times the volume of the entire commerce of all the nations of the world, leaving out the United States. That is an astounding statement. Including England, including every country except the United States, this latter country last year had a vastly greater volume of commerce than all the others. 149,000 miles of railway have moved last year 482,245,000 tons of freight. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance informed us last night we had moved the same year in Canada 16,000,000 tons, or one three-one-hundredth part of the freight moved upon the railways of the United States. The amount of freight moved by all the nations of the world, exclusive of the United States, was 92,432,000 tons, which is less than one-quarter the freight moved on American railways. The earnings of the United States railways were \$824,000,000 last year; the earnings of all the shipping of the world, leaving out the shipping of the United States, amounted to \$535,000,000; the railways of the United States earned on freight \$287,000,000 more last year than all the shipping of the world, excepting the shipping of the United States. Those facts enable us to form some dim conception of the vast volume of that commerce created by one hundred years' experience of the system of reciprocity between the commonwealths composing that great confederation. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that a tariff would be tolerated between the eastern groups of those States and any of the other groups, or between the middle group or any of the

other groups, or between the southern or Pacific groups? Do you think that a tariff would be permitted by the States of the Union to exist between any one of those groups? No, Sir, it would be detrimental to their interests and never would be permitted. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, in what does this great northern group, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans and embracing all the Provinces and territories of the Dominion—in what respect, geographical or natural, this northern group differs from either the southern, the middle, the western, the eastern or the Pacific group of the great American confederation? Geographically we are the same, our interests are exactly the same as theirs, and to debar us from that continental trade enjoyed by all those States is to inflict upon us the same injuries that would be inflicted upon any one of those groups of States if they had not their internal commercial relations with their sister States. I repeat, Sir, that our interests in this great continental group of Anglo Saxon commonwealths are identical with the interests of every group of commonwealths in this great constellation, and that to debar the States which comprise this Dominion from free access to the markets of the country south of us is just as detrimental to our interests as would be the attempt, which would be resisted by every State in the Union, to place any particular State under similar disabilities to those which are forced upon us. Reciprocity, Sir, is not a mere theory; it has worked the most beneficent results in that great country, it has increased the population from 3,900,000 to 61,000,000, and it has produced those astounding results in trade and commerce which I have laid before the House. It has made that country the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, a nation which in 1862 contained but a little more than one-half the population and considerably less than one-half the wealth it does to-day. It enabled that country to place in the field two and a-half millions of armed men and to incur an expenditure of \$6,000,000,000, which is nearly wiped out to-day. Now, notwithstanding natural laws and notwithstanding artificial restrictions, I say that natural laws do assert themselves. When those artificial restrictions were temporarily removed to a partial extent in the period extending between 1854 and 1865, that increase in the commerce of this country with the United States as explained by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) yesterday, was prodigious. The total trade of Canada with the United States ran up from \$20,000,000 in 1854 to \$84,000,000 in 1865. Since the restrictions have been reimposed that trade has fallen back, and after a lapse of twenty-four years the total trade between Canada and the United States is some \$2,000,000 less than it was in 1865, showing the beneficent results produced by reciprocity and the opposite result by restricted trade measures. Mr. Speaker, if we were to adopt unrestricted reciprocity we would have the same ratio of increase as the United States, and if unrestricted reciprocity went into operation this year, by the year 1900 our trade with the United States would be \$325,000,000 with the same ratio of increase. You must bear in mind, Sir, that the proposition before this House contemplates the throwing off of all shackles which existed during the reciprocity treaty. That was only a partial reciprocity treaty, a reciprocity treaty merely in natural products; but now the proposition we are discussing contemplates the admission of all the products of both countries, and there is no reason, Sir, for supposing that under the operation of such a treaty that commerce between the United States and Canada would not equal \$500,000,000 in the year of our Lord 1900, but notwithstanding the restrictions imposed upon trade there is still a great amount of trade transacted between those two countries. Last year, of the total amount of imports into Canada, 42 $\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. came from the United States, of the total amount of exports from this country 42 per cent. of all went to the United

States. We are importing from the United States \$45,000,000, in round numbers, and exporting \$37,000,000, with the result that the volume of trade inward is $42\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the whole, and outward 42 per cent. of all our trade, as I have said. Now I shall come to the consideration, Mr. Speaker, of the most practical part of this question, the one that interests the great producing classes of Canada, and I would proceed to the consideration of this branch of the question by asking, what do we sell them? We sell them horses, cattle, sheep, peas, and on those articles a duty of 20 per cent is levied. We sell them fish, and by the United States returns, the duty on fish last year was 21.72 per cent. We sell them barley, rye, oats, and buckwheat, and the duty on each of these articles is 10 cents a bushel. We sell them potatoes, on which the duty is 15 cents per bushel. We sell them hops, on which the duty is eight cents a pound. We sell them wool, on which the duty is 10 cents a pound; hay, on which the duty is \$2 a ton; lumber, on which the duty is \$2 per ton; butter, on which the duty is four cents a pound; iron ore, on which the duty is 75 cents per ton; coal, on which the duty is 75 cents per ton; and salt, on which the duty is 12 cents per cwt. in bags, and six cents per cwt. in bulk. We sell them all these articles and many more. The American statistics are not kept as well as ours, I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will be glad to hear, and it is impossible to ascertain from them with exactness the amount of duties collected on Canadian imports last year or any preceding year. They give the amount in mass, but do not distinguish countries as we do in our statistics, and there has been no change in their practice in that respect since 1920. But we can arrive with a fair degree of accuracy at the amount of duty paid to the American Government on Canadian imports, and that amount was last year in all about \$5,500,000. Now, the practical question that interests the people of this country above all others is, who pays this duty? If it can be shown that the American consumer pays the duty—that for these articles which we export to the United States we get just as much as we would if no duty was imposed, I think one reason we urge for adopting unrestricted reciprocity would cease to exist; but if it can be shown that in the majority of cases the prices we received for these various articles is just so much less than it would be by the amount of the duty, then we have a very practical interest in the question. Now, we will consider this question first, in the light of the farmer's case, next in that of the fisherman's, next in that of the lumberman's, and then in that of the miner's. Now, I will trouble you with a few figures, showing the quantities of articles imported from Canada into the United States last year, because this is a very important point, and I wish to attempt to demonstrate the position I take. I give the quantities of certain articles imported, and I compare the volume of those imports with the production of the same articles in the United States, as shown in the census of 1880, except that in the case of barley I take the production of 1886, as I was able to obtain that:

| Article. | Quantity. | Rate of duty. | Duty paid. | United States production. |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Barley..... | 9,437,717 bush. | 10 cts. | \$943,771 | 60,000,000 bush. |
| Beans..... | 197,764 " | 10 " | 20,680 | |
| Pease..... | 405,358 " | 20 " | 66,268 | |
| Wheat..... | 341,508 " | 20 " | 68,300 | 459,483,137 " |
| Malt..... | 182,176 " | 20 " | 34,435 | 18,273,102 " |
| Potatoes..... | 1,276,809 " | 15 " | 191,520 | 169,458,539 " |
| Hay..... | 69,460 tons | \$2 | 138,900 | 35,205,712 tons |
| Horses..... | 18,225 | 20 p. c. | 442,867 | 10,357,488 |
| Cattle..... | 45,765 | 26 " | 177,551 | 35,925,461 |
| Sheep..... | 363,046 | 20 " | 194,896 | 35,192,074 |
| Wool..... | 1,297,867 lbs. | 10 " | 129,786 | 155,681,751 lbs. |

These figures show that we sold them one bushel of barley to every seven they produced; one bushel of wheat to every 1,200 bushels they produced; one bushel of malt to every 100 bushels they produced; one bushel of potatoes to every

Mr. CHARLTON.

130 bushels they produced; one ton of hay to every 500 tons they produced; one horse to every 600 they raised, one head of cattle to every 700 head they raised, one sheep to every 100 they raised, and one pound of wool to every 130 they produced. I do not think any one will say that the removal of the duties charged by the United States on these articles which we sold to them would have the effect of reducing the price of their own productions. I do not think you can convince the common-sense yeomanry of this country that it would, because they know that the volume of our exports to the United States is so small compared with the volume of the United States productions, that the imposition of the duty has little or no effect on the price in that country. Upon these articles which I have enumerated there was collected last year \$2,500,000 of duties; and in addition to the articles I have named, we sold them buckwheat, rye, oats, turnips, vegetables, hops, flaxseed, seeds, poultry, butter, cheese, mutton, meats, &c., &c. The duties paid on all the articles sold by the farmers of Canada in the United States last year amounted to no less than \$3,000,000, and the proportion these articles bear to the total quantity in the United States is infinitely small. It is preposterous to suppose that the removal of the duty from these articles, the quantity of which is so small compared with the total raised in that country, would seriously affect the prices of the bulk of these goods produced in the United States. Then with regard to the fishermen's case. Last year we exported to the United States fish to the amount of \$2,717,509, the duty on which, estimating it at an average of 20 per cent., which is $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the rate given in the United States returns, was \$543,500. Now, the United States production of fish in the same year amounted to \$43,046,053. We sold them therefore one-sixteenth of the quantity of fish they consumed, and they themselves raised or produced fifteen-sixteenths. It will hardly be maintained that the removal of the 20 per cent. duty on one-sixteenth of the entire product would affect to any appreciable extent the value of the remaining fifteen-sixteenths. With regard to the lumbermen's case, we sold to the United States last year 508,304,000 feet of plank boards and joists, the duty on which amounted to \$1,016,608. In addition we sold to the United States lath, hardwoods, lumber, deals, spruce lumber, deal ends, pickets, staves, shingles, &c., and I have no doubt that the total amount of duty collected in that country on the product of our forests reached \$1,200,000. While we sold to the United States that quantity of lumber, they produced themselves, according to the census of 1880, 18,000 mille feet, and the production last year was undoubtedly much greater. Our exports to them, therefore, averaged but one thirty sixth part of their total produce of lumber. I do not think that the removal of the duty on our small percentage of one thirty-sixth would at all affect the price of the balance, and the result is that we pay the duty on the lumber we export. Let us look at the miners' case. Last year we sold to the United States 404,042 tons of coal, on which the duty collected amounted to \$303,032, and the production in 1880 in the United States—a production which has since largely increased—was 70,480,426 tons of coal. Last year it must have reached 10,000,000 tons. I doubt very much whether the removal of the duty of 400,000 tons would seriously affect the price of 10,000,000 tons. Of iron ore we sold last year to the United States, 23,385 tons from the Lake Superior ports, and the United States produced in 1880, 7,061,829. Last year no doubt the production in that country reached 10,000,000 tons. The trade in iron ore last year from the Lake Superior ports was of vast volume, reaching a value of over \$30,000,000. It employed over one-third of the total tonnage on the lakes. You could go to Erie, Cleveland, Black Rock, or Buffalo, and in each port you would find vast fleets of ore-

carrying vessels. The business was one of enormous magnitude, and which conferred great advantages on the commercial community of all the States bordering on the upper lakes, and while the volume of that trade amounted to 10,000,000 tons in these ports, we have to show on this side this paltry figure of \$23,000 tons as the total export of our ore to the United States. And this in face of the fact that there is lying at Coes Mine, at the head of the Ontario and Central Road, actually over 30,000 tons of iron ore, which have been lying there for the last two years. We have on the Canadian side an enormous quantity of ore of the best quality, and but for the restriction placed on the trade, our export would amount to millions of tons annually; it would give employment to thousands of men and millions of capital and furnish traffic to new railway lines. Instead of that, we have, owing to the restriction imposed on our export trade, but the beggarly show to make of 10,000 tons shipped to the United States. We pay the duty on what little we do send. If we did not, we would send to the United States vastly more, because there would be an enormous demand for it, and the quality of our ore being superior to what is obtained in the States. Let the restriction imposed on our exports of ore be removed, and an enormous demand for it will spring up. Turning to the article of copper ore, I find that last year we sold 5,267 tons to our neighbors. We have an enormous quantity of this ore on our shores, but the duty of 2½ cents effectually bars the trade. Of salt, last year we sold to the United States 106,335 cwt., while the United States production in 1880 was 29,805,293 cwt. Our salt obtained the small sale it did in spite of the duty, and solely on its merits, because it is of a superior quality, and if the duty were removed it would force its way into American consumption. But for the duty an enormous trade would spring up in the salt districts of Lake Huron. One of the best demonstrations of an increase in trade which will be sure to follow the removal of the duties, is furnished by the trade on eggs. In 1870, our export to the United States amounted to \$314,000, in 1873 it reached \$631,204, and in 1887, \$1,821,464. That little item has grown to be one of the most important articles of export in Canada, simply because the duty was removed on the importation of eggs into the United States. So much for the question of who pays the duty upon what we export to the United States. I repeat that, in my opinion, the volume of our exports to that country is so insignificant in comparison with the vast bulk of the production of that country, that the duty imposed is simply extracted from the prices received by the producer in this country. Our trade with the Americans last year amounted to \$45,107,066 of their productions. What did we buy? We bought cotton goods, coal, furniture, tools, implements, machinery, hardware, books, coal oil, manufactured brass, cotton, tobacco, hides, &c., and the duty on these imports amounted to \$7,99,591. To what extent did the duty on these articles enhance the cost to the consumer? Did he get them for the additional cost of \$7,290,000, being the amount of the duty? What would they have cost, in other words, had the duties not being imposed? This brings out one of the objectionable features of indirect taxation that I am about to demonstrate. Every dollar imposed by this Government in the shape of duty means an enhanced cost to the consumer of \$1.50. The \$1 of duty is added to the cost of the article by the wholesale dealer when he receives the article in his store. Then he proceeds to figure up his profit on the cost of that article, and assesses his profit, not on the cost in the invoice, but on the cost with the duty added, which is part of what he pays for the goods. If, therefore, his profit be 20 per cent., that article goes to the retail merchant, costing him \$1.20 more than it would have cost him had there been no duty. The retail merchant, when he places

the article upon his shelf, figures his profit of 25 per cent. on the total cost of the article, so that he adds 25 per cent. on \$1.20—not on a dollar—and the consumer has to pay the profit in each case on the duty, as well as on the invoice price of the goods. I maintain, therefore, that every dollar of duty levied by the Government implies a loss to the consumer of \$1.50, unless the wholesale dealer's profit is less than 20 per cent., and the retail dealer's less than 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Except in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. In all countries. I am demonstrating that the duty of \$77,000,000 levied upon our importations from the United States last year, meant more than an enhanced cost to the consumer to the extent of the duty alone. It meant an additional tax of 50 per cent. on the duty imposed, and last year this tax must have reached \$10,000,000. Our imports from the United States last year of goods not manufactured—perhaps the hon. the Minister of Customs will correct if I am wrong—amounted, in round figures, to \$21,000,000, and our imports of coal, corn, hides, tobacco, settlers' effects, amounted to \$15,200,000. The imports of manufactured goods, if that statement be correct, would amount to \$24,000,000, on which this duty of \$7,292,591 was imposed. Now, the question is, who paid the duty? It may be said that if we claim that the duty on exports from Canada is paid by the producer in Canada, we must admit that on imports from the United States into Canada the American producer must pay the duty. But the cases are not analogous. While we export to the United States an amount of our productions which is scarcely felt in their market, we buy from the United States an amount which is equal to \$1 in every \$223 produced in that country, because the production in the United States in 1880 was \$3,369,579,191, and our imports amounted to about \$24,000,000. So, if that trade was destroyed, if we bought nothing from them, it would make very little difference in the volume of their business or in the prices asked in the country. If this theory is correct, and I contend it is, and I believe that the thinking, practical classes of people in this country will see that it is, then the loss to Canada from duties which are imposed on the exports from this country and on the imports into this country amounts, in regard to the producing classes of this country, to at least \$15,000,000 a year. In addition to that, there is another feature to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. For every shipment from Canada to the United States, no matter how insignificant the amount may be, the shipper must obtain a consular certificate, and that involves trouble and cost. In every entry made at custom houses in the United States, the shipper must run the risk of seizure and trouble with the custom house authorities, and that feature of the trade deters a great number of men who would be buyers and operators in the market from engaging in the business at all, and it deprives this country of the advantage of competition to a marked extent, it deprives us of a class of men who would be our most valuable dealers and would pay the best prices for our productions, but on this account they will not come to this market at all. If either of these bought a drove of horses or a herd of cattle and entered them at a custom house in the United States, and it was claimed that the entry was under the amount of the proper value, and the animals were detained there, and the dealer had to summon witnesses to prove that his entry was correct, it is clear that that is a class of trade that a great many people will avoid; and my belief and my practical knowledge of this matter warrants me in saying that we lose half as much from the lack of competition in regard to our commodities as we do on the duties which have to be paid on those commodities. If we lose \$5,500,000 in duties, we probably lose \$3,000,000 a year by the lack of competition, by the repelling

of these competitors who would otherwise engage in the trade, by the custom house restrictions. We lose something else besides this. We not only lose the benefit of the competition we would have but for the absurd restrictions upon trade, but we lose the great benefit, which we cannot estimate, which would accrue to this country from the increase of trade. If our trade with the United States last year was \$82,000,000, and if the adoption of this policy would run it up in twelve years to \$300,000,000, what amount are we losing? The loss is greater in that direction than the loss from duties or the loss from want of competition, and we can scarcely measure or compute the loss which Canada sustains through the duties which are imposed, and through the regulations which hamper the interchange of commodities between the two countries. I will conclude this branch of my subject by saying that unrestricted reciprocity would, beyond all question, benefit the farmer, that it would benefit the fisherman, that it would benefit the lumberman, that it would benefit the mine owner, that it would benefit the laborer, and, of the 287,000 people in Canada who were given by the census as belonging to the industrial classes, the great majority were blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers, masons, bakers, brickmakers, and so forth, all of whom would be benefitted by this arrangement. In fact, it would benefit ninety-nine out of every hundred in this Dominion. In fact, it would benefit all except the rings and the combines and the pet industries which have been fostered and pampered by this Government, and have been permitted by this unjust legislation to prey upon their fellow citizens. I have no doubt that the adoption of this policy would increase the value of farm property in a few years by at least 30 per cent. I have no doubt that it would increase the value of mine property beyond computation. I have no doubt that it would increase the value of the timber lands in this Dominion by at least 50 per cent. I believe the adoption of this policy would stop emigration, that it would bring back to us a portion of the million Canadians whom we have lost through emigration to the United States. I believe it would lead to a rapid increase of wealth, and would be in every respect an unmixed blessing to the vast majority of the people of Canada. Now, I propose to consider the question as to whether unrestricted reciprocity would injure the only remaining class that I have not alluded to, I mean our manufacturers. I have no doubt that a change as radical as this would be would unsettle some lines of business. I have no doubt that it might prove injurious to some manufactures. Common fairness compels me to say that I believe this might be the case, but I believe that the result of this policy, the average outcome of it, would be the conferring of great advantages on the manufacturing class as a whole of this Dominion, and I shall proceed to give to the House the reasons I have for this belief. There is no doubt that its adoption would rout the combines. It would rout the sugar combine and the cotton combine, and all those other combines that our friends on the other side of the House have felt compelled to have a committee to deal with.

Mr. HESSON. Have they not combines on the other side?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think they have, but they are about to strangle them there, while here they are the result of the hon. gentleman's own policy, they are his own offspring, and he would hardly attempt to deal with them in that way.

An hon. MEMBER. It would be infanticide.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says it would be infanticide, but these combines are hardly infants, they are monsters. I would like to enquire, why our manufacturers in Canada cannot succeed. Are we a people of less in-

Mr. CHARLTON.

telligence or of less enterprise than the Americans? Are we unable to compete with them in an open race in a fair field, with no favor shown? We will hardly admit that. Have we not as cheap labor as they have, and have we not as cheap capital as they have? I hold that we have, and I hold that in any industry in Canada that was adapted to the country, that was a natural industry, we could compete with the Americans, and I believe that opening the markets of 60,000,000 people to our manufactures would lead to a vast increase in the manufacturing operations of this Dominion. We have unrivalled facilities in this country for the manufacture of boots and shoes. We have the hemlock bark and we have innumerable hides in this country. We have also unrivalled opportunities for engaging in manufactures of wood, and millions of dollars could be profitably employed in that direction. The various productions of wood in the United States employ over \$100,000,000 of capital. We have great advantages in this country for the production of a superior quality of tweeds, of blankets and of woollen goods of various kinds. We raise the best combing wools on this continent, which is a branch that could be indefinitely extended if we had access to the markets of the United States. We have great advantages for the manufacture of paper and of wood pulp. We have the forests, we have the raw material in abundance, and this might become a very important branch of manufacture in Canada if we had the market of the United States open to us for the sale of these articles. We have unlimited opportunities for engaging in the business of manufacturing charcoal iron. We have the ore, we have the forests to convert into charcoal, and the Americans are nearly destitute of that necessary article in their business, and the producing of charcoal iron might, and would speedily be transferred to Canada if the restrictions upon trade between the two countries were removed. We have great advantages for engaging in the business of fish canning. We might do almost all that business for the continent. We could supply 65,000,000 of people with canned fish and productions of our fisheries. I do not need to dwell upon the various means of manufacturing for which this country is peculiarly adapted. I repeat that wherever there was found a line of manufacturing for which Canada was adapted, a great expansion in that particular business would speedily follow the adoption of reciprocity with the United States. Now, a dread seems to possess some of our friends that it would be in the highest degree dangerous to come into competition with the manufacturing establishments and with the great aggregations of wealth in the older manufacturing States like Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania. It is apprehended that great danger would lie in the fact that while our own establishments are comparatively weak, while we have no great aggregations of capital such as exist in those States, we would be brought into competition with enormous establishments, with millions upon millions of capital, with unlimited resources and with perfected processes. Well, there may be something in this. At first sight it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that this was a serious objection and it occurred to me that some light might be thrown upon this matter by looking into the statistics of the progress of manufacturing in the newer States of the American Union, States similarly situated with Ontario and our Provinces. Well, I investigated the manufacturing returns of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and California, and I expected to find in those new States, the most of which have only been settled recently, that the comparison between them, and the older States would be unfavorable to the newer States, and I was surprised to find that such was not the case. Now, the increase of the productions of manufactures in the Dominion from 1871 to 1881 was 83 millions, equal to an increase of 40 per cent. The following table shows the increase between those dates,

in Ontario and several States of the Union, with the percentage :

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Ontario</i> :—1871 | | \$114,706,000 | |
| 1881 | | 157,989,000 | |
| Increase | | 43,283,000 | = 38 per cent. |
| <i>Ohio</i> :—1870 | | \$269,713,000 | |
| 1880 | | 348,298,000 | |
| Increase | | 78,585,000 | = 30 per cent. |
| <i>Indiana</i> :—1870 | | \$108,617,060 | |
| 1880 | | 148,006,000 | |
| Increase | | 39,389,000 | = 36 per cent. |
| <i>Michigan</i> :—1870 | | \$ 94,716,000 | |
| 1880 | | 150,715,000 | |
| Increase | | 55,999,000 | = 59 per cent. |
| <i>Illinois</i> :—1870 | | \$205,620,000 | |
| 1880 | | 414,864,000 | |
| Increase | | 209,244,000 | = 101 per cent. |
| <i>Wisconsin</i> :—1870 | | \$ 77,214,000 | |
| 1880 | | 128,255,000 | |
| Increase | | 51,041,000 | = 67 per cent. |
| <i>Minnesota</i> :—1870 | | \$ 23,110,000 | |
| 1880 | | 76,065,000 | |
| Increase | | 52,955,000 | = 228 per cent. |
| <i>Iowa</i> :—1870 | | \$ 46,534,000 | |
| 1880 | | 70,045,000 | |
| Increase | | 24,511,000 | = 52 per cent. |
| <i>California</i> :—1870 | | \$ 68,594,000 | |
| 1880 | | 116,218,000 | |
| Increase | | 49,624,000 | = 74 per cent. |
| <i>Massachusetts</i> :—1870 | | \$553,912,000 | |
| 1880 | | 631,135,000 | |
| Increase | | 77,223,000 | = 14 per cent. |
| <i>New York</i> :—1870 | | \$ 785,194,000 | |
| 1880 | | 1,080,496,000 | |
| Increase | | 295,502,000 | = 37 per cent. |
| <i>Connecticut</i> :—1870 | | \$161,065,000 | |
| 1880 | | 185,697,000 | |
| Increase | | 24,632,000 | = 15 per cent. |
| <i>New Jersey</i> :—1870 | | \$169,237,000 | |
| 1880 | | 254,380,000 | |
| Increase | | 85,143,000 | = 50 per cent. |
| <i>Pennsylvania</i> :—1870 | | \$711,894,000 | |
| 1880 | | 744,818,000 | |
| Increase | | 32,984,000 | = 4½ per cent. |

So, Sir, we find that in the eight States I have mentioned, in the period between 1870 and 1880, the increase in the manufactured products was \$561,000,000, or an average of 62 per cent., against the increase in the Dominion of 40 per cent., and an increase in Ontario of 38 per cent. Then, taking the old manufacturing States which produce more than one-half the goods produced in the whole Union, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, I find that the increase during the same period was \$515,000,000, or about \$50,000,000 less than in the eight new States I have mentioned, and that the ratio of increase was 21·6 per cent., against 64 per cent. in the new States. This is a striking result, and it demonstrates that the ratio of increase in manufacturing is more than as rapid again in those new States, and the newer they are the more rapid the increase; the most rapid increase was in Minnesota, 228 per cent., the increase in Illinois was over 100 per cent., and in California over 74 per cent. Now, Sir, is there anything in the condition of Ontario, or in the condition of this Dominion, that exposes us to a more relentless competition with those old manufacturing centres than those new States were exposed to? Are we not as capable of making progress as these western

States in the establishment, development and growth of manufacture? I hold that we are, and when I examined the statistics with regard to the growth and development of manufactures in the cities of the west, I was again struck with the wonderful result I discovered. The following table shows the value of manufactured productions, in 1880, in the principal cities of the west:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Buffalo manufactures, 1880 | \$ 42,937,000 |
| Detroit do | 30,181,000 |
| Cincinnati do | 105,259,000 |
| Cleveland do | 43,604,000 |
| Louisville do | 35,423,000 |
| Chicago do | 249,022,000 |
| Milwaukee do | 43,473,000 |
| St. Louis do | 114,333,000 |
| San Francisco do | 77,824,000 |

Statistics show that the ratio of increase is many times more rapid in these cities of the west than it is in the older cities of the east. In view of these facts, I think that we are needlessly alarmed, that there is no ground for the alarm that exists in the minds of some men, that the manufacturers of the Dominion are not capable of competing with those old manufacturing centres in the eastern States. The results in the western States give the lie to such an assertion. We may disabuse our minds of any fears as to our abilities to compete with those centres and to successfully maintain and sustain our manufacturing interests. The fact of it is, Mr. Speaker, that our manufacturers, as well as our lumbermen, our farmers, our fishermen and mine owners, need the blessings of continental free trade. They need a wider market. They are confined here to a market of 5,000,000 of people. They need the adoption of a policy that will break down the barriers and open to their access 60,000,000 of customers more, and there can be no doubt that they would derive vast advantages from the removal of those restrictions. So much, Sir, for the question as regards the benefits that are to be realised by this country from unrestricted free trade. As I said at the commencement, this is a question which requires candid treatment, it is a question which requires fair treatment. It would be dishonest, it would be criminal on the part of any public man discussing this question, to seek to delude or mislead the people of this country. They have a right to demand of every patriotic citizen that he shall, at least, state what he believes to be true; and in discussing this question, Mr. Speaker, I would scorn to adopt a policy that was calculated to deceive my countrymen, for the purpose of securing a transient political advantage. Now, I propose, Sir, to examine candidly all the objections, so far as I am aware, that are urged against this proposal of unrestricted reciprocity. First of all, it is urged that it is disloyal. Well, Sir, to whom is it disloyal? It may be disloyal to Manchester, it may be disloyal to Birmingham, but is it disloyal to Canada? That is the question that concerns us. We are not charged with the guardianship of the interests of Manchester, of Birmingham, of England; we are charged with the guardianship of the interests of Canada. If we do not guard those interests expressly given to us they will not be guarded. Time and again our interests have been given away to advance Imperial interests, and it is our business to guard our own interests; and if this policy is loyalty to Canada, if it is calculated to promote the interests of Canada, that is as far as I care to enquire with respect to the question of loyalty. Now there are 4,750,000 people in Canada. What are they? They are British subjects, and they are just as much entitled to consideration as 4,750,000 British subjects in England. How many British subjects in England are there who can possibly be affected by this proposed change? We imported from England last year \$4,496,000 worth of goods. Suppose they were all the products of manufactures, suppose they were all the productions of the skilled labor of

England, how many men would it take to produce that amount of goods? I stated, in reading over the development of manufactures in the western States, that in 1880 Milwaukee produced \$4,500,000 worth of goods; within a fraction of the entire amount we import from England. How many inhabitants had that city? It had 115,000; and I venture to say that not one-third were engaged in manufacturing. How many people does it take to produce the \$44,000,000 worth of goods we import from England? In 1880, according to the returns, the production in the United States was \$1,950 per head for each man, woman and child engaged as factory operatives in that country. Upon this basis the production of that amount of goods means the employment of 25,000 operatives, it means that at the very outside 75,000 people in England are dependent upon the production of the goods that have been exported to Canada and sold in this country. And we are asked to do what? We are asked to place in one scale the interests of 75,000 people in England and in the other scale the interests of 4,750,000 people in Canada, and to decide that the claims of the 75,000 people shall out-weigh the claims of the 4,750,000. That is the kind of loyalty in this connection. I do not care for that kind of loyalty. I am engaged in looking after the interests of my constituents, and I care a great deal more for them than for nabobs in Manchester. What do you suppose is the amount of profits derived from this business in England? It may be \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, or even a little more. How much British capital is invested in Canada? I am told there is \$560,000,000 invested. Now, the interests of those men who have made investments in Canada are intimately connected with the prosperity of this country, and even admitting that we were to sacrifice the interests of those people engaged in manufactures, would we not be benefited? How much money is there invested in England to produce the goods sent to Canada. The investment, at the outside, of \$30,000,000 will produce that amount of \$44,000,000 worth of goods. The ratio in the United States was \$2,790 of capital to \$5,363 of products, nearly two of products to one of capital; and it is a liberal estimate to say that \$30,000,000 of capital invested in England is all that is invested to produce the goods sent to Canada. Place in one scale the men having \$30,000,000 of capital engaged in producing goods sent to this country, and place in the other scale the interests of English investors in this country to the extent of \$560,000,000, besides the interests of all the people of this Dominion, and we are asked to say that we will consider the interests of the owners of \$30,000,000 of capital invested in manufactures paramount to the interests of the other class who have invested \$560,000,000 here, besides the capital of the people of this country. That is not the kind of loyalty I intend to stand by or advocate. It is assumed upon this hypothesis on which I have been dealing with this question, that unrestricted reciprocity would abolish imports from England. It will do nothing of the kind. It may temporarily check those imports, but the increased prosperity which will be sure to be given to this country will lead to increased trade. It has ever been so and ever will be so, and the result will be that in a very few years, instead of abolishing English trade, there will be a large increase of English imports into Canada. I can remember the time, Mr. Speaker, when hon. gentlemen opposite were not so superloyal. I can remember when we were discussing the National Policy, and when it was urged that that policy was a disloyal one as regards England, that it threatened British connection, those hon. gentlemen said: "So much the worse for British connection." I rather suspect the motive which prompts hon. gentlemen opposite on this occasion to make such a leading cry of this cry of loyalty. There is another feature of this case to which I might be

Mr. CHARLTON.

permitted to allude most briefly in connection with the charge of disloyalty. I believe it is a matter of interest to the whole Anglo-Saxon race, to every English-speaking man, whether he may be in America, or the United Kingdom, or Australia, or New Zealand, or the Cape of Good Hope, or Hindostan, or wherever he may be on the face of this broad earth, for they are scattered over the whole face of it,—I believe it is the interest of every English-speaking man that cordial relations should exist, that friendly relations should exist between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family. I believe that any policy that will draw closer the bonds that connect the United States and England, that will increase the cordiality existing between those two great powers, that will have a tendency to bring those two powers to act in concert and in alliance, is a policy that should receive the commendation and the support of every man, not only in Canada, but in every English-speaking country in the world. I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that no question is likely to arise—no question for many years, except the Alabama question, has arisen between England and the United States, threatening to dis-ruver the amicable relations between those two countries—that has not had some connection with Canada. The Fisheries dispute—we cannot say it ceases to exist—which so lately was an ominous question, threatening the relations between those two countries, was purely a Canadian one; and if we adopt any policy that brings Canada and the United States into closer commercial relations and removes the danger of friction between this country and the United States, we adopt a policy that is likely to lead to that result which we consider so desirable, the drawing closer together of these two great branches of the master race, I believe that a powerful argument in favor of unrestricted reciprocity can be founded upon that view of the case. I believe we would be justified in entering into negotiations and seeking to draw these two peoples closer together, closer in commercial and closer in social intercourse, if no other consideration had weight in the premises. So much for the disloyalty objection. Now, the next objection urged to this proposed arrangement is that it would lead to annexation. Lead to annexation!

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear somebody say, "hear, hear." What does that objection admit—what does it tacitly, inferentially admit? It admits that it would be such a splendid thing we would want more of it, that it would work so well we would not be satisfied with a half measure but would go the entire distance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say that it admits that it would be a good thing. Perhaps it would; but it would not be a good thing to the extent of bringing about annexation. It would have a direct tendency, on the contrary, to prevent annexation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I repeat it—it would have a direct tendency to prevent annexation. I remember when I was a boy that the annexation sentiment in this country was rampant. I remember a manifesto issued in 1849 signed by hundreds of prominent Conservatives in this Dominion, and it put the arguments in favor of annexation with great power and force. I know, Sir, that annexation was debated and discussed and that the great mass of the people in that section of the country in which I live believed in annexation. I attended as a member, a little Lyceum Debating Society in the village of Ayr, in the present county of Waterloo, and we had a question of the advisability of annexation debated there, and I was surprised to see that nine-tenths

of the people present were ardent annexationists. What was the cause of it? Was it because they considered the political institutions of the United States superior to those of Canada? No, Sir, I think not. It was because they desired freer commercial relations with the United States and that they saw in annexation the only mode of obtaining it.

Mr. BOWELL. It had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It had everything to do with it, and I will show you how it had to do with it. In 1854, when we got freer commercial relations with the States, annexation died out. We never heard of it then. It was not a desire for annexation on political grounds, but the sentiment was created by the desire to obtain free commercial intercourse with the United States, and by that desire alone. Now, Sir, we have an annexation sentiment to day, and it is growing in this country, and it is growing because of the mismanagement, the recklessness, and the extravagance, and the corruption of the party in power. If there is any one thing that actuates the public mind and that has a tendency to spread this annexation sentiment in Canada, it is the desire that is felt by the farmers, and lumbermen, and other producing classes of this country to obtain free trade with the United States. It is that, Sir. It is not because they do not believe that our political institutions in Canada, if honestly managed, are not as good as those of the United States, for, Sir, nine out of every ten of the people of Canada believe our institutions are better, as they have a right to believe. It is the desire for unrestricted commercial relations that promotes the sentiment in favor of annexation. Now, Sir, you secure an arrangement by which we can obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and if you do not find as a result of that arrangement that agitation for annexation dies out completely, you may take me to the block and take off my head. This would be the inevitable result of such a policy, and it is the way to put an end to the annexation agitation altogether in this country if we can have through a commercial treaty all the material advantages that can result from annexation. So much for that objection. Then there is another objection made, and so far as I have heard it made, it is made by Conservatives, and it is this: it is that it would be a bad thing, because it would prevent our getting good terms for annexation in the future when we want it as we otherwise could. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say to that is, that it may be an objection that will have weight with some friends on the opposite side. We are not looking for terms of that kind and the objection has no weight with us. Then, Sir, another objection urged is: "Well, we cannot get it and there is no use talking about it, and besides it would not be dignified to ask for it." That is what our friend from Huron (Mr. Porter) said the other night. He said that our abject whining and cringing must be disgusting to the Americans, as they had refused overtures for free trade. Sir, it is not abject whining, it is not cringing to come openly and boldly like a candid, truthful man and say to another: "I believe that we can make an arrangement mutually advantageous, and I approach you with a proposition for an arrangement which I believe will be advantageous to both of us." What do those gentlemen want? What would they ask? Would they ask that 60,000,000 in the United States should come to 5,000,000 in Canada, because it would not be dignified for 5,000,000 to go to 60,000,000. They must indeed have an extraordinary sense of their dignity when this would stand in their way. I do not see anything undignified or improper in either one of those peoples making proposals to the other. If we contemplate any arrangements which we, on this side, conceive could be effected to our advantage, it is neither undignified nor improper, on the contrary, it is in the highest degree

dignified, to make approaches to our neighbors and lay before them what we believe to be the reasons that ought to actuate and influence us in entering into an arrangement for our mutual advantage and benefit. But, Sir, whether we can get it or not there is one thing we can do, and that is we can try. This word "can't" is a word that is not made use of very much by energetic business men. The way to ascertain as to whether you can do a thing or not is not to say "I can't do it, and I won't try to do it." The way to do it is to go like men and to try and do it, and see what the chances are. If you fail to accomplish it you cannot accuse yourself for having been false to your own interests, and for not having made the attempt. But, Sir, there is another reason which will not warrant any man who is acquainted with the chances of success in saying or admitting that we cannot do it. We are warranted in believing that the Americans are ready to make a fair and equitable arrangement. We have, in fact, official assurance from the State Department of the United States that such is the case. We have assurances from public men of that country that such is the case. We are, in point of fact, invited to make our proposition, and we are decidedly assured that this proposition, if reasonable, will be favorably entertained. Then, the next objection made is, that we cannot make a treaty on advantageous terms. Well, Mr. Speaker, we never need make a treaty that we do not consent to, and we never need consent to a treaty that is not satisfactory; and we never can tell whether we can make a satisfactory treaty or not until we have made the trial. Then, the next objection is a very important objection. It is, that this arrangement will not yield us enough revenue. Now, Sir, I do not know whether I had better examine into this question on the basis of both a proposal for unrestricted reciprocity and on the theoretical basis also of commercial union, or not, for as a theoretical disquisition it might be interesting to take up the question on the basis of commercial union. However, Sir, I will proceed to show what would be the probable outcome if we made the arrangement contemplated by the resolution now before the House—unrestricted reciprocity. It would be admitted, I presume, that we would sacrifice the duties upon American importations, amounting last year in round numbers to \$7,300,000, the total revenue from excise and customs last year being \$28,687,000; deduct from this the collection of duties on imports from the United States and it leaves a balance of \$21,388,000, which would be the revenue with the loss of the American duties. Now, Sir, in 1880 our revenue from customs and excise was \$18,479,000. On this basis I have named, admitting the loss of \$7,300,000, we would still have a revenue of \$2,902,000 more than we had in 1880. Our revenue in 1881 was \$23,942,000, and upon the basis I have mentioned our revenue would be \$2,545,000 short of the amount of revenue collected in 1881. Now, Sir, the revenue in 1881 was \$2,000,000 higher than the revenue in 1878, and the expenditure in 1881 was actually greater than this country was warranted in making or is warranted in making to-day. The question, Sir, is, can we under this arrangement go back to the scale of expenditure that existed in 1881? If we can do that, Sir, if we admit that we lose from our revenue \$7,300,000, and if we admit it is not possible to readjust our tariff, and that it is not possible to supplement that loss by increased revenue from other sources which undoubtedly it is possible to do, if we admit that for the sake of argument, we are still warranted in saying that it is possible to go back to the expenditure of 1881 and that we would have revenue enough without any change in our tariff even with unrestricted reciprocity. Now, would it be possible for us to effect retrenchments? We who have run up our expenditure from \$13,486,000 in 1868 to \$36,000,000 in 1887; we who have increased our expenditure four

times as fast every year as the population has increased, is it possible to retrench in this country? Well, Sir, if it is not possible to retrench, it is not possible to avert ruin; if it is not possible to retrench, the country has got to go to the dogs; if it is not possible to retrench in this country, we may as well give up the case—the whole case. Now, I hold that it is possible. I will tell you where you might effect some retrenchment. You might abolish that sum of all political villainies, the Franchise Act, and you would save \$400,000 at one stroke, and you would also save your character, and your consciences would be clearer. You might get along with a little less expenditure on public works and buildings. I believe that in the United States, with all its wealth, there are about 60 cities only where they have public post offices. They only give post offices to large commercial cities such as New York and Buffalo.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do they take to build one post office?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. They have a good deal of money, and they have to build larger ones, because they do not build any in small towns. They do not go into the business of building little \$6,000 post offices as bribes to the people; they have not got as low in the scale of humanity as that. Well, we might save very largely in the expenditure on public works and buildings; we might cut it all off, the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel. We could save by abolishing the vicious system of superannuation.

Mr. BOWELL. How much?

Mr. CHARLTON. It amounts to between \$200,000 and \$300,000 now. We could save on railway subsidies, and avoid the enactment of such little scenes as occurred in No. 8 a few years ago. We could save by putting an end to that system of bribery which character in giving grants to useless railway lines of \$3,200 a mile. We could cut off the whole thing with advantage to our treasury, advantage to our morals, advantage to our charter, and advantage to our hopes in the future, not only in this world, but in the world to come. We have been spending millions of dollars for the purpose of carrying immigrants to the United States through this country, and we could cut off the whole of that appropriation with advantage to the public.

Mr. LISTER. What would the newspapers do without that?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is a question I cannot answer; I am afraid some of them would rat. Then, Sir, we could reduce somewhat, I think, the cost of the civil service. We have a great many incumbents in the service of this country who are most valuable officers, who, in fact, are underpaid, and we have a great many whose services are not worth a shilling a year—a great many useless appendages; and I venture to say that a business man could take charge of the departments of the civil service of this country, administer them on business principles, increase their efficiency 20 per cent., and reduce their cost 65 per cent. Then, if we had amicable relation with our neighbors, we could reduce the cost of the militia system by \$1,000,000 a year, and what we might spend beyond that would be mostly wasted. We could reduce the cost of legislation. If it became necessary to revise our system, I think we could do with one member to represent 40,000 instead of 20,000; we could get along with half the number of members in this House; and as for the Senate, we might get along with any number you could name from half-a-dozen to sixteen, as it is only a little junta of very little use. We could get along with a reduction of the mail subsidies, and then my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has been fishing these nine years without any bait on his hook for reciprocity —

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a good bait.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not bait enough to get a nibble. He caught a gudgeon at Washington, and it was the only thing he got. Yes, it is possible to reduce our expenses by the entire loss we sustain from the American duties. We could reduce our expenses \$7,000,000 a year, with advantage to ourselves, advantage to our morals, and advantage to the taxpayer, and have a better Government than we have today. We could do it by cutting off the means of corruption which the Government enjoys and so lavishly uses in the management of this country at present. And then you must bear in mind that whatever policy increases the prosperity of this country will increase the tax-paying resources of the people. Whatever policy increases the wealth and population of this country will inevitably increase the imports; the man who has an ample income will consume more goods than a man who is straitened in his circumstances; and if we can make the great producing classes of this country prosperous, and at the same time vastly increase their numbers, we need have no fears of the revenue more than perhaps a temporary derangement of one or two years while we are getting ready to cut down our expenses. As I said before, I estimate the saving to the producing classes of this country in the mere matter of duty at \$15,000,000 a year. I also estimate that a vast amount is lost in the duties we have to pay on the goods we export to the United States; and a further sum is lost in placing an extinguisher on the growth of the population in this country. Suppose it was necessary to resort to direct taxation, the necessity of which I deny; but suppose for argument that it should be necessary, here is a policy by which we propose to save to the people of this country directly \$15,000,000, and indirectly as much more. The question is, can the people of Canada afford to give three or four dollars for thirty dollars? Can they afford for the sake of gaining advantages amounting to from \$15,000,000 to \$30,000,000 a year, to submit to a direct taxation of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 a year temporarily? I should say that if the necessity existed, the people would cheerfully submit to the imposition; but the necessity does not exist. It would be, in short, a godsend to the country if we were compelled to retrench—to lop off many of these expenses which are neither for the good, nor the honor nor the prosperity of the people of the Dominion.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting the River St. Clair Railway, Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm the charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Bronson, and Weston Lumber Company.—(Mr. Perley, Ottawa.)

Bill (No. 35) to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

KINCARDINE HARBOR TOLLS

Mr. ROWAND moved second reading of Bill (No. 30) to authorize the town of Kincardine, in the county of Bruce, to impose and collect certain tolls at the harbour in the said town.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation of the purport of this Bill?

Mr. ROWAND. I understand the object to be to renew the power of the town of Kincardine to impose certain tolls.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Debate on the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright and the proposed amendment of Mr. Foster, resumed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I must apologise for the length of time I have occupied in discussing the resolution before the House. My excuse is that it is a large question, and I do not know that I could have shortened the time very much without failing to deal with some of the questions which I thought were essential to the discussion. I hope the House will not judge me to have been guilty of wasting its time, and I shall not trespass very much longer upon its patience in connection with this discussion. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was engaged in discussing the question whether the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity would leave Canada in a position where a sufficient amount of revenue could be secured to meet our actual necessities and wants, and I was endeavoring to point out the absolute necessity that rests upon this country, entirely apart from all considerations in connection with unrestricted reciprocity, to curtail its expenditure and diminish its expenses. I had pointed out during the afternoon the fact that we are in many respects competitors with the United States. We, as well as that country, offer homes for immigrants; we, as well as that country, expect to promote our growth by attracting to our shores people from the continent of Europe, and, in order to enter upon this race with any prospects of success, it is necessary that we should not be handicapped by expenses of administration and burdens of debt greatly in excess of those resting upon the shoulders of the people of the United States; and for this reason I now repeat what I said before that it is in the highest degree essential to the prosperity of Canada that we should retrench our expenses. I find, after deducting from the taxation of the United States the amount applied by them to the extinguishment of their public debt, that our duties of customs and excise exceeded those of the United States last year by \$2.15 per head. We raised \$6.03 per head, and the United States \$3.88 per head, aside from the amount which they applied to extinguishing the public debt. We must bear in mind also that the United States are called upon to provide for certain expenses from which we are free. They have their diplomatic and consular expenses to provide for as a nation, and the only thing in this line for which we have to provide is the cost of the High Commissioner in London. Then they have to provide for an army and a navy. Last year, they expended on their pension list \$75,029,000; upon the army, \$34,561,000; and upon the navy, \$15,141,000. Our expenses on similar items were, \$102,000 for pensions, \$1,974,000 for the militia and mounted police, and \$205,000 for ocean and river service, making a total of \$4,281,000 as against \$123,721,000 in the United States. To have made our expenditure on these services equal to theirs in proportion to population,

we should have expended \$9,419,000 more than we did, and yet our taxation from customs and excise is \$2.15 *per capita* more than theirs. Whatever light we look upon this question in, we must be impressed with the necessity which rests upon this country, if it desires to avoid going to ruin, to bring down its expenses somewhere in the region of those of the United States, ever bearing in mind that that great country is our competitor and will continue to be our competitor, that we lie side by side with it, and that, if we are to secure immigration and to people our great wastes, we must offer inducements to the population of the old world nearly, if not quite, equal to those which are offered by the United States. In considering the objections that are raised to unrestricted reciprocity, I shall next refer to the seventh objection, which is the assertion that is made, that it will ruin our manufactures. I will refer to this briefly, because I have already referred to it in discussing the question whether our manufactures are likely to be able to compete with those of the United States, if trade restrictions are removed. I have pointed out my belief, and I think with reason, that our manufactures are able to compete with theirs, but even if they were not, I say the country would not be warranted in foregoing the advantages which would be derived from unrestricted reciprocity in order to promote the interests of so small a fraction of the people of this Dominion as those engaged in manufactures. Even if the manufacturing industries of Canada would be obliterated by the removal of these restrictions, which is not the case, still the great mass of the people of Canada would be benefited, and we would be acting in conformity with the principle that we should adopt the course which will do the greatest good to the greatest number. The next objection made is that this would injure our shipping interest. I deny emphatically that unrestricted reciprocity would have any such effect. Those familiar with the shipping on the great lakes are aware that Canadian shipping on those lakes is not worth within 30 or 40 per cent. as much as American shipping, because Canadian vessels are debarred from the most profitable trade on these lakes, which is the coasting trade. A Canadian vessel cannot clear from Chicago for Buffalo, or from Chicago for any other American port on the lakes, and is debarred from transporting ore, which amounts to a trade of several millions of dollars per annum, from Lake Superior to the lower ports. In fact, Canadian boats are debarred from the most lucrative trade on the lakes; and, if we had reciprocity, it would open to them a business from which they are entirely precluded now. On the sea coast it is the same thing. The most profitable trade is the coasting trade, from which we are now entirely excluded, and in that matter we would derive enormous advantages from the adoption of reciprocity. The next objection is one which was raised by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and it is an objection which has had great weight with some portion of the mercantile classes in the large cities. That is, that the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity would injure the wholesale trade in this country, that it would put an end to the distribution of supplies to the retail dealers scattered throughout the country by leaving them free to make their purchases in the great marts of the United States. I do not know, but I apprehend that this objection, like most of the others, would be found to be nearly if not entirely groundless. I am not able to say definitely and with certainty what the effect might be on the wholesale trade, but I wish to point out the result in this regard in the American markets themselves. If the result were to be in Canada to compel or to lead all retail dealers to buy in New York, that ought to be the result now in the United States, where no trade restrictions exist. But that is not the result in the United States. The cities of Buffalo, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, Omaha, San Francisco, St. Louis, Nashville, New Orleans—

all these natural centres seem to supply almost exclusively the country adjacent to them with the goods it requires. Scarcely a retail merchant in a thousand goes east to New York from the west of Chicago to buy goods, and it is found to their convenience, and to their advantage, to go to a wholesale market quite near to them rather than go to a distant one. The character of the trade now is to buy frequently, to sort up, as merchants term it, to buy in small quantities, and keep their stocks complete. In doing this it is not to their advantage to go to a distant and expensive market. The course of trade leads them to buy either of travellers or to send in their orders themselves, and the result in the United States is, that the wholesale trade of that country is distributed among the various commercial centres scattered over that country, and these commercial centres supply almost exclusively the retail trade of the country adjacent. Well, if the same rule would hold good in Canada in the case of unrestricted reciprocity, trade would not be removed from the actual commercial centres where it is now. The trade of New York and the trade of Chicago, to a considerable extent, consists in the supply of jobbing houses, jobbing sales, sales to large wholesale mercantile establishments in the interior, and a great number of these extensive New York houses would not care to be troubled with the small business of a great number of small retail houses; they would rather sell to jobbers direct than to supply these houses. And I think for these reasons that the fears entertained by the wholesale trade in Canada that the business would centre in New York, are entirely groundless. The next objection made is this: Well, we are quite prepared to take reciprocity, we are anxious to get it, we have been ready at all times, and we are ready now, to have reciprocity in natural products. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say truthfully that we also are ready for that. If it were possible to secure reciprocity in natural products, I would be in favor not only of having a standing offer to that effect on our Statute-book, but I would be in favor of publishing that offer in every city of the United States, of putting it upon every door post; I would be in favor of making that offer known by placing a circular before every voter in the United States, if we could secure reciprocity upon the terms upon which the hon. gentlemen are willing to take reciprocity. But we cannot get it, it is futile and useless to talk about it, and when they say: Oh, we are willing to take reciprocity on such and such terms, it is equivalent to saying: We will not have reciprocity and do not want it—because they only propose to take it on such terms as they know they cannot get it. What is the arrangement these gentlemen would be glad to make? The arrangement they would like to make would be an arrangement that could not be called an equitable one as far as the United States are concerned. The reciprocity treaty which was in existence from 1854 to 1865 was almost exclusively to the advantage of Canada. We sold to the United States everything that we could desire to sell to them, but they could sell to us nothing that they had to give us in exchange for the produce we sold to them. They were called upon to pay us in gold for the production of our farms, our forests, our mines and fisheries. Now, they said, that is not a fair system of trade. If we are to buy the products of your labor, we want to have the privilege of giving you in exchange the products of our labor. It is reasonable that they should have that privilege, and it is for that reason we cannot get a renewal of that treaty. It is for that reason we must admit the products of their labor into this country, in return for the privilege we ask of them to have the products of our labor admitted into theirs. Now, the last objection I shall refer to to-night is, that we can get something better. We do not need to look for this at all, it is said; it is all useless to talk of reciprocity when we can easily secure an arrangement that will be infinitely better to Canada. What is it? Why,

Mr. CHARLTON.

we can secure Imperial Federation, and that will be infinitely better, it is asserted, for the interests of this Dominion than unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Well, Sir, what is implied by Imperial Federation? What do the advocates of that scheme in Canada propose to secure? Why, they propose to secure, on the part of Great Britain, the imposition of differential duties in favor of the colonies, they propose that England shall impose duties upon raw materials, upon food, upon lumber, upon wool, and upon all the raw materials that are imported into that country from all nations except the colonies. Well, does any sane man suppose that England is going to return to the corn law system? Does any man suppose that England will impose duties upon any raw material whatever for the benefit of her colonies? I think it is preposterous to suppose it. I do not think any party in England would venture to make such a proposition, and the scheme of Imperial Federation is not only not within the range of probability, but it is not within the range of possibility, as understood by the advocates of the scheme who propose it as an arrangement preferable to securing unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Now, Sir, I am through with dealing with the objections raised to the consummation of this scheme. I think that I have met these objections fairly, that I have stated them to the House without withholding any argument that can be raised against the scheme. I have striven to deal with this question in the spirit of fairness. I believe that it is in the interest of the party to advocate this matter and deal with it in that spirit. I believe that the case is so strong that we have but to state the arguments, have but to state fairly the advantages that would flow from the scheme, have but to meet fairly the objections that are raised, and to state reasons why they do not lie, in order to convince any candid and unprejudiced mind that what this country needs, that what will conduce to the prosperity of this country above all things else, is the very thing that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford declares would be beneficial to Canada. Now, Sir, when this debate commenced, I confess I had my doubts whether this issue would be placed fairly before the people of this country. I was afraid there might be something kept back in connection with these fishery negotiations. I felt that it might be possible that the eminent gentleman who occupies the position of Finance Minister, and who was also one of the British Commissioners at Washington, might spring upon us during this debate, some document which would give color to the claim that he had actually attempted to get reciprocity in the natural products, and that we might be placed in a position where it would be difficult to combat a cunningly framed argument of this kind. But, Sir, fortunately for the party on this side, fortunately, perhaps, for the party on the other side, fortunately for the country, certainly, the issue is a distinctly defined and sharply cut issue. When the Government amendment was placed in your hands last night there was no longer any doubt as to the character of the issue. It is a clearly defined issue between Unrestricted Reciprocity and the National Policy of this country, nothing more and nothing less. That resolution says:

"Canada, in the future as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States, in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, which was adopted in 1879, and has since received, in so marked a manner, the sanction and approval of its people."

In other words, The Government of this country is in favor of obtaining reciprocity upon unobtainable terms, and upon unobtainable terms only; they do not wish to obtain reciprocity on any other terms, except such terms as they know are not acceptable. That is the analysis of the position of the Government with regard to this question. They are not in favor of reciprocity upon any conditions

on which reciprocity can be obtained. They consider the National Policy, that gigantic failure which has produced great national disaster, is preferable to unrestricted reciprocity, and they prefer to go on increasing our debt, piling up taxation, sending thousands and hundreds of thousands of our citizens from our country, and doing without the blessings of continental free trade—they prefer to pursue this line and continue the National Policy rather than to impair any portion of that policy by seeking continental free trade. That is the issue. I am glad the issue is so squarely defined. I may say for myself, and I think, for the party on this side of the House, that we shall be glad to meet the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House upon this issue. The country cannot misunderstand it. The issue is clearly defined. Men may take a position honestly on either one side or the other, and no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite have honest convictions on that side of the question, as we certainly have on the other. We will put the issue before that great jury, the people, and will leave it to that jury to settle the question which so intimately affects their own well-being and prosperity.

An hon. MEMBER. You may change your mind before another election.

Mr. CHARLTON. The House will no doubt be glad to hear that I am about to conclude my remarks, and I must thank the House for the very great courtesy to which hon. members have listened to me. I have to promise the House, moreover, that the occasions will be very rare when I shall trespass on its patience so far as I have done on this occasion. I am happy to say, in conclusion, that I believe this country has great resources. I believe this country is destined by Providence to have a grand future, and that consummation can only be thwarted by its own folly and mismanagement. But I believe our autonomy cannot be preserved if we go on in the way we have been going. I believe that to persevere in the course we have been pursuing for some years past, to follow that course for a very few years more, would entail irretrievable ruin upon the Dominion. I believe our path is beset with difficulties, and I am sorry to say that the greater number of those difficulties are of our own creating. We have created them, we must bear the consequences of having created them, and we can only remove them by energetic methods, only by subjecting ourselves to the very unpleasant experience of retrenchment, of economy, of dismissal of officers, and of reducing the expenses of Government. It was said by Artemus Ward that Brigham Young was a very much married man. We are a very much officered nation. We have in every department of the Government at least two officers where we require one; it is the case in the civil service, it is the case in this House. We have Custom house officers, Excise officers, weights and measures officers, you can scarcely count the number of officers in the pay of the Government, and one-half of them are useless officers. As I said before recess, a business man or business men organising this Government on business principles could carry on the public business with greater efficiency at very much less cost than is now incurred. We have, in addition to maintaining that great number of officers, got into the habit of adopting very corrupt methods.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear—on that side.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the innocent side. I was down the other day in the County of Prince Edward. I found there a gentleman, late a member of this House, now thank Heaven a member of this House, who had been unseated for what? Because an indiscreet friend had paid a drunken loafer, who voted against the Reform candidate, on the night subsequent to the election a dollar to get rid of his importunities.

Mr. BOWELL. That was only one charge.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was the most serious case and all the other charges were withdrawn, he was unseated on that charge. Now, what did I find going on in that county? The Dominion Government were dangling promises in the shape of bribes to the extent of thousands of dollars before the electors. I found the inhabitants of Pictou were promised a new post office, and a gentleman who was in the way of the regularly nominated candidate had, as I understood, and it can be denied if it is not true, been promised that he would receive a good snug sum for the site for the post office if he retired from the contest. I see it is not denied.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to assert that the Government made the promise?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government I understand sent an emissary, and I understood he had made the promise?

Mr. BOWELL. There is not one word of truth in it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then I should like to know what means were used to retire Mr. McCuaig. There were some means used.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in his secrets, so I cannot tell you.

Mr. CHARLTON. I found in addition to the post office promised to Pictou that the people were to have the harbor channel deepened.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. And a bridge was to be built from Prince Edward across Quinté, and an extensive marsh was to be drained and a channel was to be dredged out—all these things were to be done if the people of Prince Edward County would return a supporter of the Government. Those were the influences used there. They were told that they could not have one cent if they did not return a supporter of the Government, that they could not have a new post office, the harbor deepened, the marsh dredged or the bridge built. These methods I condemn. They are having a most ruinous and demoralising effect on the voters of the country. The Government are increasing expenses uselessly, and it is time the people turned out of office men who resorted to those methods, and many worse, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. HESSON. Explain the Glengarry case.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the courts give their decision the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) will be enlightened on that matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you will tell us it is the case of a drunken loafer.

An hon. MEMBER. He was spending his own money anyway.

Mr. CHARLTON. In addition to those methods pursued by the Government in elections we have the costly mistakes that the Government have made. No less than \$42,000,000 were expended on the Intercolonial, and the Government has since been engaged in spending more millions to destroy that property by building the Short Line. Then there was the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway; and there are whispers now and hints that that portion of the road from Sudbury Junction to Port Arthur is to be abandoned. It might as well be abandoned, but we have expended tens of millions of dollars on its construction. Of our total debt of \$219,000,000 no less than \$80,000,000 were thrown away on the different mistakes made by the Government. We have this wildly extravagant expenditure, this mountain of debt, this terrible drain of the exodus, and we stand to-day a young nation in shackles, in fetters, borne down by this mountain weight placed on its energies and progress, it is time the incubus was removed. The hour

is not yet too late, but the hour may speedily come when it may be too late, and to remove this incubus requires courage and requires determination. The evils that confront us are of the gravest character. We cannot remove them merely by willing that it should be done, but we must make an effort and it must be a great effort too, and we must write upon our doors the saying, wise and old, "Be bold, be bold and everywhere be hold." Be not too bold, but better the excess than the deficiency, better the more than the less, better

"Like Hector on the field to lie
Than like perfumed Paris turn to fly."

Yes, and the resolution, Mr. Speaker, which has been placed in your hands by my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) points the way to extricate this country from these difficulties, and the admission of Canada to participation in the commercial and business advantages arising from unrestricted reciprocity would mark the commencement of a new era, a new epoch in our history. Combined with retrenchment, Sir, and economy and the management of public affairs it will stay the tide of humanity now ebbing from our shores; it would bring back again most of those who have left us, it would bring in capital, it would necessitate enterprise, and it would make of this country that great nation which the bountiful gifts and the boundless resources of nature have placed in its possession and designed that it should be.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, Sir, with great pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend. That speech, in which he has gone over the whole ground, from his point of view, has occupied him nearly three hours, and I must ask the indulgence, not only of my friends but the indulgence of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House when I attempt to answer such a veteran parliamentarian. In rising to reply to my hon. friend, whom I met in 1882 on other fields of fight, I am conscious how arduous is the task which is before me, for he is cunning in fence and a great master of figures and details. Now, Sir, I confess I was struck by the fact that on this occasion, as on so many other occasions, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they come to deal with the affairs of Canada, with its present and its future, have done this time what they have done on so many other occasions, they have rung the changes on the old set of bells. My hon. friend who has just sat down tells us that this question is to go before the electorate on the next occasion, and he, I suppose, anticipated winning on this horse. Well, Sir, all I have to say to him is this, that we have very recently come from fighting the battle along the whole line, and practically the same issue that is raised here to-night, or was raised the other night by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was before the country and has been before the country on three successive occasions, and the electorate have given their verdict on it with no uncertain sound. I am glad, Sir, that my hon. friend is so well pleased with the definiteness of the conduct of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Conservative party. In the conclusion of his speech he said he was delighted that the question had been put so fairly and squarely, and with no ambiguity from this side. But what do we find on the other side? Under which king are you fighting, gentlemen? What horse are you to win on? Is it the horse of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or is that which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has just trotted on the field? Oh, I will not say he is either foundered or spavined; I will not say that. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech, said:

"It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to set up as an extraordinary ground for objection, that when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted trade with the United States you must thereby of necessity discriminate against English manufacturers and

Mr. CHARLTON.

manufacturers of all other countries except the United States. Now that is true I admit that."

What did the hon. gentleman the member for Norfolk say last night, when my friend the Minister of the Interior asked him what he meant by unrestricted reciprocity? He told us that he meant by unrestricted reciprocity—I have his words here—"leaving the Customs duties of each country free." Now, which is your policy? Is it the unrestricted reciprocity of the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who says that you are to let all the goods of the United States, whether they are such goods as are produced in Canada or not, in here free, and that the United States should let all the goods of Canada in free, or that we are to have our respective tariffs. Which is it? We have the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) here now, and he ought to get up and tell us. He ought to enable me to pronounce the same eulogy on him and on his party for honesty and fairness and definiteness that the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pronounced on our amendment to the motion made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Sir, when I heard the ex-Finance Minister speaking the other night, and also when I heard my hon. friend who spoke last, I could not help being struck by the similarity between their demeanor and the doctor in *Le malade imaginaire*, when the doctor gets dismissed he gets into a fearful temper and he threatens the unfortunate patient with destruction. You were physicians for five years, you were the doctors of this country, you had the prescribing for this country, and the country found, to use the elegant language of my friend a moment ago, that under your treatment it was going to the dogs. It dismissed you. The country dismissed you and instantly you became angry. You declare that the country is in a terrible condition, and ever since that you have been ringing changes on these lacrimonious and lugubrious statements, but the country has gone forward in spite of you; and I do not think, Sir, it is very likely that the discharged doctors will be taken back. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken seemed, in fact, to be conscious of the person that I have just referred to, and conscious of the similarity between him and the doctor in Molière's famous comedy, for he said: "I will make the diagnosis of the case." Why, Sir, they have been making the diagnosis of the case for some years, and not only have they made the diagnosis but the prognosis as well. Their diagnoses were wrong, and their prognoses have not amounted to anything, for, as I have said, the patient is going on flourishing. Now, Sir, I shall endeavor to refer to some, or all, of the points made by my hon. friend. He lays down very properly the proposition—and it is the only proposition that has been laid down on that side since the commencement of this debate that will bear discussion—he lays down the proposition that the proposal which we are here discussing is one that intimately concerns the well-being of Canada. Yes, indeed, Sir, it intimately concerns her well-being, whether we adopt the views of those gentlemen, or whether we go on in the path of progress or extension, confident in our future, and with that boldness, which, in the language of Longfellow, my hon. friend has eulogized. Why, Sir, the very thing that we have been is, that we have been bold, but not too bold; we have had faith in the country, but those gentlemen would have us go forward with a timid step, and in such a tentative manner that the very danger of annexation, which hangs on the mind of some people when discussing this question—but which never hangs on my mind, for I have the utmost faith in Canada—would be imminent. If we had gone on in the way they wanted us to go annexation would have been inevitable. So that is a proposition that I entirely endorse. Some of the other propositions that have been made I could not endorse, because as I will show as I go on, there is scarcely a proposition made by hon. gentlemen opposite that has

not a major premise which, when stated, shows not only that the syllogism is fallacious, but that it is ridiculous as well. The hon. member said we should look at our environment, and I have no objection to look at the environment of Canada. I have no objection to look at what Canada is, at her resources, her surroundings, her opportunities; and the more I look at them the more confident I become in her future. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the growth of the United States. He told us he would compare the burdens of the two countries, and he took for his argument, I think, very fallaciously the *per capita* comparison, just as he has concluded his speech with a *per capita* comparison; and as the reasoning of himself and his friends on this subject is fallacious when they have recourse to facts, which is very seldom, they nearly always misstate the case. The hon. gentleman made the statement that our taxation amounted to \$6 and a fraction per head, and he stated that that was something like \$3 and a fraction more than the taxation of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, what did he say?

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated that the taxation of this country from Customs and Excise was \$6.03 per head, if I remember rightly, and that that was \$2.15 more than was expended in the United States from Customs and Excise, aside from the amount paid on their debt.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, the hon. gentleman spoke very low at the time, and I did not catch accurately what he said; but I caught what he said in the beginning of his speech. And now let me state to you that the taxation of Canada in 1886 was \$25,226,456, or \$5.26 per head, while the total taxation in the United States was \$309,819,193, or \$5.28 per head, 2 cents in favor of Canada. But, Sir, it would never do for any hon. gentleman opposite when speaking on the condition and prospects of Canada, to bring forward a fact that would be in Canada's favor. Now, Sir, when the hon. gentleman comes to make a comparison of Canada with the United States—with a country that is highly organised and that is nearly a hundred years older than Canada, what is the major premise, to talk in the language of logicians—and the hon. gentleman who brought forward this question is a ripe scholar—what is the major premise in his mind? Why, that a federation which commenced its career some twenty years ago with 4,700,000 people ought to make as good a showing as a federation of 60,000,000 that commenced its career a hundred years ago. That is his major premise, and the moment you state it, it sounds ridiculous and the whole argument disappears. The true comparison—and then, of course, you have to take into account the age of Canada—would be Canada's population plus her organised wealth, plus her inchoate wealth, and the population of the United States plus her inchoate wealth and her organised wealth. Of course, we could not for one minute think that the organised wealth of Canada would compare with the organised wealth of the United States—that would be perfectly absurd; but the inchoate wealth of Canada—the wealth of British Columbia in its mines, the wealth of our vast, rich prairies in the North-West, with its millions of wheat fields, the undeveloped wealth of our fisheries, timber and various other resources—will compare advantageously with that of the United States; in fact, we have more undeveloped resources than the United States. Therefore, the comparison when made properly is a comparison that tends to the advantage of Canada. Then the hon. gentleman made a comparison as to population, and tried to make out that Canada has not progressed as rapidly in population as the United States. In fact, he took the tone that is always taken, that we are not doing well, that we are going back, that ruin is staring us in the face, that, to use his words, we are going to the dogs, but that every-

thing is halcyon and progressive and satisfactory in the United States. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, because I would like to read to him a few sentences, not spoken by a member of the party of which I happen to be a humble member; but I will read them for the edification of the party opposite, and meanwhile I will conceal the name of the man who uttered them until I come to the close. This is what he says:

"The statistics show that the exports of Canada *per capita* were greater than those of the United States, and her *per capita* imports are also greater than our own. Her *per capita* railway mileage is about the same as those of the United States. Her growth of population from the date of our Declaration of Independence up to the present day has been equal to our own, ours at that date being about 3,000,000, and hers being less than 300,000.

"The records of her criminal courts show that she has a smaller percentage of crime than we have. She is the only country in the world whose national debt is not a war debt, with the exception of two or three millions expended in putting down the recent Riel rebellion. The whole of her debt has been incurred in the development of her internal improvements. In addition to her line of railway extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, her Government is subsidising a fast line of steamships to ply between Halifax and Liverpool, and the Imperial Government has agreed to subsidise a line to run between Vancouver, Yokohama, Hong Kong, and Australia. A company has been organised to lay an ocean cable from Vancouver, *via* Sandwich Islands, to Yokohama, Hong Kong, and Australia. An Atlantic ocean cable is to be owned by the same company which owns the Pacific cables.

"Thus her great railway, by means of the steamships which will ply between Halifax and Liverpool in connection with it, and the Pacific line subsidised by the English Government, which will also run in connection with it, will have both under its control. Its railways are reaching out for the carrying trade of the two hemispheres. Not only this, but the transcontinental telegraph system and both the Atlantic and Pacific cables, of which I have spoken, will be under the control and owned by her railways.

"These are not visions of the future. Most of them are realities of to-day. Already we can step into the most luxurious car which runs on this continent to Vancouver, on the waters of the Pacific, and ride continuously in it for a distance of 3,700 miles until you reach Halifax, on the Atlantic. This country has also a great inland water way from the mouth of the St. Lawrence, in the Atlantic, to the head of Lake Superior, and all her own, except the locks at Sault Ste. Marie.

"These great lines of commerce traverse broad stretches of our own country, will tap almost every important centre of trade on our northern border, and are now stretching their arms across the State of Maine to the seaboard, south to St. Paul, and the vast interests that centre in these grand transcontinental lines that are knit together by them, invite to other fields of conquest this side of the great lakes, until Portland, Oregon, St. Paul, Chicago, Buffalo, New York, and San Francisco pay tribute to these interests and share in their wonderful growth and development; and it may astonish some present to know that to-day the Dominion Government has subsidised, and is now subsidising, a railway in connection with this vast system across the State of Maine, to shorten the route to the cities of the eastern seaboard.

"Look for a moment to the unlimited resources of that country, with her great lakes and rivers, and forests; with her natural storehouses of gold and silver, of coal, iron, copper, and lead. Her pastoral and agricultural resources are unlimited, and 1,500 miles north-west of St. Paul we find actually the great wheat fields of this continent, and which, when fully developed, will not only equal, but far surpass the great Odessa region in Russia, and 40,000 square miles of coal underlie this same territory."

I need hardly tell you it is not a Canadian Reformer that speaks; at all events, it is not a Canadian Reformer who has a seat in this House. The gentleman who speaks is Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Ackron, Ohio. That is the way an American, a highly instructed American, looks at our resources, and I am only sorry that a countryman of his is not present to hear what he said. If my hon. friend who spoke last were here, I am sure that would edify him; and I was rather surprised that my hon. friend did not wax a little conscious of the parent source whence he draws his life blood and say something in reply to one of his leaders, who, last night, sneered at immigrants, for, after all, the hon. gentleman is, like myself, an immigrant. The hon. gentleman spoke of the exodus. That was almost the first thing he took up, just as did the hon. member for South Oxford, when introducing his resolution. That hon. gentleman indeed, had so much to say about the exodus that he was almost through his speech before I became aware that he was discussing the tariff. I thought at first it was an immigration speech that the hon. gentleman was delivering; in fact, I thought he had got hold of a manuscript

copy of a pamphlet which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture was likely to publish on immigration questions, and had misconstrued it, and quoted it here. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the exodus. These pessimists derive great consolation from the exodus, forgetting entirely that nothing was more natural than that there should have been a large emigration from this country to the United States, as I shall show, Sir, in a moment. A great deal of that emigration to the United States took place before our Canadian Pacific Railway was built. We have in Canada, I am glad to say, a most highly organised system of education; in fact our educational appliances are in advance of our position in many ways. Our educational appliances are in advance of our organised society, and the result is there has always been in Canada a large number of highly educated men, men educated at our normal schools, chiefly at the Government expense, who, when they do not find in Canada scope for that kind of activity for which their training fits them, turn naturally to a country in which communities are more highly organised than they are in a great part of this country. In the United States, a similar movement is visible. What takes place here, happens to the Eastern States. Yet we do not hear of the New England States being destroyed because there is a large emigration from them to the Western States. The fact is, that the line of emigration goes not on lines of longitude, but on lines of latitude. It goes from east to west, and it was natural, when we had no Pacific railway, that this emigration, on which hon. gentlemen opposite dilated at such length, should have taken place. That emigration from the Eastern States is still going on. I have here a report of a Governor of Dakota, in which he says:

"Early in the spring a large colony of settlers coming direct from Vermont and New England points located in Hangar county, about 25 miles south of the Northern Pacific."

And the Governor of New Mexico tells how another colony went from the New England States. I do not believe, Sir, that if you were to enter into any legislative body in these States, you would find gentlemen standing up and declaring these States were going to the dogs because the more energetic and restless spirits, persons who could not find scope for their abilities at home, took Horace Greely's advice to go west. The argument that because a portion of our population has gone to the States, there must be something wrong, has been stretched too far. Did no one leave for the United States when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power? Did no migration take place to the States from Canada then? Did no migration take place before they came into power? Why, Sir, this thing has been going on for 25 years, and so long as we have in our brains the restless, aggressive, and enterprising pioneer blood of the Norman, Gaul and Saxon, so long shall we find this emigration taking place. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to deal with the North-West. He seemed to think that the North-West was in a very bad way, and would be greatly benefited by unrestricted reciprocity. Well, one of the first consequences of that policy would be that the American ranchmen who are now at their wits' end to know where to get food for their vast herds, would come across the lines and swamp our ranches. Do you suppose they would leave any money in this country or do anything to develop this country? They would not. In ten years, our vast grazing areas of the west would be eaten clean off, and these people would have sent the money they made out of the cattle to the States, to go into the pockets of the millionaire ranchmen living in New York, Chicago and St. Louis. That is what would take place in that part of the country under unrestricted reciprocity. Then, when the hon. gentleman went to the North-West, he dealt with the progress of population, and, of

Mr. DAVIN,

course, could see nothing but darkness and despair. But what are the facts? Manitoba, in 1870, had a population of 18,995, including Indians. Manitoba was admitted into Confederation on the 15th July, 1870, and what her population would have been to-day, if the policy of my hon. friend, the right hon. the First Minister had been carried out, and the Canadian Pacific Railway built in accordance with the agreement made in 1873, it is impossible to say with exactitude, but it is certain that Manitoba would to-day have a very much larger population than she has. Nearly ten years elapsed before the railway was built, and since the railway has been completed, not quite ten years have passed. What are the facts? The census of 1886 showed a population of 108,640, and the census of 1881 showed a population of 65,954, or an increase in five years of over 60 per cent., and that notwithstanding the reaction from the boom of 1882-83. In the same period the occupied dwellings increased 86 per cent. Let us compare that with the hon. gentleman's favorite Dakota, with the territory that the hon. gentleman can never mention without going into paeans of joy. In 1860 that territory had a population of 4,837. In ten years it had only reached 14,181, or an increase of less than 10,000. In 1880 its population was 135,177, so that their favorite territory has not done much better than Manitoba. Washington Territory, in 1878, had a population of 50,154, and, in 1883, a population of 92,508. In those years it increased only 42,354, while Manitoba in the same time increased 44,686. British Columbia has greatly increased its population in the same period. In about three years it ran its population from 36,247 up to 49,459. It only got the railway about that time ago, and that is the progress it has made since; and with that progress and with the extraordinary attractions of the Province of British Columbia, with its mining wealth, with its farming attractions, with its fisheries, there cannot be the least doubt that that Province will go ahead with giant strides. Take Utah again. It has three lines of railway, and in 1887 immigrants only increased 11,074, and its present population is 106,500. Montana, those who would boom it say has a population of 130,000, and last year had a population of 120,000, but I am assured that the population is really not above that of Manitoba, and it has three lines of railway. New Mexico in 1860 had a population of 27,000, and in 1870 of 91,870, being a gain in ten years of 4,840. In 1880, after an active year of railway construction, it had a population of 119,565. Idaho again had a population of 32,610 in 1880, and now it is estimated that its population is about 90,000. Arizona was shown by the census of 1880 to have a population of 40,000, and now the population is estimated at 80,000. It has three lines of railway. Now I do not think that a comparison with those territories reflects any discredit on the progress made by Manitoba or the North-West Territory. My hon. friend, when speaking of the North-West Territory and of Manitoba, spoke about Minneapolis, and Milwaukee, and St. Paul, and said that our settlers should have access to those markets. Why, if our settlers had access to those markets, if you break down the wall, if you break down the tariff, if you take away the protection, if you destroy the policy of the Conservative party, which I can assure the country, if I were addressing the people outside, can only be maintained as long as its friends are maintained, what will happen? All chance of Winnipeg becoming the Chicago of the west will disappear, and whether Winnipeg or some other city is to attain that eminent position, there can be no doubt whatever that the time must come when we shall have, west of Lake Superior, a great commercial city like Chicago; but there is no chance of it if you destroy the tariff. Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul—these will be the markets to which the people of Manitoba and the North-West will go, and what will happen then to our farmers? Our farmers

will not have a home market. They will not have what we find in Winnipeg to-day, and what will soon be in every town along the line, manufacturing energies and manufacturing industries, and the mouths to be satisfied and the stomachs to be fed which manufacturing industries produce. Now, speaking of Dakota, I read something of what a United States gentleman said. I am going to read something from the *Globe* for hon. gentlemen. I am sure it will prove most edifying. It used to be the bible of the Reform party. Whether it retains that rank at present or not I really do not know, but at one time it held a very eminent position as the organ of that party. The *Globe* sent a correspondent into Dakota. Probably the *Globe* told the correspondent to go into Dakota in order to get facts, booming facts for these districts for hon. gentleman opposite, facts probably to be used in this debate. I do not know, but here we have the special correspondence of the *Globe*, and this is what the special correspondent of the *Globe* says:

"I made it my first business to enquire into the existence of the so-called exodus of disappointed Canadians, or newly arrived immigrants into the United States; and as the result I have no hesitation in saying that such an exodus does not exist. From the Custom house officials and old residents on both sides, I learn that for some years there was a regular emigration of this kind; but last year no person crossed southward to settle, except a few so-called 'beats,' who left Canada per force, and for Canada's good, and even these were counter-balanced by a similar number of persons who had got on the wrong side of the American law, and were obliged to begin life again in Canada. For some time past there has been no movement of immigrants in either direction. How, then, it may be asked, is the undoubtedly more rapid population of Dakota, and especially the large number of Canadians, settled in it to be explained? In this way, before the Canada Pacific Railway reached Manitoba, a few years ago it was impossible for any settler to get there except by way of the American railways through Chicago and St. Paul, and then by team or water up the Red River into Canada. Manitoba, of course, was to these intending settlers little but a name; and along the whole line of their journey, from St. Paul northward, they were waylaid by American officials and dealers in real estate, who described to them in extravagant terms, the Arctic climate of Manitoba, and the distances and difficulties of the journey that remained, and so induced the majority of them, without difficulty, to remain and take up land before crossing the boundary. Since it is now easier to reach Manitoba than to reach Dakota, these influences have, of course, ceased to be effective, and Manitoba is undoubtedly filling up faster than either of the American States at the present day. I have spoken several times of the indebtedness of the farming class—"

I hope the hon. gentleman who spoke last night, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is in his place, because I am sure this will interest him. I listened with great pleasure to his speech. It illustrated what I have often known, that farmers are constitutional grumblers, but, when I heard the vigor of his language, and saw how admirably he could state his case, I saw that we had in him a fine specimen of the settlers and yeomen that Scotland gives us, and, notwithstanding his lugubrious view of the situation, I believe him to be a successful man and to be surrounded by successful men. Now, I ask his attention. I know it will do him good. In case the glance he took into the abyss of misery, the caldron of unhappiness that hon. gentlemen there brew, should have disagreed with him, this will certainly act as a salve to his wounded feelings:

"I have spoken several times of the indebtedness of the farming class, and although this is a matter in which it is everybody's interest to suppress the facts on both sides of the boundary, I have many reasons to believe that the Dakota farmer is very much worse off in this respect, and that almost without exception, he is the prey of a shark-like class of jobbing money lenders of which I neither saw nor heard of an example in Manitoba. Certainly there is nothing so half so significant or unpleasant there as the printed list I saw posted up in the elevator at Gretna, a list of 100 farmers on whose machines one machine company, (if I remember right, a threshing machine company, of Racine, Wisconsin) have chattel mortgages."

These are the friends of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the cheapness of whose machines, and the delicacy of whose commercial transactions he is never tired of eulogising.

"This was a warning to every one, especially the elevator proprietors, not to purchase the crops of these men, as they were mortgaged to the above company, and side by side with it was the warning of

the elevator people, that they would prosecute for fraud any mortgaged farmer attempting to sell them his crops, as these crops could, of course, be distrained upon by the mortgagor. Thirty per cent., too, several people assured me, was a common rate of interest exacted by the money lenders. In one case I was even told of a loan renewed at the rate of 70 per cent."

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was able to quote the *Globe* the other night as really coming round to the side of Canada, and I am glad to be able to quote the *Globe* to-night as also doing some justice to Manitoba and the North-West, and some justice, also, the pet states and provinces of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, as I told the House, I had the pleasure on several occasions in 1882, of hearing, and meeting, and fighting the hon. member for North Norfolk. And, Sir, he is a gentleman of great logical power, he is a very able man, he is full of statistics, he is so full of them that he sometimes misquotes them. He is not always accurate. Now, he stated here to-night: "There has never been a time when the prices of agricultural products were not higher on the other side of the line—in Chicago, I think he said—than on this side. Now, he made a similar statement in 1882 at Tilsonburg when I met him there, and a similar statement when I met him at Norfolk. It was at Tilsonburg he made the statement that on the very day he was speaking the price of wheat was higher in Chicago than in Toronto. That was on the 29th May, and the quotations in the Toronto papers the following morning sent up from Chicago were to this effect: Chicago, spring wheat, \$1.23½ to \$1.25½. Toronto, spring wheat, \$1.33 to \$1.37, or a difference in favor of Toronto of 9½ cents to 11½ cents. On that occasion he said: And it has always been so since that policy became operative—meaning the National Policy. Sir, very frequently since then, the price of wheat in Toronto has been largely ahead of the price in Chicago. So much so for my hon. friend's accuracy. He also spoke about Dakota and Manitoba, and the North-West farmers being greatly injured because they have to pay too much for their machinery. Why, Sir, my hon. friend the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) when speaking on this topic, dismissed, by facts, statements of that kind. I was up in Winnipeg in 1879. I know something of what the price of machinery was at that time, and I can assure the House that instead of the price of machinery having gone up the price of machinery has gone down. So the statement is entirely erroneous that the farmer in Manitoba or the farmer in the North-West has to pay more in consequence of the National Policy. My hon. friend, at this period of his speech, stopped, and he thanked God that we had an intelligent people. Well, Sir, I am thankful, also, that we have an intelligent people, because if we had not an intelligent people, I am afraid the views of hon. gentlemen opposite now being put forward, might be put into practice disastrously for this country. The hon. gentleman also reverted frequently to the exports and imports, and to the inter-state trade of the United States. We admit that they are a rich and a prosperous people. I have stated that the question is not whether five millions are as rich as sixty millions, but whether we are better developing the country on our own lines than if we were to jump into the maw of the United States. That is the question. He asks: Have we a satisfactory exhibit? All I have to say is this: I should say we have. And then having talked in this way of Canada, without having shown that the patient is suffering, having come, as it were, for the doctor, having come to a perfectly healthy individual and saying: Oh, you are very bad, you have this and you have that—he then prescribes, and what is the remedy? He says: Honesty, economy, retrenchment, access to our natural markets. Well, Sir, at the next election we can discuss honesty and retrenchment, but it is more germane to the question now before the House to discuss the subject of access to our natural markets. There is, I find, a remarkable consist-

ency, after all, in the Reform party. I have in my hand here a speech made at New Glasgow, N.S., in August, 1881, by the ex-leader of the Opposition, a man whom I am sorry this House has even temporarily lost, because no one, whether he is opposed to the hon. gentleman, or whether he is a supporter or a friend of his, can doubt his ability, or fail to see what a gap he must leave in any assembly. Mr. Blake, speaking at New Glasgow, said :

"Your natural channel of trade is with the neighboring Republic. Your exports will find the best market there, and your imports should come from there."

Now, Sir, that is the remedy, that we are to seek our market in the United States, we are to get our imports from the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that our geographical position is of such a sort that we cannot do other than seek our imports from there and send our imports there, if we want to succeed. A great deal more is said of our geographical position than is warranted. In the first place, the argument of geographical position is greatly discounted by the fact that we live in an age of railways and telegraphs. That makes all the difference in the world. It has made a difference in the sites of towns; it is no longer absolutely necessary to choose a river bank for the site of a town. Again, the telegraphs have brought places nearer each other. British Columbia was almost an infinite distance from the Maritime Provinces before the era of railways and telegraphs. It would be impossible to cross the Rocky Mountains with any sense of national connection if there were not railways and telegraphs. But if there is any force in that argument let me call the attention of the House to this: that the argument tells as much against the United States as it tells against Canada. Does not the United States stretch across the length and breadth of the continent? Has it not the Rocky Mountains; has it not a vast stretch of barren territory, too—I use the language of the hon. member who introduced the motion—separating one part of it from another? And if we are to go to geography, to topical argument in regard to national development, why the geographical feature of North America would suggest, not one vast federation, according to the utopian dream of some people, but three great republics or empires, one on the shores of the Atlantic, one on the shores of the Pacific, and one in the centre, with its outlet to the sea in the Gulf of Mexico, and probably one north with its outlet in Hudson Bay. That is the division, if you are going to follow geography. But it is too late, it is as absurd for a young nation like ours to be thinking always of what might have been as it is for a man to do so. A man of twenty-five or thirty may think that if his education had been directed into different channels he might have had advantages that he had not obtained and matters might have been different with him; but a man thinking of the past is a very foolish man. The only thing over which we have any control is the present; that is the only thing on which we can make any impact, and if we are sensible men it is the only thing with which we will busy ourselves. So it is with a nation. It is useless to think about these geographical features. It is all very well for Mr. Goldwin Smith, who is a student, in his library, who is not a man of action, who is not engaged in governing the country, to sit there and discuss difficulties of this or of the other kind, and say that a geographical difficulty exists here and a geographical difficulty exists there, and that certain laws will operate in this way and certain laws in the other. But for us here, who are practical men, the question is really, and it is behind this whole question, shall we, to use the language of hon. gentlemen opposite, throw up the sponge, or shall five millions of men, the chief elements of which belong to the greatest nations of the world, the nations that can stand before any nation that ever existed, whether

Mr. DAVIN.

these five millions, with the vast wealth of Canada, with its millions of acres of fertile lands, with its mines, its lakes, its rivers, are to develop this country, or whether they are to shrink from the task on account of the bug-bears raised by a student in his library about geographical difficulties. Too much altogether has been made of that. Geographical difficulties indeed! Why the French-Canadians, with some of whom I have the pleasure of sitting side by side in this House, did not shrink from the greatest possible difficulties, and in the land whence I come, in the North West, say it is true of the whole of Canada,

"Our tiniest rill, our mightiest river,
Roll mingling with their fame for ever."

It is absurd to suppose that the descendants of those men, to suppose that French-Canadians, that descendants of the Anglo-Saxons, that descendants of the Celts in this House and in the country, that five millions of men, with the opportunities we have, should shrink from the great task we have before us of building up a great nation, because that is my hope, and if I did not believe it would occur, I would throw up the sponge at once and would not care about the task.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. But I say "yes." I was not sure that it was an hon. member, but I thought that it was another species that interrupted me. Canada is described as having length without breadth, as an eel-skin, as a few miles of fruitful and fertile territory stretching along the boundary line. But the facts are thus set forth by a well-known authority, Mr. Griffin:—

"About 100 miles north of the great lakes is a belt of rocky country, the greater part of which is of little value for agricultural purposes; but there are rich mines, vast areas of timber and valuable fisheries, and grasses grow with such luxuriance that it must become some day one of the greatest stock-raising countries in the world. This region extends northward to the height of land, the water-shed separating the waters flowing into the great lakes from those flowing into Hudson Bay. On the other side of the height of land a fertile, well-wooded country slopes down to the Hudson Bay. The rivers all rise in the neighborhood of the rocky section. If it were as smooth and fertile as other parts of the country it would soon be stripped of timber near the sources of the rivers, and the country would be subject to floods such as those which have devastated Ohio and other sections of the United States owing to the destruction of forests. But the Ontario Government, having wisely recognised the necessity of preserving the forests (under the guidance of my friend Mr. Phipps) can easily keep that region at the sources of the rivers always well-timbered. The mines and the fisheries can be developed, lumbering can be carried on under the supervision of a government forestry bureau, and stock raisers can avail themselves of the succulent grasses. North of that narrow strip are millions of acres of fertile farm lands. The country between the height of land and Hudson Bay only requires a railway to develop it, and a railway has already been chartered. According to the reports of Professor Bell and other well known scientists there are immense deposits of iron and anthracite coal side by side along the rivers emptying into James' Bay. The distance from Toronto to James' Bay via the Northern Pacific Junction and James' Bay railways will be 575 miles. When the railway to James' Bay is completed anthracite coal will be brought from the northern mines to the people of southern Ontario. Near the city of Ottawa is a mountain of the finest iron in the world. The coal mines of the James' Bay region will be connected by railway with Ottawa, and also with the rich iron mines on the north shore of Lake Superior, less than 300 miles away. South of the anthracite coal region are enormous beds of lignite coal, peat and porcelain or China clay of superior quality."

Canada has breadth as well as length, and if they will only pay half the attention to the capacities that Canada possesses as they do to the United States they will be able to grow as enthusiastic about their own country. This year has brought painfully before us the superior advantages of Canada: painfully I say, because there was a loss of life on the part of many American citizens in that great blizzard which visited the American North-West. Our whole Dominion lies north of the cyclone belt. Three-fourths of the land adapted to the production of wheat is in Canada, and Mr. Wiman, one of the inspirers of this movement, in fact he is the corypheus of the movement, tells us that we have two hours more sunshine in the North-West than they have in the land below the line, and that under those circumstances

he says that we have great advantages for wheat growing. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) dwelt on the inter-state trade of the United States as enormous, and he seemed to think it was a fair thing on his part to compare the inter-state trade of the United States with the export trade of other countries. But, Sir, when he compares the inter-state trade of the United States with its own export trade he will know, what he would have known had he compared as he might, Mr. Blue's report—although our statistics, I am sorry to say, are not in a first rate condition—but if he took Mr. Blue's report for the Ontario Government, and if he took Mr. Blackeby's report to Sir Leonard Tilley in 1885, he will see that the internal trade of Canada was enormously greater than its export or import trade. How comes the United States to have this great inter-state trade? How comes it to have the home market that he lauded so much? It is, Sir, because of that very protection that he wants us to forego. He does not seem to have observed for one minute that when he was pouring on the States all the applause that he could, about their development and internal wealth, that this only shows that the policy of the United States, which Alexander Hamilton and Madison and Webster, from one time to another advocated was the true one, and the policy that the hon. gentleman himself advocates because he believes in protection. Well, Sir, what does his argument prove? It proves that if we want to become a great nation, if we want to develop our resources in such a manner that the internal trade shall be a great factor in our life, we must imitate the United States and pursue the same policy of protection. Now, Sir, what did one of the Cobden tracts says in regard to the United States many years ago? It said:

"It is our guarantee that if America will put down monopolising manufactures, when our election time comes we will lay Manchester and Sheffield alongside Indiana and Illinois, the finest States of the Union. These artisans and these mechanics will manufacture for them and they may grow food for us."

Now, Sir, we know very well that it does not make much matter what the form protection takes to help an industry, provided it is protection. It is well known that a time came in the history of England when actually free trade was the surest way of protecting its manufactures, and that the way to give protection to those manufactures was to open the doors to cheap food. The fact that manufactures are more advanced, are richer and are more highly organised in any set than in another is sufficient protection. If we should adopt the course suggested by the hon. gentleman what will happen? Our manufacturers will be placed in competition with the manufacturers of the United States, who are protected as compared with our own manufacturers, not only by the fact that a great deal of what articles they deal in are patented, but by the fact that the United States manufacturers are enormously richer, are more highly organised, and that they are in fact long come to maturity, while our manufacturers are only in an adolescent state. The result would be to place us in the position sketched out in the Cobden Club Paper. That policy would bring St. Paul and Minneapolis and other cities of the United States, near to portions of our country, with the result that they will manufacture for us and we will grow food for them. I will show you bye-and-bye the market that those gentlemen think is so valuable is a treacherous one, and there is no guarantee whatever that the demand will continue for the class of articles that we export to the United States. Mr. Hitt is a United States statesman who takes much interest in our affairs, and he is of course in favor of commercial union. Indeed, I think judging by the speech of my hon. friend the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that he, too, is in favor of commercial union.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course he is.

Mr. DAVIN. In an interesting speech, which I remember reading, the hon. gentleman said that "whatever the Liberal party would do he was determined to stand by commercial union, and he nailed his colors to the mast." What do we find here to-night? His colors are not nailed to the mast, but they are come down. I am sure that the ship is just the same, but he gave her another coat of paint and put another name on the bowsprit, and the hon. gentleman sits in the poop with the sails flapping against the mast waiting for a breeze. But, Sir, the breeze is not to be coaxed by any such metamorphosis as the ship has undergone. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, for a man so well informed in figures, is sometimes very reckless in his statements. He said that the treaty should not be like the old reciprocity treaty, which, he thought, was all on the one side. He declares that that was a one-sided treaty, that it was a juggled treaty, and the advantage was on the side of Canada. I have here in my hand the tariff and Mr. Brown's statements in regard to what took place, and the figures, Sir, are irrefragable, because I have tested them by authentic sources. It is impossible they should be wrong, because they would have been exposed at once. This is a memorandum by Sir Edward Thornton, K.C.P., and the Hon. George Brown on the commercial relations past and present of the British North American Provinces with the United States of America. I find from this that in the thirteen years of the operation of the reciprocity Treaty the Provinces purchased from the Republic, according to the United States returns, commodities to the value of \$346,180,204, and the Republic purchased from the Provinces \$325,726,520, leaving a gross cash balance in favor of the United States of \$20,454,246, yet the hon. gentleman has said that the treaty was all on the side of Canada. In speaking of that treaty I confess I thought the hon. gentleman was a little disingenuous; I do not use the word offensively, as he knows well, because it is not in my nature to say anything offensive to anyone. He spoke of the enormous volume of trade that existed in favor of Canada during the continuance of that treaty. There was an enormous trade done between Canada and the United States at that time; but, Sir, the hon. gentleman never told the House—I do not suppose he would treat his constituents in the same way—what is one of the conditions of a true view of the case, that during that time the Grand Trunk Railway was building, that during that time there was a great war going on below the line, that millions of people were taken from the factory and workshop to fight on battle fields, and that therefore the people of the United States had to go where best they could get their goods. I think when those things are taken into account, it will probably be found that instead of \$20,000,000 being in favor of the United States in ten years under a treaty of that sort, under ordinary and normal circumstances there would be a far larger sum. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke about the market of the United States for Canada, and it seems to me that there is a great fallacy in the way hon. gentlemen speak about the market. To refer again to the language of logicians, that is what is called the fallacy of division; it is distributing one term in one premise, and leaving it undistributed in another. It is assuming that what would be good for one man or one set of men in a country would be good for all men in that country. The hon. gentleman refers to our export of horses, rye, barley, oats, and what not to the United States, and he argues with curious inconsistency that when we import from the United States we pay all the duty on what we import, and when we export to the United States we pay all the duty on what we export. Well, Sir, that is a most extraordinary state of things. It revolutionises political economy. But the hon. gentleman who is leading in this debate said the other night that "nice customs courtesy to great kings," and I suppose

such heaven-born geniuses as are leading in this debate can revolutionise political economy and overturn the laws of exchange. But, Sir, I am inclined to think that that is a mistake. The Hon. James Young, who is a prominent member of the Reform party, and an exceedingly able and honest man, dealing with this question, says it is perfectly absurd to say that we pay the duty on the horses that we send across the line. Now, Sir, dealing with this question of the market, I will ask the House to bear with me while I bring before them the relative markets that we have. Our aggregate imports and exports from 1873 to 1887 inclusive, were as follows:—

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Aggregate imports and exports..... | \$2,864,000,000 |
| Trade with United Kingdom..... | \$1,243,000,000 |
| do United States..... | \$1,230,000,000 |
| do other countries..... | 396,000,000 |
| do countries other than United States..... | \$1,639,000,000 |

Our aggregate exports for the same period were:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Aggregate exports..... | \$1,305,000,000 |
| To United Kingdom..... | 650,000,000 |
| United States..... | \$529,000,000 |
| Other countries..... | 126,000,000 |
| Countries other than United States..... | \$ 776,000,000 |

Now, our imports for 1887 were:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Total imports..... | \$112,892,236 |
| From the United Kingdom..... | \$ 44,962,233 |
| do other British countries..... | 1,704,200 |
| Total from the British Empire..... | \$ 46,666,433 |
| From the United States..... | \$ 45,107,066 |
| do other foreign countries..... | 13,865,929 |
| Total from foreign countries..... | \$ 58,972,995 |
| Total from countries other than the United States..... | 60,532,367 |
| Our aggregate trade..... | 202,408,042 |

The percentages on home consumption for 1887 are as follows:—

| | |
|---|----------------|
| United Kingdom..... | 42·6 per cent. |
| Other British countries..... | 1·6 do |
| Total British Empire..... | 42·2 do |
| United States..... | 42·8 do |
| Other foreign countries..... | 13·1 do |
| Foreign countries..... | 55·9 do |
| Countries other than the United States..... | 57·3 do |

Our aggregate trade for 1887 was as follows:—

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Total aggregate..... | \$202,408,047 |
| With United Kingdom..... | \$ 89,534,079 |
| do other British countries..... | 5,151,010 |
| do British Empire..... | \$ 94,685,089 |
| do United States..... | \$ 82,767,265 |
| do other foreign countries..... | 17,702,885 |
| do all foreign countries..... | \$100,470,150 |
| do countries other than United States..... | \$112,387,974 |

Now, Sir, it will be seen that our trade with countries other than the United States, that our trade with the British Empire, is an exceedingly valuable trade; and as the hon. gentleman specified the goods we exported to the United States, I will ask his attention to tables that have been prepared by Mr. McGoun, of Montreal, for 1885, and I found in testing them that they were perfectly correct, and that about the same ratio of figures would apply to last year, and therefore I make no scruple of adopting them. The first table shows the principal exports for 1885, from Canada to the United States. The exports amount to the sum of

Mr. DAVIN,

\$12,642,000. Amongst these we find eggs which the hon. gentleman spoke at some length. Now, Sir, the second table is that of the chief exports of Canada to the United States of articles of which the United States export to the world at large exceeds the United States import from Canada; and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, because he stated that the question before us was a very important and critical one. He said nothing could be more solemn than the nature of the question we are discussing, and, therefore, I may assume that if I can show the hon. gentleman he is mistaken in the view he takes, he will show, by turning from unrestricted reciprocity, the great righteousness he displayed in turning from commercial union, and we shall find him voting with the Conservative party and supporting what is really the affection of his innermost heart, a protection policy. I will take first the item of coal, of which the export from British Columbia to the United States amounts to \$1,178,000, and the exports of the United States of coal reached in value \$1,999,000. Copper ore, we exported to the United States \$245,000 worth, and the United States exported \$4,759,000 worth. I call the attention of the House to that item, because the hon. gentleman, echoing Mr. Wiman, declared that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, any amount of copper ore would be sent from Canada to the United States, yet, as I have shown, the United States export copper ore to the value of \$4,739,000. The same remark applies to iron ore. The hon. gentleman's dulcet utterances are still ringing in my ears, as he declared that we would send any amount of iron ore to the States, were his panacea applied. Well, we exported iron ore to the States to the value of \$132,000, and the United States exported to the value of \$12,891,000. Take horned cattle. Of horned cattle, we sent to the United States \$1,411,000 worth, and the United States exported \$12,906,000 worth. Hides, horns and skins, we exported to the extent of \$459,000, and the United States exported \$4,153,000 worth. Peas and beans, we exported to the United States to the value of \$484,000, and the United States export of these articles reached the value of \$522,000. Wheat, we sent to the United States \$268,000 worth, and the United States exported \$72,933,000 worth. Yet, that is the country where we are to obtain an enormous market for our farm products. Is the hon. gentleman aware that within the last ten years the development of wheat growing in India has made such strides that the English and the other European markets are menaced by it, even to the exclusion of the United States wheat. Why, at a farmers' convention held a month ago in Chicago, the probability was discussed of the time coming when not a bushel of wheat would be sent across the Atlantic. Only that I do not want to trouble the House with more statistics than are necessary to prove my case—and I have the statistics showing the progress made in wheat growing in India, I would enter into this part of the question. Of rye, we sent the United States \$150,000 worth and they exported \$12,000,000 worth. In potatoes, our export to the United States reached the value of \$108,000 as compared with an export from the United States of \$265,000. I understood the soul of the hon. member for Queen's, Mr. Davies, was troubled the other night in the matter of potatoes. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that the United States export more potatoes than we send them, and therefore the glowing vision that rose before his imagination of any amount of potatoes going to the United States is born entirely of an uninstructed fancy. Wood staves and headings, we sent to the United States \$31,000 worth, and they exported \$1,950,000 worth. Other lumber, we shipped to the United States to the value of \$184,000, and the United States exported to the amount of \$1,182,000. Household furniture, we exported to the United States to the value of \$147,000 while the United States exported \$2,128,000 worth. Other wood manufactures, we sent

across the line \$221,000 worth, and the United States export was \$1,590,000. The total export of all these articles from the United States from Canada amounted to \$5,300,000, while the total exports of the United States to the rest of the world reached \$119,298,000; and yet that is the market those hon. gentlemen say we are about to capture. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to another table which is still more instructive, and that is a statement of the articles that we export to the United States and of which the United States retain the whole or the greater part. Wood planks, we exported \$6,805,000 worth and the United States exported \$6,575,000 worth. Laths and palings, we exported to the United States \$220,000 worth and they exported \$48,000 worth. In shingles, our export amounted to \$133,000, and the United States export reached \$132,000. Barley we exported to the extent of \$4,477,000 as against the United States export \$346,000. Of hay we exported to the United States \$1,181,000 against their export of \$204,000. Malt, we exported to the United States \$290,000, and they exported none, and malt was one of the articles the hon. gentleman dwelt upon. Horses, we exported to the States \$1,524,000 worth, and they exported \$367,000 worth. Sheep, we sent to the States \$773,000 worth, and the United States exported \$572,000 worth. Wool, we exported to the United States \$186,000 worth, and they exported \$88,000 worth. The American returns show that their import trade with Canada, in these articles I have mentioned amounts to \$157,575,000, while they exported to the value of \$8,433,000. The total import—and I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to this—of these articles, according to the United States returns for 1885, was \$20,507,000 worth, and according to the same returns our total exports to them was \$17,575,000. Now, these are the only things for which we could find a profitable market in the United States, and yet what is the fact? We sent them \$17,500,000 worth out of the \$20,000,000 which they imported, so that at present, even with the tariff, such as it is, we control the only part of our trade with the United States which is really valuable to us. In regard to all the other things, in regard to things that we send them which they send away, what is to prevent Canadians, with the enterprise that the hon. gentleman said our manufacturers should have, with the energy which our manufactures should have, what is to prevent these gentlemen finding out the markets themselves and keeping the profit in Canada which goes to the middleman in New-York? The hon. gentleman asked in connection with this, who paid the duty. I have already pointed out the absurdity of saying that we pay all the duty on our exports to the States, and that we pay all the duty on our imports from the States. That is a very jug handled affair. Some malign fairy must preside over the laws which govern exchange and strangely alter them, in order to give the hon. gentleman an argument, but I think I have shown that, when the hon. gentleman wants a fact to buttress up his argument, he takes the readiest way—he invents it; he falls back upon his invention for his fact, and I am bound to say that, in that respect, he is a man of great capacity. As to this statement about paying the duty, I have heard the hon. gentleman speak about so much being paid on horse shoe nails. I remember once when he made a speech when I met him in 1882, in which he described that, if I wanted to shoe my horse, I was taxed something like 35 per cent. on the nails, if I smoked a cigar, I was taxed so much on that; and I found that he taxed me so much that at last I discovered that, in smoking cigars and shoeing my horse and getting wearing apparel I was taxed beyond my income, which has always been a very moderate one. That was answered very practically in this House by my hon. friend, Mr. Wigle, who is no longer here, I am sorry to say, and who is a loss to this House. From that gallery I heard him demonstrate the utter absurdity of this statement which

had been made as to the duty being paid by us on all we import under a protective tariff. That is to say, the duty is paid on articles which pay Customs duty when they come in, but most of these articles do not come in; they are made in the country. The other day, when one of the hon. gentleman's friends was making a speech at a bye-election, he described how much was paid on wool which entered into the manufacture of garments. In fact, he diagnosed—I like that word “diagnosed” which the hon. gentleman gave us to-day, and I shall never forget it—he diagnosed the unfortunate situation of the people of Canada in that respect, and an old fellow who was there listening to him, and who had a wife who was handy at making clothes, took a pair of his unmentionables in his hand and said: “That wool was grown on my own sheep, the cloth was made at home, how much duty do I pay on that?” And the old fellow stroked his knee with the perfect satisfaction and confidence that he had overturned one of the Reform missionaries. I will read three or four lines, if it be only to recall the pleasant voice and the incisive logic of my friend Mr. Wigle. He says:

“Home competition brings down the price. But that is not the best of it. Without this National Policy, we would be compelled to get these hats in the United States; and the manufacturers of hats would have all that country to sell their hats in, and would bring their surplus here. Now, without this policy, we would have to pay that dollar. Where would it go to? Every man knows that it would go to the United States. The hatter would pay the dollar to the wholesale man, the wholesaler would pay it to the retailer, the retailer to the laborer, the laborer to the butcher, the butcher to the farmer, the farmer to the blacksmith, and the blacksmith to some one else, and every man whose hands that dollar went through would make from 10 to 25 per cent., and it would benefit thousands of people in the United States. Where would the hat be? In Canada, and in six months it would be worn out, then we would have neither hat nor money. I have a hat that was bought in London at the rate of \$4.50 a dozen, or three York shillings a piece. That hat can be sold for 50 cents, giving a profit of 33 per cent.; and the result is that, when that hat is worn out, the money is in the country, and the poor man can buy another with it. But the argument of the hon. gentleman is that the poor man has to pay this duty. Now, how is it? The poor man comes into a store where there is a hat for 50 cents, another for 75 cents, another for \$1, and another for \$1.25, all manufactured in Canada, but, if he wants a finer hat, he takes a fine wool hat on which duty has been paid; and I say that, if he buys a \$4 hat, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party of this country. The poor man is not compelled to buy that kind of a hat, but if he wants a hat like the one the Leader of the Opposition wears, and he pays his \$3 or \$4 for it, that is his business and not the business of the Reform party. Now, Sir, we will come to the question of a particular kind of cloth. The hon. gentleman, when talking to the people of West Kent, told them that the poor class of people paid 50 per cent. on their cloths, while the rich man paid only 23 per cent. Well, I had occasion to go to a factory in West Kent, and I said, ‘I want a yard of your heaviest cloth’. There is the piece of cloth I got.”

He held it up before the gaze of the Commons.

“It has a pound of wool in it, and I paid 50 cents a yard for it. It cost 30 cents to manufacture it. Now, I would like to know where is the 50 per cent. paid on that piece of cloth. I will promise the hon. gentleman that, if he or any of his supporters behind him—and there are a lot of merchants there—can stand up and show the House that there is 50 per cent. of duty paid on this kind of cloth, I will leave this side of the House, and go and support the hon. gentleman.”

I quote that because it is put in a more emphatic and a better way than I could put it, but I will quote the language of the Adam Smiths and the Bastiats in regard to this matter. What they lay down is that the moment you invest capital, it always displaces capital, and if you send the capital out of the country, you have only displaced one capital in your own country and have lost the money you have sent out, and there cannot be the least doubt on that head. In this connection the hon. gentleman referred to eggs, and he dealt in superlatives as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did. In fact, when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford, I was reminded of what Sydney Smith told the Yankees of his day, that they should avoid superlatives. Everything with them was enormous. And the hon. gentlemen told us that, if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our trade with the United States in ten years would amount to \$300,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. He said \$500,000,000.

Mr. DAVIN. He said \$500,000,000, did he? Oh, a couple of hundred millions are nothing to the hon. member. He does not give us the least ground for believing him when he says that. He merely makes the statement, just as it is enough for the ex-Finance Minister to make assertions. I read his speech at Ingersoll, I have it here, and in fact it would have saved the reporters a lot a trouble if, instead of taking down his speech the other night, they had cut out of the newspaper the speech delivered at Ingersoll and set it up, because it was the old Ingersoll speech over again. I have it here, and the ex-Finance Minister, whose demeanor shows how modest a man he is, thinks it is enough for him to say that there would be an enormous development, an extraordinary development of trade if this were done, and his first lieutenant in this matter takes the same course, and gives us on his *ipse dixit* the wonderful progress that would be made. Now, he instanced the case of eggs. I will show him that broken eggs are not what they are cracked up to be. Now, he says that under free trade between us and the United States, there would be an enormous expansion. That is what his leader says in this matter, too, although on *a priori* ground, it can be demonstrated that such a thing could not be. Suppose I take the market of the United States as represented by 100. He says you would have the market of 60 millions. What does that mean? It would be a market of 60 millions *plus* the 5 millions in Canada. The size of a market is relative to the number of people who trade in it. If you have a market, say, of 100, and let there be ten persons coming to that market, of equal energy and equal push, there is one-tenth of the market for one of them, and therefore the size of the market is not a relative thing. But when the hon. gentleman says that we would have a market of 60 millions, and that our trade would go on with unlimited expansion, does he suppose that the energy of the people of the United States is to lie in abeyance during that time? Does he suppose that they are not going to come into our market? The honorable gentleman has used a most fallacious argument in this connection. He has taken the enormous product of the United States in one or two particulars, and he says: Look at what we send them, or look at what we import. Do you suppose that is going to be a matter of any importance to people who export and import so much? There he falls into the fallacy of regarding the people of the United States as a single person, he falls into the fallacy of attributing to the various minds that make up the trading community of the United States, a sentiment that would come into the mind of a single man if he were exporting or importing. To that single man his proportion of the trade of Canada would be a very small thing. The truth is that the markets of the United States, the merchants of the United States are made up of units, all of them looking where they can make a dollar, where they can plant a dollar which will produce the most profit to them. Of course, instead of their disregarding the Canadian market, we find gentlemen who are advocating this thing in Congress, pointing out the value of our market, pointing out that the result would be that from Halifax to Vancouver, in every shop and every store, they would see United States goods and United States machines. And so, Sir, there is the same fallacy in supposing that because one article may have made progress under free trade, every article will do so. It so happens that they need our eggs. I do not think they would need a large amount of our machinery, or a large amount of our furniture. I do not think they would need a large amount of those things which they export in 10's and 50's of millions. But let us take the egg. The hon. gentleman declares that in twelve years we would have a trade worth 300 millions under free trade; I ask his attention to what took place in

Mr. DAVIN,

regard to eggs. In 1833, under free trade, we exported 13,413,744 dozens of eggs, to the tune of \$2,251,304, or 17 cents a dozen. In 1886 we exported 12,708,883 dozens of eggs, to the tune of \$1,728,082, or a decrease in those three years of over half a million dollars. So you see that the reasoning of the hon. gentleman does not go down to facts. He contents himself with saying: Oh, there will be an immense expansion; there will be an immense trade. He says: Look at eggs. We do look at eggs, and they do not bear out what he says. I do not know what the eggs were that we exported, but I know that the eggs of the hon. member for North Norfolk are cracked; at all events I have cracked them now. Now, Sir, on this occasion the hon. gentleman broke out into a tirade against combines in Canada. I hope the committee that my hon. friend has moved for will lead to the suppression of this evil, because combines are illegal on the part of traders or manufacturers with a view to keeping up the price of an article. I have heard of such things in Canada, and I hope that if there are such they will be dealt with vigorously and put down. But I would ask my hon. friend. Are there no combines in the United States? Why, it is part and parcel of the same system he has pursued. Everything is *couleur de rose* in the United States, there is nothing wrong in the United States. Although the hon. gentleman is a member of the Parliament of Canada, and aspires to be a Minister, I am glad to see that the sentiment of patriotism is so fervent within him that he can see nothing wrong in that great land. But he cannot expect us to look at things in that light. We are practical men here who must not look at things from the point of view of sentiment. We must look at them with close logic, with the responsibilities that attach to our position as members of Parliament, and such unsubstantial rhetoric as we have had from those hon. gentlemen on this question, cannot be allowed to weigh with us, and I know it will not weigh with the country. Then he says this new scheme will bring back part of the millions of Canadians. Why does the hon. gentleman suppose if you had unrestricted reciprocity, that the merchant who is established in Chicago, or the professional man who is established in Chicago, or New York, or the Western States, the farmer who has built there his house, the mechanic who has gone there—does any man suppose, does the hon. gentleman himself suppose, if he will be candid with me, that any portion of these 1,700,000, some of them Canadians, others, I believe the sons of Canadians, would come back to Canada? Why, it is a most absurd idea. Sir, I do not consider that we should perpetually mourn over the fact that the natural restlessness and the natural ambition of the races from which we spring, should assert itself, and should lead to an occasional migration to the States. I have explained, however, that the conditions which led to any large migration, no longer exist. Then he asked the question, whether unrestricted reciprocity would injure our manufactures. He says: I admit it would injure some lines of business. That itself is a very serious matter. The hon. gentleman admits that the proposal he makes here, which neither the hon. member for South Oxford nor the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have shown will confer the least benefit on Canada, for they have only said it will do this or the other, but they have not given us any solid ground on which to rest—will do serious injury to certain branches of business. That is a very extraordinary statement. But the hon. member for South Oxford said it would be advantageous to the majority. There is sitting near him an hon. member who is well acquainted with the trade of Canada, and he knows well that what I am going to say is true. He is perfectly familiar with the fact that when a manufacturer or merchant, but especially a manufacturer, is competing with a rival in business, two cents a ton is a very important matter, espe-

cially when he is engaged in a struggle with a new competitor. We will suppose the line between the two countries wiped out, and that our manufacturers are face to face with the manufacturers of the United States, and that the American manufacturers are coming in here to seize and capture our market, then those manufacturers will do what a witness before a Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons stated that English manufacturers had done, sell at an enormous loss in order to capture the market, and, when they have crushed out competition, recoup themselves by selling goods at any prices they like. The hon. gentleman knows that under those circumstances a few cents a ton is an important matter. We suppose that our manufacturers are face to face with this market of sixty millions and they got into it. What do they find? They find that they have a longer haul than the American manufacturers in order to reach the markets, a difference of two hundred or three hundred miles as the case may be; but supposing it is only fifty miles, we in the west know what a difference is made even by that distance. Not only so, but the Canadian manufacturers will be utterly alone there, and would have to compete with old established rivals and make a character for themselves. They would be handicapped from the word go, and would have none or very little chance with their rivals—one or two might succeed—but the American manufacturers, owing to their greater wealth, more highly organised industries, and the greater perfection of their "combines"—for they are not putting them down there as we are doing here—would be able to stalk through our Canadian markets. But in this connection I really must remind my hon. friend of a phrase that he used in a speech which I read with great interest—"that protected-to-death country, the United States." How very inconsistent it is that we should be asked to go into that protected-to-death country by free traders, the men who once followed the Hon. George Brown, who was once considered the Bright of Canada, who thought that the sun rose only over Manchester—that those men and the followers of Hon. Edward Blake should actually want Canada to go into that protected-to-death country. When speaking of paying the duty I should have mentioned another fact. If a citizen of Canada pays heavy taxation now, what would he have to pay if this country joined the United States, because by the same parity of reasoning you have to put on the prices, whether the system of the hon. member for South Oxford or that of the hon. member for Norfolk was adopted, on the principle of the reasoning followed, that if you take goods to the United States you have to add the duty in the United States port of entry. So an unfortunate Canadian would be taxed a great deal more under this *régime* than the hon. gentleman would feign introduce; but happily it is out of the question. The hon. member dwelt on the great advantages we would possess if his propositions were carried out. He actually said that we could supply the whole sixty-five millions of people with canned fish, although they have large canned fish factories of their own. I am afraid we would not drive them out of that market. When asked the question as to whether we would not be brought into competition with such manufactures as I have described, the hon. gentleman in order to get rid of it made a comparison, the fallacy of which I will show. He compared Ohio, Indiana and California and some other States in regard to manufacturing progress. How is that progress in regard to manufactures made there? Any man who knows anything about those States and Territories is aware that rich capitalists go in there from the Eastern States and invest large sums, build great factories, and in those cases a large proportion of the profits goes to the Eastern States. That is the way it is done, and we hope as Canadians that the same thing or something like it will take place here. But give us time—there is no need for

such tremendous hurry. We will do the same thing in Canada, and indeed we have already started in the same way. In fact people are going into the North-West not only from the Eastern Provinces but from England, France and Germany. Then the hon. gentleman dealt with the objections that might be raised to the proposition. The first objection to which he referred was that of loyalty, and he declared that he was as loyal as any one, but his loyalty was to Canada. I will say here that there is no man living whose heart beats with more pride than does mine in regard to the British flag; but my first duty is to Canada too, the first duty of all of us is to Canada, and it is because that is our first duty that we supported a protective policy. If we were thinking more of England than of Canada we would never have imposed protective duties because we knew there were a great number of people in England who did not approve that policy, who even resented the tariff we adopted. But the hon. gentleman talks much about loyalty. I have here a speech delivered by the ex-Finance Minister at Ingersoll, and in it he speaks of the subject of loyalty in a very strong manner. He says, that for his part England does not take much interest in Canada and he does not see why we should trouble ourselves so very much about England. Let me say about this question of loyalty that it is not merely a sentiment, and I hope there is not a man in this House that would sneer at sentiment—but it is a most practical thing, this our loyalty to England. If we were to make such a treaty as those gentlemen would have us make with the United States what would happen? It would have to be made by Congress according to the constitution of the United States, for the third power given under the clause of the constitution deals with this and declares that only Congress can regulate such a matter. Congress cannot merely inaugurate but it can modify a treaty, and as Mr. Hitt the other day said: "If we do not like a treaty or if we find it act unfairly we can change it." What is the meaning of "change it?" Does it not mean to go back on it after probably doing any amount of damage to Canada? and after we had overturned a system under which we are prospering? The people of the United States would put the interpretation of power upon any arrangement we would make with them, and then, Sir, we would not be in the position that we are to-day. When the hon. member for Cumberland and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain went down to Washington if they made a treaty binding Canada what would we feel in regard to it? Why, we know well, that in regard to any instrument that the United States authorities had put their seals to, and that the plenipotentiaries representing Canada and England had put their seals to also, that the lion of England would look on and see that it was observed. Then, Sir, we would find that loyalty was a practical thing.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, "hear, hear." That lion is as powerful and as strong as ever it was and in any arrangement that we may make, as long as we are true to our position as members of a great Empire, we have the power of England to see that we are not handicapped and that our agreement is going to be carried out by the other side. But, Sir, suppose the agreement that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is made, and that we are to have a reciprocity treaty arranged to suit the Americans in the respect as pointed out by my hon. friend's plan that we ought to have duties of our own on the seaboard. Suppose that happens, what will be the result? We have admitted the United States manufacturers free, we have discriminated against England, we have discriminated against our fellow colonists of the Empire and we have discriminated against the whole world in favor of the United States, and then if the United States after a few years should say to us: "I see

you have the advantage"—as I admit we ought to have the advantages in distinction from the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright's) plan—"You must put up your tariff to the same height as ours." We may say: "This is not in the agreement;" but they will tell us: "Congress is going to take that course and you will have to follow suit." And suppose Congress does insist, can we go to England and ask her to help us to make the people of America carry out the agreement? Would not England say: "You have repudiated me, you have discriminated against me, how can you ask me to help you to do this thing?" We then would be abandoned and by either the arrangement which the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) or the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) proposes, we would put ourselves in chancery and we would be like the rabbit in the wild cat's paw. Is that a position that my French-Canadian friends or the other members of this House would wish to place themselves in? I have before me the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Ingersoll. I once spoke in Ingersoll and I know what a hot bed of liberalism it is, but I notice that in all that speech where he deals with this question completely and where he lays down what the possibilities would be he does not receive a single cheer. I state here that I do not believe that on this question the Reform party of Canada will follow the hon. gentlemen opposite in the disloyal course they are taking.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Well the next election will tell you as the bye-elections have told you about commercial union. What is the difference between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity: very little indeed unless it is the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) goes from the disloyal cry to annexation and he does not think his policy would lead to annexation, but in speaking at Ingersoll his leader said, speaking on the danger of annexation: "There is a risk I cannot overlook, but it is a choice of risks and our present position is anything but one of stable equilibrium." The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says: That those who say it would bring about annexation only admit that annexation would be a very fine thing, and that having got so much of reciprocity we then would be most anxious to go in for annexation." Sir, I have shown you that if we went in for unrestricted reciprocity we would be in such a position that the wolf would be constantly complaining that the lamb trouble the stream. Any one who has given attention to political economy knows that you cannot in regard to any article of import or export make a tariff that can last for five, or four, or two years even. In anything so delicate as the exchanges between countries, the most skilful arrangement of tariff will be close and clumsy, and, therefore, we never can be certain that changes may not have to be made. If we once took this step which is proposed we would simply be helpless in the hands of Americans. What would we have to do under such circumstances? Why, Sir, every year we would have to send delegates to Washington to wait in the lobbies there to get their orders to bring back to this House The Parliament of Canada, which is now as free as any Parliament that exists in the world, and the next Parliament in importance as it is of English-speaking men to the Parliament which meets at Westminster, that Parliament which has looked forward to such great things from this country, would have to send down its delegates to the lobbies and treat with fair and unfair lobbyists until the senators had decided what our fate was. Very naturally, if this were the case, we would say: "Let us get rid of this, anything is better than this state of things," and we would be ready to go in for annexation. Then about the

Mr. DAVIN.

"better terms" which my friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said some Conservatives expected some years hence. I do not think I need deal with that. No Conservative, I fancy, looks forward in that way, and if he does he would not be worthy of the name of a Conservative, and not much worthy of the name of a Canadian either. The hon. gentleman then dwelt with the question of revenue and I am bound to say that he dealt with it in a very gingerly manner. He pointed out that we would lose right off over \$7,000,000 under the arrangement proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) both tariffs being the same. And if it happened as Mr. Blake said it should be that we would get all our imports from the States and send our exports there, where would our revenue be? We should have to go in for direct taxation, which the hon. gentleman says he does not fear. Well, as the hon. Minister of the Interior pointed out, there is no taxation the incidence of which is so unfair. An income tax is very unfairly collected, it depends so much on the honesty of the men on whom it is imposed. The hon. gentleman says he does not fear it, but I venture to say the people of the country will. He talked about the danger to our shipping. Why, Sir, of course our shipping would disappear, if we got all or the bulk of our imports from the United States. Imports and exports have to pretty nearly balance each other; you have to pay for imports with exports, and if we are going to trade with the United States, all our business would have to be done over lines of railway and not in ships, and so our shipping would disappear. Then, Sir, he alluded to Imperial Federation. Well, I do not think Imperial Federation is up here. If it were, one might be inclined to say something on it; but I have no desire to go out of the record. Now, Sir, I will call the attention of the House to a view of this question that has not yet been touched on. It is admitted by the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk, that there would be a danger of annexation. Now, Sir, I have never been afraid of annexation, for this reason, that I know very well that the United States have no desire to commit the blunder of forcibly attempting to annex the people of Canada. In the first place, they would fail; and in the next place, if they succeeded they would have a very unmanageable Ireland on their hands, and other elements of discord and disruption that are working in their midst at the present moment, would make themselves felt. Now, Sir, there is an important question that bears on this subject. If a sensible man were going to make a new departure, he would ask himself, is it likely to have the element of permanence? Is it sure, Sir? Can we be certain that the future of the United States is assured? Are there no clouds upon the horizon? Prof. Gillian and Judge Tourgée have written books showing the enormous growth of the black population of the South. They have shown that there are now eight black republics on the hands of the United States, where the blacks are in a majority. They have shown that the negroes are increasing at a ratio far in excess of the increase of the whites from immigration and from natural increase, and Judge Tourgée calculates that in 1900, the very period at which the imagination of my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk fired, the blacks will actually outnumber the whites in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen may laugh and say "oh" to that; but if they will take the trouble to read those books, written by the first men in the United States, and if they will give so humble and so illiterate a person as myself some credit for appreciating an argument of the kind, it will probably be as creditable to their intelligence as any utterances of that sort that they may indulge in. I say, Sir, under those circumstances, with an element in the United States calculated to give rise to disturbance, an ele-

ment no counterpart of which exists in Canada, with the black population increasing at a ratio that menaces the future of the Republic, it would be a most monstrous thing on the part of Canada to throw in her lot with the United States. And, Sir, let us make no concealment about this. The real issue, the issue underneath this movement, the important issue, is: Shall we take a step that will land Canada into the United States and make this country part and parcel of it? There is not a man of any reflection in the country who does not know that that is the real issue, and the reason hon. gentlemen are so intent on saying that that is not the issue is because they know that the young men of Canada—aye, and the old men too—the men of the Reform party—the greater part of them, no less than those of the Conservative party, for there are 7,000 of them that have not bowed the knee to Baal—are loyal to Canada and have faith in Canada's future. When I read originally the speeches made by my friend Mr. Goldwin Smith, by Mr. Wiman, by my friend the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, about all that this thing would do for Canada, I was amazed; and when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford the other night dilate on the enormous progress, the vast expansion, that would take place if his policy were carried out, it reminded me of one of those blood-curdling incidents of the old German ballads, where we see a young maid dressed in bridal robes, full of hope, full of life and splendor and joy, but the bridegroom proves to be a skeleton, and the marriage couch the cold earth. These gentlemen come and talk to Canada to this young nation, of untold wealth, of unmeasured prosperity, of delusive progress, of intoxicating dreams; and what do they ask her to do in order to attain all this? To shiver her solid existing prosperity—to realise aggrandisement by extinction—to live a tuller life by walking into her tomb. But, Sir, I tell these preposterous propagandists of a contemptible pessimism, who whine out that Canada is doomed

"The grave's not dug where traitor hands shall lay
In fearful haste her murdered corse away."

No, Sir, Canada's future is secure. She is still young; but the day of maturity is at hand; and centuries hence, when the historian shall have marked with a pen of indelible scorn the character of this movement, her heart will be strong, her life vigorous, she will go forward in ever-expanding progress, beauty's ensign purple on her lips and on her cheek, and the day remote beyond human ken "when death's pale flag will be advanced there."

Mr. LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly the most important question that has been discussed in this Parliament since Confederation, and it would be presumption on my part to attempt to add any arguments in support of reciprocity after the eloquent and elaborate speeches which we have had the pleasure of hearing from several members of this House. But, Sir, the reasons which have been urged in support of the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford apply so forcibly to the Province of Quebec that I think many voices should be heard from that quarter. It is thought in certain sections of the country that the Province of Quebec did not take any interest in that matter. Even the earliest advocate of reciprocity wrote a pamphlet in which he asserted that the present attitude of the Province of Quebec is one of isolation, and went on to say that if isolation in commerce would make a people great, then the destiny of the Province of Quebec, in her present frame of mind, was one of superlative greatness. I must say at once that this opinion is entirely incorrect. It was no doubt asserted in good faith, and for that very reason it becomes the more necessary to repudiate it as damaging to the cause of reciprocity as well as to the Province of Quebec. In no class of the people there, does any such desire of isolation exist, either politically or commercially. A friend of mine was telling me some time ago that he would favor political an-

nexation to the United States, because he felt himself lost in the Province of Quebec among the French Canadians. I can say this for my countrymen, that they do not think they are lost in Canada; yet, although they are surrounded by an English population, if it were a bad thing to be so surrounded, they would not think it much worse whether the surrounding people were called American or British, and they would consider it a great blessing if a close relation of some kind were effected with the United States which would bring prosperity to their homes. I do not say this to express any desire to sever our political connection with Great Britain. I am an admirer of British rule. I do not think we could have a better form of government than the one we now enjoy. One single reform would make that Government a model one, and that reform would be commercial independence. If we had commercial independence, we would have nothing to envy anybody. Yet we must not be blind to the truth. We must see things as they are. The time when the very name of the United States was a bugbear in some parts of the Province of Quebec has gone by. At that time it was thought a sin to think of closer relations with our neighbors, but since then the sinners have become so numerous that we have had to strike that sin off our list. There is not perhaps one family out of ten in French Canada, which has not one or more of its members now residing in the United States, and I can say without exaggeration that there is nearly one-third of the whole French-Canadian population now residing in the United States, some permanently and some temporarily. These people know well all the advantages that would be derived from closer relations with that country. It is there they go for money when they are penniless. It is with American money they pay off the mortgages on their farms, and I can say this, that there has been in some parts of the Eastern townships of Quebec so much money sent by Canadians from the neighboring Republic that it reduced the rate of interest. Twelve or 15 years ago, it was a common thing to see money lent at 10 or 12 per cent. on mortgages. Now 8 per cent. is a very heavy rate. I must also say that in some of these localities the agricultural interest is in such a state of depression, particularly in places where the farms are not very good that one-half of the farms would have been abandoned by this, if the United States were not there as a place of reserve in case of need. Under these conditions, it is impossible that the Province of Quebec should have any desire to remain isolated from the other Provinces. On the contrary, that province is quite ready to help in any movement tending to improve its condition, and in support of this statement I might mention, without looking further back than a few months ago, that at the Provincial Conference held in Quebec and, of which the idea started from Quebec, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was recommended by the representatives of the Quebec Government as well as by the leading men of most of the other Provinces. (Now, before speaking of the advantages which would result from reciprocity, I cannot help answering one great objection which is made against that policy. It is said by the adversaries of reciprocity that it will discriminate unfairly against Great Britain. I cannot, for one moment, admit this. I am sure that if we had that reciprocity, it would stimulate our business to such an extent that before many years we would do far more business with Great Britain than we do now. Yet supposing that assertion be true, we can fairly reply that England does not discriminate in our favor. England treats us just as she treats every nation on the face of the earth, and it would not be in her interest to discriminate in our favor. In support of this proposition, we might well use the argument which has been used by the First Minister, when discussing a policy which was improperly called the National Policy. As a self-governing people, he said, we have a right to consult our own interests first.

This argument will be conclusive of itself, but there are many illustrations of its force. Let us recollect some of the events in the past, and we will see that the motive power of politics in this country has always been self interests. We, in Quebec, are not in the same position as the other Provinces of Confederation, and I speak more from the Quebec point of view than from the general point of view. In 1760, when Canada was conquered by England, was it through a motive of love, was it through any kindly feeling that Canada was taken away from French domination and made an English colony? Surely it was then self interest that dictated England's policy. After that we were governed several years by military rule. Surely that rule was not inflicted on us through a motive of justice, but purely through self interest. Whether rightly or wrongly, it was thought better to treat in that way the conquered. I do not complain of that, but I say it tends to prove my theory. After that again, in 1864, when the standard of rebellion was raised among our neighbors, England thought fit to deal with us more fairly, and we were then granted the British North America Act. We were given back our French civil law, and we were exempted from the test oath. It was surely again interest that dictated such a policy. It was the fear of seeing us join the rebellion. It might be said that in our history there are some exceptions, but those exceptions will only confirm the rule. At the same time, when the twelve States sent delegates to their first Congress in Philadelphia, what was their first move? They passed resolutions remonstrating with the Imperial Government for the charter which had been granted to this country. It was not in their interest that they did that, and it was soon after proved, and they soon afterwards understood it themselves. A very little word thoughtlessly spoken prevented us from joining them. Soon after, they voted three addresses, one to the King and one to the people of Great Britain justifying the action they had taken, and a third to the Canadians. In that address they expressed very different views than those contained in their resolutions. They offered us as many privileges and advantages as has been granted us by England, and in that they acted according to their interest, but it was too late. I might say that all and every important event of our history will prove that the motive power of politics in this country has always been interest. We have fought for years for rights which have been admitted to be just and legitimate. We have fought for British rights and they were granted to us. England yielded to our just demand when she thought it was her interest to do so, when it was seen that the game was a very expensive one. I do not say those things to recriminate. I do not expect that we would have been treated any better by any other nation on the face of the globe, but I say that this theory is a common axiom of common sense. I admit that for fifty years we have been most fairly treated. We have enjoyed great freedom, and under no other flag than the British flag would we have been better treated, and I do not deny that we owe gratitude to England, but in a case of interest like this, our debt of gratitude is not so enormous that we should sacrifice our own interest, not even for England but for a certain number of her manufactures. It is a very strange argument to hear the hon. gentlemen on the other side not saying that reciprocity would be bad for Canada, but that it would be bad for England. It appears that we are very rich, and that we must do this for the sake of poor England. As I have heard here in this House, not only loyalty but charity begins at home. Now, before enumerating some of the advantages which I think would result from reciprocity, I think I should answer a few of the other objections which have been made to the motion presented by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman who preceded me began his brilliant address by a long citation from one Mr. Ritchie

Mr. LAVERGNE.

of Ohio, and that Mr. Ritchie, it appears, knows our country very well. He made a very brilliant exposition of our wealth, of our natural resources, of our mines, our beautiful rivers, in fact, of all our natural wealth he made the most brilliant picture; but I would have been most happy to hear that citation continued up to the end, to hear the conclusion of that citation, and I would have been very much surprised if Mr. Ritchie did not conclude that this immense wealth, these immense resources wanted to be developed, and that the best way of developing these immense resources was by the way of reciprocity or commercial union. There can be no doubt that this gentleman made this brilliant exposition with an end and with a desire, and what desire could it have been if not a desire of participating in those immense resources. Now, we are told, that we are a young country. I will admit that, as far as growth is concerned, we are a very young country, but as far as age is concerned, we are not so much younger than the country adjacent to us. The hon. gentleman had the advantage of being born in a country far more important than this, and perhaps we have over him the advantage of knowing the history of this country a little further back, and, if I have been well taught, and I think I have been correctly taught in that fact, I think this country was settled over three hundred years ago and not one hundred years ago. We have been also told that it is not true that we pay duty on all importations and pay duty on all exportations, and the proof in support of that is that it is against all the principles of political economy. I could not see any conclusions arrived at by the hon. gentleman. Yet, if the hon. gentleman was here, I would relate to him something which occurred in my county, and to my personal knowledge. One of my present constituents, in 1878, was a great Conservative, a great admirer of the Conservative policy, and endorsed protection. That man happened to be a farmer and a cattle dealer. He endorsed that policy, and made a great deal of noise in his parish, and perhaps he made conquests of electors for his party. In 1882, after having driven his cattle to the United States at different times, he began to think that policy was not as sound as he thought at the beginning. He began to find out and was able to make out who it was that was paying the duty. In 1882 he voted, but he did not brag any more. He did not say anything. In 1885 there was a local election in that county, and mixing up both Governments, holding both Administrations, which were both Conservative, responsible for their faults, he did not vote at all. Then he began to understand that it was the farmers who were paying the duty on the cattle he was driving to the United States. In 1887 he was one of my strong supporters. I will not follow the hon. gentleman on all the grounds he has gone through. He has taken us from the Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. Certainly he has displayed a vast amount of knowledge, and I can say that I have admired his brilliant expositions, but owing to my own deficiency, owing, perhaps, to my not understanding his language, which is not my own, I could not see the bearing of all he said. Now, I have heard an hon. member of this House speak of inconsistency. Although the hon. gentleman for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not present at this moment, I wish to remark that citing speeches made ten or fifteen years ago are no great answer to serious arguments. If we were to argue on that line, I would have to ask the hon. member if he always held the same opinions he does now of the administration of the right hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, it has been said that we are in a very prosperous condition, and, therefore, we do not need a change. In support of that argument we have had extracts read from a speech of the Hon. George Brown, made ten or fifteen years ago. I do not say that I share the opinions of that gentleman at that time, but I say that speeches made ten or fifteen years ago are no answer to arguments made to-day. Now, I

come to the real point at issue—would it be to our interest to have reciprocity? Perhaps it has been thought that I was not friendly towards England and was aiming at some change in our political position, in the beginning of my remarks. That was far from my object. I sincerely believe that if we wished for a political change in this country, we could find no better mode of bringing it about than by maintaining our present trade relations with the United States. It is to be remembered that in the Province of Quebec, French-Canadians do not hold the same sentiments of attachment to England as English-Canadians. We all admit that we owe a debt of gratitude to England, but we know very well that in this question there is not the same feeling in the Province of Quebec as may exist in the other Provinces. If our present trade relations continue for 25 years, not only will one-third of our population be found in the States, as at present, but the majority will be there. There will be a temptation for them who are not of a British origin, who do not make such a great difference between Americans and Englishmen, there would be a temptation for them to say that they would like as well to have Washington for their headquarters as London. Would it not be a temptation for them to say that they saw more convenience, and, perhaps, more advantage, in having their metropolis at Washington than across the ocean? I do not say that we have any such desire, I do not say that we even think of annexation, but I say that if the present situation continues for a long time, certainly there will be temptation toward a political change. If we are true patriots, if we desire the Provinces to remain united, we should adopt some means to prevent the disintegration of this Dominion. I say, Sir, that the best means of obtaining such a result is to improve our trade relations by commercial reciprocity with the United States. Certainly we cannot say that the National Policy has been a success in this country; I cannot say it has been a success in the Province of Quebec. In the city of Montreal, perhaps, some new industries have been established, and perhaps in a few other places; but I would not say that even in the city of Quebec the manufacturing industries have been promoted by protection. There are natural industries in the city of Quebec that live by themselves, they are established on solid foundations, and reciprocity would not affect them in any way. There are also, perhaps, a few manufactures in the city of St. Hyacinthe, and I know that my hon. friend who represents that county will support the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. But, Sir, where are the manufactures in the rural constituencies of the Province of Quebec. When that policy was inaugurated we were promised that it would not only benefit Montreal, that it would not only benefit three or four cities in the Province of Quebec, but it was to benefit the whole Province. Where is the increase of population? Where is the decrease in the immigration of our countrymen? There is none. Where are the promised industries in the rural constituencies? There are none. I say the situation is worse than it was ten years ago. The people naturally look for a change in order to better their actual position. This agitation was commenced in the Province of Ontario, and it has not been carried to the same extent in Quebec. Yet the echoes of that agitation have reached us, it has reached all the Canadian homes, it has reached all the fathers who have seen more than half of their families leaving their home for the neighboring Republic. I have visited a certain number of localities in my constituency, and when I have spoken of reciprocity, I have pleased the people immensely. They recollect the prosperity we enjoyed when we had a partial measure of reciprocity before. They know that reciprocity means about 20 per cent. increase in the value of their products; they know that if they have horses, cattle, oats, potatoes, poultry, hay, lumber, to sell, they will get for all these articles at least 20 per cent. more. They

know it from experience. Now, Sir, it is said that farmers do not pay anything of that taxation in the way of duty. I think it is easy to show that they pay an enormous taxation. I will only give an example on that point. I will take the counties near the St. Lawrence River—Champlain, Montmagny, Berthier and Laprairie—in which counties the people produce a large quantity of hay. It is not unusual for some farmers to sell as much as 100 tons of hay in a year. Many of the farmers in the Province of Quebec have sold their hay in the United States, in fact it may be said that the hay of the Province generally goes to the States. A farmer who ships a hundred tons of hay has to pay a duty of \$200. If a farmer, sends a horse there worth \$100 he has to pay \$20; on \$200 worth of cattle he is compelled to pay \$40. If he sells three hundred bushels of peas, which is not an excessive quantity, the duty will amount to \$45. Let me say here that the farmers understand as to who pays the duty. I will not say more on the point, except that I am satisfied that a farmer in comfortable position will pay \$300 a year duties on products shipped to the United States. Our geographical position also impells us to the adoption of this policy. Grant that our facilities of commerce are equal to the demand, although I do not think that they are at the present time, for neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor the Intercolonial answer the demands of commerce, the people of the Maritime Provinces could not trade with any advantage with the people of the North West or British Columbia, and not even with the people of Ontario. I might go further, and say that although there is plenty of flour to be purchased in Ontario, yet in spite of the tariff wall erected, the Province of Quebec, not further back than 1886, brought over \$100,000 worth of flour in the United States, paying a duty of \$54,000. On some occasions Quebec has not been able to raise sufficient breadstuffs for her people, and on those occasions she has found it more advantageous to deal with the States than with the neighboring Province of Ontario. Is it not, moreover, a fact that Ontario buys a large quantity of coal from the State of Pennsylvania? It will be unnecessary for me to discuss at length the interests of the fishermen in this question, for they have able advocates here; yet I may say that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces find it more advantageous to deal with the New England States, and the Americans are their best customers even in spite of a tariff of 30 per cent. In regard to the lumber interest, we have heard the statement of gentlemen of experience and who are engaged in that business, and while it will be needless for me to go over the ground again, I may remark that the farmers of Quebec are highly interested because they have yet large tracts of forest, and when they clear their lands they have to destroy good timber, and if they could obtain a fair return for the timber they would be largely benefited. The adoption of such a policy as is proposed might, perhaps, be advantageous to the manufacturers of Montreal and perhaps to two or three small places, but the majority of the people, the great bulk of the people, would derive immense benefit from such a policy. It appears at the present time as if this country is to be administered for the benefit of a small minority of its inhabitants. Everybody will admit that if the rural portion of the country were in a prosperous condition, if the farmers were prosperous, the laborers and mechanics who live among them would also be prosperous; and if all those classes were prosperous, certainly the country merchants would be prosperous, and if they were prosperous surely the city and wholesale merchants would also be prosperous. Thus the whole country would immensely benefit by the introduction of such a policy. I am satisfied that the objections made to this proposition will disappear if the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government choose to advocate such a measure, and not one out of 25 of his supporters would fail to follow him, in fact

they would all fall into line very quickly. The Premier would earn the gratitude of almost the whole people of Canada if he were to confer such a boon on this country. I go further, and say that in regard to political power—and we are not interested in saying this—if the hon. gentleman would advocate that cause and carried it to a successful conclusion he would secure power for himself and his friends for the remainder of his life, which I hope will be a long one. But even supposing it had not that result, but that his friends and supporters who are the manufacturers and monopolists of the country should turn against him and forget past favors, suppose that they should not support him any longer, which is most improbable and almost impossible, nevertheless the carrying of such a policy to a successful conclusion would be a glorious ending to his career. The hon. gentleman would certainly acquire a name and fame unequalled in this country. And, Sir, he would follow an example which he need not disdain. He would follow the example of another Tory—an English Tory—whose name is cherished in the old country, would follow the example of Sir Robert Peel. When the corn laws were abolished in 1846 by the Imperial Parliament Sir Robert Peel uttered some memorable words, and the right hon. gentleman would have a right to say as Sir Robert Peel said at that time in the words which I will cite:

"I shall leave a name execrated I know by every monopolist who will maintain protection for his own individual benefit, but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes breathed with expressions of good will in the homes of those whose lot it is to labor and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow; when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundance of unprotected food, the sweeter, because it is in no manner leavened by sense of injustice."

Those noble words have not found any echo on the Treasury benches of this House for ten years, yet, Sir, it is better late than never. Now, Sir, I will answer to another objection which is made. It is said, and truly said, that we cannot make that treaty alone. It is said that we have to obtain the consent of the other contracting party, but I may say this that there are in the neighboring country some advocates of this proposition, and that we should not for a moment be discouraged if we meet with some difficulties, because we are assured that this cause which we now advocate will be beneficial to both countries and it ought to carry victory in the end. If we do not succeed as soon as we would like to yet we will triumph in the end if we are like the men who entered the Corn Law League in England. If we work with patriotism for the good of this country, if we work with the same energy as men like the Cobdens, the Brights, the Villiers and others have worked when they decided they would have free trade in England; if we work as those men did we are sure to carry victory, and, Sir, if we do not carry victory to-day, and if our active efforts result only in a simple expression of opinion, yet it will be a step—a great step—in the right direction.

Mr. McNEILL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, March 19, 1888.

No. 13.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 19th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Henry Corby, Esq., for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Hastings.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

FOOD ADULTERATION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This alteration is chiefly in consequence of a ruling by Judge Dugas, of Montreal, that baking powder is not an article of food. Some baking powders are positively injurious, and prosecutions to prevent their sale cannot be successful without this amendment. It would also enable samples to be taken in wholesale stores of chicory, pepper dust, and other adulterants, and perhaps lead to preventing their sale. The object of this amendment is to qualify as analysts before the courts the members of the examining board who are appointed by the Government to examine as to the qualifications of applicants for the position of public analysts. The present examiners are Dr. Girdwood, Professor Marsan and the Chief Analyst, and it seems only reasonable that their position should in no respect be inferior to that of the candidates who may pass their examination. The assistants to the chief analyst appointed by the Government must undergo the same examination as the public analysts, and they are equally well qualified to appear in court and give evidence. This amendment authorises Council to appoint special collectors in addition to those indicated by the Act. The latter being generally resident where the samples are collected, are well known to vendors of food, &c., in the same place, and may not succeed in getting fair samples of the goods actually sold. Should Council appoint special inspectors they would travel over such a wide area that they would not be readily recognisable. This alteration

is for the purpose of effecting a division of labor in examining the various samples collected; for as drugs and fertilisers are so numerous and varied that it is impossible for any one analyst to keep himself informed regarding the composition and adulterations of all of them, and to be thoroughly practised and skilful in their examination. New methods for this are being continually proposed and adopted, and new literature is continually being published regarding the various branches. If it were made possible for each analyst to confine his reading, his analyses and researches to one department of the science, he would become much more skilful and experienced in it than his fellows, and his word would have the greater value. There are eight public analysts, besides the chief analyst and his two assistants. This staff might be made much more efficient by each member of it having his attention confined to the examination of only a certain class of the substances referred to in the Act, and it is to make this possible that the amendment has been framed. There are many substances liable to adulteration which are not included under foods, drugs and fertilisers. Soap, soda and white lead may be mentioned as instances of such articles which might be subjected to inspection as soon as any Order in Council issued to that effect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) further to amend the law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases. He said: Last Session an Act was passed making final the decisions of the courts of this country in criminal matters, and it has been considered expedient to define more exactly and precisely than was done by that Act that the provision pertains to appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council. The present Bill, therefore, merely amends the short Act adopted last Session by introducing these words:

No appeal shall be brought in any criminal case from any judgment or authority or order of any court in Canada to any Court of Appeal by which in the United Kingdom appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council may be heard.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIABILITY OF CARRIERS BY WATER.

Mr. MADILL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 49) to amend the Act respecting the liability of Carriers by Water. He said: The Bill is one in the interests of the settlers on islands and coasts depending upon common carriers by water for mails, provisions and supplies. It is introduced for the purpose of preventing common carriers from refusing to carry the freights, provisions and supplies along the routes and land passengers at the advertised rates, and imposing a penalty for any infraction of the rules or any discrimination against the settlers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC PAPERS.

Mr. TROW. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I wish to make a suggestion in reference to the unusual de-

mands which are made throughout the country for copies of *Hansard*. I think there is scarcely any member of the House who has not received applications for copies of the *Debates* containing the interesting debate which is now in progress. I question whether there has been a debate since Confederation which has attracted more attention throughout the Dominion. The distributor has received communications from members of Congress and others in the United States, asking for copies of the *Debates*; and I think that while the type is standing, very reasonable terms could be made with the printer for an extra number of copies for distribution. The whole country is interested in this debate, and I hope the Minister who has charge of the matter will allow a few more thousand copies to be printed for circulation. It is utterly impossible to supply at present the number of people who are applying daily, not merely for the speeches on one side, but those on both sides. It might be well to have the whole of the speeches compiled at the close of the debate in pamphlet form.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to enquire of the Government when some further papers, which seem to be exceedingly important in connection with the Fishery Treaty, are going to be brought before the House? I have in my hand what purports to be a copy of some papers which have been laid before the British Parliament by the British Government; and among them I find a very important document which I do not think this Parliament has seen yet. It is the instructions of Lord Salisbury to the commissioners. We have already had laid before the House the powers from the British Government to the plenipotentiaries; but I find there was issued on the same date, the 24th October last, very important instructions from Lord Salisbury to the commissioners. You will remember that the powers which were laid before the House referred to the plenipotentiaries' dealings with "all or any questions relating to rights of fishery," "and any other questions which may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorised by their Government to consider and adjust." Now, there is nothing in the papers which have been so far laid before the House, to show that the plenipotentiaries were authorised to consider or adjust anything but the matters relating to the rights of the fisheries. However, I find from these instructions of Lord Salisbury that there were special powers given to the commissioners outside of the fishery question. Here is one clause of these instructions:

"Whilst I have judged it advisable thus, in the first place, to refer to the question of the fisheries of the Atlantic coast, it is not the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the discussions of the plenipotentiaries should necessarily be confined to that point alone; but full liberty is given to you to enter upon the consideration of any questions which may bear upon the issues involved, and to discuss and treat for any equivalents, whether by means of tariff concessions or otherwise, which the United States plenipotentiaries may be authorised to consider as a means of settlement."

Now, it must be apparent how very important this document is to the discussion of the very question which is now before Parliament, and I am sure it is a great slight cast upon this Parliament by the Government and those entrusted—

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman to limit himself to his question, stating what papers he wants and what importance these papers are for the conduct of the business of this House. I have already drawn the attention of hon. members to the fact that these questions ought not be made the occasion of a speech, and I must see that the rule is respected.

Mr. EDGAR. I bow to your decision, Sir. I only wish to point out that whereas those matters have been laid before the English Parliament, they should at the earliest moment be laid before this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had limited himself to that remark, I would have answered Mr. Trow.

him at once. The attention of the First Minister will be called to the hon. gentleman's remarks as soon as he comes in.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) made recently a suggestion which I think we ought to carry out, with regard to a larger publication of this debate. There is no doubt a very large demand for further copies of the speeches in this debate on reciprocity. I do not know that the Government can do anything, but it would be well to call the attention of the Debates Committee to this matter, and suggest that they might see their way to have a larger number of copies printed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman has said, this matter is not in the hands of the Government, and this Parliament had decided before that a certain number of the debates should be printed each day and distributed. The debate on this subject was not foreseen, and the House did, therefore, not see fit to order an additional number of copies. The debate has now gone on for three days, and I suppose a complete edition would be required. Of course, if the Printing Committee think proper to move in the matter, they may take it up at the next sitting.

Mr. TROW. I understand the type is not distributed, and consequently the whole debate can be put in print again at a very reasonable figure, which it could not be after the type is distributed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention of the Committee is called to it, and no doubt they will take the matter up.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the kind permission of the hon. gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate (Mr. McNeill), I wish to make a short personal explanation with reference to the charge brought against me by the hon. gentleman who followed me in this debate (Mr. Foster), concerning my action upon the resolution before the House. I had not the opportunity of hearing the speech of the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Foster), as I was not in the House when it was delivered, nor did I see the report of his speech until Saturday. Otherwise I would have taken opportunity to make my explanation before this. In his remarks, the hon. gentleman charged me with having, in this House, advocated the resolution submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), although a few months ago I had denounced, in the most severe terms, the policy it embodied. The hon. gentleman made this charge, based on a quotation from a newspaper report, assuming the report to be correct, and argued from this that I could not be sincere or honest in the opinions I have expressed in this House. I desire to say that there is no foundation whatever for the charge made by the hon. gentleman. I desire to say that the remarks I made in this House in support of the resolution of my hon. friend for South Oxford, are not at all at variance with the position I took and the remarks I made before the Charlottetown Board of Trade.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in order if he is speaking to the amendment before the House, but otherwise he is not.

Mr. DAVIES. I am speaking with the kind permission of the hon. gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend, Mr. McNeill, has no power to give that permission, and I maintain the hon. gentleman is not in order unless he is speaking to the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES. It is a personal explanation I am making.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not. It is an answer to a speech delivered in reply to the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman is now combatting the argument presented to this House by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. These personal explanations are usually allowed, because they partake of the nature of questions of privilege. If an hon. member rises to deny that he made certain statements imputed to him during a debate, he is allowed to do so, but he ought to limit himself to a formal denial. He must not proceed to deliver a speech on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would have taken the opportunity, which is often taken by hon. gentlemen, of rising to make an explanation when the Orders of the Day were called, but I understood from your remarks, Sir, the other day that such was not considered to be the proper course; and as I am not going to take up any time and my hon. friend has kindly given way to me.

Mr. McNEILL I simply understood my hon. friend to say that he wished to make merely a personal explanation.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is right. I desire simply to make a personal explanation that I had not previously the opportunity of making, with reference to the very serious charge brought up against me of inconsistency by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman, quoting from a summary report of the proceedings before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, which appeared in a Conservative paper, and in which I am set down as having said, that unrestricted reciprocity is impracticable and impossible and that the Americans were not such arrant fools as to grant it, and taking this report as correct, proceeded to ask what weight, could be attached to any arguments I might use in this House in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, after that statement I had made before the Board of Trade of Charlottetown, a few months ago denouncing any such policy. The hon. gentleman said:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade—"

Mr. FOSTER. I never said that.

Mr. DAVIES. I am reading the quotation which the hon. gentleman read.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you not say so?

Mr. DAVIES. That is what I intended to convey. I was reading the quotation on which the hon. gentleman based his statement:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would retain the right to frame its own tariff as against the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent tariff, while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent. The immediate consequence would be that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the States by way of Montreal. To this the States, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent. An unrestricted reciprocity, although it would suit us as well as commercial union, was, therefore, impracticable."

That was the quotation. Now, I did not make use of such language as is here reported. I used that language with a very strongly pronounced and distinct qualification, which was clearly understood when I stated it. The board of trade were discussing several proposals for obtaining free trade relations with the United States. Some were in favor of commercial union, and some in favor of the scheme known as unrestricted reciprocity. A portion expressed their desire to have the freest trade relations between Canada and the United States that could be obtained, similar to the

freedom of trade which existed between State and State, so that there should be no custom houses on the border, and that not only the United States goods should be passed free, but that all goods, whether they were manufactured in Canada or in the United States or abroad, should be passed free. These same people wished also to retain, if possible, in the hands of Canada the right to maintain our tariff and to regulate it as we pleased. In answer to that, I told them that such a scheme of unrestricted reciprocity was impracticable and impossible, that if Canada retains a tariff of 25 per cent., and the United States a tariff of 35 per cent., and you have no custom houses between the two countries, the whole of the importations will naturally come into that part of the country which has the least tariff, and that the country to the south of us which has the higher tariff would not be such arrant fools as to assent to any such arrangement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is cheered. That is common sense and plain fact, and what I said then I repeat in this House, and I say that the proposition which we have now before us is not that proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hardly think, Mr. Speaker, that this interruption is quite fair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that the proposition which is now before the House, made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), does not contain the only objection and the fatal objection which I then pointed out, and which I said would render the scheme impracticable, and I simply desire in closing to say that, when I had resumed my speech before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, I moved a resolution at the close of my remarks which shows pretty clearly what I intended, what I was understood to say, and what I did say, although, in the Conservative paper from which my hon. friend quotes, I am not as fully reported as I ought to have been. I moved:

"That this board warmly approves of reciprocal free trade with the United States on the broadest possible basis, including the abolition of the restriction on the coasting trade and the transfer of vessel property, and embracing the concession to the Americans of the common right with our fishermen to use our fisheries."

That was the statement I made there, and the statement which I repeat again.

Mr. FOSTER. I have only to thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to this, and for the lucid explanation he has made of his own words. I do not think it requires any more remarks from me.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, and on the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. McNEILL. As I understand that many hon. members desire to take part in this debate, I shall endeavor to make the remarks I desire to make to the House as short as possible. In the first instance, I think we may all feel satisfied to know that, for once in the history of this Parliament at least, all parties in this House are agreed upon one point—the Liberal-Conservative party on this side of the House; the Rouge party, which I hope I may say without offence, is more particularly represented by the courteous and eloquent and able gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House; the Grit party, led by the hon. gentleman the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); the Parti National, marshalled under the baton of the hon.

member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); the Politico-Philosophical party, if I may so express it, of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); the Insular party, so solid and firm in its allegiance to the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Davies); the party of pure political principle, so worthily led by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar); the party of detraction, of which, alas, the great leader fell in the general engagement of last year, but which is properly represented by his old supporter and lieutenant, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); the party of political morality, that great party which two Sessions ago so many hon. members opposite sought to lead that I should not then have dared to discriminate among them, but which I think I may, without offence to any one else, say, is now in this House under the worthy command of the hon. member for Gleggarry (Mr. Purcell) and his not less distinguished friend the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook); and last, but not least, the great party of one, which my hon. friend, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), delights to call the third party, but which I think most hon. members of this House would call the first party, because I am sure my hon. friend himself would admit that he, at all events, would call it a No. 1 party. We may congratulate ourselves that all these great parties are united upon one subject, are agreed upon one point, that it would be greatly to the advantage of Canada if we could obtain freer commercial relations, freer trade relations with the United States. For years past, the people of the United States kept up a great tariff wall against us. Over and over again we have entreated them to take it down, and they have just as often refused. And why have they so refused? The hon. member who moved this resolution (Sir Richard Cartwright) has told us. He has told us that they so refused to take down that tariff wall because they wished to punish the people of Canada. He has told us so in those words; he repeated the same statement before this House, but this is what he said at Ingersoll:

"We know that the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was abolished not so much because it was injurious to the United States, for on the whole both parties profited by it, as because they wanted to punish us for the sympathy some of us had displayed with the South during the rebellion."

It is true that the people of Canada—and we would have supposed, perhaps, that they were within their rights in sympathising with whomsoever they pleased—it is true that the people of Canada did sympathise at that time with the weaker side, and I think it is a somewhat interesting little bit of information that we now have from the hon. gentleman who asks us to hand ourselves over, body and bones, to the tender mercies of those same people, that the people of Canada were deliberately punished by those people because they ventured to sympathise with the South in their struggle for independence, I think, Sir, that is a little bit of information which the voters of Canada may very well mark, learn and inwardly digest. But I believe the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in his information. At the same time I wish to call attention to the fact that this is not the only reason why this great tariff wall has been upbuilt against us. It is not merely for the purpose of punishing the people of Canada; it is also for the purpose of coercing the people of Canada. It is a matter of history that this treaty was abrogated by the United States, this great tariff wall was raised up against the people of this country for the purpose of coercing the people of Canada into annexation. Now, if any hon. member on the other side of the House ventures to controvert that statement, I will take occasion to read from the utterance of the great apostle of this movement, Mr. Wiman, and you will see that he endorses what I have said. After alluding to the U. E. Loyalists, he says:

Mr. McNEILL,

"I have alluded to them because there is a tendency in the American mind to feel that isolation and the refusal to admit Canada to the privileges of the market of the United States, will have the effect of forcing them into a humble position as applicants for a political alliance. Doubtless the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 was largely influenced by this consideration."

Then, in answer, apparently, by anticipation, to observations which have since been put forward, by hon. gentlemen opposite, he goes on to say:

"But it had an effect entirely contrary—"

You will observe, these hon. gentlemen tell us that it is having that effect, and that so soon as we do away with trade restrictions, this annexation feeling, which they allege to exist in the country, will subside. He goes on:

"But it had an effect entirely contrary to that which was expected, and to-day there is not in the wide world a country more loyal in its sentiments than is Canada to British connection."

Now, there are the statements of Mr. Wiman on that point, and I venture to think that it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the bearing of this fact upon the discussion which is now proceeding in this House. I think it is essential that every hon. member in this House should bear in view the fact that this tariff has been imposed against the people of Canada by the United States, partly to punish them, and partly to coerce them into annexation. Mr. Wiman, as I have said, tells us that there are people in the United States who still hope to succeed in their attempt to coerce the people of Canada into annexation by these means, and hon. gentlemen opposite encourage these people in that opinion; hon. gentlemen opposite tell these people that if they only continue to maintain this tariff against the people of Canada, they will succeed in their end and object, and coerce us into annexation. We have heard that statement from almost every hon. member who has addressed this House during this debate. Mr. Speaker, I venture to think that the men of Canada are not made of such slight elements. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to bring this statement to the test of fact. I challenge them to take any constituency in the Province of Ontario; they may select a favorable occasion for the election, and bring out their candidate on the annexation platform, and try out the question before the people. No, Sir, they will not accept that challenge. But I do not want to be misunderstood; I do not want hon. gentlemen to think that I suggest to them to risk the loss of a seat in this honorable Chamber by any such trial as this. No, what I propose to them is that they should select the most favorable constituency in Ontario, and endeavor to elect their candidate on the annexation platform for the high office of poundkeeper, and I venture to tell them that they cannot do it and they know it well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is talking annexation?

Mr. McNEILL. But it would seem that hon. gentlemen are desirous of educating their party up to the annexation standpoint. Every speech that has been delivered from that side of the House heretofore, in this debate, bears upon the face of it, the signs and tokens of such a desire.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is not so.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says it is not so. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution told the people of Canada that Great Britain was but little able to help them; he told us that Great Britain was isolated, friendless and alone. Sir, I do not intend to discuss that question with the hon. gentleman now, it is rather a large issue. But I will give the hon. gentleman the credit of saying that I believe he was fully persuaded of the accuracy of what he said, or he would not have made that statement. Well, all I have to observe on the subject is that his having made that statement, believing it to be true, shows that he has given very superficial consideration to the subject. What did the hon. gentleman tell us next? He told us that

the people of Canada were under no obligation to England. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if the people of Canada do not owe to Great Britain their existence to-day as a great and free people. I would like to ask him if they do not owe all their rights and privileges as freemen to Great Britain. But, Sir, I will not answer the hon. gentleman in any words of my own; I will answer him in the words of a Canadian whose name, I am ashamed to say, at the present moment, I forget:

"Britain bore us in her flank,
Britain nursed us at our birth,
Britain reared us to our rank,
Mid the nations of the earth."

"In the hour of fear and dread,
In the gathering of the storm,
Britain raised above our head,
Her broad shield and stalwart arm."

"Stand, Canadians, firmly stand,
Round the flag of fatherland!"

But, Sir, I prefer to leave the statement of the hon. gentleman to be determined upon by the great universal conscience of the people of Canada. And then having so far paved the way the hon. gentleman went a step forward and he told us that we would be better off if we cast in our lot with the people of the United States. That was not anything in the nature of a proposition for annexation—Oh no! nothing of the kind; that was not leading up to annexation, as the hon. gentleman says; but he told us that, nevertheless. He took care, however, Mr. Speaker, to guard himself against the indignation of the people of this country by immediately adding that he did not want to cast in his lot with the people of the United States. My hon. friend who addressed the House a moment ago, if I mistake not, had some enthusiastic utterances in his speech somewhat tending in the same direction; and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had a passage in his speech in which he drew a glowing picture of what would happen when the two British peoples of this continent were united together. That has nothing to do with annexation either. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us that for his part he thought it would make little difference on which side of the line a man happened to reside, for the people were one and the same. And that also has nothing at all to do with annexation. The hon. gentleman who spoke last in the debate, the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) drew attention to the fact, and seemed to dwell with special unction upon it, that Washington was on this side of the Atlantic and that London was on the other side of the Atlantic, and he said that the people of Canada might think that perhaps the nearer metropolis were the more convenient of the two. But he, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentleman who led this debate, took care to guard himself immediately by saying that he hoped they would not do anything of the kind. Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not wish to be understood as alleging that any of these gentlemen desire annexation; but I do wish distinctly to say, that their speeches show that they are well aware, and they are pressed down with the consciousness that if we adopt the policy which they suggest, we run an enormous risk of annexation, and they endeavor to minimise the evils of annexation which they know in their hearts the vast overwhelming majority of their own supporters utterly disapprove. But Sir, if there be any direct proof of the statement I have just made required, I have it here. My hon. friend who addressed the House with such eloquence on Friday night referred to this statement, but I wish, with the kind permission of the House, to read again the ominous words addressed by the hon. member for South Oxford to the people of Ingersoll last October. He said:

"There is no doubt whatever in my mind, also, that we cannot overlook the risk that does undoubtedly arise, that increased commercial intercourse with the United States may strengthen the hands of those who desire to see our political system absorbed in theirs."

And he further goes on to say:

"I have no hesitation in saying, frankly, that if the United States are willing to deal with us on equitable terms the advantages to both countries, and especially to us, are so great that scarcely any sacrifice is too severe to secure them. I am as averse as any man can be to annexation, or to resign our political independence, but I cannot shut my eyes to the facts. We have greatly misused our advantages, we have been foolish in our expenditures, we have no means of satisfying the just demands of large portions of the Dominion, except through such an arrangement as commercial union."

You see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman at that time used the expression "commercial union" as synonymous with that of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have got the situation clear. This is just where we stand, and the people have for some time suspected it. This tariff is kept up against the people of this country, partly to punish them for daring to sympathise with the South in their struggle for independence, partly to coerce them into annexation, and the hon. gentleman opposite who moved this resolution has himself told us that we run an enormous risk if we adopt his own policy of putting into the hands of the United States the power to coerce us into annexation. That, I say, is just where we stand, and the people of the country have suspected it for some time. Now, Sir, they are fully agreed with Mr. Mowat, the Premier of this Province, when he says that British connection has been for Canada unmixed good; but they are not at all sure that the immersion of 5,000,000 of the people of Canada in 55,000,000 or 60,000,000 of the people of the United States would mean anything else than the subversion, the hopeless and absolute subversion of Canadian interests there, and they are at the same time perfectly satisfied that for very many reasons indeed it would be anything in the world but unmixed good, and therefore they do not sympathise with this movement to the degree in which we have been informed they do by hon. gentlemen opposite. But there is another reason why they do not sympathise with this movement. They are weak enough to have some respect for that altogether illogical and indefensible thing called sentiment, and they carry that weakness so far as actually to prefer their own country to the United States, and to prefer the members of their own family to foreigners, all of which is pure sentiment and therefore foolishness; but we must simply take matters as we find them. The people of Canada are, in my opinion, growing very suspicious indeed of this movement which has so strangely been inaugurated by persons in the United States, a new and entirely unheard of movement on their part urging Canada to enter into closer trade relations with them. I say they look upon that movement with some degree of suspicion, because they found that in the first shape it took that of commercial union. That has now been abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite and repudiated by them. The people found that it was, in point of fact, simply a thinly disguised attempt upon the part of those persons in the United States to accomplish by "slyly climbing into the branches" what the people of the United States have themselves told us they had failed to accomplish by violently shaking the tree: in other words, Sir, they have come to the conclusion that this movement in favor of commercial union was simply an attempt on the part of the people of the United States to obtain the mastery and control of our trade, commerce and finances. Therefore, while we have always been ready and while we are ready now, as the Statute-book shows, to enter into arrangements pointing towards commercial dealings with the people of the United States, we look upon this particular movement in favor of it with a very great deal of suspicion indeed, having already as we conceive discovered under it a dangerous conspiracy against the commerce and the political independence of

Canada. Now, Sir, the people of Canada are, I believe, perfectly ready to enter into a fair bargain with the people of the United States for reciprocal trading relations with them, but I think they are very unwilling to enter into a bargain with the people of the United States which shall be an unfair bargain to Canada, and they are still more unwilling to enter into an arrangement which shall be dictated exclusively by the people of the United States and the terms and conditions of which shall be arranged exclusively for the benefit of the latter people. The last bargain of this kind which we had with the United States was, it seems to me, a pretty fair bargain for them. My hon. friend told us on Friday night that that bargain resulted to them in a balance of trade to the extent of more than \$20,000,000. Those figures which my hon. friend quoted were the American figures, but the figures given by the Hon. George Brown were not "twenty millions and a little over" but ninety-five millions and a half. The Hon. George Brown maintained that the United States had had the advantage in that bargain to the extent of \$95,500,000. Now, the probability is that the proof in this case, as usual, is to be found in the mean between those extremes. At all events I think we must see that that was a pretty fair margin for the people of the United States. They had a pretty good share of whatever was to be gained by that transaction, and so much was it so that we find that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of New Brunswick considered that the United States had got very much the better of that bargain, and they complained of its pressing upon themselves unduly. Now, then, what do we find to-day? We find that the people of the United States tell us plainly that they will not enter into any such arrangement with us again; they tell us plainly that that bargain was far too favorable for us, and that it was not favorable enough for them. I think that the people of Canada, at all events, have got pretty fair warning, and that warning from the people of the United States themselves who tell us that the bargain which gave them an advantage to the extent of from twenty to ninety-five millions of dollars was not nearly favorable enough for them and was far too favorable for us. It seems to me, therefore, that the people of Canada may very readily see that if they are to have closer trade relations with the United States they must expect to pay pretty dear for their whistle. But, Sir, we are told that there are one class of the people of Canada who are to be enormously benefitted by the bargain. The bargain calls upon us to give up our protective policy. The people of Canada require protection against the United States just as much as the people of the United States ever require protection against England. No people ever required protection for their young industries more than the people of Canada do to-day, but we are told that we are to give that protection up as a portion of the bargain. We are told that at least one class of the community will benefit, and that class the one to which I have had the honor to belong ever since I came to Canada, sixteen years ago—the farming class; and more especially the Ontario farmers are, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, to be benefitted by this arrangement. Now, Sir, if I am not wearying the House, if I am not taking up too much time I would just like to investigate for a moment the statement that the Ontario farmer is to be so enormously benefitted by free interchange of farming produce with the people of the United States. Before I do so I will say, with the permission of the House, just one word in reference to the Canadian farmers generally. We have heard a great deal from the other side of the House about the desperate condition of indigence to which the Ontario farmers have been reduced, and in support of that assertion we have heard a great deal of the fact that farming lands in Canada have deteriorated in value. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this observation with regard to that argument, and that is, that it is

Mr. McNEILL.

entirely beside the question. Whether the values of farming lands have in fact deteriorated or not has nothing whatever to do with the question. It is perfectly well known, Sir, that owing to the enormously increased means of communication and the facilities for carrying the goods of the farm to the farming markets of the world that those markets have been overstocked in comparison to the condition in which they were a very few years ago, and, Sir, it is apparent that by reason of this there has been a depreciation in manufacturing values; and when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that in Canada we have in this matter the experience of all the rest of the world, I should like to know what it proves. It does not advance their case one iota. In this connection, Sir, we must remember that the farming lands of free trade England have depreciated such an extent in the same time that the depreciation in the value of the farming lands of Canada—if there be any—is absolutely comparatively nothing. Although, in England we should have expected that the very opposite should be the case because the supply of land is so limited and the demand is so great. If hon. gentlemen wish to advance their case, if they want to make a point in this matter they must go on to show that the depreciation in value of Canadian lands has been greater in proportion than the depreciation in the other farming lands of the world and they must show further that the farmer of Canada is in a worse position than the farmer in other parts of the world. It is very well known, Sir, to every hon. member of this House, that they have made no such attempt. It is very well known, to every hon. member of this House, that they have not attempted to grapple with the facts and figures adduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, and laid before the country some time ago, and those adduced by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, who has moved the amendment,—facts and figures which prove conclusively and irrefutably that the condition of the farmer of Canada is vastly better, vastly more sound, than that of his neighbor in the United States. And, Sir, when we remember what the condition of the farmer is in free trade England, the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite becomes simply laughable, for the condition of the English farmer is pitiable in the extreme. But, Sir, to return to the point from which I diverted, what would the Ontario farmer gain and what would he give if we had a free exchange of farm products with the people of the United States? In the first place, Sir, I may say that when the people of the United States ask us to open our markets to them, and to expose our producers—I now speak of manufacturers and farmers alike—to all the weight and strain of competition with the accumulated wealth and resources of fifty five or sixty millions of people in the United States, they ask us, Sir, to do what under similar circumstances they never would have done themselves. They ask us to pursue a policy the very reverse of that which they have themselves pursued with such conspicuous success. And, Sir, if we had this free trade with the United States, the first thing that would stare the Ontario farmer in the face would be the fact that he had lost his home market by the closing down of our manufactories; although, waiving that for the moment, I think the Ontario farmer will begin now to see the value of the home market, from the statements that have been made with regard to the value of the home market in the United States—a home market which has been built up by the adoption of the very policy there which we have urged should be adopted here. But I was about to ask, what would the Ontario farmer gain, and what would he give? In the first place, Sir, we should have free entry for three of our staple products—our horses, our sheep and our barley. Those are the three principal products for which we should obtain a better market in the United States. And what should we give, Sir, in return? We should give to the people of the United States a

free entry into our markets for their wheat, their coarse grains, their western corn, and their western pork. Now, I should like to ask hon. members if it is so very clear that the Ontario farmer would gain a great deal by that transaction. They had free entry for their wheat before, and I wonder if hon. members of this House have realized exactly what that amounted to. I confess I did not do so until I commenced to study the figures; but what I found in them positively startled me, Mr. Speaker. I found that during the five years immediately preceding the introduction of the National Policy we had imported into Canada from the United States, for home consumption, \$34,000,000 worth of their wheat, whereas during the last five years, since the National Policy has been introduced, we imported only \$1,100,000 worth. In other words, the Ontario farmer has had the difference, \$33,000,000, paid into his pocket for his own wheat sold in his own market, and he has thereby at the least saved the cost of transporting that wheat to the sea-board and then taking it across the Atlantic. And, Sir, if hon. members will only study the prices of wheat in Chicago and in Toronto respectively, they will find that the Ontario farmer gained a great deal more than that. But that is not all, I find, referring to the same period, that in the last five years compared with the previous five years the Ontario farmer has had the advantage, so far as coarse grains and other breadstuffs are concerned, to the extent of \$11,000,000. And, Sir, if we remember that during those five years immediately preceding the National Policy, the quantity of coarse grains consumed in this country was very small indeed, compared with that which is consumed in the feeding of stock to-day, we shall see that this represents in a very small degree the advantage we have gained in this respect from the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen will remember the way in which the price of oats used to be brought down with a rush by the sending of American cheap oats into our market. And those who grew peas for sale a few years immediately preceding the introduction of the National Policy and immediately after, will know that the price of peas advanced under that policy very much indeed. And now, Sir, what about western pork? We all know that the market of the Canadian farmer for his pork was depressed to the last degree. In one of those years, 1878 or 1879, I knew very well an Ontario farmer who had to sell his pork for \$2.50 per hundred. Now, free trade in produce means the free entry into our markets of western pork, and I want to know whether the destruction of the home market for pork will in any degree be compensated to the Ontario farmer by the greatly advanced price that he is going to obtain for those early spring chickens, you know, which he is to rear in the snows of January and February, to compete in the New York market with the fowls raised in the warmer latitudes of the United States. Now, Sir, just let us see the avalanche which hangs over the home market for Canadian pork to-day. The year before last, according to the last figures I have got, they exported, of bacon, \$25,000,000; of ham, \$5,250,000; of fresh pork, \$4,400,000, and of salt pork, \$20,750,000 worth. That is a competition which the Ontario farmer may expect when we have free trade in farm produce. And, Sir, he will have something more; he will have the advantage of seeing our markets flooded with oleomargarine, and butterine and bogus butter, and bogus butter oil. He will have these to his heart's content, to compete with the genuine butter manufactured by the wives, daughters and sisters of our Canadian farmers. More than that, he will have to compete in his own market with the cheaply-fed, with the corn-fed cattle of the United States; and more than that, he will find, in order to assist him in that competition, that his own cattle will be scheduled with the cattle of the United States and excluded from the markets of the mother country. Now, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that

if the trade in farm produce would be to the advantage of the Ontario farmer—and I do not say that it might not—I think, at all events, it would by no means be an unmixed blessing; and I think they will further agree with me when I say that if, for the privilege of introducing the produce of his farm into our market, we give the American privilege of introducing the produce of our farm into his, we shall have given him a very fair equivalent. Now, the question that the people of Canada have to ask themselves is, are they prepared to give a great deal more? The policy proposed to us demands that we shall give a great deal more. It demands that we shall admit American manufactures free; and that, in the opinion of the enormous majority of the manufacturers of this country, who are best able to judge, means practically, to a great extent, the annihilation of the manufacturing industries of this country, and the destruction of the home market of the Ontario farmer. Are you prepared to throw that into the bargain too? But that is not the bargain, because we have to give something more; we have to lose seven millions of dollars directly and millions of dollars indirectly, and we have to throw that into the bargain too. But that does not even yet represent the bargain. We have to do more, Sir, we have to give up the right to regulate our own tariff to suit our own needs; and the needs of a young country like Canada in that respect are, as we have been taught by the people of the United States themselves, very different indeed from the needs of an old-established and wealthy community like theirs. It is demanded of us that we shall exactly assimilate our tariff to theirs, and that, by their own admission, would be incalculably to the injury of a young country like Canada. We may ask, who is to regulate the tariff when changes require to be made? The hon. the Minister of the Interior has told us. The Americans themselves have told us through their newspapers, that their tariff is to be regulated by Congress; but I will waive that argument, and I will assume that they give us some kind of fair play and some representation in the body which is to regulate that tariff. What will that representation be? They are fifty-five or sixty million people, and we are five million people. If they should give us representation according to our population, in what condition would we be when those questions arise, which conflicting interests would certainly cause to arise, between the one party and the other. I say we should be in a helpless and useless condition of impotency; we should be obliged to take whatever our good masters would be kind enough to throw unto us. We would have to throw that into the bargain; Sir, it is no bargain; it is national degradation and abject surrender. I say that, under such circumstances, our position would be absolutely unendurable; with our own hands we should have placed their heels upon our necks, and with our own suffrages we should have voted away our own independence. But that is not yet the bargain. We are told that, in order to carry out the terms of this specious contract, we must also discriminate in favor of the American goods against the goods of the mother country. In other words, we are to sacrifice our sentiments and throw our sympathies into the bargain, too. We are to cast down in scorn and derision the impulses of the noblest element of humanity. Strike out sentiment from the nature of man, and, Sir, you at once degrade him to the level of the brute creation. Where is the dividing line to be found, if it is not at sentiment? It is not at appetite, it is not at instinct, it is not even at reason. It is only to be found in the appreciation of the ethically beautiful, the great and the good. There alone is to be found the argument from nature for the existence of the human soul. There alone is to be found the argument from nature for our hopes of immortality. What, Sir, I would ask are these thoughts too deep for utterance which vainly

flutter about like sweet birds in the dark cottage they inhabit? In the most sublime passage in English literature, the great master has compared these unutterable sympathies to the music of the spheres. He makes Lorenzo say:

"Look how the floor of Heaven
Is thick inlaid with patines of bright gold.
There is not the smallest orb which thou behold'st,
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quivering to the young-eyed cherubims;
But, whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly clothe it in, we cannot hear it.—

I would ask, what is that divine harmony? Is it sheer, unadulterated greed for gain? What is a good, true, a noble man? Is he not a man who is actuated by good, and true, and noble sentiments and who lives up to them? The sentiment of Canada speaks out trumpet-tongued against the policy that is proposed to us by the hon. gentleman, and we are coolly requested to degrade and to depress and to stifle the highest impulses of our people in order that that precious policy may be carried into effect. But, Sir, no. Why, we are told that is not the case. We are told, forsooth, that it will be to the advantage of the mother country to run the risk of the disruption of her Empire, because at some day—God only knows when—the people of Canada will become vastly better customers of hers than they ever were before. Well, all I can say with regard to that is that the people of Canada are customers of the mother country to the extent per head of the population of \$3.84, and the people of the United States are customers of the mother country to the extent of \$1.83 per head of their population; and hon. gentlemen can decide the force of the suggestion made by hon. gentlemen opposite for themselves. But, for my own part, speaking for myself, I say that this is "the most unkindest cut of all," for it simply amounts to an attempt to betray the mother country with a kiss. But I would ask, why it is that we are called upon to commit this deed of imperishable infamy? The hon. gentleman gives you a reason. He tells you it is because we are broken, bankrupt, and going head over heels to destruction. Fortunately, the people of Canada can decide that question for themselves, without reference either to the hon. gentleman who makes the assertion or to any hon. member on this side of the House. They can decide that question for themselves by reference to men whose business it is to study the financial status of nations, men who do not care three straws whether it is the Hon. Edward Blake, or Mr. Laurier, or Sir Richard Cartwright, or Sir John A. Macdonald who has control of the destinies of this country, men who look at this from a purely business point of view, men who look at this matter with the cold, calculating eye of making money out of it; and what is their verdict? What is the verdict of the financiers of the world on this matter? Their verdict is, that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. They not only do not agree with the hon. gentleman, but they say that the very reverse of what the hon. gentleman has said is the fact, and they back their opinion with their money by lending us their money on terms which are much more favorable than those on which money was ever lent to Canada before. But we have another reason offered why we should follow out this precious policy, and what is that? I have referred to it once before, but I think it ought to be referred to in this House. This is the reason given to us by Mr. Wiman why we should adopt this policy. He says:

"When one recalls the 5,000 miles of coast line fishing privileges possessed by Canada, the limitless forests of timber, greatly needed by the United States, the exhaustless hills of iron ore, the copper, nickel and other minerals, the mountains of phosphates, the miles and miles of coal in close proximity to eastern manufacturing centres and western needs, the infinite variety of riches which God in His providence has placed in these regions for the good of all mankind; and when one recalls that for the most part these are lying silent, dormant and dead, it needs only to turn and look into the earnest faces of the great nation

Mr. McNEILL.

on the borders of Canada to realize that the good Providence has also provided a people whose high mission it is to take these vast riches and most gratefully enjoy His bounty."

That is the reason given to us by Mr. Wiman. The policy of the Liberal Conservative party, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman who has made the name of Canada famous throughout the world, has been a policy of building up, a policy of construction, a policy of binding together. The right hon. gentleman has sought to provide the people of Canada with the means of developing the vast resources of their country; the right hon. gentleman has sought also to soothe jealousies, to soothe local jealousies and to assuage old-time animosities; he has sought to teach the people of this country that the interests of the races and creeds and industries and classes and Provinces are first and foremost of all Canadian interests; he has sought, in short, to build up a great Canadian nationality in North America, a nationality which shall at the same time be as truly and as thoroughly an integral part of the British nation as the Welsh, or the Irish, or the Scotch, or the English nationality is. Surely that is a great and noble policy. Surely every true Canadian ought to strive to help it on. And the chief corner-stone of that policy has been the provision by which it is attempted to arrange that the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian farmer—that Canadian industry, in fact, shall have the benefit of its own Canadian market; the provision that seeks to arrange so, as far as possible at least, that the money which is paid for goods consumed in Canada shall not be conveyed out of Canada to the impoverishment of the country, but, as far as possible, shall remain in the country, to be re-invested in native industry and still further develop the resources of the country. Unrestricted reciprocity means blotting out with a sponge all we have made under that policy; it means, in the opinion of many men best able to judge, the transference of the commerce and the trade of the cities of Canada to the cities of the United States; it means the domination of our trade and commerce by the United States, the loss of our commercial and of our financial independence, and, in short, the subjugation of Canada by that people. And it means more still. It means, in my opinion at least, without one shadow or shade of doubt, the severance of those ties which bind us to the mother country and bind our Empire together. I would ask the French Canadian members of this House if they are prepared to support such a policy as that, if they think, that, under the new condition of things which would grow up under that policy, their own peculiar rights and privileges would be so very much more secure than they are to-day; and of the members of this House, irrespective of race or class or creed—ay, or of party too—I would ask, are you prepared to hold your grip upon your own Canada and to continue to develop her own latent resources with the same courage and energy in the future as you have displayed in the past, and which in the last few years has won for you the admiration—yes, I may say without exaggeration, the wonder—of the civilised world? Are you prepared to join hands with those whose high policy it is to build up a Canadian nationality in North America, and at the same time to preserve and, if possible, consolidate the world-wide Empire to which we are heirs? Are you prepared, in the future as in the past, to take your stand, in sunshine and through storm, by the old land and the old flag, or, on the other hand, are you prepared to cast in your lot with those who, in the columns of their newspaper press, are, day after day, writing down British institutions, and deliberately and scandalously misrepresenting all that England does? Are you prepared, at their instance, and by their advice, in craven fear, at the very moment of splendid victory, to surrender to the pressure of a party which Canada has not only so long successfully resisted, but which, with native inborn energy and genius, she has

converted into an instrument for her own good? Are you prepared, at the very moment when victory folds her pinions upon your banners, to haul down the flag of Canadian nationality and of Imperial fame? Are you prepared, at the instance of these men and by their advice, to lend a helping hand in the dismemberment of your own Empire? Are you prepared even to risk it, as the hon. gentleman tells us you must do, if you adopt his policy? Are the Commons of Canada prepared to do all this and to risk all this in order that the great nation on your southern border may, in the simple and graphic words of Mr. Wiman:—

“Take—”

“Take,” Mr. Speaker,—

“—the vast riches of your own native land, and most gratefully enjoy them.”

What the Commons of Canada will do, Sir, I am well assured, and if hon. gentlemen opposite, not content with that verdict, dare to do as they now propose, dare to submit to the judgment of the people of this country, and be so unworthy, so suicidal and so base, right sure am I that from every city and town, from every hamlet and country district, they will have the answer, swift and clear:

“Confound their politics;
On thee our hopes we fix,
God save the Queen.”

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the principle involved in the resolution now under the consideration of this House is so far-reaching in its character, and fraught with such tremendous interests to the future welfare of this country, that I do not feel inclined to let it go to a division without asking the attention of the House for a very short time while I offer a few observations on the subject. I feel under a considerable difficulty at rising to speak at this period of the debate, because the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me from this side of the Chamber, have submitted to the consideration of the House and the country a proposition so broad, so statesmanlike, so far in the interests of this country, that the Chinese-wall-of-protection party on the other side, eloquent and argumentative as their speeches have been, from their own standpoint, have been wholly unable to gainsay the position we have taken. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the commencement of this debate, on our side of the House, have submitted a proposition, and have proclaimed correctly the condition of this country to be such, and its financial position such, as call for the immediate consideration of this Parliament, and the consideration of the people outside of it. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen, in the early part of this debate, quoted speeches which had been made by hon. gentlemen on this side on previous occasions. They endeavored to make out that some hon. gentlemen on this side had been inconsistent in their utterances, and that the policy which they advocate now was not in accordance with the policy which they had advocated, individually, on other occasions. One of those gentlemen, my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), has answered for himself to-day; he has shown this House that his speech, taken in its plain and literal meaning, from beginning to end, was not capable of the interpretation which the hon. Minister of Marine chose to put upon it. And I have no doubt that hon. gentleman will endeavor, before this debate is over, to make quotations from observations of mine. I hope they will do so. However, I may spare them the necessity of that, Mr. Speaker, because I intend to give this House, before I resume my seat, the benefit, if benefit it may be, of the opinions which I have expressed with regard to our relations with the United States for a very considerable number of years past. Now, Sir, we have, in this present position, an entirely new departure. We have here a question which has never yet been formally submitted to the consideration of the people. It has been an

abstract question; it has been one which people's minds may have dwelt on, but it has never been the deliberate policy of a party, and it has never been deliberately submitted for the consideration of the people. And how are we met? We are met with the cry that it is disloyal to the old country. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat indulged us with that cry to a considerable extent, and closed his speech by an appeal to the sentimental aspect of this question, and stating the strength of that sentiment in the hearts of the people of Canada to-day. Sir, I agree with the hon. gentleman that there is a great deal in sentiment. I agree with the hon. gentleman that great needs and great sufferings have been undergone for the sake of mere sentiment. But, Sir, if sentiment stands between us and our necessities to-day, our duty to Canada points to the course we should take in the interests of Canada. Sir, sitting here as one of the representatives of this Dominion, I am prepared, for my part, to say, let us consider the interests of Canada first. That, Mr. Speaker, has been the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that has been the policy of the hon. right gentleman in times gone by.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That was the policy laid down by the right hon. gentleman in that Minute of Council quoted by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, when the right hon. gentleman declared that the only way to make the people of Canada contented in their present position was to make them prosperous; and no one knew better than he did that if there was prosperity in this country from one end to the other, the people were satisfied and contented with their political position. But, as has been shown, if the true interests of a country were suffering, if the people saw on the other side of the line a market which would take all of their surplus productions, if they saw that market closed by a Chinese wall against us in consequence of the action of this Government, then I say that the time would come for the people of Canada to look around and make overtures, as this resolution invites us to make, to the large, friendly, and powerful people to the south, and ask them if some *modus vivendi* may not be arrived at whereby we two English-speaking races on this continent may be able to exchange our products to our mutual advantage. I say, at the outset of this discussion, that I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen on the other side pointing out all the disadvantages that are going to arise to the Dominion under the operation of such an Act. I am glad to hear that for this reason: because the friends of this measure—and we have friends on the other side of the border—will be able to show the people of the United States that there is at least a division of opinion on this side of the border. If there was only one view of the question taken in this Chamber, if every member in the House and every man in the country would cordially accept the views advanced by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, why, the friends of that measure, and I believe they are growing in the United States, would not have the advantage of pointing out there was a division of opinion on the other side of the border as well. I hold that this is a matter which, while largely in the interests of Canada, is largely in the interests of the people of the United States as well. It is to their interest—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. An hon. gentleman says “hear, hear.” Does the hon. gentleman in any of his dealings with his fellow-man expect to have all the advantage on his own side? Why, is it a policy that no far-reaching statesmanship ever for one moment contemplates or desires. We desire, if we go to the United States, to say to them: Here

we come offering you a trade which is to your advantage to do, and which during the time you had it under the operation of the reciprocity treaty proved to be such, and now with our enlarged commercial system, our increased number of railways, our increased population in Canada—and in the United States as well—we believe it will be a measure for our mutual benefit, and so, come, let us trade together. Why, the Minister of Finance when at Washington the other day made this proposition. I regret he is not here. How do we now know that the Minister of Finance did not make a proposal similar to that called for in the resolution before the House? We know he proposed a resolution there in the interests of extended commerce; and now we find a resolution brought down here under the direction of the leader of this House calling for a Chinese-wall policy of protection against the United States. Well, Sir, it appears to me that if the Minister of Finance were here to-day he would have either to explain his policy, or the leader of the Government would have to explain his. We seem to have Mikado and Tycoon in this matter, and I would like to hear whether the policy of the Tycoon at Washington can be reconciled with the policy of the Mikado in the House of Commons to-day. The hon. gentleman who resumed his seat a few moments ago said that the Americans were trying to coerce us in consequence of the hostile position we assumed during the Southern War. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, thought he was right in the evidence he offered; but if the hon. gentleman had occupied a seat in this House from 1874 to 1878, during the time the National Policy was first discussed in this Chamber and subsequently over the country, the hon. gentleman would have remembered the speeches made by his leader, by the Finance Minister, by every Tory member in this House to the effect that we are going to teach the United States their position. We were not going to allow them to have the advantage of our market, we were not going to allow them to make this a slaughter market for their products, and we were going to impose a tariff and a National Policy against the United States which was going to bring the United States to their senses in a very short time. I contend that those utterances of our public men on that occasion in this House and afterwards in the country did more than any other line of policy ever adopted, more than the National Policy itself, to embitter the public sentiment of the United States, the minds of the leading statesmen in Congress, against the people of this country who were gulled by such an utterance as that; and when, unfortunately for the interests of Canada, the Government came into power and had an opportunity to carry out their policy, they carried it out to the fullest extent, they carried it out with the boast that they were going to reduce our imports and trade with the United States, they were going to increase our trade with Great Britain and were going to teach the United States the fact that we could get along without them. The absurdity of that was seen from the beginning, the absurdity of that has been felt by every business man and by every farmer and by every man who has any acquaintance with the position of affairs in this country. We are living alongside of the people of the United States who want what we have to sell; they take, and they are the only people who will take and who can take what we have to dispose of, and we have to send them our products *minus* the duty which was imposed in consequence of the threatenings of the Tory party of this country. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, indulged occasionally in poetical quotations. I followed him with a great deal of interest, and if he had confined himself to poetical quotations I am sure, in many respects, his statements would have been more accurate and more interesting to the House. The hon. gentleman indulged in a quotation from an unknown author, and as if to show how easy it was to descend from the sublime to the

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

ridiculous, he first came down to the level of pork, and then by two or three steps at once, to oleomargarine. I thought, Sir, that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue must have apprehended what the hon. gentleman was going to say when he walked over and took his seat alongside of him during the discussion, and if the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could have only had the opportunity of giving him a wink and a caution, he would have said: "My good friend do not touch oleomargarine because, remember, that only a few years ago I brought in a Bill to enable oleomargarine to be imported and manufactured in this country." It was only on account of this strong feeling in this House that on motion of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) who sits beside me, the permission of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was given to prevent its manufacture and introduction into this country. Leaving aside the hon. gentleman's conclusion with regard to our duty and our loyalty towards England, and I would not have a great deal to answer to. But, Sir, I would ask the hon. gentleman for one moment to refer back to the journals of the House in 1867, and he will find that the party which he follows to-day, and the leader which he serves under to-day, who was leader of the House and Government on that occasion, in the very first address from the Throne which he put into the mouth of the Governor General to deliver to this Parliament caused it to contain those words: "I congratulate you on the legislative sanction who has been given by the Imperial Parliament to the Act of Union under the provisions of which we are now assembled and which has laid the foundation of a new nationality." What does a "new nationality" mean, Mr. Speaker? Does it not mean the severance from the old country and could it mean anything else? A "new nationality" meant nothing less. It meant the independence which those gentlemen had been speaking about, during the whole political campaign that preceded the Act of Union, from every hustings in the Dominion of Canada, when public men stated publicly, that when we had attained our present position henceforth we were going to assume the duties and the aspect of a new country. I repeat again that on the very first occasion on which this House met after Confederation the hon. the leader of the Government put into the mouth of the Governor General those memorable words that "we inaugurated a new nationality." That, Sir, was the consequence and the object of the Union, as stated at its very inception. The hon. gentleman who spoke so eloquently with regard to our duty towards the old country would do well I think, Sir, if he would ask his hon. colleagues to explain their meaning, when, at the very first opportunity they had of meeting the representatives of Canada under the new system of government, they announced to them, as the policy of the Administration, that they were going to adopt a new nationality. Sir, it ill becomes any of those gentlemen to endeavor to brand the hon. members on this side of the House and to argue that we are endeavoring to lead the people away from the old country. They themselves were the first; their leader, their Government, and the leader of the present Government was the first to indicate to the people of this country at large that we had made up our minds to adopt a new nationality, which meant severance from the old country. Now, Sir, what did the hon. gentleman with regard to this question say? In addition to the charges they make against us of being unfair to the country, he said that we have not been able to prove that this policy would be of advantage to our farmers, our fishermen, and our various industries. Now, Sir, this question, remember, as I said before, a very few years ago, was not in the position which it is to-day. We were not aware then what the position of the question would be in the United States. To-day what do we see? We see a broad invitation from that distinguished man Mr. Bayard, the American Secretary of State, to Sir Charles Tupper, asking

him to "come and discuss the questions in a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations between the two Empires." That invitation is the same as coming from the head of the Government, and, indeed, we had previously received almost a similar invitation from the head of the Government himself. This coming from the Premier, so to say, of the United States—the leader of the Cabinet, was an emphatic declaration on the part of the people of the United States, so far as the Government were concerned, that, in their judgment, the time had arrived when this question could be properly considered with Canada. Sir Charles Tupper, the hon. the Minister of Finance, who has since been in Washington, made a most cordial reply to this invitation. He did not intimate any desire on the part of Canada not to enter into the relations, but he says: "I entirely agree in your statement that we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement and that there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries." Here, Sir, we have then the whole case before us. We have since seen a resolution introduced into Congress by Mr. Butterworth and, subsequently, by Mr. Hitt, and we have seen the public expression of opinion from public men in the United States with regard to this measure, and we believe to-day that they are watching with great deal of interest the discussions that take place in this House. The hon. gentleman has quoted occasionally from Mr. Wiman. Now, Mr. Wiman, I have no doubt, has given considerable attention to this question, and Mr. Wiman's idea would be quite in accord with the policy now under consideration here. He says:

"The second plan of unrestricted reciprocity to which in your letters you referred would be a most admirable arrangement, and next to the old reciprocity treaty would be most acceptable no doubt throughout Canada. It is as you say that the extension of the plan as laid down in the treaty of 1874, urged by General Grant on the part of the United States, and by the Honorable George Brown on the part of Canada. Had this negotiation been successful no Act in General Grant's Administration would have paralleled it in importance and beneficial results to the United States; while this consummation as a result of Mr. Brown's efforts would have added a lustre to a name already famous in Canada that would have been international in its scope."

Then, Sir, he goes on to say:

"The conclusion therefore is that while the first plan in the foregoing list—the old reciprocity treaty, is impossible, the second that of unrestricted reciprocity is possible only by the early and prompt action of the Canadian Government, speaking on behalf of the people and making at once the necessary propositions from which the knowledge of the fact, I believe could be promptly carried through in view of the agitation and interest which has been excited on the question here. If no such action is taken by the representatives of the Canadian Government it is impossible to conceive that the American Congress could be induced to initiate a move of this limited character."

Now, Sir, you will find by this that Mr. Wiman, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, had come to the conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity such as we are advocating to-day was entirely in accordance with the sentiment in the United States and would find acceptance there. This question of our relations with the United States as I have said before has been considered at various places and has been spoken to by myself, and as I may be mis-quoted or partially quoted by the hon. gentlemen who follow me I will read what I said in the House last year while that question was under consideration:

"In regard to the treaty I think it very undesirable that here or elsewhere any expressions of opinion should be given as to the great desirability or necessity of a treaty with the United States. Shortly after the treaty expired there was a meeting held at the Chamber of Commerce, Halifax, when a resolution was moved calling on the Government to take immediate steps to renew it. On that occasion I said I thought that while it was well known throughout this country that our people were anxious for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty on equal terms, it was not wise or judicious that we should publish to the world from every commercial standpoint the opinions we entertained on that subject. I am aware this expression of mine was quoted against me on a recent political occasion in my own province, but I expressed it there

in the same sense in which I would express it here, because I believe the Government recognising their responsibility in dealing with a matter of such importance, would be freer to act on behalf of our country if there was not brought to bear from the other side expressions of opinion from our own people that we could not live or prosper without trade relations with that country."

I took the precaution of adopting that policy for this very reason. I did not wish to say anything that might be used against us by those in the United States who are opposed to a reciprocity treaty with us, in any future negotiations which might take place. I remember very well the speeches which were delivered in this House, on the Washington Treaty, by the hon. leader of the Government and the hon. Minister of Finance. I remember those hon. gentlemen standing in their places and pointing out the great advantages that we were gaining under that treaty—pointing out that under it we were gaining everything and giving up nothing; and the speeches of those hon. gentlemen were quoted entirely in the American case submitted to the Halifax Commission. And while I did not suppose that my speeches would have so much importance in the eyes of the public as the speeches of gentlemen who occupy the high position those hon. gentlemen occupied at that time and still occupy, I was unwilling that any member of this House should make use of any language which American negotiators might throw up against us whenever we came to negotiate with them. Shortly after that I was interviewed by the *Boston Globe*, which was very anxious to know what we, in Nova Scotia, thought in regard to this matter. In that interview I said:

"I was a member of a Government and belong to a party that has always desired the closest commercial relations with the United States, and I do not hesitate to say that, if our party came into power to-morrow our first object would be, so far as consistent with our financial obligations, to place our trade relations with our neighbors across the border on the freest and broadest basis possible. I do not believe in Commercial Union. Neither country, I believe, would agree to it, but if the tariff of both countries could be reconsidered I think a way would be found by which we might trade with our neighbors, who are our natural customers, on a much more liberal and extended basis than we do at present. I believe that a great deal of bad feeling was engendered in the minds of the people of the United States and in the minds of her leading statesmen by the constant cry that was kept up by the Tory party of the Dominion during the time that the Liberal Government was in power, that they (the Tories) by pursuing a policy of retaliation would force trade concessions from the Americans. The Liberals of this country never desired such a policy. They desired the freest trade relations consistent with revenue requirements, believing that the more intimate our commercial intercourse was the better feeling it would engender among the population of the two countries."

"We cannot forget that we have a large interest in the New England States particularly. Their factories are operated largely by Nova Scotians, their fishing fleet is largely manned by our own hardy sons, and the number of people from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island who have made their homes in their towns and villages it would be difficult to ascertain."

I was also interviewed by the *Chicago Times* which reported the interview as follows:—

"Hon. A. G. Jones, M.P., largely engaged in the West Indies and fish trades, has been watching with considerable interest the discussion of the question in the United States. Public opinion in Canada would be likely to shape itself in response to action that may be taken in the United States. The people of the Maritime Provinces would favor reciprocity in the limited sense, or a broader measure like Commercial Union, if that is found practicable. 'Our commercial interests are with the United States, and not with Canada,' Mr. Jones said. 'We have no binding trade interests between the east and west of Canada, and are ready to extend our commercial relations with any country that will take our products.' If the United States Government were disposed to favor unrestricted reciprocity with Canada, Mr. Jones thinks, no great difficulty would be experienced in adjusting details of the arrangement to the satisfaction of both parties. It is argued that free trade with the United States would be discrimination against the mother country, but Mr. Jones believes no opposition need be feared from that quarter. England knows that the surest way to make Canada contented with her political status as a portion of the Empire is to make her people prosperous. That would undoubtedly be the case under unrestricted free trade with the United States. 'I look on the proposition with moderate favor' Mr. Jones said, in conclusion, 'and am prepared to discuss it for the best interests of the country. It has not yet been made a party question.'"

Now, Sir, these are the opinions which I have expressed on this measure up to the present time, and therefore I feel

perfectly free to-day in coming here and giving my allegiance to the policy set forth in the statements I have read. But, Sir, we have heard from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—and they have endeavored to propagate the idea in their papers—that the policy of the Liberal party to-day, the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, means direct taxation, the withdrawal of Provincial subsidies, the withdrawal of subsidies to various railways in the country. Sir, I take entire and immediate exception to that statement. There is no such plank in the platform of the Liberal party to-day; there is no necessity for any of these results in the arrangement we advocate for the approval of this country. We must come here and discuss this question in a fair and honest spirit, neither overstating nor understating the case, and I am prepared to say that we should probably lose a small amount of revenue under such an arrangement; but we should be able to economise in certain unnecessary expenses to the extent of a few millions. And, then, Sir, above all, instead of having our people in the condition we find them to-day from one end of this Dominion to the other, instead of finding their resources crippled, their energies hampered, their farms mortgaged, and looking with hopelessness to the future, we should have contented and prosperous people, a people with money in their pockets, and we know what it means when people have money in their pockets, for they spend it, and the very man who spends one dollar to-day, would, under such a condition of affairs, be able to spend three or four dollars to-morrow. Therefore, I look without the slightest apprehension to the change involved in the proposition before the House. If it involved anything approaching direct taxation, I should say, stay your hand; for I should say that this country could not under any system of government adopt direct taxation. Although it might be the most economical if people understood it, they have not been educated up to the great economical fact that direct taxation would be the cheapest system they could adopt. And therefore you have to accept public opinion as it is. No party in this country would stand twenty-four hours, if they went to the people with direct taxation on their banners.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen opposite agree with me. Therefore I take this exception at the outset, because I deny most emphatically that any such result can possibly be involved in the adoption of the policy which we recommend to-day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman may say that it would be unfair to the country to discriminate against her with regards to the United States. Why, is it not equally unfair to discriminate against the British manufacturer, in so far as the principle and the sentiment are concerned, in favor of the Canadian manufacturer? There is discrimination against the British manufacturer. His goods cannot come in owing to it, and if they do not come in under one condition of affairs, they will not under another; and so far as the logic and the sense is concerned, it is just as unfair for this Government, under the National Policy, to discriminate against the English manufacturer by high protective duties in favor of the people of Canada, as it would be under other circumstances to discriminate against him in favor of the people of the United States. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other night dealt at considerable length upon the advantages of our inter-provincial trade which has arisen out of our present political condition. To fortify his opinion, the hon. gentleman quoted an observation made by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. I thought, as the hon. gentleman made that quotation, he might have had sufficient respect for himself, as a member of the Dominion Government, to have avoided the sneer he indulged in when speaking of the Attorney General of

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

Nova Scotia, who is not here to answer for himself, by saying that he was a man who had made a great deal of noise about himself the last two or three years. If the hon. gentleman were to meet the Attorney General for Nova Scotia in debate, I have no doubt the Attorney General would be able to hold his own, and in his absence it is not very statesmanlike on the part of a member of this Government to attempt to belittle a member of the Local Government. Had the hon. gentleman quoted the Hon. Mr. Longley fairly, he would have had this advantage, that I would not be in a position to make the retort which it is in my power to make to-day. We very often find hon. gentlemen opposite making quotations from the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side, without giving us the entire quotation, but only giving us that portion, which taken by itself, bears out the impression they endeavor to create. They are careful not to give the fair and literal meaning of what was said. Now what did Mr. Longley say at the banquet delivered at Boston? He said:

"God and nature never destined that Nova Scotia and Ontario should trade together. We trade with Ontario, to be sure. Their drummers permeate our country, and sell, \$10,000,000 of goods annually, and we pay for them almost wholly in hard cash. Where do we get the money? We get it from the people of the United States."

Now, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had finished the quotation by giving us that part of it, he would have done Mr. Longley the justice, to which Mr. Longley was entitled. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that a large trade had been growing up between the east and the west. Let us see in what that trade consists. He says there is a large amount of sugar brought over the Intercolonial Railway. Well, there is, I admit, a very considerable quantity sugar of coming over the Intercolonial Railway, but when we find every year an annual deficiency of \$100,000 to \$200,000 in the working of the Intercolonial Railway, when we see \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 charged yearly as capital account to the Intercolonial Railway, half of which should go to current expenses, I ask, is it any great advantage after all to force this trade at the expense it involves. The hon. gentleman says that coal is brought over the Intercolonial Railway. Coal is brought from a certain county represented by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and we have the statement, in reply to my enquiry, and which the hon. the Minister of Railways had the frankness to put in his annual report as explaining increased expenditure and diminished receipts, we have the statement that every pound of that coal carried over the Intercolonial Railway was carried at a dead loss. Is that the way to promote trade in this country, by making such a sacrifice? Hon. gentlemen, familiar with this business, are aware that when we come to put a rate of three-tenths of a cent per mile on coal, that involves a loss to the country of a very extensive character. I have been told by gentlemen familiar with the business, and whom I consider as high authority, that about three-quarters of a cent per mile is the minimum rate in the United States, which, it is considered, will compensate for working expenses, so that when we come to cutting that rate down to three-tenths of a cent per mile, it is forcing trade at a very heavy expense, which the tax-payers have to bear. The hon. gentleman says that about three-quarters of a million bushels are carried over the railway. There again the National Policy comes into play. If we were clear of the National Policy to-day, we would not require to carry flour over the Intercolonial Railway at a loss because I suppose it hardly pays—at all events it does not more than pay—running expenses. What would we do without the National Policy? Why our national trade is with the United States; our little fishing vessels could in twenty-four hours take the product of our hard industry and toil to the United States, if we had access to those markets, and exchange them for

flour, which they would bring back free of duty and land at our own doors, having got rid of what the late Hon. Joseph Howe called "the Canadian corn law," like the corn law which the people of England got rid of half a century ago, and people of the Maritime Provinces would not to-day be paying 50 cents more for their flour than they would if all the restrictions imposed by the National Policy were swept away, and they had free access to the markets of the United States. I say there is not a single article which we get from Ontario, or which Ontario or Quebec gets from the Lower Provinces, that could not be got on much more favorable terms if it were permitted by the operation of the tariff. There is not a single article that we get from the Upper Provinces that we could not get better from England or the United States if the tariff permitted us or if we were back in the condition we were in the happy days gone by. Hon. gentlemen say that a trade is being build up, but they are forcing it at frightful expense, and I say emphatically that a time in the history of this country will come when different opinions will prevail, when the people will see that their interests do not lie in the policy which is advocated to-day; and, when that time does come, there will be a fearful retribution and a shaking of dry bones amongst those manufactures which are fostered by the policy of to-day. The Liberal party would be unworthy of its standing in this country, unworthy of its principles and its traditions, if it did not, when it had the opportunity, wipe away the condition of affairs which I have pointed out, under which the present Government are forcing trade one way and that at an expense to the country and at a great cost and burden to the consumers. We find that in addition to being prevented from getting articles from our neighbors and from the old country which we desire to get, as a whole, under the operation of this tariff, for the benefit of a few manufacturers who can subscribe large sums for election expenses, we pay very much larger sums for everything we consume than we should do under other circumstances. Gentlemen here and elsewhere have pointed out, and have taken advantage of the country in this respect, that, as they say, for the last three or four years the people should look to see how cheap sugar has been, how cheap cottons have been, how cheap other articles have been during that time. We do not deny that these articles have been cheap during the last three or four years, but they have been cheap all the world over. The over-productions have been immense. The over-production of sugar has been enormous, and the improvement in machinery and the increase of mills has brought that branch of industry down to the finest possible point. But we lose all the advantage of this. Prices have gone down of late, and we have not had the advantage of it; and why? Because we are cursed by a policy which takes 25 per cent., 30 per cent., 40 and 50 per cent. out of us for the benefit of the manufacturers in order that they may have more money to subscribe for their party. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman ask what more did the taxpayers pay to-day than they did before the National Policy? I will only take one article. If the Minister of Marine had been at the meeting of the Combines Committee the other day, he would have heard a question and an answer given there which would have satisfied him, I think, that we pay more at least than we would under other circumstances. The question was asked of one of the sugar dealers: How much does sugar cost in England. His answer was, 16s. 6d. per 112 lbs. He was asked what that was a pound, and the answer was 3½ cents. He was asked what was the price in Montreal from the refiners to-day, and the reply was 6½ cents per pound. Only in that one article of sugar there is a difference of 3½ cents per pound, and that principle permeate, every manufactured article, every article that every man is obliged to consume and requires for the use of his family in this country.

Imagine what 3½ cents per pound of sugar means. It means from \$7.50 to \$8 a barrel. In the production of a refinery like the Canada Refinery in Montreal of 1,000 barrels a day, the gain to them and the loss to us is \$7,500 per day. If you take that principle and apply it to every manufactured article in this country, hon. gentlemen can easily see that the argument adduced by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, pointing out the increased cost of living under these circumstances, was amply justified. But that is not all. The difficulty under the present condition of affairs is this: We have certain articles to dispose of wherewith we purchase our needed requirements. The farmer has his wheat and his grain, his horses and sheep, and the various articles that he cultivates and raises; the fisherman, after his hard toil, has his fish, and the lumberman has his lumber; but where does it all go? It goes to the United States, and, when it goes there, to the only market which will take it, it is met with this heavy duty, and they have to take off the product of their industry, and they have that much less when they come back to Nova Scotia with which to buy all these articles which are protected, which are raised up here for the benefit of the manufacturers, but which those people cannot do without. They cannot buy in the United States. They can only take their product there, no matter what it may be or how small it may be, and bring back the price here and invest it in articles such as this sugar at \$7.50 a barrel more than it should be. Is there any wonder that there is a mortgage of 33½ per cent. on the farms of Ontario? The farmers of this country have been living, but they have not been prospering, and they have hardly known what was the matter with them, but they are realising now the condition of affairs which has taken from them the legitimate product of their industry, and I venture to say that there is a fearful reckoning coming in the near future, when these men realise that for all these long years they have been gulled under the impression that they were getting these articles cheap and that they could not be produced any cheaper. I remember when the Postmaster General delivered a speech in his own county, when I had the honor of meeting him on an occasion which, I am sorry to say, did not have the desired effect. He was pointing out to his people there that the cause of all this cheap sugar and cheap cotton and cheap iron was the National Policy, was because the duties were so high, was because they had taken the duties up from 15 per cent. under our régime to 25 and 30 per cent. There was a little country lad sitting up in the gallery, and he said: "Well, Mr. McLellan, double the duties again, and we will get them just so much cheaper." It was a reasonable answer, and just such a one as the hon. gentleman might have expected.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. JONES. When the House rose I was endeavoring to show that there had been a certain amount of inter-colonial trade as the result of Confederation, but it had been forced at a cost which was detrimental to the best interests of the country. I shall now proceed to deal with a statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who said that we had failed to show that the National Policy had injured the interests of the fishermen and the miners. I will take our coal interests in the first place, and I do not know that I could produce to this House a better or a higher authority than Mr. Lithgow, of Halifax, a gentleman who is accepted in Nova Scotia as the mouthpiece of the coal interest in that Province. Now, when the duties were imposed on foreign coal, accompanied by the increase in the tariff, Mr. Lithgow took a correct view of the situation, according to my view, and, I think, according

to the views of reasonable business men. But I will let Mr. Lithgow speak for himself. Writing on this subject at that very time, he said:

"Anyone acquainted with the wants of a colliery in Nova Scotia will tell you that the new tariff about doubles the duties payable under the old tariff, and that the duties now imposed on colliery plant and supplies average more than the duty levied on imported coal and coke. When I think how the National Policy proposed to foster our mining interests, of Mr. Tilley's proposing to impose such a duty as would give to home industry the home market, and then think of what it and he have done for the coal mines, I—well—better not write my feelings lest the Philistines rejoice. My conviction is the Cape Breton collieries are much worse off under the new than under the old tariff. They cannot now get any more for their coal; they cannot now put their coal into Ontario; they have now to pay twice as much duty as before. Messrs Redpath & Drummond, I will venture to say, make more profit within one year under the new tariff than all the Cape Breton collieries will under ten years, aye, or fifty years' protection the new tariff affords them. The Spring Hill and Pictou collieries, by means of subsidies, in the way of low railway freights, will be able to send coal into Canada, but the Cape Breton collieries, which cannot be thus favored, are in a worse position than before."

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the date of that letter, 1879?

Mr. JONES. Yes, I suppose it was shortly after 1879. Since then we have put 10 cents on coal more than in 1879. But if Mr. Lithgow, who, I repeat, was considered a good authority at that time, says that the duties now imposed on colliery plant and supplies average more than the duty levied on coal and coke, it is evident that 10 cents will not benefit them to any appreciable extent. Then again, since that time the duty on anthracite has been removed, which has placed them still further in an unfavorable position. Then, Sir, take the Londonderry mines. The Londonderry mines, in the county of Colchester, were established under a Nova Scotia 10 per cent. tariff. They manufactured iron there for many years. They were fairly successful for a certain time, but the moment we came into Confederation, and all these heavy duties and charges were imposed, the result was that that mine, to my great regret, became embarrassed, and it passed into the hands of a large company. It went on from year to year and finally became bankrupt. A year or two ago it passed into the hands of a second or third company, and I hope sincerely with better success. Still, the past history of that undertaking will serve to show how those interests have been benefited in Nova Scotia. So, if the hon. gentleman did not understand how the National Policy had failed to benefit our fishermen, I think he is hardly the man who should be at the head of that important department. And if he cannot see how the absence from freedom of exchange and from liberty to dispose of the products of their fisheries in the only market that requires them, and how, handicapped with heavy duties, these people have to send their produce to that market, at no matter what cost, I think the hon. gentleman has lived a good many years in vain. I see it was stated recently by Mr. Wiman, at a banquet in Montreal, and I have not seen his statement questioned, though I have not had the time myself to verify it from public documents, that from the expiration of the first reciprocity treaty, down to the present moment, the products of Canada have paid 100 million dollars into the American treasury. Now, Sir, is it any wonder that the farmers and other interests of this country are suffering if, during that time, such a large amount has been paid by them on the products of their industry, and while they have been compelled to use that market, as the only one open to them? The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us the other night, that the farms valued at \$800,000,000 were mortgaged to the extent of \$275,000,000, on an average 43 per cent., and 6 per cent. interest on the mortgages imposes an annual obligation of \$16,500,000. I say, Sir, this is a most startling statement. I regret that it cannot be questioned. I should have been delighted to have heard some hon. gentleman opposite show the hon. member for Huron had over-

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

stated his case. When that hon. gentleman produced these figures, taken from the official documents of the country, and when no hon. gentleman opposite, up to the present time, has been able to contradict that statement, I say that we are brought face to face with a condition of affairs in this country which is of a most startling character. If the farmers of that fine Province of Ontario, with its excellent climate, have been brought, after so many years under the National Policy, to the verge of bankruptcy, as described by the hon. member for Huron, I say the time has arrived when every well-wisher of this country, with a sincere desire of benefiting that large interest, should endeavor to discover some means of amelioration, whereby the products and industries of that large class of our people may in some way be relieved. Sir, if that statement is borne out, as I have no doubt it will be, by the realities of their position, the farmers of Ontario have the matter in their own hands; and I have full confidence that when this matter comes to be presented to them, and when they see on the other side of the line a market for their produce in which it will bring as much as American produce itself—because our produce is a small affair compared with the productions of that great country, as was shown by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other night—I say I have confidence that when the farmers of Ontario come to discuss this matter in their own homes and over their own firesides they will at no very distant day take it into their own hands and teach these Chinese-wall protection-men on the other side of the House, these men who want to build up "rings" and foster "combines" that wring from the farmers their very last cent—I say I have confidence enough in the intelligence of the farmers of Ontario and of the Dominion at large to believe that these men will be taught a lesson that will be of a very surprising character. The policy and extravagance of our Government which has taken on an average for the last ten years from eight to ten millions of dollars out of the people more than the actual necessities required has been another important factor in this question. We were told in 1878 by Sir Leonard Tilley in St. John, by the Finance Minister and by the leader of the present Government that we were spending too much money when we spent \$23,000,000. The people were told that if they turned out the Government and replaced the Conservatives in power, they would be able to administer the affairs of the Government for a smaller amount. And what have we seen? When the people took hon. gentlemen opposite at their word and placed them in power the annual expenditure went up year by year by leaps and bounds until he has reached nearly \$40,000,000 during the past year. We have now before us Estimates for \$35,000,000, which, no doubt, will be increased by the Supplementary Estimates to \$38,000,000 and probably \$40,000,000. I say hon. gentlemen opposite have taken from eight to ten millions more out of the consumers of the country than the necessities of the case required, and when you come to add that amount to the \$100,000,000 which have been taken out of the producers by payments on products sent to the United States, I repeat, is it a wonder that the farmers of Ontario are driven to the money lenders for their daily wants? Is it any wonder that the farmers and fishermen and in fact those engaged in every industry in Canada, except a few bloated manufacturers and combines, are laboring at the present moment under such severe depression? Badly as we are off undoubtedly, in the Maritime Provinces I am happy to say that I do not think the farmers there are in the same bad position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say I do not think they are, for this reason: We have a variety of resources in the Province of Nova Scotia, which perhaps no other Province in the Dominion possesses. We have not only our farming

industry, but we have our fishing, and coal, and lumbering, and shipping industries, and our farmers are all, to a certain extent, more or less interested in one or more of those industries. Then, again, we have in parts of the Province of Nova Scotia a very large fruit industry which has grown up with the old country, and which has brought hundreds of thousands of dollars into our Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

M. JONES (Halifax). Yes. What has the National Policy to do with that? Those products are not consumed in Canada. When Providence in its wisdom has given us good crops in these directions were do we find our markets? We find them in England or in the United States; and, therefore, it is that I believe the farmers in New Scotia are not in the same position to the same extent as are farmers in Ontario. They have lived, but they have not prospered. There is a great difference between making a daily living, comfortable though it may be, and prospering, as honest, and industrious, and hard working, and intelligent men should. In a country like ours the farmers should not only live but they should prosper, and if you take from them by placing heavy taxes on the products of their industry, while they live they cannot make any accumulations for their old age. These may not have a direct effect, and many a man is day by day wondering why he does not do better, and why the present times are so different to the old times when we had reciprocity with the United States. The farmer raises as many potatoes and as many cattle, he catches more fish, and yet he is compelled to ask himself the question after a year's hard toil is over: Why are we in a different position to day from what we were doing the time the reciprocity treaty was in operation? The result is obvious. During reciprocity he had access to the American market and everything rushed to that market. Our potatoes found a market in the States—there is no other market for them. The potatoes of Prince Edward Island, which is one of their chief crops, found a market there—there is no other market for them. At the present moment those potatoes are taxed 15 cents a bushel. If you estimate that an acre will produce from 200 bushels to 400 bushels, you will find, taking the lowest calculation, 200 bushels, that the duty or incubus placed on every acre of land cultivated in potatoes in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick amounts to \$30. Sweep away the present tariff and give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and what would be the result? Why, our farming industry and our farm lands would go up with a bound; every man and every farmer would know that he could put in a crop and cultivate his land, because that large country alongside of us afforded a boundless market for his enterprise; he would know that that country could take whatever he had to dispose of and his farm would immediately improve to the extent of \$30 per acre. Take the farmers of Ontario. It is not very far out of the way to say that Ontario farms do not produce over eighteen bushels of wheat to the acre on the average, say twenty bushels if you like. The whole value of one acre of wheat in Ontario would not amount to as much as to a farmer in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, would save on the duty on potatoes sent to the United States. It must always be remembered that we have no other market for those products. Canada, as we call it in the Lower Province, for we call it Canada still and always will, takes no part of our products, it takes nothing from the Lower Provinces in the shape of natural products for it has its own. The West Indies take our products only to a very small extent, only a few cargoes, nothing in proportion to the annual product. They don't go to England, because England sends them out sometimes to the United States themselves, and here we

are alongside of the markets that want them in the country we have at hand to send them to, no matter what the duty may be. I do not like to repeat that here, as it might be repeated against our case when argued elsewhere, but I do repeat here, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of our farmers that if the duty was 30 cents a bushel, and it only gave the farmers of the Maritime Provinces 5 cents a bushel or even 2 cents a bushel they ought to be enabled to place their goods on this market. Under such a condition of affairs when it is a matter of life or death to them, I say, Sir, with all the responsibility that belongs to the statement, that there is only one issue before us down there and that is either reciprocity or repeal. I say, Sir, that Nova Scotia when we had an opportunity and untrammelled by all the influence, and corrupt influence of a corrupt Government—I say, Sir, when we had a legitimate expression of public opinion in Nova Scotia, and when we went before the people of Nova Scotia under a proper Franchise Act, not being controlled by returning officers or corrupt revising barristers, the honest opinion of the people of Nova Scotia was in favor of repeal. If there is anything that is going to make them contented with the Union to-day it is to make them feel that the people here who are responsible for the policy of the country at the present momentous time are laboring to secure them a market which will open to them a channel by which they may realise the fruits of their industry. I say, and I repeat it again, that there is only one course open to them, and I say it here as I have said it before in my own county and elsewhere, there is only one question for us in the Maritime Provinces to-day—that is reciprocity or repeal. If you do not choose to labor to give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States that feeling of repeal which is latent to-day will spring up again in all its force.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is dead long ago.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). He said repeal was dead and buried long ago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is dead.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will find out in his own county, if he ventures to follow his party to the extent which his approval would appear to indicate; he will find if he goes to the electors of Nova Scotia at no distant date what the public sentiment is on that particular point. I listened to the hon. gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) this afternoon, when he referred to this question. He taunted us to go to the country and obtain an expression of opinion on the policy we advocate. Sir, we are not in a position to go to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not in a position to advise or control a dissolution of this House, but, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his friends are in that position, and let them dare to go to the country; let them if they dare go to the country on this question of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish for one moment to explain to the hon. gentleman. I did not suggest he ought to go to the country in that sense. I suggested he ought to take a favorable opportunity for holding an election for the office of poundkeeper upon the annexation platform.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose the hon. gentleman under those circumstances is prepared to be the candidate. I say, Sir, when the hon. gentleman who is challenging this side of the House with temerity and desired us to open a constituency and try the question of unrestricted reciprocity, that one constituency would do no good. Let

him and his friends dissolve this House and go to the country and then we will see a corporal's guard scarcely, of those honorable, patriotic gentlemen who are willing to suffer for their country but do not seem disposed to die for their country. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said that Montreal and Toronto were very prosperous. I am glad to hear it and it is only natural that it should be so. I am glad to hear it, I repeat, as I am always glad to hear of any part of the Dominion or any other place being prosperous. But, Sir, it is very easy of explanation. We know that since this Government has been in power within the last ten years they have added within a fraction of one hundred million dollars to the gross public debt of this country. We know that they have taken from eighty to one hundred million dollars more than they ought have done out of the taxpayers of this country by the iniquitous National Policy. We know, Sir, that those two large sums of money going into circulation and that Montreal and Toronto being the centres of commerce in the east and west of the old Provinces of Canada, must naturally have a great share of the advantage. We know, Sir, that those large centres of commerce, attract the largest amount of capital, and the property which had been distributed through the Dominion by means of those expenditures of from one hundred and eighty to two hundred million dollars has borne its fruit and those cities have been advanced. They have been advanced in no other way; they have been advanced at the cost of the whole of the rest of the Dominion, and just as long as those large cities go on and prosper in this way the rural districts will suffer to that extent. But, Sir, have they improved as much as it would appear from this statement. I notice that at a public meeting of the Board of Trade called at Montreal the other day that Mr. Drummond, that eminent sugar refiner of Montreal, who is the president, delivered an address, which I think the hon. gentlemen opposite would find very instructive if they read it. The speech was with reference to the Government assuming the debt of the Harbor Commission in Montreal. I do not propose offering an opinion upon the assumption of that debt, but I will say this much, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a much more legitimate appropriation of the public funds of this country to cheapen the harbor in Montreal and reduce the expense attending the imports and exports of that large centre of commerce, than to have given the large sum of money they did give to a member of their administration to build up a rival railway to the Intercolonial which is owned by the Administration. Now, Sir, what did Mr. Drummond say?

"In opening the meeting he spoke in a manner that was little short of mutinous to his friends at Ottawa. Hitherto, he said, the impression had prevailed that Montreal would come out all right, no matter what happened; but now there was no use mincing matters, and it must be stated openly that this city had arrived at a crisis in its history. The charges in the harbor of Montreal were three or four times as great as those in the port of New York, and whilst the exports of the country had gone on increasing enormously during the last ten years the trade of Montreal had remained almost stationary. Montrealers had for years been amusing themselves in discussing plans for remedying the evil, but nothing really had been done, and to-day they were forced to acknowledge that Montreal was not in a position to compete with American ports. Outward exports were taking the route by way of New York because carriage alone was charged and all dues were abolished. This was not a Montreal question, but a national question, and it was gratifying to find that over one hundred members of the House of Commons had pledged their support to it."

It evidently seemed that they had done a little log rolling around the House and had secured the promised support of one hundred members of the House of Commons.

"The time had arrived for plain speaking. The port of Montreal was hastening with rapid strides to a condition of bankruptcy."

This is one of the cities which has been so highly favored by the National Policy, and Mr. Drummond continues:

"The income of the harbor commissioners was not sufficient to carry on the ordinary routine work of the port, and the inevitable result of Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

bankruptcy or repudiation was close at hand unless the Government took immediate action.

Now whether Mr. Drummond was right or wrong, that statement on the face of it does not convey the *coulour de rose* aspect of the prosperity of Montreal which hon. gentlemen on the other side seem so desirous to make out. Hon. gentleman have stated during this debate that this policy was going to injure the manufacturers. I need not go into that branch of the question because my hon. friends who preceded me have dealt with that question in such an exhaustive manner that it is completely unanswerable. Let me take one or two illustrations. It is evident, if the public prints can be relied on, that the Ontario manufacturers are not all of that opinion. We have seen from day to day statements made by Ontario manufacturers that they are not apprehensive of the result of unrestricted reciprocity; and these are men with a knowledge of their business, with ample capacity and ample industry. I say that wherever a manufactory was established under proper management previous to the introduction of the National Policy, it has succeeded, if not to a great extent of late years, to a sufficient extent to yield a fair return on the capital invested. My hon. friend the other night quoted also Mr. Gibson, one of the oldest and most enterprising business men of the Province of New Brunswick, who has built up a large cotton mill in that Province. He was interviewed on this question, and what was his answer? He said: "So far from my dreading unrestricted reciprocity, or apprehending any difficulty in connection with my industry from it, I should feel gratified that it would open up to me a market of 65,000,000 people, instead of 4,500,000 as at present;" and Mr. Gibson is a man whose judgment as a business man is relied on more than that of almost any other man in the Province of New Brunswick, and I may say in the Province of Nova Scotia as well. He was able to gauge the condition of his Province so well that when the question was put to him, he was ready to answer at once and emphatically that so far from his apprehending anything disadvantageous to his cotton industry, unrestricted reciprocity was just what he desired to see carried into effect. Then, I am informed by an hon. member of this House that the other day one of the proprietors of the new sugar refinery to be built in Montreal, in conversation with him, said: "We are putting in all our machinery of the most improved pattern, and are building our refinery according to the most improved methods, and if the unrestricted policy prevails, and we have a market in the United States, then, instead of having our market overcrowded every little while, we shall be able to compete successfully in all the border and Western States with the American refiners." Does anyone doubt a statement like that? Why should not our refineries in the Lower Provinces, and in Montreal as well, be able to do a large portion of the business in the American border States? Our climate is good, our labor is cheap, our coal is cheap, and we have capital for our enterprises, and instead of these large refining industries every little while being brought to a dead stop by orders from the head centre, or being limited in their production by orders to produce only so many barrels a day, so that a great many men are thrown out of employment—instead of having that condition of affairs, which will grow worse with the advent of another refinery to compete with them in the market, all these things would be changed, and they would have a constant market which would enable them to keep their enterprises going and give ample employment to their men all the year round. That is a consideration which may not have occurred to those less familiar than I am with that branch of trade. The refining industry of this country would be one of the first to reap the advantage of unrestricted reciprocity. I have said that we have cheap labor. Can anyone doubt that after the exposure made in the city of Quebec the other day before the Labor Commis-

sion? I noticed by a paper published here that the last statement made there gave the startling fact that mill hands in the city of Quebec could only get 35 cents a day, and that women were laboring in the match factories of Quebec for 15 cents a day. Is it any wonder that the people emigrate to the United States? Is it any wonder that these people should be dissatisfied? Why, one of our Nova Scotian or Canadian girls who goes to the United States as a domestic servant is able to earn from \$14 to \$20 a month with her board, while a poor girl in the Province of Quebec, who, perhaps, cannot leave her home, is laboring there for \$3.50 a month and paying her board. If there is anything to show that we would be able to compete in the matter of labor with the people of the United States, it would be that startling fact which was revealed before the Labor Commission the other day. Now, Sir, I will give you a statement with regard to the general condition of affairs in the Province of Nova Scotia, made in a letter written by a gentleman in Halifax who worked as hard as any man in that city to defeat me in 1878, and succeeded. This gentleman has more small properties in the city of Halifax and controls more investments than any other man in that city to-day. I refer to Mr. James Thompson. Some one having stated that the value of property would not decrease in Halifax, Mr. Thompson wrote as follows:

"I saw in the report of a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce a few days since that one of the merchants of this city had asserted that the real estate of the Province had increased at least 50 per cent since Confederation. I was somewhat surprised at the statement, and am anxious to know from what sources the facts are derived which would warrant such a conclusion.

"Some years since I took the trouble to get the amount of the assessment rolls of some of the counties of this Province, and arrived at an entirely opposite conclusion. Taking four leading counties, representing the four of our leading industries,—Cape Breton as representing the coal mining interest; Antigonish as representing the farming interest; Hants as representing the ship-building interest, and Queen's as representing the lumbering interest, and we will find that the assessment rolls amounted in 1863 to \$11,316,000, while in 1884—at the time he was writing—they had decreased to less than \$3,000,000."

That is the effect it had with us, and since that time I may say that so far from having improved in value, their value has become less and less from day to day, until, in the city of Halifax at least, it is almost impossible to sell property at all. I notice in a St. John paper to-day the advertisements of property to be disposed off at public auction, and the auctioneer puts at the foot of the advertisements this notice: "Any bid will be accepted that will more than pay for the taxes and the rates." Well, we have had a large amount of property sold for taxes in Halifax. At one time last year, there were some two hundred or three hundred properties advertised for sale under the sheriff's hammer, and on one occasion a valuable wharf property, which had a few years ago been sold for \$40,000, only realised just one half that amount. You can go through the streets of Halifax, from one end of the city to the other, and I do not hesitate to say that on enquiry you will find that since our free trade with the United States was put an end to, the value of property in the city of Halifax has fallen more than 50 per cent. A condition of affairs equally disastrous exists in other parts of the Provinces. Now, I come to the fishermen. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries must be very unqualified to fill the position he holds, if he does not know more about the interests of our fishermen and the way unrestricted reciprocity would benefit them than he was disposed to admit the other night. Perhaps the hon. gentleman in the receipt of his \$7,000 a year, hardly understands the hardships and toil which our fishermen go through from year to year. Is he aware that at one or two o'clock in the morning, these men rise from their beds, light their candles, cook their frugal meals, and go out in their small boats miles from the land, encountering heavy weather, in cold and rainy seasons, and come back in the

afternoon with the product of their day's labor—may be a few barrels of mackerel and herring or a few quintals of codfish? What are they to do with their harvest? These men know when they catch the mackerel, that their only market is in the United States; they know that only a few of the fish go to the West Indies; they know that every mackerel caught along the Atlantic coast, in the Province of Nova Scotia, of a valuable character—what we call our fat mackerel—must go to the United States, even if the duty were \$10 a ton. These fish do not go to the old Provinces of Canada, they do not go to England, they cannot go to the West Indies, because being fat they will not keep in that hot climate; so that every barrel of mackerel, no matter what the duty may be, and no matter if it brings only a net return of one or two dollars a barrel, must go to the United States or be thrown overboard and allowed to rot. I hold in my hand the statement of a vessel which, in 1885, the year after the reciprocity treaty was terminated, landed 800 barrels of mackerel in the port of Boston. That may seem a large amount to any one not familiar with the question, and it is a large amount, far above the average. These men under ordinary circumstances would have been able to realise a very fair return, but when they went to the United States and had to pay the duty of \$2 a barrel, what was the result? From their hard labor, from the 15th June to the 30th October, in rain and shine, in calm and storm, exposed to all the inclemency of that boisterous Atlantic coast, these hardy fishermen only realised, after all that long, hard summer's toil and labor, the paltry sum of \$30 a piece. Can such a condition of affairs be allowed to exist while a remedy is possible? Can such a condition of affairs be allowed to remain, if there is within sight a possible arrangement which will open a market to the product of these hardy men? The Government would be unworthy of the position they occupy if they did not strain every effort, if they did not use every possible influence to open this market. I am not sanguine that we are going to convince any hon. gentleman on the other side. I know how strong is their party allegiance, I know that they will follow their leader, and that we cannot expect to convert them; but I know that we have an intelligent constituency behind every one of them, and it is to those men we are appealing. It is to the intelligent constituencies that we are addressing our observations to-day, and it is possible that some Robert Peel may come out from the ranks of the Tory party to carry a great measure as that illustrious statesman did the great measure of the abolition of the corn laws of England. It may be that some shaft, some argument, may go forth, which will reach the hearts and the convictions of some leader on that side, who, when he sees the momentous interests involved in a trade with 65,000,000 people alongside of us, and sees that by his efforts he may forward a scheme which is going to make two great peoples to a certain extent one, which is going to allay a great deal of the acrimony and disputes which have prevailed for years past, which is going to do a service and not a disservice to the old country, who, when he realises that England and America are the two greatest countries and may together bid defiance to the world, and that a peaceful alliance with the United States in our trade relations and a peaceful settlement of the Irish question, which, I am proud to say I have always advocated, and which I believe to be nearer accomplishment to-day than it ever was at any time in the history of that country,—are now, more than ever, desirable,—who, when he sees the immediate possibility of bringing these two great nations together in peaceful alliance and harmonious working, a great Anglo-Saxon race, will not be untrue to his own judgment, will not be faithless to his duty, and allow his prejudices to control him, but will give this matter the consideration we have a right to expect from every

hon. gentleman here. What is the position of these fishermen to-day? \$500,000 per year is what the fishermen of this country, under the present policy of restriction, pay to the revenue of the United States; that is when they have a fair catch. All that would be changed, and the \$500,000 would go into the pockets of our own fishermen.

An hon. MEMBER.—No.

M. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says no, but he is not sufficiently familiar possibly with that branch of the subject to know, as pointed out by the hon. member for Norfolk the other day, that, while we catch a certain quantity of fish, the Americans catch a much larger quantity. The price of these articles is settled by what the Americans produce themselves, and the quantity which we send, which is small to them but great to us, will go there and will not affect the price in their market, and we will obtain the same value. Does anyone suppose that the fishing industry of this country is to remain in the position we find it to-day? Does any hon. member desire that it shall always be kept in the same condition, that there shall be no further development of that great industry which a benign Providence has placed within our reach? What is the use of developing it to any further extent if we have no market? What is the use of our people making efforts to build new vessels, to send out new crews and to catch more fish, if we have no market for them? The market of the United States is the only market we can ever look to to successfully develop to any extent that great fishing industry along our shores. Looking at its position to-day, it is a matter of life or death to them down on the shore. One hon. gentleman quoted a statement from the Halifax Chamber of Commerce to show that the fishing industry was fairly profitable. What was said in that was not very committal one way or the other. They said that the prices were low in the early part of the season, but that, as they had advanced considerably later in the season, the result of the year's fishery had been fairly successful. How was that brought about? If the hon. gentleman had known this fact perhaps he would not have given this the prominence he did. In the early part of the season fish were very low. Then we found that we had hardly a good catch. That was not, however, the important factor. The fisheries in St. Pierre-Miquelon, which had been so much reduced the previous year, in spite of the ruinous bounty of 10 francs per quintal, were still further reduced, and they did not send out one-tenth of the number they sent out the previous year, and so reduced the catch of the previous season. The catch in Newfoundland was short, and it was almost a failure in Labrador; and then came the news that the great Norwegian fishery, one of the largest in the world, counted by millions, had been a failure to a very great extent. When all this was known in the consuming markets of Europe and elsewhere of course there was an advance in fish, and our men to that extent realised an advantage; but we cannot hope to expect, and we do not desire to see any such condition of affairs again. However, if it had not been for that condition of affairs, had it not been for the failure in all these places to which I have referred, the fishing interest in Nova Scotia would have been a very poor affair last year. But what had it been for the few years previous? If the hon. gentleman had been really interested in that question, he would have known that in the three previous years, instead of that industry being productive at all, the men had barely made a living out of it. Prices were so low, while the catches were large, and the United States markets were closed to them, that our own people as well as those in Newfoundland reduced their outfit and their catches as well. But, give us access to the United State market, give us access to the fifty or sixty millions of people alongside of us, then our fishing industry, with the millions and millions which are involved in it, would go forward with

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

leaps and bounds, and there would be such an increase in that branch of commerce as would give wealth to that part of the country. The hon. gentleman asked us what was a natural market, and he said that France, if nearness was to be considered, was a more natural market for England than some of the distant places with which England had much greater commercial relations. The hon. gentleman might have stated his case with equal force if he had given us the whole condition of affairs, if he had stated that there were only two countries in the world with which England had greater trade relations than with the French nation alongside of her, and those are India and the United States. India, with its millions of people, must be and naturally will be for a very long time the greatest market that England possesses, and the United States, that Anglo-Saxon country, is the next greatest consumer of her products; but the French nation, alongside of her, was also valuable to her, as \$250,000,000 were taken by the French during the year, according to the public records, and, although the hon. gentleman may not think that a very large amount, I consider it sufficient to establish the fact that, but for the immediate proximity of France to England, but for the free trade policy, inaugurated to some extent by Mr. Cobden and subsequently carried out to a certain extent, introducing better trade relations between those countries, it would not have amounted to the large sum it did. I would like the hon. the Minister of Marine to go along our coast when he visits Halifax next year, instead of allowing his gunboat to go down the shore electioneering in the county of Shelburne, instead of sending her down there to sound along every little harbor in the county of Shelburne, but of course not to make promises. Oh, no; we have the word of the gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that he made no promises, I do not say he did, but I say that, when he went down on board that Dominion gunboat, with the Dominion flag flying over his head, and the so-called engineer going into every port along that coast and sounding, and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf, and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a lighthouse here—I do not say he made any promises, but the inference would be natural. If the Minister of Marine, instead of allowing his navy to be employed in that way, would go along our coasts himself and judge of all these questions, I think he would be in a much better position to give an opinion. He would find there one thing. He would find that our hardy fishermen are leaving us and going to the United States, as I am sorry to say. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) would say that sentiment should keep them at home and let them starve. Sentiment is very strong, but a man cannot live on sentiment alone, and, when these hardy fishermen go out in one of our own vessels and fish by the side of an American vessel, and the American vessel takes 1,000 quintals of fish, and our vessel takes 1,000 quintal of fish, and our own men are on board that American vessel and go into an American port, and get 50 cents a quintal more than the man who lands his fish in Nova Scotia, I say that sentiment will stand a very short time against such an argument as that. I know, from my own experience, that a large number of vessels last season were prevented from going into the fishery because they could not obtain the crews, because the men had all gone to the United States. Go down to the Island of Cape Breton, My hon. friends from Cape Breton here will bear me out—

Gen. LAURIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman confirms my statement, as I knew he would from his frankness. But I say, go down to the Island of Cape Breton, and there you will find that almost all the population, a large number of people there who used to be engaged in our shore fishery, have gone to the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know better, for I am engaged in that business myself. Years ago we used to have tens of thousands of valuable shore fish brought to the Halifax market and exported all over the world; that branch of commerce, as far as regards the shore fishery, is a thing of the past. Those men have gone banking, and under the new condition of affairs, and when they found that our fishing vessels could not fish on as favorable terms as the Americans, they emigrated to the States and engaged on board American vessels. When they go there they make acquaintances, acquaintance leads to friendship, friendship leads to settlement, and settlement generally leads to marriage, and the United States reaps the advantage we lose from their industry. This operation has been repeated from year to year as the years roll round. Now, Sir, the National Policy was started, if I remember rightly—I do not wish to misrepresent the Government—with four objects. The first was to encourage manufactures, second to increase our trade with England, third to reduce our trade with the United States, and fourth to secure reciprocity. Now, let us examine for one moment how far these objects have been secured. Take the manufactures first. Certain manufactures, no doubt, have been established in certain parts of the Dominion, and certain manufactures have made large sums of money. There were large manufactures before the National Policy, which yielded a fair return. Take the city of Halifax, which I represent—what did the National Policy lead to there? I venture to say that so far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, the operation of the National Policy has been a curse instead of a blessing. What do we see with reference to the Halifax sugar refinery; \$400,000 were put in that refinery. It went on for a year or two, but it lost all its capital, and owed the bank \$250,000 besides. The bank sold out the property to the present proprietors, minus \$100,000 which they lost; therefore there was just half a million dollars lost in the Halifax sugar refinery since it started. What it may do in the future I do not know, I only hope it may have a successful career. Then, again, you take the sugar refinery across the harbor. It was built by English capitalists at a cost of \$700,000, and was one of the most thorough refineries in the country. It ran about twelve months and then failed. It was taken over by the bondholders for less than \$300,000, and is now starting under their management. Therefore, taking these two operations alone, I show you most conclusively—no man can gainsay it—that in the city of Halifax alone, there has been one million dollars wasted, lost to the capitalists of that country—let alone the cotton factory in Halifax, the stock of which would not bring 50 cents in the market to-day, costing \$350,000. That is the beneficent effect of the National Policy so far as we are concerned. Well, Sir, have they increased our trade with England, and diminished it with the United States, as they promised? We find that our exports to England, in 1878, were \$45,941,000; in 1887, they amounted to \$44,571,000, or \$1,369,693 less in 1887 than in 1878. Then, take our exports to the United States. We were not going to do any more business with the United States, remember: we were going to teach them a lesson and build up a Chinese wall. Our exports to the United States in 1878 amounted to \$25,244,898; in 1887, to \$37,660,199, or an increase of \$12,415,000 during that time. Then take the aggregate. In 1878, the aggregate with Great Britain was \$83,372,279; in 1887, \$89,534,079, or a gain of \$6,162,760. Then take the United States. The aggregate trade in 1878 was \$73,876,437; in 1887, \$82,767,265 or a gain of \$8,890,728. Therefore in this respect you will see that so far from the National Policy increasing our commercial relations with England, it has reduced them; and so far from decreasing our trade with the United States it has increased it; in these two respects it has been a total failure. Now, Sir, what we want below, as I said before, is free access to

our customers across the line. We are here 4½ millions of people, speaking the same language, as has often been observed, with the same natural tendencies for trade, with the same industry, I hope, and with the same capability for business, I believe. I say, Sir, that if you can bring these two countries into closer commercial relations, and by some arrangement acceptable to the people of the United States, entered into at this favorable moment when the people of the United States seem to be considering this question, if the Government can make a proposal to them which will bring about such a change as I have indicated, then I think we shall be fortunate indeed. We want, moreover, in any arrangement made the coasting trade free to us from the Atlantic to San Francisco. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, what effect it would have upon the great ship-building interests of the Lower Provinces, of the Province of Quebec, and, of course, of the Western Provinces as well. We are naturally situated for ship-building all along the Atlantic coast. There is not a harbor along that long coast line, there is not a creek on the eastern or western shores but where you will see small vessels and vessels of very considerable tonnage being built year by year. They can be built more economically with us than in the United States, because the wood is at our hands, and they are built by our own people largely during the season when there is no other employment or occupation. Imagine, I say, if you throw open to the people of the Maritime Provinces that great boon, the right to buy American ships or to sell our vessels in their market, what an impetus it would give along our sea coast. The Americans cannot compete with us as regards the cost of vessels. I repeat that their wood is more expensive and there is a difference in values of about twenty-five or thirty per cent. This has always given us a certain advantage in our fishing outfits and enterprises, and if we had access to their markets from Maine to California, it would open up a wide field for our sailors and fishermen, of which they would immediately take advantage, and we would see hundreds of vessels built along our coast for employment in the coasting trade of the United States. In all this matter there is no one question greater than this: reciprocal coasting trade and reciprocal registration of vessels. I listened the other night, with a good deal of amusement, to a quotation made by the Minister of the Interior from a speech or document purporting to be written or spoken by the late lamented Hon. George Brown. I thought that if dead men's bones could rattle in their graves, or if a voice could come to us from the tombs, what maledictions would we hear from that old Reformer, that any utterance of his should ever be construed into an approval of the monstrous policy under which this country is laboring at the present moment. That old Reformer who devoted his whole life to freeing commerce from its shackles, to securing for us free trade, and to promoting the good of his fellowman, would have been the last man to have countenanced such a policy, and he would have scorned the idea that any sentiment that he ever uttered or any word he ever wrote could be brought forward in support of the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. No, he lived in different times under different circumstances. He lived in times when commerce was free; when it was not necessary for a householder to go hat in hand to ask a "combine" if he might buy so many pounds of sugar. He did not live in a time when a house-maid on going to a grocery store had to ask most humbly from the "ring," "combine" or guild or whatever they call it whether she might buy a bottle of pickles. He did not live in a time when a boy on going to a store had humbly to ask permission to buy a box of matches valued at two cents. All these are natural consequences of "combines" and guilds. Does any man suppose the Hon. George Brown would approve any such conditions and the imposition of such burdens on the trade and commerce of

the country? No, he lived in different times. He lived in times such as are indicated by Tennyson when describing the glorious reign of her present Majesty, he said:

"And statesmen at her council met
Who knew the seasons when to take
Occasion by the hand, and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet."

We in this matter are bound to go forward, and this question has come to stay. We are bound to carry it to a successful conclusion. It may not be this year or next year, but within a few years the hon. gentlemen opposite will remember what I am telling them to-night, that public opinion in this country will not sustain the action which they are going to adopt, that public opinion will be in harmony with the sentiments proposed by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and the policy embodied in the resolution of the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We are going to make this the great question of the country for some time to come. We believe the people will approve our efforts; we believe, when they are educated, they will see the vital importance it is going to be to every industry in which they are concerned, and they will come to our assistance. We are going into the battle, and we are going to inscribe on our banners as the watchword, as the motto, as the text of the Liberal party, these noble sentiments echoed by the Secretary of State for the American Union, Mr. Bayard, who when writing to a friend a short time ago said: "Providence has made us neighbors, let wisdom make us friends." Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I beg to move the following amendment to the amendment:—

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I was somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon after a statement made with such assurance and with such exultation by the hon. gentleman who has led the other side in this debate, that from the Maritime Provinces especially should come a wail for unrestricted reciprocity. I was somewhat surprised, I say Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances that a question said to be exciting such an amount of interest among the business people of the Maritime Provinces was brought before us by a gentleman old in politics, a gentleman well acquainted with political strategy, a member representing his party from the Province of New Scotia, travelling back to the dusty journals of this House for 1867 in order to attempt to bring arguments to bear against the Liberal Conservative party on a charge of having been at one time disloyal to the interests of the Empire. It struck me as a curious commentary upon the boasted strength by their principles initiated in bringing the main resolution before this House, that an hon. gentleman holding the position that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) the senior member from his Province does, that he thought it necessary, and thought it wise, to labor, and hopelessly labor for some minutes before the Parliament of Canada with an argument so puerile and so weak. The hon. gentleman devoted some time calling the attention of the House to what his contention actually was and that contention being that the language which he quoted from the mouth of Lord Elgin, representing the Crown in this country conveyed sentiments traitorous to the Crown and sentiments at variance to the sentiment which brought about the connection of this country with the mother country and which serves to this day to maintain that connection. It seems strange to me that the

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

hon. gentleman had not read a little more diligently the journals of 1867 since he turned his attention to old and ancient literature, because on page 248 of the same volume he would have found that that Parliament by him thought to be so disloyal, by him thought to be so in favor of sentiments of independence from the mother country, had resolved:

"That in the opinion of this House the interests as well of the British Empire as of the Dominion and of the several Provinces of which it is composed will be best promoted by the maintenance and consolidation of the existing Union, and that this House confidently trusts that due attention to the interests of the people of the whole Dominion and a wise and judicious course of legislation will result in the general acceptance of the Union to the inhabitants of the Dominion and conduce to the well-being and harmony of the whole country."

In support of that resolution he would have found the names of gentlemen whom I hope it is not unparliamentary to mention by name and which I do for convenience sake, the names of Cartwright, Mackenzie and Mills—landmarks that perhaps might have induced him to steer clear of a point such as the one he had raised. I think the hon. gentlemen in this House will have been amazed when they reflect that before six o'clock the arguments of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) were so few, that the arguments of the hon. gentleman were so weak and that up to that time he had hardly reached the resolution, and hon. gentleman will be justly surprised that a gentleman occupying the prominent position that he does in mercantile business in the Province of Nova Scotia and dealing as he said himself every day in the fish market, selling fish and buying fish, that that hon. gentleman, acquainted as he is with all the different branches of trade, and knowing the circumstances of our trade in that Province, has not attempted to deal with the resolution before the House. So far as he touched the question of reciprocity he argued for a long time (and most of the members of the House agreed with him) in favor of the treaty of 1854. He went on to show that the interchange of articles mentioned and enumerated in that Treaty had been beneficial to both countries alike and that in the Maritime Provinces there was a strong wish for the renewal of that interchange. No man to-day attempts to gainsay that statement. But when for a moment the hon. gentleman did allude to the resolution before the House he showed, as strongly as he could show, the strength of the position of this side of the House on that question. Then he said if this contemplated move, this contemplated turn of affairs, "change of front" I think he called it, meant direct taxation, that he for one would call "stay your hand." Yet he had the direct statement made by his leader in this debate, he had a long and able argument before him to show that direct taxation was not such a terrible thing. He had before him the unmistakable utterances of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that direct taxation would ensue from the passage of this resolution.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I quote his words to do him justice:

"Can they afford for the sake of gaining advantages amounting from fifteen to thirty millions to submit to a direct taxation of two millions or three millions temporarily. I should say if the necessity existed the people would cheerfully submit to the impost."

Mr. CHARLTON. Notwithstanding I distinctly said that it was my belief direct taxation would not be resorted to.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). We have had the expression of the belief of those hon. gentlemen oftentimes before. We have also the experience between 1874 and 1879 that no calculation ever made by the financial leader of that party in reference to either the revenue or taxation was ever borne out by the facts, and that no prophecies ever made by him at any one time were ever verified by our experience in those sad and troublesome years. It did amuse

me to-night, and I am sure it amused hon. gentlemen in this House generally, to hear some of the sentiments enunciated by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). He apparently to use an old phrase came "cringingly" up to one issue that stared him on the face, and that was that he had to take back a great many sentiments and a great many principles propounded by him in public in his own Province, and in this House, and in the Chamber of Commerce of the city he represents. He knew, and therefore feared that those principles would be brought against him, and he pretended to go over the whole of them, stating some of them, and endeavoring to follow his leader by spurning and treating with contempt any charge of inconsistency. But it did amuse me, Mr. Speaker, and it somewhat pleased me as a Canadian, to hear the hon. gentleman, who within this House, last session, indignantly denied that he was a Canadian in any other sense than by an Act of Parliament which he abused and which he villified, declare to-night, after his leader from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that he was going to follow the banner that had upon it the inscription "Let us consider the interests of Canada first," and not only so, Mr. Speaker, but I remember that this hon. gentleman fought under a banner only a year ago—hardly a year ago—which had inscribed upon it "Nova Scotia for the Nova Scotians against Canada for the Canadians"; under a banner upon which was inscribed the words "Don't forget that repeal means reciprocity; only by repeal can we get reciprocity," and yet he adds to this new banner which he flaunts in the air to-day the words "reciprocity or repeal," thus reversing all of the mottoes and every old standard in that respect. No one can blame him. His leader in this debate, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has boldly announced that there is a complete change of face, and that his party are to a unit upon the principle against which they were diametrically opposed a short time ago. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all earnestness, and I ask through you to the people of this country, whether hon. gentlemen in this House representing the interests of Canada, representing the interests of their constituents can so glibly go behind a record? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is merely a charge of inconsistency with which they are now met? In my opinion the position of the Liberal party as announced in this House and in this debate is of a far more serious character than that which they suppose. They cannot go behind the record in that manner. They cannot say that what they thought a few years ago or a year ago can be all upset now. The hon. member for South Oxford said he would not waste time over charges of inconsistency. I say that the charges standing against him to-day, brought in this debate and still unanswered, are charges of a gross breach of faith on the part of the great political party for which he speaks—charges of a violation of distinct and emphatic pledges made by the leaders of his party all over the country more than a year ago to capital and labor, which has embarked everything in this country under those pledges. From 1867 almost down to 1887 every capitalist and laborer in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific had the right to believe that both political parties in the country were pledged to reciprocity in the natural products of the two countries, and no other. Not only by the statements of their leader at Malverne but by resolutions moved in this House, it is clear that both parties in this Parliament had pledged to the manufacturing interests that their money was safe.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.) An hon. gentleman says "no," but he in his position is bound to say "no" to any proposition propounded by us in this debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in a desperate position, and they are right to say

"no" when their late leader is on the other of the ocean. But that leader, when he said he spoke not only for himself, but for the party he represented, and especially for Sir Richard Cartwright—for he named him—that leader pledged his party not to play the bull in the China shop if they were returned to power at the last election; but you have never seen more furious bulls than the hon. gentlemen who have attacked the manufacturers and the vested interests of this country. They speak as if these men alone are guilty of these horrible combinations in trade, although they know that guilds have invaded other countries than Canada, even England, the mother of free trade. But it is a serious charge which I bring against these hon. gentlemen, and it cannot be answered in a flippant manner, but must be squarely met; and I will ask the House to listen to some proofs which I will adduce in support of it. We had an admitted organ of the Liberal party in 1880 using this language:

"What is the main promise of those who wish to detach the Dominion from Great Britain in order to make the country a preserve for Yankee manufacturers, who are totally unable to compete with British manufactures on fair terms? That the producers of our raw exports may gain free admission to a market of 50,000,000 people. The inference which it is hoped that ignorant people will draw is that the whole American people would straightway wish to purchase Canadian produce if a Zollverein were established. But free admission to the markets of California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas, and dozens of other States would cause about as much Canadian produce to be sold there as could be sold to the inhabitants of the moon. Of the 50,000,000 people assumed to exist in the United States how many live in a locality to trade with Canada? Parts of the half-dozen States lying east of longitude 90° and between parallels of latitude 40° and 45° contain the people with whom we are asked to form a commercial union, taking their manufactures at exorbitant prices. One little corner of the 'market of 50,000,000 people' is offered to Canadians as the price of their national extinction! Men who advocate a base surrender of their country for money do not cease to be disgusting though they become also ridiculous when it is evident they are duped by their own sordid imagination."

I am reading from the *Toronto Globe*. Again on June 8, that paper said:—

"Who can name any great staple that does not command as high a price in England as in the United States? The American farmer gets no more for his grain than his Canadian competitor, as is evident from the fact that both send their produce to the English market. It may be said that Canadian barley would rise in price if admitted free to the American market. How long would the enhanced price be continued? Only till a greater breadth of Canadian soil was devoted to raising the grain."

Then, again, the same paper said:

"The average yearly value of fish exports from Canada during the seven years between the termination of the reciprocity treaty and the fiscal operation of the treaty of Washington, from 1867 to 1873, was \$4,003,375, of which \$1,137,839 worth was imported into the United States, and \$2,865,535 worth was absorbed by other markets. Thus, under a tariff meant to be prohibitive, 28 per cent. was marketed in the United States, and 72 per cent. in other countries. In the six years which have transpired since the removal of duties under the Washington treaty, from 1874 to 1879, these exports have averaged \$5,971,867, of which \$1,720,156 worth was imported into the United States, and \$4,251,731 worth found other markets. The percentage to the United States was a trifle over 28, and that to other countries was a fraction over 71. Whilst the annual increase of fish trade during this latter period average \$1,958,512, only \$582,317 worth represents exports to the United States, the business with other markets having increased to the extent of \$1,386,196 yearly average."

It went on to show that the Americans paid any duty which they placed upon Canadian fish. That was the position of the organ at that time, and it is perfectly reasonable for hon. gentlemen to claim that they are not on every occasion, perhaps not on any occasion, to be held bound by the utterances of that paper. But, as I can show, that paper voiced not only the opinions of the party, but of the country in that most unmistakable manner. The senior member for Halifax has admitted that he has made statements contrary in spirit to the arguments he now advances, and he does not hesitate to tell us that his political morality is of that high order that under the exigencies of the case he felt that it was justifiable that we should deceive the Americans—it was not right that we should stand up in the

face of day and tell the truth about the state of trade in Canada, we had to mark carefully the effect any utterances of ours would have on the Americans; and he fulminated charges against the leader of the Government and other men in the Cabinet, because in discussing grave questions in this House they had given expression to their thoughts. And this political moralist confesses as much as that he has supported the statements I have made; but whether he confesses it or not, I will show from the record that it is impossible for him to gainsay the fact. For instance, when the Washington Treaty was before the House and I may say that this extract as well as some others the hon. gentleman took care not to read the hon. gentleman said:

"He felt as a representative from Nova Scotia that, however anxious he might be for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the United States on fair terms, he was not willing to give the United States everything that we had to offer as an inducement to reciprocity. If we gave them permission to fish in our waters we put them in competition with our own fishermen."

Again, the hon. gentleman said, when a resolution on this subject was before the Chamber of Commerce:

"That the Chambers of Commerce at Halifax unite with the board of trade in St. John in requesting the Dominion Government to take prompt and effective steps to arrange a reciprocity treaty with the United States and to make efforts to secure advantageous trade relations with the Spanish and British West Indian Islands."

The hon. gentleman, then a prominent member of that board, and previously a member of the Dominion Government, used the following language:

"He thought that too strong an expression of opinion might injure our prospects. He believed in the maxim, never be too anxious make a trade. In speaking at a public meeting he referred to reciprocity in the West Indies. That was the larger and more important question."

And yet, Sir, you heard to-night the hon. gentleman declare in loud, stentorian tones that the American market is the only market for those poor fishermen who lit their lamps and went out to sea in their little boats in early morning. To-day he tells us that the American market is the only one for those fishermen, but he did not hesitate on a former occasion, when it suited his purpose, to tell the Chamber of Commerce in the city where he lives, that to obtain control of the West Indian market was the important question for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Again he is reported, in his own organ, the *Halifax Chronicle* to have said:

"Hon. A. G. Jones said he had come to listen rather than to take part in the discussion, but thought it was well to be careful how we proceeded in this matter. The cause might be injured by being too strong in expression. There was an old adage that it was not well to be too anxious for a bargain. No person believed in reciprocity more than he, but he thought the exercise of caution might be the wisest course, that was all. He found that no one in the Dominion objected to a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States on fair terms."

What was the hon. gentleman's object may I ask to-night in indulging in the strong expressions he made use of as to the absolute dependence of the Maritime Provinces in the United States markets? What was his object in taking this stand to-night, and calling on us to appear in an abject manner before a rich and powerful country which has in view many ambitions and far reaching projects. It was not well, he said, before the Chamber of Commerce, to be too anxious, but we should take a wiser course. He then found that no one in the Dominion objected to a Reciprocity Treaty on fair terms, and we have utterances by the hundred of a similar character from hon. gentlemen opposite up to the very time when, as now, it seemed probable that we would have reciprocity ultimately, that we would have a reciprocal tariff on fair terms; up to the time when all this seemed possible, as it does now, you had all these hon. gentlemen, all over the country, declaring this was not a political question, declaring that we were all one on the question of reciprocity with the United States—but the change of base to-day is sudden. It comes after a general elec-

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

tion, when that party, driven to desperation, are now hunting daily for a policy, and almost daily proposing a new one. For ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, that party has proved itself most peculiar. The hon. gentleman tells us to-night he did not believe in Commercial Union. He read from his scrap book, what he said to some gentlemen who visited him in his store at Halifax. That hon. gentleman, as we all know, has a considerable influence with the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, which is supposed to be the exponent of his views. He has told us: "I do not believe in Commercial Union, and neither party would, I believe, agree to it"; but his organ, the *Halifax Chronicle*, did not hesitate, time and again, to use language, which I would not like to use in reference to the hon. gentleman, when it said that "the Canadian who opposes Commercial Union is a natural-born sneak and coward." We know, and I must mention it in justice to the writer of these lines in the *Chronicle*, that an hon. gentleman on the back benches had the temerity, was plucky enough, to introduce a resolution, going the whole length of the opinions of an hon. member who is more pliable, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a resolution going straight for Commercial Union. How did hon. gentlemen opposite treat this man, who, according to the *Halifax Chronicle*, was not a natural-born sneak and coward. They told him to withdraw his resolution, and go in for that which the organ of the senior member for Halifax has characterised as that of a natural-born sneak and coward. Language of that kind from the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite is, I think, unfair, and on their behalf I repudiate it. I do not think it is fair criticism. Now, we had a very important utterance from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who spoke at some length on reciprocity the other day, and who indulged in many arguments which are quite tenable by hon. members on this side, in vindicating the old Reciprocity Treaty, and dilating on the advantages which the people of the Island derived under it of sending their potatoes and other articles where they pleased. That hon. gentleman representing the maritime contingent in 1885, in this House, on the Liberal side, moulded together all these expressions of opinion, blended together these different views from the different Chambers of Commerce throughout Canada in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty, and I would bring before the House the language the hon. gentleman used, in support of the point I am endeavoring to make. He alluded to the resolution of the Chamber of Commerce which I have read, spoke of the desirability of a renewal of the treaty of 1854, and strongly favored making the fisheries a basis and measure for further commercial relations, concluding an interesting speech and able argument with the following resolution:—

"In view of the early termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, this House is of opinion that negotiations should be opened with the United States of America, as well for the renewal of reciprocal relations accorded by that treaty to American citizens and British subjects respectively, as for the opening up of additional reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States, and that in the conduct of such negotiations Canada should be directly represented."

He cited, as I have said, the strong opinion in the Maritime Provinces in favor of a renewal of the old Reciprocity Treaty; and later on, the ex-leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking for the whole party, stated that the policy of his party was the policy of a tariff for revenue purposes only. He contended that he was consistent, inasmuch as it was no new departure, because this Government, through its extravagance, had made it necessary to raise a certain sum per year, and he could not see for the life of him, having studied the matter in every aspect, how that tariff could be materially interfered with, and he pledged his party at Malvern, as strongly as any statement of his could pledge it, that even if his party came into power, he would not play the bull in the China shop, but would

respect vested interests and only abolish the duty on coal and cornmeal. I ask again, how is it, after these pledges to the people, after this declaration of policy, not only from the mouths of the statesmen of that party, but by their resolutions in this House, they should propose now this entirely new departure, as it is declared to be by the senior member for Halifax. The question of the tariff and of reciprocity was threshed out, as many others raised in this debate have been threshed out, by the people at the polls; and they understood, no matter how loud demagogues might rant, that we could stand by the National Policy and at the same time stand by the interests of those concerned in the natural products of the country, and that we could, with the consent of the people and with their desire, as soon as possible, obtain reciprocity in natural products with the United States. As a Canadian, I blushed to hear the hon. gentleman who opened this debate take the position, in support of his resolution, to induce the people of this country to favor unrestricted reciprocity, that this country was in a state of retrogression, and that our position was not satisfactory. He told us, it is true, that great economic changes had taken place. He attempted to justify this change of base, not by argument, but by the statement that it was due to great economic changes, and that, therefore, the charge of inconsistency was a weak one; but he alluded to the economic changes which took place between 1867 and 1877; he alluded to none, he could cite no such changes between 1887 and 1888, and 1887 is the time when these pledges were put solemnly before the people. Unlike Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth, who have shown much more skill in managing this question and endeavoring to persuade some of our countrymen to get into the position into which the American manufacturers wish them to get, he argued by the hour to show that we were going metaphorically to the dogs in Canada and that the people would be benefited by any change. I deny, and I deny emphatically, that the country is retrograding, and no hon. gentleman has been able to maintain that position by any statistics which have been laid before us. We have been told with what skill some gentlemen can manipulate statistics, and that you can prove anything by statistics. So you can. It depends on the honesty with which you use them. I will not weary this House by showing the credit side in contrast to the side of the account which those hon. gentlemen have placed before the people, to sicken them, to take the heart from them, to fill them with despondency and despair, and to make them feel that any change would be a change for the better. I will call before the House some hon. gentlemen occupying official positions in this country, I will call before the House as witnesses hon. gentlemen from one end of the country to the other whose position cannot be questioned, statesmen occupying distinguished positions in this country, and I will cite their statements as to the condition of Canada. The testimony which I can produce is such as will bring pride in the heart of any honest Canadian or any true lover of his country. I will begin by a gentleman whose praises are often sung by hon. gentlemen, I will begin by citing the language of Mr. Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, who is, I take it, in full accord with these gentlemen in their political schemes and who would do anything, I take it, that he could do, in any justifiable manner, to enable them to obtain power; but, when he met the happy Canadians who fell into a crowd in another part of this country on that day in last July, which seems to be such a black and dark day to hon. gentlemen opposite only in this debate, that hon. gentleman was able to say, and to say truthfully:

"If they compared their Dominion with the United States, they would find that they had nothing to be ashamed of. (Hear, hear) A comparison of the statistics of both countries for the past half century would show that the percentage in every department was greater in Canada than it is, on the aggregate, in the United States; and as Canada had prospered in the past, so she would in the future."

Would you have heard the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House using language of this kind in this debate without thinking that there was mutiny in the ranks? Would you not have thought that any hon. gentleman who used that language must have gone behind the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and must be advocating, as he is, some scheme different from that of the leader. Allusion has been made to another gentleman, the Minister of Education of the Province of Ontario, a well-informed man, an able man, a man who is proud of his country, a man with Canadian pluck and Canadian vim, and a man who is enabled to look at Canadian affairs with hope and to take a good view of what has taken place in the past and of what is probable for the future. That hon. gentleman, whom I had the pleasure of meeting a short time ago, uttered then the same sentiments as those which I quote. They have been alluded to before, but this evening I am bringing forward the words of gentlemen who occupy a position in this country which I have not, gentlemen whose words cannot be confuted by hon. gentleman opposite. This hon. gentleman, who sat for a long time in the House of Commons and who is now in an important position in the Government of Ontario, was called to face Mr. Chamberlain during the short stay which that gentleman made in Canada, and, like all Canadians who are proud of their country, he was able to make a good showing for Canada, and was able to tell that distinguished gentleman from England that—

"It is Canadian enterprise that has made this country. It is a great deal to have done that. Had he seen it fifty or forty or, perhaps, thirty-five years ago, or thirty years ago, when our forests were unbroken, when our industries were undeveloped, and when we had scarcely a mile of railway, he would have said that not even the most enthusiastic and sanguine expectations could have hoped for a condition of national prosperity such as we have in Canada to-day."

He also said:

"There is abroad a spirit—"

Is it a spirit of despair, as the hon. gentleman would tell us, a loss of national hope and a feeling of dependency upon our neighbors? Not so. He says:

"There is abroad a spirit of enterprise which only waits the natural growth and development of ordinary opportunities and time to produce results which we can scarcely dare even to imagine in case we should be charged with exaggeration or perhaps something worse. There are \$174,000,000 in our savings banks, and of paid-up capital of our railways there are \$623,000,000. We possess all the advantages of civilisation, and are surrounded by all those influences which tend to make up a peaceful, happy and contented people. I am glad he has seen these things, for it has sometimes struck intelligent Canadians, when they have been visiting the old country, that among Englishmen—though not of course, among those of Birmingham (laughter)—there exists very erroneous ideas with regard to the civilisation and comforts and happiness of the Canadian people."

And that is the language used in 1888, by a leader among the gentlemen who stand up here and sing, as the hon. gentleman who spoke last sang, mournful ditties in reference to the condition of our people. So this Commercial Union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or anything which may get our necks under the yoke of American manufacturers, is referred to by the gentleman who has promoted it so much, in a pamphlet which is called Commercial Pamphlet No. 4, in which he takes issue with these hon. gentlemen:

"By a uniform tariff against all nations, she has shown her real and complete commercial independence, and under this condition has made a progress and attained a position of which every Canadian has good reason to be proud."

Now, why do they not, like men, come and face the issue and discuss it on the merits, and not occupy the time of this Chamber and the time of this country by abusing our country, by minimising its resources, by telling us everything is going wrong? Why do they not come up like men, as Mr. Wiman has done, and as I believe, as far as I have seen, Mr. Butterworth has done, and tell us plainly that the reason why we should join our destiny with that of the United States is not on account of our poverty but on account of our strength, and that, as enterprising men

who have built up industries here, as Mr. Wiman says, and have built up a position which should bring pride to every Canadian heart, we will be benefited by joining our destinies with theirs, and marching on in the same line with them, of united prosperity. I could respect their arguments in that line, but, instead of that, they take up the whole time by keeping as far away from that resolution, as far away from the particulars of that resolution, as far away from the tariff that would be framed under that resolution, as far away from the condition of the revenue which would result under that resolution as possible, and by talking to us about our miserable and wretched state. They know, Mr. Speaker, that their position is unsound, and is opposed to the latest utterances of any of them when speaking without strong feeling of partisanship. Now, I have cited some evidence; and I would recall, too, the eloquent language of the late leader of that party, a gentleman now regaining health, I hope, on the other side of the world. That hon. gentleman was able to speak in the most elegant language at Edinburgh, when he met an old colleague of Mr. Chamberlain's. He told Mr. Gladstone, and was able to boast in Edinburgh, of the magnificent strides in the path of progress made by his native Province of Ontario. He used language that I wish to God we could hear oftener from him and from his colleagues in this House. It is the language used on this side of the House, it is language that would give hope to the young men of this country, and would spur us on to greater endeavors in the future. The hon. gentleman who leads in this debate, on the other side of the House, when he went to England to borrow money, when he asked the English capitalists to invest their money in this country, did not harangue them in the style, or upon the facts or matter, that he has done on this occasion. Every hon. gentleman is familiar with the bright side of the shield that was shown then, and the honest side, as well. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, some testimony that I think ought to carry weight as to the condition of affairs in this country, and to prove that the position taken by the hon. gentleman is unsound. I wish to quote, also, the language of the hon. member for South Oxford when he sat on this side of the House in 1818, on an occasion when he visited the Maritime Provinces. I am not now dealing with the childish charge of inconsistency. In citing language previously used by the hon. gentlemen opposite inconsistent with the language used by them in this debate, I cite it for the purpose of the argument contained therein, and I cite it for the purpose of proving the insincerity of this movement. At Halifax, on August 19, 1878, when, as every one knows, and as no one has denied, the condition of affairs in Canada was far worse than it is to-day, when hon. gentlemen were apologising, so to speak, all over the country for the condition of affairs, this hon. gentleman, who now tells us that there is retrogression and that the country is getting into a frightful condition, used this language:

"These men who tell you that it is impossible to exist as a commercial people unless you have reciprocity might as well tell the United States that if they want to drive you into the Union all they have to do is to refuse you reciprocity for a certain number of years longer, which is the very best way that can be adopted of inducing the American people to enter into commercial relation with us. For my part I will deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or another. No Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among a great number of his fellow-countrymen."

What is the hon. gentleman doing now, Mr. Speaker? Driven, as I say, desperate by the serious reversals which he has met with at the hand of the people, kept out of office for so long a time, after having changed his political faith in order to obtain office, that hon. gentleman is now pursuing a course which he said no Canadian statesman worthy of the name would pursue, and so affect a portion of his fellow-countrymen. Well, we were particularly referred to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

seemed doubtful whether he could convince the splendid yeomanry of this Province, of whom I now speak, with whom I have had the pleasure of conversing, and whose condition I have examined, he seemed doubtful whether he could convince them that they were in this dependent, this abject, this poverty-stricken condition. But with that contempt for the Maritime Provinces which seems, in this debate, to have characterised the utterances to which I am about to allude, he turned around and said he expected to hear something from the Maritime Provinces. He expected to hear a wail of woe sounded from that quarter. Yet I will do my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) the credit for saying that he rather turned the table on his leader for the nonce. He told him that down in the Maritime Provinces the farmers—if I do not misrepresent his language—were not so badly off; it was the mortgaged ridden farmer of Ontario that was suffering, and his leader might turn his attention to his neighbors and not treat the Maritime Provinces with contempt. I think I can fancy the reason of the sincerity of the hon. member for Halifax. I think I know why he did not talk about the drying up of the cities by the sea. That is a great phrase in the mouths of the Reform leaders in the east, that we are drying up in the Maritime Provinces, that we are not as rich as we used to be, that real property has gone down, that assessment is low, &c. I think I know why the hon. gentleman drove slowly over the ground; I think he had read the words put into the mouth of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, at the opening of the present Session, wherein his own allies in Nova Scotia politics, now snugly ensconced in office, stated that they were happy down by the sea, and that things were not going wrong. This is the language of the hon. gentleman's friend and ally, Mr. Fielding, put into the mouth of His Honor on the 23rd of February, 1888:

"1. In welcoming you to the scene of your legislative duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the fair measure of prosperity enjoyed by our Province during the past year. While in some quarters exceptional conditions have operated unfavorably, as a rule the labors of our people, in the various branches of industry, have been remunerative and there has been an improvement in business which, it is hoped, will continue."

"2. I have particular pleasure in calling attention to the activity that prevailed in mining, an industry of great importance not only because of the capital and labor engaged in it, but also because of its value as a contributor to our provincial revenues."

The hon. gentleman touched a little on another subject, the effect of reciprocity on the coal trade, that branch of trade that brings to the coffers of the Provincial Treasury such a large proportion of its revenue. The hon. gentleman knows that there are members in this House from the coal regions of Nova Scotia that could meet him upon any ground such as that which he took only for the moment from Mr. Lithgow. And *en passant* I may say that I was surprised, that I was amazed, at that hon. gentleman's attempting such a weak thing, at his laying himself open to the emphatic answer that he did. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman who formerly represented Pictou in this House (Mr. Vail) read this old letter of 1879 from Mr. Lithgow, and yet he was answered in this House, and the hon. gentleman must have known what the answer was, that Mr. Lithgow took it all back after experience. Mr. Lithgow prophesied that the duty on coal would be of no advantage, he wrote as the hon. gentleman said he did, but he was honest enough, and sensible enough, after experience, to take back every word that he penned in that letter; and he sent it to the press, but that is not kept in the scrap book of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They do not keep the bright side of the shield now-a-days, they have turned that away in hopes that it will rust. Now, the hon. gentleman ought to know that the statistics of his Province are against him, if he attempted to stand up here and asperse too heavily the fair fame and commercial position of the Province of Nova Scotia. He knows well

enough that he and I had to pay, as taxpayers, for the publication of a document issued after the so-called repeal victory, when these men—I won't say demagogues; perhaps it is not fair—but when these men had the hardihood to go all over the Province from one end to the other, and talk about Nova Scotia as Ontario members have not hesitated to talk about Ontario. Those hon. gentlemen when they found themselves in responsible positions holding the seals of office, ambitious of a good record and a good showing while public affairs were under their control, published at the expense of the people of Nova Scotia an official document to be circulated broadcast in the British Isles. And what did they tell us of the condition of that country long years after the abrogation of reciprocity, twenty years after Confederation, twenty years after the time when we were threatened with commercial annihilation? These so-called anti-confederates, these so-called repealers, these so-called secessionists, these so-called annexationists, were induced to confess to the world that everything in the Province of Nova Scotia was lovely, that any man who had brains, that any farmer who had industry could obtain in a short time a livelihood, impossible to get, where? In the mother country alone? No, but in the American union as well. They issued a document, a copy of which I hold in my hand; it was issued by the Government of Nova Scotia in 1885 and it gives the names of the members of the Government. I wish to quote from it somewhat at length to show the hollow hypocrisy of the party that has taken part of the colors of our party, and patched up a new flag at this time of day. I wish to quote from this document also to bear out what I have said. At page 16 we are told:

"There are plenty of farms already under cultivation which may be bought at very reasonable rates, and any practical farmer with a small capital may at once possess a good and comfortable home."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I am glad the hon. gentleman is pleased.

"And by energy, industry and enterprise may make for himself a fortune and position in Nova Scotia in a few years, such as he could not obtain in a lifetime in Great Britain."

Here we come to the poor workingman that hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of commiserating, and I suppose the fisherman is included. The report says he gets very well paid in Nova Scotia,—and this is twenty years after the abrogation of reciprocity, and several years after the introduction of the accursed National Policy to which the hon. gentleman has so eloquently referred. On page 37—I like to stick to the record, and especially to the record of the hon. gentleman—this is the statement:

"By moderate industry the owner of such a place can rear his family, on better food probably than he could give them in England, with the same expenditure of capital and labor. And that is about all the average Nova Scotia farmer attempts. He does not knuckle down to his work in the severely continuous style that is practically compulsory in England and Scotland."

The hon. gentleman tells us the farmer barely lives; but he does live, and when the hon. gentleman's friends were clothed with the responsibility of office they did not hesitate to say that the farmer does not knuckle down to work as the farmers in other countries do. The report continues:

"If he had a reasonable rent to pay, as well as a living to earn, he would be compelled to work harder, to cultivate less superficially, to loiter less around the country store, to do less riding in his buggy, to get his woman folk to make more butter and less pastry, and in short by dint of having to make a struggle to escape eviction and bankruptcy he would often land himself into a state of comparative affluence. But there is not much hope of any such result from the average Nova Scotian farmer."

The Government add that this description is furnished by Mr. Imrie; they add the following foot note:

18-1888-4

"Mr. Imrie's description of the average Nova Scotian farmer is pretty nearly correct, but in every county in the Province there are farmers who are pretty considerably above the average, who have placed themselves and their families in more than comfortable circumstances, and have by their industry and attention to business acquired considerable wealth. Such men are second to none in intelligence and standing in the Province."

What condition of affairs does my hon. friend expect? Is he looking for some Utopia where a farmer can obtain more than that, where by honesty and industry he can obtain more than a comfortable living in Nova Scotia? Is he to roll in wealth without working; or what is the condition of affairs to which the hon. gentleman would prefer we should bring the people of the country? Next, as regards shipping. That hon. gentleman attempted to teach me, as one of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia some years ago by his long speeches that American shipping under the tariff of the United States and under their shipping regulations was being swept off the sea, the condition of trade in the United States and the condition of labor there was frightful to behold. But the Government of the day in Nova Scotia, in sympathy with, perhaps in council with the hon. gentleman, but at all events the Government of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, said in 1866, in this report at page 17:

"Nova Scotia owns more shipping in proportion to the population than any other country, and our vessels do a larger proportion of the carrying trade of the world."

Mr. WELSH. When is that?

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). In 1866.

Mr. WELSH. How is it now?

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

"They may be found in every port of the habitable globe, loading and discharging cargoes on our own and foreign account."

I knew the hon. gentleman would contradict me, but I did hope he would not contradict the official organs and publications of his own party. Well, then, it is not unreasonable for me to suppose that the hon. gentleman had some reason for passing lightly over the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. I wish to complain of a habit in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), indulges as a representative statesman of this country. The comparison which the hon. gentleman makes between the condition of affairs in Canada and the United States is unfair to Canada and unworthy of him. I say that no comparison he has made has been fair—he has never acted as any reasonable man would expect him to act, when making a comparison. He compares our condition with the condition of the United States when they have sixty millions of people, at a time when they have startled the world by the leaps and bounds by which they have gone forward in the path of progress, at a time when they have reduced their national debt almost one-half, at a time when everything in that country so far as matters affect us are definitely settled. He compares our condition at a time when in the States all secession is gone, not at a time when, as in Canada, small politicians are endeavoring to set Province against Province. I say if the hon. gentleman were fair, if he had the courage of his convictions, if he were strong in the faith he preaches to this House and the country, he would compare our condition with that of the United States when they had four or five millions of people and not when they have fifty or sixty millions. We may not live—perhaps we may—to see sixty millions of people in this country; but there are many men who have looked into this matter whose views can be accepted who have not hesitated to say that, judging from our past progress, our future will be even greater than that of our neighbors to the south. Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, a few statistics, not many, to show and to explain the unfairness of this argument. For instance, he speaks of the frightful and alarming

reductions in our aggregate trade and he takes for his illustration two years. He takes the year 1873 and he takes the year 1887. He calls attention to the fact that our aggregate trade has dropped from \$217,000,000 in 1873 down to \$202,000,000 in 1887, and he tells us that is an alarming state of affairs and that we must ponder over it. Well this so-called reduction being admitted, I must remark that he did not tell us the other side of the story. When that hon. gentleman took charge of affairs in 1875, when he refused to adopt the National Policy, when he attempted to hold our markets with a 17½ per cent. reduction against the American competitor, the retrogression began. In 1875 it dropped to \$200,000,000 and when in 1876 when that hon. gentleman was in power to \$175,000,000, and in 1879 to \$153,000,000. That hon. gentleman as an ex-Finance Minister of the country standing here to explain honestly, and candidly, and fairly our financial condition tells the House and tells the country that we are in an alarming state, and that there was an alarming reduction in the volume of trade. I will read you when in 1878 this reduction was going on most rapidly, the statement made by that hon. gentleman vindicating the position of Canada, glorying in the position and boasting of our commercial strength, but he told the House then something different to what he tells it now. He told the House that these were not alarming features, although the volume of trade was being reduced. When he made his finance statement in 1875 he did not hesitate to say:

"It is not necessary for me to spend any further time in reviewing the volume of our exports and imports."

It had dropped then below the figure at which it now stands.

"I do not consider that it is any proof that a country like ours is retrograding in any way because there is a check to the exports. Many authorities who are entitled to great respect are inclined to think that we have rather overstepped the mark in our progress in this direction."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this shows the inconsistency and insincerity of the hon. gentleman advancing an argument like that as compared with what he advances to-day. I shall ask the House to bear with me in vindication of the position of our country as compared with the United States. I compare the total trade, the volume of trade, as the hon. gentleman calls it of the United States when they had a population of 17,000,000 with the condition of affairs and the volume of trade in Canada, when we have five million. In 1840, the aggregate trade of the United States, amounted to \$239,000,000 or about \$14 per head of the population. In 1850 it still amounted to \$14 per head of the inhabitants, who numbered then to 23,000,000. We have seen that in Canada, during the year 1887, when the hon. gentleman says the volume of trade has decreased so alarmingly, that it amounts to \$202,000,000 on the figures which he gives, and that this represents \$40 per head for every Canadian in this country from one end of it to another. I say the purpose seems to me suspicious when an hon. gentleman of that gentleman's ability stoops to an argument so unfair and an argument so directed against the position and against the reputation of his own country. Then about the exodus. How he delighted and how every year he seems to delight over the exodus which he says is taking place from the older Provinces to the West or to the Western States. And he thinks that those features are alarming. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have his colleagues on record with utterances on this point which will give us hope. We have, for instance, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), when it was his business—it was his pleasure, I hope—to sound a different note in Canada, and when he did not think it was necessary to rouse sectional feeling, and to talk about the desire of the Provinces to get away from Confederation. He came as Minister of Militia to Halifax in 1878 to render an account of his stewardship;

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

he came and he admitted the exodus from Canada, which is admitted by all sides and cannot be gainsaid, at a time when the people were leaving the country in large numbers. The Minister of Militia said:—

"Why, we find those very people clamoring to get back to Canada. What is the reason for this? It is because those men, attracted for a time by the high wages offered in the States, now find themselves utterly without the means of support, and are desirous to come back to this country of Canada—this wretched country of Canada."

We have, fortunately, statistics giving the condition of our friends on the other side of the line. Taking the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, and comparing them with the older Provinces of Canada—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island—the statistics show that according to the census of 1830–31 there was a population of 1,953,717; in 1881 4,010,206, showing an increase in 50 years of 2,056,309; whereas the figures for the older Provinces of Canada show, in 1830 and 1831, 1,065,215; under the last census 4,141,424, showing an increase of 3,076,209, as against 2,000,000 in the States I have mentioned. Now, Mr. Speaker, one is almost forced when the argument, as far as the statistics are concerned, shows different results, to think that the figures have been made to suit a purpose. It reminds me of the story of the judge long ago, who, in dealing with a case before him, asked the counsel to explain where this land was situated in reference to which there was a dispute. One counsel said the land lay on this side (pointing to one place), and the other counsel said that it lay on the other, and the judge wanted to know what he could do in the matter. The debate has shown that figures can be used in reference to the condition of the country in very false lights. For what purpose did those gentlemen ransack their brains and devote their ingenuity in a most unfair manner to try and show that a deplorable state of things exists in favor of a country which we all ought to try and advance in every way possible. Now the hon. gentleman came to the question of inter-provincial trade, and as the Minister of Marine has devoted considerable attention to that I do not propose to go very closely into it, but I again appeal to the record. I again ask the House to take as some proof in support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that an inter-provincial trade exists. My friend from the Maritime Provinces will say that there is less inter-provincial trade existing to-day than existed in 1878. Mr. Power in his address to the electors of Halifax in 1878 said that the quantities of furniture, machinery, &c., sent into those Provinces from the upper Provinces were such that if the tariff be increased as the Conservative leaders proposed and as would be the case if the Conservatives were returned to power those Provinces would be flooded with Canadian manufactures of every description. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in the same year, when referring to Nova Scotia being the slaughter market for Canada, speaking to the people of Nova Scotia, said:

"But where does the competition come from in regard to Nova Scotia manufacturers of which I regret to say we have not more?"

They were in a bad state in those days.

"It comes almost exclusively from the old Provinces of Canada."

Then you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the grievances of the hon. gentleman's allies in Nova Scotia are not against manufactures as manufacturers, but against manufacturers as Canadian manufacturers, since Canadian manufacturers come from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The party opposite is welcome to an ally of that description, Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman endorsed the statement of Mr. Longley that even under the present condition of affairs those dried up Provinces, those Provinces dependent on the United States could get \$10,000,000 from the States every year to send to Quebec and Ontario for those manu-

factures. Well, this is a happy condition of affairs and there is nothing to complain of in that. The hon. gentlemen want the money from the United States and the hon. member from Halifax says they can get it. Then he tells us that this trade, which he is forced to admit does exist, is not a natural trade, but a trade forced over the Intercolonial Railway at great cost to the people of Canada. Now, I will answer the hon. gentleman by a letter he wrote a short time ago, in which he insisted that instead of that being a cause for complaint, these ruinous rates of the Intercolonial Railway were actually too high and ought to be lowered. Only a year or two ago, he wrote to the press, saying:—

"We did indeed complain of the rate on sugar being too high, both for us and for them, as has been abundantly proved during this winter, when all the sugar for Montreal, instead of being landed here, as heretofore, has, by the unwise and narrow policy of the Dominion Government, been diverted to New York."

I call the attention of the House to his particular reference to the rates on sugar and coal.

"The Intercolonial was built to promote and accommodate the industries of the country, and to facilitate inter-communication at the lowest possible rates. It was never expected to pay as an investment any more than the canals of the west expected to pay interest on their cost—and my complaint is that the rates have always been too high, and that the department have not carried out the object for which the road was constructed."

He says again:

"I repeat my contention, therefore, that the rates of sugar are and always have been too high, both for the Montreal refiners and for us as well."

The rate was then 18 cents.

"I am not disposed to find fault with the Government for making this reduction in tolls, as I think it wise policy that so far as possible our public works should be made the hand-maid of commerce, and on the same grounds the rates on the Intercolonial Railway should be very considerably reduced so that the object for which the road was constructed may be carried out and all parts of the Dominion receive the advantage of it in that way."

Could inconsistency go further? Now, on the question of fish the hon. gentleman, as was natural, dilated. He endeavored to persuade this House—and he based the statement on his reputation as a dealer in that article—that we pay the duty on fish, and from that argument the House was called to follow him through the rest of his argument to show that we pay the duties on the other articles we export to the United States. Well, Sir, the day was when the hon. gentleman would have spurned that proposition, inconsistent as it is with the teaching of every teacher of Free Trade. The day was when he did advocate a very different theory—the true Free Trade theory, that the Americans paid the duty on what they bought from us. In August, 1878, when the senior member for Halifax was not the free lance he is now, ready to fire a shot at his own allies if by it he can gain an advantage in the Lower Provinces, when he was not ready to join any movement in the hope of getting his party into power—that hon. gentleman, holding an official position, at a time when his utterances were weighed more carefully than they are now, did not hesitate to tell an audience in Halifax that:

"Fish are sent to the United States and the West Indies, and are not affected in their value in any way by any regulation that may be imposed here or elsewhere."

I might go on quoting from the language of the hon. gentleman. Time was when he found it necessary to oppose a measure of reciprocity with the United States—to oppose the Government for obtaining the concession of free fish from the United States. To-night we hear a great deal from him about the advantages of free fish in the American market; we are told that the poor fishermen pay the duty to the American Government, and what a boom it would be to them to have it taken off. But the hon. gentleman opposed a measure to take the duty off in 1872, when he belittled the whole Washington Treaty and all the advantages that Canada was gaining under it, as many

members of the opposite party have done, as the hon. member for North Norfolk did as late as 1878, when his own friends were charged with not having done much in that direction. The senior member for Halifax at that time said he had found that under the Reciprocity Treaty, over seven per cent. more of our fish went to the United States than when the duty was imposed, and he said the paltry amount given to Canada only amounted, in the year which he took for the computation, to the small sum of \$94,000 on the quantity exported. But an hon. gentleman in this House, who holds perhaps a more important position in his party, who does not fight them in his own Province, or abuse or villify them when he turns his back on them and comes to Ottawa—the hon. member for Queen's, who is an authority on fish, who played an important part in the negotiation at Halifax and there obtained some knowledge that he should now impart to the minds of those hon. gentlemen who are so fierce about the advantages of free fish—that hon. gentleman, in my hearing a few years ago, when speaking on another subject, said:

"I am not going into the great question of who pays the duty on the mackerel, the consumer or the producer. The general question has been debated very often in this House, and it is not applicable to this peculiar business. The question in this case depends simply on whether or not the home production at the time is equal to the home demand. * * I acknowledge that in some years we have to pay the duty to some extent, and I am now speaking, mark you, of only one species of fish, mackerel, for which the Americans give us our sole market, but ordinarily we do not pay the duty because they do not catch enough off their own coast to supply the demands, and the price goes up sufficiently to induce us to supply the deficiency."

And mark my words, if these hon. gentlemen discuss the new treaty, that has been laid on the Table, you will hear them talk about the exhaustion of the fisheries on the American coasts, and then we shall be able to form the conclusion who pays the duty. It is true, the hon. member for Queen's only referred to mackerel, but the hon. gentleman who buys fish every day and makes his money out of them, did not hesitate to oppose the Washington Treaty, and to tell this House as a merchant that it was of no advantage to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. I do not intend to say whether he is right or wrong; I am not taking that line; I am exposing—and I believe I have succeeded by the proofs I advanced—the hypocrisy of the party, which in this eleventh hour, in its desperate position, has nailed these false colors to its mast. Hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed their love for the American manufacturers, and if we adopt their ideas of what they consider beneficial for the American manufacturers, and give up what we consider beneficial for the Canadian manufacturers, then we will go in and enjoy the benefits of this union, which some call commercial union and others unrestricted reciprocity; we will adopt some change or any change, so long as it will excite a popular feeling which will bring hon. gentlemen from that side of the House to this. The real design of our American friends is shown by the language of the advocate to which allusion has often been made. What did Mr. Butterworth say in the United States? Did he go through that country like a demagogue, telling them they were all going to ruin, that protection had ruined their shipping and their farming industry, and that trade combinations all over that country necessitated a radical change? No, and this is, indeed a curious coalition which has been forced between Mr. Butterworth, an out-and-out protectionist and these men who have been haranguing all over the country in favor of free trade. Mr. Butterworth is consistent. He declares himself to be a protectionist, he says he is always an American, and not one of those men who one day talks of tariff for revenue only and another about free trade, and again hold out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. He says, I believe in protection; I believe the time is not ripe when we can safely meet the manufacturers of Great Britain in an outer mar-

ket; I believe if we can gain the Canadian market, we can sell there our surplus products and manufactures, and we can relieve the congested state of our markets at the expense of the Canadians. Of course this is my language.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will give him Mr. Butterworth's own words. In a letter which he addresses to all the members of Congress, he uses the following language with reference to Canada:—

"The location of her great highways of traffic, lakes, canals, rivers, railways, open up to us at once an exhaustless supply of raw material, and a constantly growing market for our manufactured surplus."

Does the hon. gentleman doubt the statement that I made? We are to be a slaughter market for the surplus manufactures of the United States.

"While correcting the inequalities in our tariff, we can, at the same time, remove from the trade and commerce of our people every restriction and burdensome tax which is not essential to the proper protection of our home industries, or necessary for the collection of needed public revenue."

"I see it stated in some of the public journals that in case the proposed arrangement is consummated, foreign goods will pour through Canada into the United States. Whether goods were entered at a Canadian port, or in the United States, would be of no consequence, since the tariff would be the same on both sides of the line."

My hon. friend says he knows they will insist on that, but that is not contemplated in the motion. What he said at Charlottetown, he contends, is all right, but that depended on the tariff, as against other countries other than the United States, being at our will and pleasure, and to expect they would have unrestricted reciprocity with us under this state of affairs was to suppose the Americans were arrant fools. But Mr. Butterworth is no arrant fool. He says that the Americans shall hold our markets in the hollow of their hands and slaughter their goods as they please, from one end of Canada to the other. Our people have had a sample already of the slaughtering business that went on before 1878, and it will take more than the arguments and ingenuity of hon. gentlemen opposite to make them forget how our trade then suffered. Mr. Butterworth proceeds to give his record:

"I am a protectionist; but we will agree that protection properly deals with the unequal conditions which exist in the field of competition as between our manufactures and those of the Old World. Those conditions, relating in the main to the cost of labor, and being so largely in favor of the plants of Europe, manufacturers there are in certain lines of trade enabled, in the absence of the influence of our protective system, to control the markets at our very doors. But this reason has no possible application to competition with Canada; and the reason ceasing, the rule ceases with it.

Not contempt, mark you, when they talk of competition with the manufactures of Great Britain. No, they fear competition with the manufactures of Great Britain, but they only feel contempt when speaking of competition with Canadian manufactures. That is their opinion of the stage at which our industries have advanced; they have no fear of competition within us. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to follow in the wake of a man whose designs are admitted, who is honest in his attacks against Canadian independence if you like, or Canadian commercial independence. Let us now deal with the other apostle of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, or anything that will ultimately lead to annexation. Mr. Wiman has put himself on record. Mr. Wiman says, as giving us some idea of what is contemplated when this consummation is brought about:

"The productions of Canada are so insignificant as compared with the total products of the United States that for many years they would not enter into competition to any serious extent with American products."

What a grand thing for our farmers. We were told by the ex-leader of the Opposition, when the National Policy was introduced, that it would bring about a few years of prosperity. The people took him at his word and adopted the

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

policy which has since brought us continued prosperity; and to-day the opponents of the National Policy now bring forward a policy, which will bring about the consummation they appear to desire, when we will be able no longer to enter into competition with the American producer or manufacturer, with any hope of success. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Charlton) told us in grand and forcible language of the magnificent condition of our American neighbors. He dilated upon the fact that they were the best fed, the best living, and the best clad people in the world. Well, was it by cringing for reciprocal relations with other countries that those people became rich, happy and prosperous. Was it reciprocal free trade that gave them their present comfort, independence and wealth? Was it by fawning and cringing at the feet of other nations and asking for help, that they became rich and prosperous? Or was it not by the adoption of the policy which has been proved to be so successful with them that we adopted it ourselves and have followed in their wake ever since. But a new incentive is given for a change of policy. We are told that reciprocal trade will rid us of monopolies and combines, that, Sir, is very good clap-trap. I have no wish to use that term offensively, but it does seem ridiculous that men in their sober senses, in an enlightened country like this, can argue that under unrestricted reciprocity, combines and monopolies would be out of the question. Why every one knows that monopolies exist in England and the United States as well as in Canada; and every one would rather, if he is to be subject to a monopoly, that he should be subjected to one that invests its capital in Canada rather than be one which expends all its means in a foreign country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to bring before the House an issue which has been fought out long ago, and which has nothing to do with the question under discussion, the issue of the National Policy. That is beside the question, in my opinion, entirely. Hon. gentleman opposite ought to know that at one time the great Paisley works of Scotland held the monopoly of the thread trade in the United States. The Americans placed a duty on thread, the consequence of which was that the Paisleys were compelled to start works of the same character as their works in Scotland in the United States, involving the investment of a large amount of capital in the State of Jersey, in order to retain control of the American trade, and the result was that the Americans got their thread cheaper than they ever did before, and American labor was solely employed in its manufacture. The same cause has had the same effect in this country in other articles. The tobacco duty killed a New York monopoly which had control of our trade. The McAlpin manufactory had a large amount of capital invested in New York in the manufacture of tobacco which they sold in our market. The duties were raised. The result was a transfer of half of the establishment with some 500 hands, who are now busy in the city of Toronto. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that Toronto in Canada did not get the benefit of this transfer, and so it would be with this unrestricted reciprocity? And this is only one instance out of many which I might adduce. Do you suppose that the factory would remain in Toronto, that the taxpayers of that city would be helped by that industry or by any similar industry in that case? Certainly not. They would go back to the place whence they came; they would go back to the large centres, so as to be near, as hon. gentlemen say, the largest markets; and so they would control our market just as the anthracite coal miners are controlling Ontario since the duty was, I may say, at the request of all sides, removed from anthracite coal. It illustrates the strength of the National Policy when the coal owners of Nova Scotia could afford to have that duty taken off, and I have not heard that they have made any complaint on that score, but it has strengthened the

National Policy in the minds of many when the result of taking off that duty has been, not the reduction of the price of coal, but the inclusion of Ontario in the district of Buffalo, and the increase in the price of coal. Knowing the effect of these rings, they want to rope in every Province under the power of these rings in the United States. They are against Canadian combinations, if you like, but they are in favor of American combinations to any extent. When I heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tell us, as the eloquent and able gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) mentioned to the House to-day, that we owed little to old England, that old England had not done much for us Canadians on this side of the Atlantic, and that we had to look out for ourselves,—that is virtually what he told us—irrespective of the interests of the mother country, and yet wind up by telling us that no one was to accuse him of disloyalty, and reminded us that he was a Privy Councillor, that he was a sworn adviser of the Queen and had been a member of the Government, and that he was as loyal now as he was then, I was reminded very much of an old story in reference to a counsel in an Ontario court, who was pleading and was advocating the cause of his client as best he could, though he was not endowed with a superabundance of ability. One of our American friends from Ogdensburg was present in the court, which I think was held at Prescott, and he asked, "Who is that fellow?" He was told: "That is a Queen's counsel." He said: "Do you call that kind of a man a Queen's counsel? Then, from the bottom of my heart, and from my inmost soul, I say for the first time in my life, God save the Queen." And so may Canadians say under such circumstances as I have referred to, God save the Queen. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) let the cat out of the bag, I think. He told us that we ought not to say very much because Sir Charles Tupper had gone as far as the hon. gentleman wished to go, and it did not lie in our mouths to take any position antagonistic to that resolution on that account. That proves the position which I take, it exposes the hypocrisy of this movement, it shows that there is no sincerity in it, but that it is a mere political trick brought to the attention of the country; but is it desirable that we should seek to have a second slap in the face in the same year? Everyone knows that that correspondence bears but one sensible interpretation. It is in the hands of everyone, and can be understood by everyone who can read, and whether Sir Charles Tupper, or the Liberal Conservative party, or the Government, wanted the freest and most unrestricted reciprocity or not, the statement was made there formally and diplomatically and was made to a gentleman who, as they say, had asked that we should treat on a commercial plan, it was made as broadly as any hon. gentleman could desire, and that offer was met with more than a point blank refusal, as these hon. gentlemen say, with more than a statement, as they say, that they had not power to treat. They have talked a great deal about a letter which was written by Mr. Bayard in May, and they make a great deal of the fact that Mr. Bayard did not come to that commission armed, as he said he would be, with the power to treat in relation to this matter. What is the responsibility resting on this Government as to Mr. Bayard's instructions, or Mr. Bayard's action, or Mr. Bayard's commission? The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) read to-day the instructions which were given to the British plenipotentiaries to go as far as they now desire this Government to go. The offers which were made by this Government show that they were authorised to make the broadest offers for commercial privileges.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. "Hear, hear." They made a proposition to treat in the broadest manner. That is there in writing, and nothing could be plainer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it was not treason.

Mr. TUPPER. The interruption of the hon. gentleman does not affect my argument that, no matter what their intention was as to the tariff which would be ultimately drawn, or as to the manner in which the industries of the country were to be ultimately affected, they put the proposition in plain, bold Anglo-Saxon: Will you make a trade arrangement with Canada—any trade arrangement, if you like; we are ready to receive a proposition, we now make a proposition that we arrive at an understanding on reciprocal trade. No language could be plainer in order to carry out that idea, and what was the answer? Not that they were not then authorised, but a distinct, unequivocal refusal. I see hon. gentlemen shaking their heads; perhaps I do not understand the Queen's English. I will read the letter, after I have given the purport of it, which is not only that they were not authorised to enter into that arrangement, not only that they would not accept the proposal, but that they would not ask for power to consider it, that they would not ask for the necessary instructions or the necessary power to enable them to consider it.

Mr. LAURIER. They say they are prepared to renew the proposals they made before, in the letter of the 27th November, which is kept back.

Mr. TUPPER. I am referring to the official reply.

Mr. LAURIER. That is in the official reply.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not referring to the correspondence which preceded it.

Mr. LAURIER. That is in the official reply.

Mr. TUPPER. This is the official reply: "While continuing their proposal—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friends seemed to be ignorant of that when they were discussing the matter, and now they want to have added to that the contents of a proposal of a certain date. Surely they are not so barren of argument, surely they are not so weak in their contention, as to add to the letter of Mr. Bayard and to force the people of Canada to suppose that we have refused to consider a proposal which is not before the people, and is not in writing. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that this refers to a proposal made before that date?

Mr. LAURIER. He says distinctly that the American proposal was made on the 27th November, and that the proposal of the British plenipotentiaries was made on the 4th December, and then that there was a reply on the 7th December, and that is kept back.

Mr. TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman wishes the people to imagine that that proposal was what he thinks it was. Is it not a little hasty on their part to ask the House to vote want of confidence in the Government because they imagine—and we know that they have imagined very curious things—that a certain proposal was made? What form of denial does the hon. gentleman want? Does he charge this Government now with suppressing a document relating to trade? Does he charge this Government now with doing a dishonorable, a foul, a cowardly act? Does he seek to bring his party to vote on a charge like that? I ask the hon. gentleman does he make that insinuation?

Mr. LAURIER. I made no insinuation of any kind. The papers have not been laid before us. But I say the hon. gentleman has no right to say that they made such an offer of unrestricted trade, when it is proven that the American plenipotentiaries made an offer which was refused by the Canadian Commissioners.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has been told time and again that the whole proposal in relation to

trade was now on the Table of the House, and the paper which the hon. member for Pictou has just read is to this effect: while renewing our proposals of such a date we decline to consider any trade negotiations relating to the fisheries.

Mr. LAURIER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that we have the proposals of the American Commissioners? We have the proposals of the British Commissioners, and nothing more.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean to say that the hon. gentleman was told time and again that Sir Charles Tupper had asked the consent of the American plenipotentiaries and of Sir Lionel West, to lay on the Table of the House everything relating to proposals looking for trade relations between the two countries, and he has done so; and it is disingenuous then to contend that the proposal that is referred to here, but which is not before the House, has any relation to trade at all.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad I brought this subject up. I am glad now to know upon what material the hon. gentleman is acting when he makes this sudden change of base upon an entire supposition that has no foundation in fact. If he does not take the statement made by the Canadian representative, perhaps he may be able to believe Mr. Angell, one of the American Commissioners, who makes a statement in entire accordance with the statement just made, that that proposition was refused absolutely. If my hon. friend had allowed me to continue, I think I could have satisfied him that no matter what theory might exist in reference to that proposal there was nothing in it of the nature the hon. gentleman imagines. The reasons for refusing the proposal would be reasons that would prevent Mr. Bayard or any representative of the American Executive from making such proposals as is contemplated. Now, what are the words:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo,—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries; the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the president authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd inst. as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action; which adjustment the American Plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

And with a reason like that, can my hon. friend seriously press this theory, that in defiance of all that rule, such a proposal was ever made or conceived? But if a further answer was necessary, we have it in the American plenipotentiaries declining to admit:

"That such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing of the interpretation or modification of the treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties, and remove the present causes of complaint, to which end they now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Well, Mr. Speaker, has it not been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the fixed and stated policy of Congress is now, and for some time has been, not to permit any such arrangements to be made by the Executive? Is not the position taken in this debate that no authority outside of Congress can interfere with fiscal matters. If that position be correct, how can he suppose that, on the contrary, such a proposal as is suggested, could have been made, or was ever contemplated? I will not weary the House by reading, and I could, a resolution from Congress, illustrative of that. It has been admitted on the other side. The Judicial Committee of the House of Representatives, in 1885 solemnly decided that no treaty could be made by the Executive of

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

the American Government which in any way interfered with the fiscal matters of the people of the United States, that all changes in the tariff were to be discussed openly in Congress; and that has been the reason, as every one knows, why, since the treaty of Washington, no such arrangement has been entered into by any country in the world by the United States, and that was a long time ago. Treaties had been made, but no treaty touching fiscal matters has been ratified by Congress since that day. Therefore it is unnecessary to argue further to show how utterly impracticable is the step that the other side ask us to take. I have gone on to show the sinister object underlying their object. But I wish to point out, in addition, that these steps taken by hon. gentlemen in this debate, the attitude adopted by them, are, according to their own opinion, calculated to prevent our receiving the benefit of a certain amount of reciprocal trade with the United States, and why? Every one knows that this party, the Government representing this party, is the only party that ever obtained trade advantages from the United States. They negotiated and obtained the Washington Treaty. The negotiations for the Reciprocity Treaty under Old Canada, were made without reference to the fishery question. We have the cause of irritation so far removed that we have identified ourselves, our party and our country, with the interests of a powerful and growing party in the United States, and we now see a measure introduced into Congress in which nearly every article which we desire to be put on the free list, a great many of the articles of the treaty of 1854, are put on the free list, and when we are moving in this direction, is it wise, is it statesman-like, is it worthy the Canadian people, that we should fall down and worship the Americans and tell them that if we fall short in this matter, we are left in a state of dire extremity? If there is any way, and I have the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite to back me up, by which we might be excluded from the advantages of reciprocal trade, it is that pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, which tends to drive us into annexation with the American Union. I was not astonished—some things did surprise me—that the financial exponent of the Opposition should take special care not to give any details or any scheme or any definite statement in which this unrestricted panacea business would work, because that hon. gentleman years ago, used to make a financial prophecy, he used to come down to the House and in the same emphatic and loud manner, tell Parliament and the country that they could mark his words, and that the imposition of certain duties would give a surplus of so much, whereas the general result was a deficiency. At Halifax, however, the hon. gentleman went further. He came there to enlighten the people by the sea, for whom he has expressed unqualified contempt that emboldened him to use language which I was sorry to hear from the lips of any man in the Canadian House of Commons. The hon. gentleman came to Halifax as Minister of Finance to endeavor to rally his party in that Province. He talked a little about direct taxation there. He tells us in his opinion now that there is no danger of direct taxation, but, even if there is, it would be a very good thing for the people. He went on to show it was the correct way of taxing the people that it would make them more careful as to how the money was spent, and for a long time he argued in its favor. However, in 1878, the hon. gentleman, knowing then a good deal more perhaps of finance and the working of the revenue than he does now, because he has been long out of office, said:

"If you deprive yourselves of your present Customs tariff (17½ per cent.) you will have to resort to some method of direct taxation, and that of a very formidable kind."

I ask that hon. gentleman now how is it that in 1878 it was a dangerous thing to interfere with the 17½ tariff for fear

of being met with direct taxation of a most formidable kind, when now, as we well know, when the needs are such that a larger amount of revenue is required, he tells us, he does not hesitate to say that though you interfere with the 25 per cent tariff, as it has been called all around, there is no danger of our having to resort to direct taxation? The hon. gentleman cannot explain this I feel confident. But he was more definite. He went into figures and, knowing how he has failed to accomplish the results he predicted formerly, I am not surprised that he comes to such a conclusion now. In that summer, as reported in the *Halifax Chronicle*, the hon. gentleman said:

"The National Policy was a loss of ten millions of Customs duties which would have to be made up by direct taxation, equal to an income tax of 20 per cent."

I always felt a certain amount of comfort in the hon. gentleman's prophecies of gloom. I stated on a previous occasion to this House that, having studied the hon. gentleman's career with some interest, I had come to the conclusion that when he declared the condition of affairs in the country were very much down, they would be very much up, and I find as I live and grow older—and the hon. gentleman reminded me last year that I was very young—I have good reason to hold that opinion of him. The hon. gentleman told us then that with the slightest interference with the existing trade of that day direct taxation stared us in the face, and the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, who sat quietly in his seat while his Province was maligned, said that if there was the slightest chance of direct taxation he would cry: "Stay your hands." Let us see if the hon. gentleman has the courage of his convictions. The hon. member for South Oxford, from whom I have quoted already, and the statement from the old speech of the late Minister of Finance of the Mackenzie Government, lead to the same conclusion, that there is considerable danger of direct taxation. I want now to deal with the charge of corruption, and I may say that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) can be excused, because I have noticed of late years that he seems to burden his mind with all the charges that so disgrace the political hustings in Canada. Now that hon. gentleman heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), charge as one of the serious dangers threatening Confederation, one of the causes of the threatened disruption of Canada, the bribery of Nova Scotia. He did not say in so many words that it was bribery under what is known as "better terms," but he alluded to the transaction known as the "Act for better terms." He charged that, as the *Toronto Globe* charges it, a bribe paid to Nova Scotia to keep her in Confederation, and naturally he thinks that the men who gave that bribe are worthy of condemnation. He indicts them, he charged not only the men who gave the money as bribers, but the Province generally as being bribed, and he declared that it was that reason alone that Nova Scotia was kept in Confederation. Will he be surprised to learn that on the hustings at Halifax the leader of the secessionists, the leader of one wing of the party in this House said to the people that he was the man to whom the people of Nova Scotia owed the credit of the bribe, that he was the man most instrumental in obtaining better terms for Nova Scotia. He boasted of it; yet he sits quietly and takes that frightful slap over the face from his leader without uttering a single word. I have something more to say in regard to it, because there is no hon. gentleman who could keep quiet on such a subject. The hon. gentleman heard the hon. member for South Oxford asperse and malign a leader under whom they were at one time proud to serve. Instead of our being guilty of the bribery—the party to which I have the honor to belong—what would the hon. member for South Oxford think of this; that if he believes the statement made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) under his own hand

in a letter he wrote to the press in 1872 when the subject was much discussed—and then I thought it was discussed for the last time—the hon. gentleman who follows his leader tells him that he was the person who proffered and gave the bribe. The senior member for Halifax said:

"What Blake and Mackenzie wanted was that the increase to our subsidy should be made as on the basis of our debt and public work, and had their advice been followed we should have had \$240,000 per annum for ever instead of \$160,000 as at present, \$85,000 of that being only for ten years, five of which have already expired."

Is the Liberal party to be charged with being guilty of high crimes, misdemeanors and corruption because that party offered only one-half the amount with which hon. gentlemen opposite would have bribed the Province? But then the hon. member for South Oxford, and the senior member for Halifax are accustomed to hold up their hands in holy horror in regard to bribes in the shape of subsidies. The railway subsidy they declare to be a high expenditure, and I would remind the House that we have been told over and over again by hon. gentlemen opposite the same old story that the granting of such large bonuses would inevitably lead to direct taxation. The senior member for Halifax denies that they would cut off the subsidies. That is too near for him, it is not the policy he desires, but I am afraid his influence is on the wane when he can sit and listen to attacks made on Nova Scotia, and can stand up and assail the interests of Ontario and Quebec as he has done this evening. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that this retrenchment is going to be based upon the stoppage of all the railway subsidies. "We can save," says the hon. member, "the railways subsidies and avoid any repetition of such little scenes as occurred in No. 8 a few years ago; we can save by putting an end to the system of bribery in giving grants to railway lines of \$3,200 a mile; we can cut off the whole thing with advantage to our treasury, advantage to our markets, advantage to our country, advantage to our hopes in the future, not only in this world but in the world to come." Now, will the hon. gentleman resign his future in the world to come for the sake of getting on those Treasury benches? We have had a taste of the qualities of the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones); we have heard his speeches in Opposition and we have heard his speeches when he was in power. Why, there was not a more liberal, large-minded man when he was in power in his professions to what he would spend if he got a hold of the public money. When he was in power the same hon. gentleman who advises retrenchment to-day (I trust that it is pardonable to allude to a past debate, but some of the hon. gentleman's most earnest addresses have been in reference to the increase of expenditure rather than to the decrease), in 1878, when running for an office, or running an election at any rate in the city of Halifax, he there claimed credit not only for the agitation for better terms, and when a Minister of the Crown this mild and subservient follower of the hon. gentleman who has defamed and villified both his Province and mine, villified him and myself and every man from that Province, this hon. gentleman went down to Halifax as a Minister of the Crown in August, 1878, and as a reason for support claimed on the public hustings "that the present Government," that is, the Liberal Government, have expended \$1,250,000 in Nova Scotia, during five years, more than the late Government expended in seven. But now it is a terrible thing for a Liberal Conservative candidate to make promises. You must not say, according to the new code of morals laid down, that when you get to Parliament you will advocate the granting of a subsidy for a railway in your county, nor will you advocate the expenditure of public money upon post offices. Post offices and public works generally were alluded to as having been promised the electors in Prince Edward County. This is a terrible thing, but now we see that in 1878 a Minister

of the Crown and the Minister of Militia of that day, the senior member for Halifax of to-day, said to the electors from the hustings at a political election, "that if he were elected he would use his influence to get the Government to extend the Intercolonial Railway to westward. It is wrong for us to promise that the Government will spend money upon public works, but it is all right for the hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all right for them to talk about retrenchment when in Opposition, but it was quite a different thing for them to practice it when they held the public purse. The same hon. gentleman further said:—

"That during the time the late Government were in power"—

The late Government was this extravagant and this corrupt Government—

"they had only spent on an average three millions a year on public works, but during the time the present Government"—

That Government that preached retrenchment and reform from 1867 down to 1874—

"they have spent on an average of six millions a year. That is the best evidence of the way the money is being expended by this Administration."

They gloried in the expenditure then and of course my hon. friend would not go back upon the policy of aiding railways and local subsidies because he knows that having regard to this question of bribery, he knows that he claimed the Government ought to do more than it has done in that Province of Nova Scotia. He knows that he and his party have wrung the changes from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, to the effect that we have been neglected since Confederation in regard to railway expenditure, and that the Government ought to have built those railways long ago which they promised to build and which I will say they will carry out their promise in this respect as they have in all others. I thought the question of bribery was settled last year, when the late leader of the Opposition discussed the matter with the present Minister of Finance, and when the present Minister of Finance was able to read the language of that gentleman and that party's lieutenant in Nova Scotia when he came down to a public meeting and promised there a far larger expenditure on railways to the Province of Nova Scotia if they would only support the Liberal party. I thought that matter of bribery was threshed out then. It does seem extraordinary that this hon. gentleman's allies down in the Province should have blamed us at public meetings for not spending enough money, and then form an indictment against us in the House for having spent so much. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion will not be fruitful; that it will not aid us at least with the United States to obtain unrestricted reciprocity by washing this dirty linen of Nova Scotia which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House of Commons of Canada and which will bring neither credit to him nor to the people who sent him here. Now we have the record of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He took up a large portion of the time of this House by telling us the other night about the effect this duty had upon our barley, and about our dependence upon the American market, and that we had to pay a duty on all the products which we send into that market. When the late Government was in power that Government which spent their money with such a lavish hand—when they occupied the Treasury benches, when also the late George Brown had failed to negotiate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States the hon. gentleman's question was of another kind. At Simcoe on February, 1878, he made a speech, and I ask the attention of the House to this, for the argument answers the very weak and disingenuous argument he addressed on the other side of the question during this debate. The hon. gentleman said:

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

"It may be claimed that the agricultural interest has been interested by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. With one single exception the average prices we have received since the abrogation of that treaty have been higher than they were when the treaty was in force. In 1875 we exported 5,400,000 bushels of barley and imported less than 5,000 bushels. Our business is in the exportation of barley; it may be that the American duty reduced the amount exported somewhat, but, of course, we cannot help that as we do not make that treaty and cannot reduce it, but that state of things will not continue longer. We have opened up a great export trade of barley with England and England will take our whole crop. We can say to the United States: If you pay us the same price for this barley less the cost of transportation which England pays you may have it."

He continued to point out that in reference to peas, beans and other articles, it was the American that paid the duty and not the Canadian. Now then, Mr. Speaker, coming again to that speech that was addressed to us to-night by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), I would like to call attention to the authority he has brought before the House on the question of the assessment of property in Nova Scotia. I think the hon. gentleman is bold. I think the hon. gentleman proved his boldness by quoting, in support of his argument on the coal trade, a letter quoted by the hon. the late member for Digby, which was answered by that gentleman's own letter; but he is a far bolder man when he quotes this statement of James Thomson, of the city of Halifax, in reference to statistics. Mr. Thomson is the man who, in the horrible year 1878, when he said all those things I have mentioned, and he is the man that came under the lash of the hon. the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That hon. gentleman held James Thomson up to ridicule in the city of Halifax; that hon. gentleman amused his audience by picturing this man as a statistician and that hon. gentleman christened him "Baron Statistics." Now "Baron Statistics" is the hon. gentleman's authority to-night. James Thomson, when he wrote this article was against the hon. gentleman; he has turned I have no doubt to his side and having turned and made a somersault on unrestricted reciprocity the hon. gentleman takes him up and quotes his statistics. On that occasion the hon. gentleman—and it would have been a help to our side of the discussion if he had repeated his argument—was reported:

"He went into the question thoroughly showing that the benefits of protection would be for the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec."

Does the hon. gentleman repudiate that argument now? Does he say that protection is not a benefit for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec? As to Mr. Thomson, here is one extract from the *Chronicle*:

"Mr. James Thomson was dealt with in a manner that would have stirred the people to indignation against him, if they had not been overcome by the ludicrous aspect of the case."

They ridiculed him as a candidate for a judgeship; they ridiculed him for the manner in which he handled figures and called him "Baron Statistics"; and yet the hon. gentleman asks the House to take his statements as to assessments. My hon. friend knows well, that in reference to that statement of Mr. Thomson's, two things can be said. If it be true, according to the assessment rolls of Nova Scotia, that property happens to have had a lower value in 1884 than it had in 1868, the hon. gentleman knows that the burning question in local politics in that Province is, how to get a fair and rational and sensible assessment, how to get the property assessed at its proper and true value; and he knows that that argument is puerile and weak, whether it came from "Baron Statistics" or any other baron. He knows that property in Nova Scotia reached a boom value immediately after Confederation. He knows that the promises which he held up to ridicule as deluding the people as to the wonderful prosperity that was going to come to them, raised the value of property to an abnormal value in 1868, and the value has no doubt since gone down to its proper and normal level. But the hon. gentleman knows that the statistics I read to-night from the authorised publications of the repeal Government give a full and complete answer as

to whether the Province is poorer or richer than it was before. Now, I have taken up considerable time, Mr. Speaker. I have carried my remarks further than I interded; but young as I am, and mindful of the rebuke I received in this House a session ago that when a member, authorised by the people of Nova Scotia, should speak, and when he should not, should be gauged by the years of that member, and yet remembering the liberal sentiment which pervades this House, I felt justified in taking up some time in quoting from the mouths of these hon. gentlemen and their friends throughout the country, to show that this movement, first of commercial union, now of unrestricted reciprocity, vague, indefinite, meaningless, about which hon. gentlemen on the other side are now squabbling and disagreeing among themselves, was nothing more nor less than a small and petty dodge of a very desperate and hopelessly beaten political party in the

18-1888-5

Dominion of Canada. These hon. gentlemen have made specious promises before; but I will tell them that in all these political wiles, as some one has said, you can fool some of the people all the time, you can fool all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool a majority of the people all the time.

Mr. RINFRET moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, March 20, 1888.

No. 19.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 20th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Henry Corby, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of Hastings, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Bowell,

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act incorporating the Mas-kinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask permission of the House to make a personal explanation. In the *Evening Telegram*, March 19, there is an article which professes to give the exact words that I used, when speaking the other night, and the words are between quotation marks so as to show more pointedly that they were those I made use of. They are as follows:—

“Goldwin Smith he characterised ‘as a student blowing bubbles in his library.’ He went on: ‘The Anglo-Saxon, the Celt, penetrated our virgin forests, tilled our virgin soil; our land will never suffer them to lapse from its memory; all our rivers and streams mingle with their fame for evermore. Who, then, shall speak of geographical obstacles? Goldwin Smith, forsooth.’”

Now, I desire merely to say that I did not use that language. It would be disrespectful to a distinguished man, a man whom, however we may differ with him, we all honor for his great literary attainments, and I thank the House for permitting me to say here that I did not use the language attributed to me.

19—1888—1

THE FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. EDGAR. Yesterday I enquired from the Government as to bringing down the instructions of Lord Salisbury to the Fisheries Commission, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works said he would speak to the First Minister about it. Has he done so?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I mentioned the matter to my colleague. He will be here shortly, and I will mention the matter to him again.

THE KENT ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some time ago we had the matter of the Kent election before us. I believe, Sir, that you were prepared to issue the writ for that election, but the gentlemen on the Treasury benches took a different view and the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In cases where a writ is not issued, and it is alleged that corrupt practices generally prevailed, the law imposes a certain duty on the Minister of Justice. That duty has, to some extent, been shifted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The committee ordered the evidence to be printed. It has not hitherto been found necessary to delay the proceedings of the committee for any length of time in consequence of the printing of any evidence necessary to be brought before it, but on this occasion nearly a fortnight has elapsed since the order was given for the printing, and up to this moment, so far as I know, the evidence has not been printed, the committee has not been called, and this large district is deprived of the representation to which it is entitled. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches ought to be in a position to inform the House why all this delay has occurred, and why whatever steps may be required to be taken have not been taken to issue the writ for the holding of an election in the county of Kent. I mentioned in the committee that rumors were abroad that it was the intention of the Government to secure delay, and everything so far certainly points in that direction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman would believe all the rumors he hears, he would have a great deal of work to do. I do not think that the rumor he mentions is well founded. The hon. gentleman may remember that, when the committee ordered the other day that the evidence in this case should be printed, the chairman was directed to have that done and promised that he would do so, and I have no doubt that he gave the necessary orders. Unfortunately, the chairman has been away for two or three days and I understand he will be back to-morrow, and I have no doubt that, on his return, he will take the necessary steps to have the committee called together and to have the evidence put in the hands of members. However, I will ascertain whether the evidence has been printed, in order that there may be no delay in the consideration of the question, but at the present time it has been left to the chairman of the committee, as it is in every case of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The amount of evidence which was sent to the committee is not a greater document than

we receive here almost every day, and more than a fortnight has gone by since the order was given for the printing of the evidence. I think it is a breach of the privileges of the House that such a delay should have existed.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, on the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto, and on the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment.

M. RINFRET: M. l'Orateur, les honorables députés qui ont jusqu'ici adressé la parole contre la motion de mon honorable ami le député d'Oxford-Sud (sir R. Cartwright) ont tous insisté sur un même argument qu'ils prétendent bien fort à l'appui de la politique du gouvernement: c'est que la prospérité règne au Canada.

L'évidence de ce fait ne me paraît pas aussi éclatante que la lumière du soleil puisqu'il faut pour l'établir, ou plutôt pour le faire avaler aux électeurs du Canada, un si grand déploiement d'éloquence, tant de longs discours, appuyés sur de fausses représentations des faits, sur des conclusions qui ne sont justifiées par aucuns principes de saine économie politique.

Le Canada est prospère, s'écrient-ils, donc il est bien gouverné. Il va sans dire que les honorables messieurs de la droite se donnent tout le mérite de cette prétendue prospérité, et qu'ils l'attribuent aux lois fiscales qu'ils ont établies, il y a quelques années, dans le but de créer des revenus considérables pour faire face à leur extravagante administration, et favoriser quelques individus pour avoir leur appui en temps d'élection.

Le Canada, M. l'Orateur, n'est pas assez prospère; il n'a certainement pas atteint le degré de prospérité auquel il aurait droit, si l'on tient compte de ses immenses ressources minières, de la fertilité de son sol dans une immense partie de son territoire, et des avantages immenses qu'il offre à la navigation et au commerce. Ce fait a été prouvé, suivant moi, d'une manière absolue par les orateurs qui ont parlé avant moi en faveur de la motion de l'honorable député d'Oxford.

Ce que je me propose de faire, ce n'est pas autant de prouver que les prétentions de nos adversaires sont erronées et que la prospérité n'est pas aussi grande qu'ils le prétendent—plaise à chaque électeur instruit et intelligent à décider par lui-même et par ce qu'il voit autour de lui, ce qu'il y a de vrai dans cette prétention. Ce n'est pas autant cela que de comparer notre situation actuelle à ce qu'elle devrait être, à ce qu'elle serait, en effet, avec un bon système fiscal, des lois qui rendraient justice à toutes les classes de la société, des traités de commerce qui nous donneraient accès à tous les grands marchés du monde.

Les différences d'opinion sur ce sujet entre nous et nos adversaires peuvent se résumer en deux mots. Le gouvernement a adopté une politique de restriction et nous voulons une politique d'expansion commerciale.

M. l'Orateur, il y a neuf ans, c'est en 1879, lorsque nous avons commencé, contre le parti conservateur, la lutte que nous continuons aujourd'hui, l'accusation favorite de nos adversaires était que nous étions théoriciens, mais que nos principes et nos théories ne pouvaient recevoir aucune application pratique, dans un pays comme le Canada, qui, d'après ces messieurs, pour toutes sortes de raisons, ne devrait pas tomber sous le coup des principes généraux de l'économie politique. Cette prétention était absurde et les faits le prouvent amplement. Quels sont aujourd'hui les effets de cette politique sur les intérêts généraux du Canada?

Le premier effet a été de répartir d'une manière inégale la fortune publique en enrêchissant les riches et appauvrissant les pauvres.

Le second effet a été d'enrichir certaines classes privilégiées aux dépens du reste de la population.

Mr. RINFRET.

Le troisième effet a été de ruiner certaines industries qui contribuaient autrefois à la prospérité du Canada en rendant impossible l'exportation de leurs produits à l'étranger, et en outre, d'imposer sur le peuple des taxes assez lourdes pour affecter d'une manière sensible les revenus des particuliers et drainer au profit du trésor et de certains favoris du gouvernement, nos ressources nationales.

D'ailleurs, M. l'Orateur, il n'y a pas un homme sensé qui n'admette aujourd'hui que cette politique de restriction ait eu pour effet de paralyser notre commerce général qui est resté stationnaire depuis une dizaine d'années, et l'agriculture, cette source principale de nos revenus, par les taxes énormes qui pèsent sur les instruments agricoles, et les articles de nécessités premières, de paralyser notre agriculture en ne donnant pas à nos cultivateurs les marchés nécessaires pour l'exportation et la vente de leurs produits.

Mais un des effets les plus désastreux de la restriction commerciale tant au point de vue moral qu'au point de vue économique, c'est l'établissement des monopoles exclusivement à cette politique antinationale: monopoles pour les compagnies manufacturières et monopoles plus désastreux accordés aux compagnies de chemins de fer.

Il est un principe qui régit le commerce et qui est basé sur le droit naturel, c'est que les prix doivent être réglés par les lois générales de l'offre et de la demande. Du moment que les demandes ne sont plus suffisantes pour maintenir par elles-mêmes une industrie, il devient évident que son utilité a cessé, et c'est une grande erreur que de décider par législation de la maintenir aux dépens du public. Mais que dire d'une loi qui permet à un certain nombre de manufacturiers, dans une même branche d'industrie, de se coaliser ensemble contre les intérêts du public et de former une triple combinaison comme l'ont fait ensemble les raffineurs de sucres, les marchands de gros et de détail de cet article de nécessité première.

Voyons ce qui s'est passé: les manufacturiers de sucre ont fait une convention ensemble pour fixer le prix de vente aux marchands de gros. Ceux-ci ont fait la même convention pour fixer le prix de gros entre eux, et le prix du détail avec tous les marchands de détail du même article. Le but de cette convention est de maintenir un prix plus élevé que le prix normal du sucre et de faire payer au consommateur un ou deux centins de plus par livre sur le prix du détail qu'il ne devrait légitimement payer.

Mais, M. l'Orateur, les raffineurs ne sont pas les seuls monopoliseurs. Il faut ajouter à la liste les manufacturiers de coton, de laine, de caoutchouc, les marchands de whiskey, de charbon et une foule d'autres.

Comment se fait-il que des combinaisons de ce genre peuvent se faire? C'est bien simple. La plupart des manufacturiers qui se coalisent ainsi contre les intérêts du peuple, afin d'amasser des fortunes considérables dans deux ou trois années sont des favoris du gouvernement qui, pour des raisons plus ou moins légitimes ont obtenu une protection spéciale pour leurs industries respectives. Le gouvernement du Canada a fermé l'entrée aux produits étrangers par l'imposition d'une taxe de 30, 40 et même 50 centins par dollar sur les articles manufacturés par ces favoris. Ces droits élevés, en empêchant toute compétition étrangère, permettent à ces manufacturiers de vendre au prix qu'ils veulent, pourvu seulement qu'ils puissent réussir à s'entendre entr'eux pour dépouiller les consommateurs, c'est-à-dire tout le peuple du Canada.

Une loi qui permet des actes comme ceux-là est une loi qui légalise le vol et un parti politique qui permet un tel état de choses ne mérite pas la confiance du public.

Le gouvernement, en adoptant la proposition de mon honorable ami le député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright) ferait disparaître du coup toutes ces combinaisons ruineuses. Il porterait un coup mortel aux monopoles de toutes sortes. Il ferait diminuer par cela même le prix de

ce que les consommateurs achètent et favoriserait en outre d'une manière sensible toutes les grandes industries du pays, en leur ouvrant les marchés d'une population d'au-delà de 60,000,000 d'âmes, et en faisant abonder au Canada les immenses capitaux de la république voisine, pour le développement des ressources naturelles de toutes sortes dont le Canada peut disposer.

Je ne crois pas être taxé d'exagération, M. l'Orateur, en disant que nous avons au Canada probablement les plus beaux et les plus puissants pouvoirs d'eau du monde entier. Il y en a partout dans les diverses parties du pays. On ne trouve presque pas un comté parmi ceux qui bordent le Saint-Laurent ou les grands lacs, qui ne soit sillonné en tous sens par des rivières qui ont leur embouchure du grand fleuve et qui pourraient faire marcher des centaines, et peut-être des milliers de moulins de toutes sortes.

Pourquoi ces moulins ne sont-ils pas construits ? Pour deux raisons : d'abord, nous n'avons pas les capitaux nécessaires pour utiliser ces richesses naturelles, et ensuite nous n'avons pas les marchés nécessaires pour l'écoulement des produits des fabriques nombreuses qui pourraient s'y construire.

La réciprocité commerciale nous donnerait les deux ; les capitaux pour construire ces fabriques et le marché pour l'exportation de leurs produits. Et nos compatriotes, qui partent chaque année par milliers pour s'en aller aux Etats-Unis, resteraient avec nous, parce qu'ils trouveraient ici tous les avantages que leur offre la république voisine ; ils auraient le même ouvrage à faire, les mêmes gages, la même prospérité générale, sans avoir à supporter les regrets de l'expatriation et en continuant à jouir de tous les droits politiques et civils dont ils sont privés à l'étranger. Mais, ce sont les cultivateurs surtout qui devront retirer des bénéfices énormes de la réciprocité commerciale avec les Etats-Unis. Il est inutile de rappeler aujourd'hui que les lois fiscales actuelles qui devaient protéger tout le monde, non seulement n'ont pas protégé les cultivateurs mais leur ont même été tout à fait nuisibles, pour la bonne raison qu'elles ont augmenté le fardeau des taxes sans pouvoir augmenter d'un seul centin le prix des produits agricoles. Mais ce qui leur est surtout préjudiciable, ce sont les droits imposés d'un côté par le Canada et de l'autre par les Etats-Unis sur les produits naturels des deux pays.

Nous ne sommes séparés de nos voisins que par une ligne imaginaire ; mais, malheureusement, cette séparation est devenue réelle par l'imposition des droits de douane qui élèvent, au point de vue commercial, une muraille entre les deux pays.

Si cette muraille n'existait pas, notre commerce serait le double de ce qu'il est aujourd'hui sur les produits naturels des deux pays, et il y aurait une hausse considérable dans les prix de nos produits agricoles.

On ne parle plus aujourd'hui que pour en rire, du fameux marché national que nous promettaient les auteurs du tarif protecteur de 1879. Si nous n'avions que le marché national pour les produits de notre agriculture, une grande partie des grains et céréales pourraient dans nos greniers ; et ces articles-là, de même que le foin et les animaux de toutes sortes, ne pourraient que commander un prix normal. Le Canada est avant tout un pays agricole ; ce qu'il lui faut ce sont des marchés pour l'exportation du surplus de ses immenses produits. Pour un certain nombre de ces produits, son marché le plus naturel, parce qu'il est le plus rapproché, est le marché des Etats-Unis. C'est presque notre seul marché pour les chevaux et autres animaux ; les volailles, l'orge, le foin, les patates, le beurre, les œufs et une foule d'autres produits. Sur ces divers articles, nous payons des droits variant de 10 à 20 pour 100. L'abolition de ces droits, non seulement ferait vendre plus cher chacun de ces articles, mais aurait de plus l'effet, d'ici à peu d'années, d'augmenter considérablement la production et par conséquent l'exportation.

Les honorables messieurs de la droite ont prétendu à maintes reprises que les droits que nous imposons sur les produits naturels des Etats-Unis sont une protection, sur nos produits de même nature, pour les cultivateurs du Canada. Il n'y a rien de plus faux que cette proposition. Je dis plus : dans presque tous les cas, les cultivateurs et les consommateurs du Canada payent le droit non seulement sur les produits naturels qu'ils sont obligés d'importer, mais même sur ceux qu'ils exportent aux Etats-Unis. Je vais essayer de le prouver. Mon honorable ami le député de Kamouraska (M. Dessaint) en a cité un exemple très concluant, l'autre soir, quand il a parlé du commerce des chevaux. C'est un fait connu, que les commerçants américains achètent tous les ans sur nos marchés un bon nombre de chevaux aux prix réguliers de notre marché, qu'ils payent les droits de 20 pour 100 *ad valorem* pour les revendre ensuite avec profit sur le marché américain. C'est établir de suite que le prix des chevaux est plus élevé aux Etats-Unis d'au moins 20 à 30 pour 100.

Supposons pour le moment que le droit disparaisse, qu'arrivera-t-il ? Il est évident que si le nombre de chevaux exportés est le même, le marché américain ne sera nullement affecté. Le prix se maintiendra tel qu'il est, et, par conséquent, le seul effet sera d'augmenter de 20 pour 100 le prix des chevaux du Canada. Le prix de chaque article est réglé par la loi générale de l'offre et de la demande. Il est donc évident que si nous exportons le même nombre de chevaux qu'aujourd'hui, cette loi générale, n'étant nullement affectée, les prix, toutes choses égales d'ailleurs, resteront les mêmes.

Mais, supposons que la disparition du droit et la hausse des prix aient pour effet, d'ici à quelques années, d'augmenter considérablement la production, et partant l'exportation, il est possible alors que ce surplus ait un effet quelconque sur l'offre et la demande, et que les prix diminuent dans une proportion quelconque ; mais cette diminution ne peut être considérable, si nous tenons compte du fait que notre population n'est que de cinq millions, et que celle des Etats-Unis est douze fois plus considérable : c'est-à-dire 60 millions. Alors, le surplus de production compenserait pour la diminution possible dans les prix.

Il n'y a absolument aucun doute, dans tous les cas, que si ce droit disparaissait tout-à-coup, le cultivateur canadien vendrait de suite 20 pour 100 plus cher, et ceci démontre encore que c'est lui qui paye ce droit. Il est sûr, d'un autre côté, que même dans l'avenir, l'abolition de ce droit ne peut que favoriser dans une grande mesure les éleveurs de chevaux du Canada.

Ce que je viens de dire à propos de l'article des chevaux, s'applique avec autant de force à l'exportation des bœufs et des moutons, des patates, du foin, du beurre et divers autres articles.

Nous exportons chaque année une quantité considérable de patates sur le marché américain, malgré les droits énormes de 15 cts par minot que nous avons à payer. Que le droit disparaisse, et de suite non seulement le prix augmentera de 15 pour 100, mais la production doublera.

Les droits sur le foin sont de \$2 par tonne. Ils sont entièrement payés par le producteur. C'est un fait qui a été reconnu par les tribunaux américains dans un procès qui a eu lieu il y a un an ou deux entre les exportateurs des comtés de Maskinongé et autres de la rive nord du St. Laurent et le gouvernement des Etats-Unis. Le gouvernement des Etats-Unis s'est décidé à remettre une partie des droits ou surcharge prélevés par la douane américaine. Et c'est la preuve la plus concluante possible que ces droits sont portés par les cultivateurs canadiens et non pas par les consommateurs américains.

Les droits sur le beurre sont de 4 cts par livre, sont également une perte sèche pour les producteurs canadiens, puisque le prix du beurre est régulièrement beaucoup plus élevé aux Etats-Unis qu'ici. Je pourrais multiplier les cita-

tions, mais je ne veux pas prolonger trop longtemps mes remarques.

Les conclusions pratiques sont faciles à tirer des faits que je viens de citer.

Dans le district de Québec, où se trouve situé le comté que je représente, les cultivateurs ont considérablement changé leur système de culture depuis quelques années. La culture des grains et céréales diminue d'année en année, pour être remplacée par la culture du foin, l'amélioration des pacages pour l'élevage des bestiaux et la production du beurre et du fromage.

Il est évident que la culture du blé ne peut plus actuellement, et ne pourra, pendant plusieurs années à venir, supporter la compétition des grands producteurs de blé du Nord-Ouest, de l'Ouest des Etats-Unis, de l'Inde anglaise, de l'Australie et de divers autres pays, qui peuvent produire à meilleur marché que nous, tant par la fertilité incroyable de leurs terres, comme on le voit dans les Etats de l'Ouest et du Nord-Ouest, que par le bas prix du travail de l'Inde anglaise et la fertilité inouïe de ces Etats et de l'Australie. La production augmente par millions de minots annuellement, et l'encombrement qui s'en suit entraîne, comme conséquence naturelle, la diminution des prix et l'impossibilité de compétitionner pour les cultivateurs de notre district. Le prix du blé affecte dans une certaine mesure le prix des grains et des céréales, au point de rendre leur culture un peu moins profitable qu'elle ne l'était dans le passé. C'est un devoir pour moi, M. l'Orateur, comme un des représentants de ce district, d'encourager toute politique qui puisse aider un nouveau système de culture que la nécessité pose aux cultivateurs que j'ai l'honneur de représenter.

Cette protection, seule la réciprocité commerciale peut la donner, parce que, pour le foin, les animaux, le beurre, les volailles et les œufs le marché naturel de beaucoup le plus avantageux est le marché des Etats-Unis. C'est là que nous vendons nos chevaux et nos animaux de toutes sortes, et nos volailles; c'est là que, sans l'imposition des droits, nous vendrions notre beurre, notre fromage et le surplus de foin dont nous pouvons disposer. Les profits actuels seraient augmentés de 15 à 20 pour 100, c'est-à-dire qu'ils seraient doublés. En effet, s'il est un fait qu'il n'y a pas besoin de prouver et que tout le monde admet de suite, c'est que si l'on fait abstraction de tous frais de culture et dépenses de toutes sortes faites pour nourriture, élevage et engraissement des animaux, les profits nets réalisés ne sont pas en moyenne de 15 à 20 pour 100. En conséquence, je ne serai pas du tout taxé d'exagération en disant que les profits nets seront doublés, et même plus que doublés par l'ablation des droits que les Etats-Unis imposent sur ces articles.

M. l'Orateur, la réciprocité commerciale aura aussi le bon effet de rendre plus facile le commerce de grains dans certaines parties du pays, quoique, en général, elle ne puisse avoir un effet marqué sur la hausse ou la baisse des prix.

Le prix du blé, de l'avoine, des pois, en général de tous les grains et céréales, à l'exception peut-être de l'orge et des pois, est réglé pour le Canada et les Etats-Unis par le marché de Liverpool. C'est un fait qui est aujourd'hui admis de tous excepté de ceux qui ne veulent pas voir et qui ne veulent pas entendre. La raison en est bien simple : ici et aux Etats-Unis, il y a un surplus de tous les grains et céréales qu'il nous faut exporter sur un marché immense que ne pourraient contrôler, même affecter, n'importe quelle législation ou combinaison qu'on pourrait faire de ce côté-ci de l'Atlantique.

Cette proposition est vraie et juste en autant qu'on parle du commerce général du Canada. Et c'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons combattu comme insensée l'imposition de taxes sur les grains venant des Etats-Unis au point de vue de créer un marché national. Nous voyons aujourd'hui quels sont les effets de cette absurde politique fiscale. Les prix des grains n'ont pas augmenté du tout; ils ont même

Mr. RINFRET.

été régulièrement plus bas depuis 1879 que la moyenne des dix années précédentes. Et, si nous prenons la peine de comparer les quotes des marchés ici, aux Etats-Unis, et en Angleterre pour ces quelque 15 ou 20 dernières années, nous arrivons à la conclusion que ces taxes sur les produits agricoles n'ont eu que l'effet d'embarrasser le commerce de grain sans donner aucun bénéfice quelconque aux cultivateurs. Je dis plus : Dans quelques cas, ces taxes sont devenues vexatoires; citons en particulier la taxe sur certaines classes de farine que nous ne produisons pas en quantité suffisante pour la consommation et que nous importons des Etats-Unis, les fleurs de bas prix, qui sont consommées surtout dans les provinces maritimes et certaines parties de la province de Québec, et la taxe sur le blé d'inde qu'on a prouvé être directement nuisible aux cultivateurs et qui pèse surtout sur la partie la plus pauvre du peuple.

La disposition des impôts sur les grains et céréales, non seulement ne ferait de tort à personne, mais ne ferait que du bien aux cultivateurs; elle ferait disparaître une taxe injuste et vexatoire sur un article de nécessité première et n'aurait pour effet que de rendre le commerce plus facile en donnant le libre échange complet entre certaines parties du Canada et certaines parties des Etats-Unis qui se touchent et qui n'auraient qu'à profiter mutuellement en échangeant leurs produits.

Mais, M. l'Orateur, ce sont les producteurs de blé du Nord-Ouest qui retireraient des bénéfices énormes de cette disparition des impôts parce que ça leur fournirait l'occasion de se débarrasser du monopole du chemin de fer du Pacifique qui leur fait payer des tarifs exagérés.

L'honorable député de Marquette (M. Watson), à la dernière session, a attiré l'attention de la Chambre sur le tort énorme que fait aux cultivateurs du Nord-Ouest la compagnie du chemin de fer du Pacifique. Et je voyais tout dernièrement dans un journal les prix comparés pour le transport du grain entre St-Paul et New-York, et, entre Manitoba et Montréal. Ainsi, en juin dernier, les cultivateurs du Manitoba payaient pour le transport du grain de Winnipeg à Montréal 50 centins par 100 livres. La distance est de 1423 milles. De St-Paul à New-York, une distance de 1420 milles, le prix du transport n'était que de 32½ cents par 100 livres, soit une différence de 17½ centins par 100 livres en faveur des cultivateurs du Dakota et du Minnesota. Ce seul fait suffirait à expliquer comment il se fait que les immigrants ne veulent pas s'établir au Nord-Ouest et pour quoi, ils passent presque tous de l'autre côté de la ligne. Mais malheureusement, il faut ajouter à cela les droits énormes sur les instruments agricoles, et la mauvaise politique générale adoptée par le gouvernement pour la colonisation du Nord-Ouest.

M. l'Orateur, nous avons dépensé millions sur millions pour la colonisation du Nord-Ouest et la construction du chemin du Pacifique. Nous avons contracté pour cela une dette immense qui devrait nous être remboursée par la vente des terres fédérales et par l'augmentation des revenus publics qui devraient s'accroître à mesure que notre population croîtrait par l'immigration dans les immenses territoires du Nord-Ouest. Je regrette de dire aujourd'hui que les espérances de ceux qui nous gouvernent n'ont été jusqu'ici que des illusions et que, de jour en jour, il devient plus manifeste qu'il ne faut plus compter sur les ressources de cet immense territoire tant que le gouvernement ne renoncera pas franchement à la politique de monopoles et de restriction commerciale à laquelle il se cramponne aujourd'hui.

Il n'y a pas de risque à changer nos lois fiscales, M. l'Orateur, nous ne pouvons faire pis. Essayons la réciprocité. Nous l'avons déjà eue pendant 12 années—1854 à 1866—et ceux d'entre nous qui étaient alors en parlement, comme mon honorable ami le député de St-Jean (M. Bourassa), se rappellent que jamais les cultivateurs du Canada n'ont joui d'une aussi grande prospérité que pendant cette

période. L'avoine se vendait alors 60 cts par minot, l'orge a atteint le prix presque incroyable de \$1.50 à \$1.60 le minot, les grains et céréales de toutes sortes, les patates, les animaux, non seulement se vendaient à des prix élevés, mais étaient littéralement enlevés sur nos marchés pour être vendus sur le marché américain. Notre commerce avait aussi pris un immense développement. En 1860 il avait doublé, et presque triplé en 1865.

Voici une appréciation que je cueille dans l'ouvrage de M. Turcotte : "*Le Canada sous l'Union*," à la page 527.

Ce traité avait été avantageux aux deux parties. Il avait considérablement favorisé les Etats de l'Ouest qui s'étaient procurés le bois de construction sur le marché canadien et qui avaient profité de nos canaux pour l'écoulement de leurs produits; il avait encore donné à quelques Etats de l'Est de grands revenus; aussi la population de ces Etats travailla-t-elle à maintenir le traité, mais elle était en minorité. Le traité avait aussi beaucoup contribué au progrès matériel des Canadiens et leur avait permis d'écouler le surplus de leurs produits sur le marché américain, et d'acheter sur ce marché, à des conditions plus favorables, les articles dont ils avaient besoin pour la consommation et l'alimentation des manufactures. Depuis le traité de réciprocité entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis, le commerce d'importation et d'exportation avait presque triplé. Il était de \$24,000,000 en 1854, et l'année fiscale de 1864 en portait le chiffre à \$69,150,000.

Et M. l'Orateur, ces appréciations de M. Turcotte ne peuvent être taxées de partisanerie en faveur du parti libéral puisque c'est un fait connu que ses sympathies politiques étaient en faveur de nos adversaires, et son histoire d'ailleurs le prouve amplement.

Sans doute que la condition actuelle du pays n'est pas exactement la même qu'elle était alors. Nous ne pourrions pas espérer de voir une augmentation considérable du commerce de transit sur nos canaux, à moins de les améliorer et à moins de donner dans les ports de Montréal et de Québec, de même que sur les canaux, des facilités qui les rendent capables de lutter pour le transport des produits de l'ouest contre les voies américaines, et surtout le canal de l'Erie. Il peut y avoir quelques inconvénients qui nuisent jusqu'à un certain point à la réalisation de cette grande mesure d'intérêt public; mais il est une chose que personne ne peut révoquer en doute, c'est l'influence énorme que la réciprocité exercerait sur la prospérité des cultivateurs et le développement de l'agriculture par tout le pays.

Le Canada, M. l'Orateur, est un pays agricole, c'est par l'agriculture qu'il peut compter un jour d'occuper une position élevée parmi les nations du globe. Nous avons dans Manitoba et le Nord-Ouest un nombre incalculable de terres fertiles, qui sont rangées à bon droit parmi les plus fertiles du globe. Il nous faut développer cet immense territoire. Mais ces terres ne sont pas les seules; dans la province d'Ontario, dans la province de Québec, il y a des contrées d'une grande richesse qui doubleraient de valeur si on ouvrait un débouché pour leurs produits. Et quel marché peut nous être plus avantageux que celui des Etats-Unis qui sont à nos portes et qui ont besoin de nos produits pour leur immense population de 60 millions d'âmes.

M. l'Orateur, nos vieilles provinces sont dépeuplées et dévastées par le fléau de l'immigration. Chaque année, nous voyons partir pour les Etats-Unis des familles en grand nombre, et une multitude de jeunes gens qui sont la fleur de notre population. Pourquoi ces gens-là s'en vont-ils? Pour trouver de l'ouvrage à l'étranger, pour faire de l'argent pour payer leurs dettes. Ils s'en vont aux Etats-Unis parce que c'est un pays prospère, parce qu'il y a plus à faire pour eux qu'en Canada. Il y a plus de commerce, plus d'ouvrage, plus d'industries de toutes sortes. Il y a aujourd'hui au-delà d'un million de Canadiens aux Etats-Unis, c'est-à-dire près de 20 à 25 pour 100 de la population du Canada, et avant peu, M. l'Orateur, si cela continue, il y aura autant de Canadiens aux Etats-Unis qu'au Canada. C'est une affaire sérieuse, M. l'Orateur, que cet exode sans cesse croissant des enfants du Canada; c'est une affaire sérieuse qui devrait attirer l'attention de ceux qui nous gouvernent. C'est leur devoir de trouver au plus tôt un remède

à cette plaie sociale de l'émigration, s'ils ne veulent pas voir d'ici à quelques années le dépeuplement complet du pays.

L'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir R. Cartwright), dans son magnifique discours de l'autre jour, attirait l'attention de la Chambre sur l'émigration considérable de nos compatriotes aux Etats-Unis, et spécialement de la province d'Ontario. Il a donné des chiffres qui sont à établir que non seulement la population d'Ontario n'augmente pas mais qu'elle est probablement moins considérable qu'il y a quelques années.

Je regrette, M. l'Orateur, d'avoir à corroborer cet état de choses alarmant, pour ce qui regarde le comté que j'ai l'honneur de représenter ici. Dans mon comté, depuis quelques années, certaines paroisses sont restées stationnaires, mais d'autres, — les plus pauvres, — ont subi une diminution considérable de population.

Je le répète, M. l'Orateur, il est malheureux de voir nos compatriotes obligés d'émigrer aux Etats-Unis pour payer leurs dettes. Et je crois devoir signaler au gouvernement que le seul moyen, selon moi, d'enrayer ce flot d'émigration serait d'adopter la réciprocité commerciale avec les Etats-Unis, ce qui, tout en faisant la prospérité du Canada ferait affluer au pays les capitaux américains pour le développement des richesses naturelles du pays et l'établissement des industries de toutes sortes. La réciprocité commerciale, en ouvrant les marchés immenses des Etats-Unis aux produits de nos forêts, de nos mines et de notre agriculture, donnerait au Canada une prospérité inconnue jusqu'ici; donnerait du travail et des gages élevés, et ferait rester parmi nous ceux qui sont forcés de s'expatrier.

Pour toutes ces raisons, M. l'Orateur, je voterai pour la proposition de l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud parce que je crois qu'elle est dans l'intérêt des électeurs que je représente et l'intérêt général du pays.

Mr. GIGAULT. Mr. Speaker, after the speech made during the last electoral campaign by Mr. Blake, the ex-leader of the Liberal party, I had hoped that the National Policy would have been accepted by both political parties, but I am sorry to find that I was mistaken. After having fought a protective tariff the Liberals now combat even a revenue tariff, which according to them was sufficient to foster our manufacturing industries, and now they come even to unrestricted reciprocity. If a revenue tariff was absolutely necessary to foster our manufacturing industries, why should the Liberals adopt such a change to-day and come even to unrestricted reciprocity? I do not contend, Mr. Speaker, that the protestations of the Liberals are not patriotic. They may have in view the best interests of the country, but, to my mind, by favoring unrestricted reciprocity they are committing an error, the consequences of which will be highly detrimental to the interests of the Dominion. The last speaker said that the farming community would be highly benefitted by a reciprocity treaty or unrestricted reciprocity. That hon. gentleman should remember that the circumstances to-day are quite different from what they were under the old Reciprocity Treaty. What contributed largely to make the American market during the old Reciprocity Treaty so advantageous to our farmers was the American war. That war has terminated. Since the end of that war the Americans have devoted a large portion of their energy and intelligence towards developing their agricultural resources, building at the same time in their fertile North-West new railways for the cheap and rapid shipment of the agricultural produce. The result of that policy has been that the agricultural productions of the United States have enormously increased. We see, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States of 1887, that in 1861 the Americans exported cattle, sheep and hogs to the value of \$254,930, while in 1887 they exported the same articles to the value of \$9,991,

614; in 1861 our neighbors exported breadstuffs to the value of \$472,152,366, while in 1887 the value exported was \$165,768,662. In 1861, during the old Reciprocity Treaty, they exported provisions and dairy products to the value of \$32,000,000, while in 1887 the value reached \$92,000,000, or an increase of more than \$70,000,000. So the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House should not have lost sight of the fact that the circumstances in the United States have so greatly changed that that market is far from being as beneficial to our farmers to-day as it was during the old Reciprocity Treaty. We can ascertain that fact, also, by the decrease in the imports of agricultural produce by the United States. An allusion has been made to hay. During the last three years there has been a constant decrease in the importation of that article by the United States. In 1885 our neighbors exported hay to the value of \$1,517,883; in 1886, \$1,035,408; in 1887, \$7,091,686, so that if we compare the value in 1885 with that of last year we ascertain that there was a decrease in the importation of that article by the United States of more than \$700,000. They also imported last year less breadstuffs than in 1885, and also imported less provisions than in that year. That decrease in imports by the United States, has been ascertained not only by myself, but also by a member of the Liberal party, who, in 1878, proposed to impose a duty on corn and oats coming to the United States from Canada. That member of the Liberal party said:

"The circumstances are changing in the United States. We are now far from exporting to the United States as large a quantity of oats as we formerly exported, and even the United States export to Canada more oats than we export to the States."

That Liberal member also said in his speech that we imported from the United States in 1876, 623,368 bushels of oats; in 1877, 672,834 bushels; while we exported in 1877, 73,078 bushels to the United States; and that Liberal member stated at the same time that our exportation of oats would go on decreasing, from the fact that the farmers of the western States during the last five years had been growing that product very extensively, and that already they provided a sufficient quantity to supply not only the United States market, but to send a surplus to foreign markets. The United States not only exports a surplus of agricultural products to Europe, but even to Canada. Last year we imported a large quantity of agricultural products from different countries, on which we collected a duty of \$668,707, and that amount would be lost to the revenue if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity. We imported live animals to the value of \$2,684,000; grain of all kinds, \$931,517; flour and meal of all kinds, \$958,740; butter, cheese, lard, \$1,187,108; vegetables, \$201,684; in all, we imported agricultural products to the value of \$3,547,449. As the Minister of the United States says in his report to Congress:

"The United States has to export their surplus of agricultural products to countries which have a deficiency."

That is the right principle. We must expect to send our agricultural productions, not to countries which have a surplus, but to countries which have a deficiency of agricultural produce. That is the reason why I agreed with the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when he said that the price of our agricultural produce was regulated, not by the American market, but by the Liverpool market. That hon. member showed, by stating so, that the natural market for our agricultural produce was not in the United States, but in England. But I may say immediately that I have always been, and am still in favor of a reciprocity treaty for the natural productions of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why?

Mr. GIGAULT. Why? Well, it has always been the policy I have supported, and that policy was included in the Statute-book of 1879. We said then that, as soon as the Americans were willing to give access to our agricul-

Mr. GIGAULT,

tural produce, we were willing to admit their agricultural produce free of duty into our country; but there is a thing which I am not ready to do in order to obtain that reciprocity treaty for the natural productions, and that sacrifice which I am not ready to make is the sacrifice of our manufacturing industries and of our home market. That is the reason why I am in favor of a reciprocity treaty for natural productions and am not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. If in reciprocity there would be certain advantages, we must consider also what would be the disadvantages of that unrestricted reciprocity, and I believe that, after we have considered the disadvantages, we must have come to the conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity would be much more detrimental than beneficial to the interests of this country. First of all, we would lose a large portion of our revenue from customs, and would be obliged to resort to direct taxation. I know it has been contended by our Canadian free traders that it would not be necessary to resort to direct taxation on account of the loss of revenue which would follow unrestricted reciprocity, but I do not see how such an opinion can be upheld. We would lose certainly more than 7,000,000 on the imports which would come from the United States; our imports from other countries would certainly also decrease, and I think I may safely say that we would lose more than ten or twelve millions of revenue by the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. And, for that loss of revenue, what advantage would we have? We sell to the Americans, our neighbors, the same kind of agricultural produce for the sum of \$15,000,000. Well, in order to sell agricultural produce to the amount of \$15,000,000, we would be obliged to resort to direct taxation for ten or twelve millions. We pay now about 20 per cent. upon our agricultural produce exported to the United States, but, if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity, we would perhaps pay 30 or 40 per cent. on account of direct taxation upon property in Canada, so that, instead of decreasing the duty, we would increase it upon the exports of agricultural produce which we would sell to the United States. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) has attacked the National Policy and has contended that the National Policy has a detrimental effect upon the condition of Canada. He speaks of the increase of manufactured goods which are made in our manufactories, as if a protective tariff had the effect of increasing the price of manufactured goods. What do we see in the United States? According to the Returns of Commerce and Navigation for the year 1887, they give the prices of the different commodities manufactured in that country. We see that in 1847 the price for standard sheetings, per yard, was 8 cents, and that in 1886 it was only 6 cents. We find that the price of standard drillings, per yard, was 8 cents in 1847, and in 1886 it was 6 cents; that the price of bleached sheeting, per yard, in 1847 was 14 cents, and in 1886 it was only 10 cents; that the price of standard prints in 1847 was 11 cents, and in 1886 only 6 cents; that the price of printed cloth, 66 by 66 inches, per yard, was, in 1847, 6 cents, and in 1886, 3 cents. That is the way that the price of those manufactured goods has been increased by a protective tariff in the United States; while here in Canada we ascertain by facts that the prices of almost all the manufactured goods of Canada have been reduced since the adoption of a protective tariff. But there is another thing which should not be lost sight of by our farmers. I contend that unrestricted reciprocity would almost destroy, or greatly diminish, the importance of our home market. Let the free traders say what they like, I know that in the county of Rouville a protective tariff has produced a very good effect. I know that our farmers are increasing their deposits every year in the banks. I know that in the cities of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, the number of consumers of agricultural produce is largely increased. Every week our farmers resort to those markets; every week parties go through our rural districts buying

eggs, poultry, animals, fruit and other articles of farm produce. And where do these articles go, and in a much larger quantity than in the past? They go to the markets of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, where there is a much larger number of consumers than there was in the past. Destroy, by unrestricted reciprocity, the manufacturing industries of those two cities, throw out of employment the thousands of workmen who gain their living in those manufactures, and what would be the result? Our market for agricultural produce would lose its importance; that would be the sad result of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) has alluded to our magnificent water powers, and he seems to believe that, under unrestricted reciprocity, the American manufacturers would leave their own country and come here to build up manufactures in Canada. Such a thing cannot happen, Mr. Speaker. When our doors are thrown open to the trade of the United States, it will not be necessary for the manufacturers to come and settle in Canada. They will have free access to our country, they will make it a slaughter market for their surplus manufactured goods. In England, in France, in the United States public men have always felt it to be their duty to protect equally the manufacturers and the farmers. They believe that they should be equally prosperous, that alongside of the farmers there should be mechanics and workmen in order to consume the agricultural products. Napoleon I, that man of genius, whom all nations have admired, not only endeavored to favor agriculture, but he also made great efforts to encourage and foster manufacturing industries. He wanted the fields covered with abundant harvests, he wanted to have villages and cities inhabited by numerous workmen in easy circumstances. He did not rely upon foreigners to create a home market and home industries in France; he relied upon the intelligence and industry of his fellow countrymen. That is the line of conduct that we should follow; and I hope we shall continue to follow it, and to encourage our manufacturing industries as we have done in the past. We have no reason to be despondent. Our North-West is developing itself rapidly, our deposits in the savings banks are increasing, our manufacturing industries are growing, and I believe that under present circumstances Canadians can create for themselves a most enviable position.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In rising to perform the task which now becomes my duty, I must compliment the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) on the speech he has just made, for the manly, upright and honorable way in which he has presented his case. I never object to any individual entertaining opinions contrary to my own, because if I have a right to hold opinions, another gentleman has an equal right to hold different opinions, as long as he places them before the House and the country in a gentlemanly and straightforward manner. I have very great pleasure indeed in complimenting the hon. member who has just taken his seat for the remarks he has made, not that I agree with his arguments, nor with the deductions he has drawn from his statistics; that does not necessarily follow. But to my mind his speech was very refreshing, because of its contrast to the harangue of personalities which we had to submit to last night, for three hours, and which appeared to be the crowning effort of the day's work. In fact I was so sick yesterday of the personalities that were flung from one side of the House to the other that I felt as if I would like to be out of the House altogether. I think that, as representatives of the people, we should deal as seriously as we can with the great issue before us. I must express it as my candid opinion that there has not been such a great issue before the Canadian Parliament since the Provinces were united into a Confederation. I do not believe that there ever was a question

that attracted more attention throughout the length and breadth of Canada than the question which has been discussed during the last few days. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when the intelligent men outside read a discussion containing so many personalities, they will be anxious to get down to the real question that is under discussion, and will give credit to those who discuss facts apart and free from personalities, which are undignified and ungentlemanly. We were told during this discussion that the Reciprocity Treaty which lasted from 1854 to 1866 was not a success; we were told by others that it was a comparative success, and we were told by others still that it was a great success. Indeed, Sir, it appears to me there is a difference of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite as to whether it was a success or not. It will therefore devolve upon me, as rapidly as I can, to prove by statistics and otherwise that the Reciprocity Treaty which we had in Canada from 1854 to 1866 was largely in the interests of the people of Canada, largely in the interests of the products of the great industries of the country, and contributing to their great success. It was stated the other evening, by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter), that there were attendant circumstances, that other events occurred during those years which rendered Canada more successful than it otherwise would have been. He stated that the Grand Trunk Railway was built during those years, forgetting the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway was commenced about five years before we had reciprocity, and a large proportion of the money that was spent on account of that railway was spent before we had the benefit of the Reciprocity Treaty. He also told us that we had a war in Europe which gave large prices to farmers for their products. It was true there was a war, but the war was nearly over when this treaty went into operation in the United States, because the treaty went into operation in March, 1855. But the hon. gentleman did not give this House to understand that on account of the excessive prices that prevailed for a number of years previously never did more distress prevail in this country than in 1857, and that there was such a depreciation in the money markets of this country that there was a great number of insolvencies and a great many destructions of property in this country. There was never a period in Canadian history when we recovered more rapidly from depression than we did in 1857, and this was on account of the impetus given to the trade of the country on account of the operation of the treaty. We are told again that in 1860 or 1861 the war in the United States had given a great impetus to the trade of Canada. Now, if the hon. gentleman who made that statement will look up statistics upon that matter he will find that our trade did not increase rapidly during the American war; he will find also that a large proportion of the Americans were cut off from the markets of Canada by that very war. The South was blockaded and 10,000,000 of people could not be reached during the war, and the result was that Canada, which formerly supplied largely to the southern States, was cut off from trading with them, so that, by the blockade of the southern portions of the American Union, we lost more than we gained in that respect. The statistics of the trade of this country with the Americans will show that that Reciprocity Treaty was a great advantage to Canada. We have it from Government figures that in 1854 the export from this country to the American Union was a little less than \$9,000,000, and in 1866, or about one year afterwards, our export was \$54,000,000. That proves without a cavil or a contradiction, and proves against any argument that can be brought to the contrary, that a great trade had sprang up between this country and the United States under the operations of the treaty. It must be remembered, upon the other side, that we had the advantage under the provisions of that treaty. Our trade grew from

\$9,000,000 to \$54,000,000, while their trade only rose from \$23,000,000 to \$29,000,000 in the same number of years. Our trade rose 500 per cent. and their trade only 24 per cent. It is perfectly clear from this that we in this country derived great advantage because of having the United States markets open to our products and thus giving the lumbermen, fishermen and miners of this country an open market in which they could sell the products of their toil. To show to you, Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary bounds which trade reached between the two countries during this period, allow me to give you a few figures which bear upon the point. We take first Canada; that is, old Canada, Upper and Lower Canada as it is called now. The export trade in 1854 was \$8,642,002. It increased in the twelve years to \$31,770,251, so that the increase of the export trade in those Provinces was 300 per cent. in twelve years. Nova Scotia had an export trade in 1854 of \$1,593,428, and her trade increased to \$3,228,550 in this period, or 100 per cent. in the twelve years. New Brunswick had an export trade in 1854 of \$489,650, and her export trade in 1866 rose to \$1,855,944, or 280 per cent. Prince Edward Island, of which we have heard so much and in such eloquent terms, had an export trade in 1854 of \$81,782; under the auspices of the reciprocity treaty which existed during those twelve years she increased her export trade to \$1,058,642, or during the period an increase of 1,200 per cent. in the export trade of that Province. This proves to you beyond a doubt that the Reciprocity Treaty had a great effect in stimulating trade in those eastern Provinces. Now, Sir, if we compare the increase during those twelve years with the increase from 1856 to 1867 it will show you a large increase in the former period over the latter period. As I have shown, we had in Upper and Lower Canada an increase of 300 per cent. in the first period and only 70 per cent. in the last twenty years, or 300 per cent. for twelve years as against 70 per cent. in twenty years. In Nova Scotia we had, during the first period to which I have alluded, an increase of 100 per cent., while during the last twenty years we had only 158 per cent., increase, or quite a considerable percentage less, taking the number of years into consideration. In New Brunswick we had an increase in the former period of 220 per cent. for twelve years, and in the same Province during the latter period an increase of 160 per cent. for twenty years. Now coming to Prince Edward Island the increase during the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty was 1,200 per cent., but for the latter period of twenty years it was only 20 per cent., or one per cent. per annum. Those facts go to show that the Reciprocity Treaty had a tremendously beneficial effect upon the export trade and the trade generally of the eastern Provinces, during the period of reciprocity and prosperity in those Provinces. Now take the shipping of those Provinces: Nova Scotia in 1863 built 31,038 tons of shipping, and in 1887 she only built 15,932 tons of shipping. New Brunswick built in 1868, 24,919 tons of shipping, and in 1887 only 6,817 tons. In 1868 Prince Edward Island built 26,041 tons, and her shipbuilding industry has been nearly wiped out altogether, for she only built this year 1,686 tons as against over 26,000 tons ten years ago. Does not this prove that the shipping industry has been wiped out, as it were, wholly and entirely by the operation of this protective or restrictive system which has been adopted in this country and continued for a number of years? Sir, I want to point out another fact in connection with this matter. As I said before, the total export trade of this country was \$8,931,904 in 1854, and \$54,704,909 in 1886, an increase of 600 per cent. The imports to the United States during those years only increased 12 per cent., showing that we had the advantage of that trade during the reciprocity year. Was there a difference of opinion in this country as to the advantages derived from the Reciprocity Treaty when the United States in 1864 gave notice of the abrogation of the

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.)

treaty? We see there was not. There was consternation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and the Executive Council, the Government of the day, met for the purpose of memorializing the English Government to take steps to prevent such a calamity falling upon the Canadian people. In order that I may give the exact words allow me to read you the report of that committee made in 1864. The report was made the 19th February, 1864, and reads as follows:—

"The Committee of the Executive Council deem it to be their duty to represent to Your Excellency, that the recent proceedings in the Congress of the United States, respecting the Reciprocity Treaty, have excited the deepest concern in the minds of the people of this Province.

"Those proceedings have had for their avowed object the abrogation of the treaty at the earliest moment consistent with the stipulations of the instrument itself.

"Although no formal action, indicative of the strength of the party hostile to the continuance of the treaty has yet taken place; information of an authentic character as to the opinions and purposes of influential men in the United States, has forced upon the Committee the conviction that there is imminent danger of its speedy abrogation, unless prompt and vigorous steps be taken by Her Majesty's Imperial advisers to avert what would be generally regarded, by the people of Canada, as a great calamity."

If in those days the abrogation of that treaty would be considered a great calamity to the people of Canada, would not the return of that treaty be considered a great blessing for the people of Canada? If the loss of anything is a great calamity, to receive that same thing must be a great blessing. Nor, Sir, was this all. There was a convention held in 1864, for the purpose of bringing to bear on the American people as much influence as possible with the view of obtaining a continuance of the treaty. You will no doubt remember that great convention which took place in the city of Detroit, and which was attended by many delegates from this country, for the purpose of discussing this question; and you will remember the great speech made on that occasion by the great father of Nova Scotia to whom every Nova Scotian looks back with pride and honor—I mean the Hon. Joseph Howe—that speech, in which he set forth the desirability for wider and freer trade with the American Union than we should have if the abrogation of that treaty took place, and in which, with unusual eloquence, he brought forward argument after argument to prove that it would be advantageous, not only to Canada, but to the United States as well, to continue in the new relationship which existed for twelve years. Now, Sir, all these facts go to prove that that treaty was a great blessing to the people of this country; and it was considered by the people of this country to be a great blessing, because there were efforts made year after year to obtain a renewal of the treaty after it was abrogated in 1866. The hon. leader of the Government had a high appreciation of its advantages, because he never gave up the prospect of obtaining freer trade relations with the American Union until this so-called National Policy was established in 1879, by which the combines and monopolies and manufactories in the country, in their influence and money, have been enabled to keep him in power. Then he forgot what he had stated in those former years, which were the years of greater prosperity than the present.

Mr. SPROULE. Is your resolution for the same kind of a treaty now?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My dear Sir, our resolution is in principle the same. We on this side of the House are perfectly willing to accept the Reciprocity Treaty upon the same terms as before; but you know very well, if you know anything at all about it, that the United States will not grant the same privileges that we had before. Are we, then, Sir, to deny the great boon to the industrial classes of this country, because the United States will not give it unless we give up the special protection to the manufacturers of this country? Are we going to neglect the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen and the miners, to

whom it has been a great boon, because, forsooth, a number of manufacturers say it will interfere with their interests and deprive them of some of the profits that the hard-working people of this country contribute out of their earnings? If the hon. member will get it, I am sure the Liberal party will hail with gladness a reciprocity treaty identical with that which we had from 1854 to 1866. But we had at that time the best end of the stick, and they will not give it to us again. But we are willing to go further to-day to get the other great boon; and I say, if it should injure the manufacturers, their interests must be sacrificed for the interests of the great body of the people of this country. It is a principle of all Governments to sacrifice, if necessary, the interests of a few for the purpose of securing benefits for the great majority of the people.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not what your leader promised at the last general election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. the present leader of the Government was favorable to a renewal of the reciprocity treaty. Nay, more, he pronounced himself a free trader on the public platforms of this country. Let me read some of the expressions he made use of. Probably the hon. gentleman who has been disturbing me does not remember so far back as that; probably he did not read those speeches. Probably he feels quieter and more complacent in his mind when he does not read what took place in his own party. You will remember that 1877 was the year in which it was decided by the Conservative party that the great National Policy should be made the issue before the country in the ensuing general election. They went up and down through the country preaching the great benefits that this so-called National Policy was to secure. But did they go to the people, and say, We are going to change this into a protective country? No, they said to the people, We have been trying for years to get a reciprocity treaty from the United States, and they refuse to give it to us; in consequence of that refusal, we are going to adopt a high protective tariff, and force them to come to our terms and give us the great boon we have been asking for. I ask hon. gentlemen if that was not the case. Now, listen to what was said at that time by the hon. leader of the Government, then leader of the Opposition, which he will likely be again after the next general election. The hon. gentleman, at Napanee, on September 11th, said:

"He was a free trader if he could get free trade."

That is just what we are to-day, and if we cannot get full free trade, with the American Union, we are willing to take partial trade. We are willing to go in for reciprocal free trade and are therefore standing on the same platform the hon. leader of the Government stood upon when he delivered that celebrated speech. At Cobourg, on August 29, he said:

"The Canadian farmer would raise his barley for say \$1 a bushel, and it would not be the brewer who would pay the 15 cents; he paid \$1 for his barley, no matter where it was from or from whom it was bought, but the duty came out of the pocket of the Canadian farmer."

Now, I think this principle the Tory party deny at the present time. When hon. gentlemen on this side were setting forth the amount of money we lose in consequence of the duty on the barley we send to the United States, it was thrown back that it was not the Canadian farmer, but the American consumers who lost it. But let me read what the hon. leader of the Government said at Newmarket, on September 14th, 1887:

"If we cannot get reciprocity of trade, we must get reciprocity of tariff."

I hope the hon. members will remember this language. The protective tariff was only put forward as an alternative to what was wanted—if we cannot get reciprocity of trade, then we must get reciprocity of tariff, but he pre-

ferred reciprocity of trade. At Hamilton, on October 17th, the hon. gentleman said:

"I want the Canadians to say to the Americans, We will have free trade, fair trade, or reciprocal trade if you like, but if you will not have any of these, we will have a reciprocity of tariff."

That proves beyond any cavil that the present leader of the Government was favorable to unlimited reciprocity up to 1878, when he fell into the trap of the National Policy; and ever since he got into that large strong trap, the combines and monopolists and manufacturers have put their foot so strongly on the spring that the hon. gentleman has never been able to get out of it. He has made up his mind to die in that trap, and his followers are determined to keep him there. But I understand there are still among the Conservative party, and even among the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, gentlemen who are in favor of reciprocity in a wider degree of trade between this country and the United States; and I believe one of these is the hon. gentleman who, I am sorry to say, has been compelled to be absent for many days on account of illness. I believe the hon. the Finance Minister has enlarged views on this question, and I believe this from many circumstances. I am, therefore, sorry he has been unable to attend this debate, so as to give us the expression of his own opinions in this matter; for I am of opinion that had he been able to do so, he would have thrown a bombshell into the Government ranks. The right hon. the leader of the Government has often told us that Providence comes to his assistance in time of need. He once, indeed stated that Providence made the wheat grow as soon as his party came into power; and I am sure confidence in a higher interposition has been verified on this occasion, and that Providence has come to his assistance during the last few days, by opportunely shunting off from the track a gentleman of great ability and great force, while the great car of Unrestricted Reciprocity was being driven across the House. But I sincerely hope that the hon. gentleman will be here before the close of this debate, to give his views on this subject. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to those papers of which we have heard so much. Among the papers placed at our disposal, is a letter written by the Hon. Secretary Bayard to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, to whom I refer now in his capacity as one of the plenipotentiaries. From this letter, I learn that a desire was expressed on the part of Secretary Bayard to have the commercial relationship between the two countries settled. We are told that Mr. Bayard writes his letters with his own hand,—that he writes both personally and officially; and anyone who knows the position that hon. gentleman holds at Washington, knows that he can speak on his own responsibility, and that in so doing he is in the confidence of the president and the six other executive officers who wrote with him. Anyone who knows the position Mr. Bayard occupies in the Washington Cabinet, knows well that whatever he pens with his own hand, even unofficially, may be taken as an indication of the policy of the American Government. Now, what has that hon. gentleman penned? He has penned the following words:—

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been a *question vexata* ever since it was concluded."

That is the immediate question which the plenipotentiaries are supposed to meet to decide; but he says further:

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

You see the force of the word "entire," and his pointed use of it. He does not mean a relationship between the farmers of both countries, or between a particular class in each country. No, he evidently embraces all the industrial

classes of the United States and the Dominion, and you see how careful he was to explain himself:

"I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

Now, where is there any reference to commercial union in this language? In the first place, Mr. Bayard pointed out that his plan was not intended to affect the political relationship of either country, and he goes further; he adds, "It is not to affect the legislative independence of either country." Now, commercial union will affect the legislative independence of this country, because under it we must have equal customs laws with those of the United States. There must be an arrangement between ourselves and the United States as to the customs laws, which must be the same in both countries, and any alteration in these laws, in years to come, would have to be based on an agreement between the two Governments. Therefore, independence of legislation under commercial union would be affected. But Mr. Bayard says it is not to be affected, and we must conclude from this that commercial union was not in his mind at all. Sir Charles Tupper agreed with the sentiment to which Mr. Bayard gave expression. Any of you who have read these papers will see how the words correspond, even in their verbal character. The language used by both hon. gentlemen is almost identical. Sir Charles Tupper replied:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement,—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Mr. Bayard's object was to call Sir Charles Tupper's attention to the method which he proposed, by which the whole commercial relations of the two countries would be brought under the consideration of a commission, on the supposition that in all probability the Government of Canada would refer the matter to the Government of England, and that power would be given the commission to take into consideration all these questions. But such power was not granted. Now, let me show you how the powers were granted in England. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) brought up a question last night—to which I wish to draw his attention—in order to show that this proposition with regard to enlarging the trade between Canada and the United States was a buncombe proposition. If you turn to the powers granted by Her Majesty Queen Victoria to her plenipotentiaries, you will find the following:—

"Whereas for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit with plenipotentiaries to be appointed on the part of our good friends the United States of America, all or any questions relating to rights of the fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland, which are in dispute between our Government and that of our said good friends, and any other questions that may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorised"—

Not "authorised," mark you, but "may be authorised," if an authorisation is required,—

"by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

Now, that authorisation and power was given to the British plenipotentiaries on the 24th of October, 1887. Powers were not granted to the American plenipotentiaries until the 18th of the following month, and they, of course, granted their plenipotentiaries exactly the same powers. What were the powers granted?

"To meet and confer with plenipotentiaries representing the Government of Her Britannic Majesty for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit all or any questions relating to rights of fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland which are in dispute between the Governments of the United States and that of Her Britannic Majesty, and any other question which may arise and which they may be authorised by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

Now, these are the powers that were given. You see that the powers given to each were exactly the same, couched in the same words. Then when this proposition

Mr. MACDONALD, (Huron).

was made by Sir Charles Tupper, in regard to the widening of our commercial relationship with the United States, what did the American plenipotentiaries say in reply? They said: We have no power to consider such a proposition at all; we must first obtain authority from the President. I want to ask the House if the American plenipotentiaries had no power to consider the proposition of Sir Charles Tupper, how had the other plenipotentiaries the power to make such a proposition? They were vested with the same powers from their respective Governments, and if one was not able to receive it, the other was not able to make it, and I believe the whole thing was done in order to lead the Canadian people astray, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) attempted to lead them astray last night. He said we were favorable to it; did not our plenipotentiaries at Washington attempt to obtain it? And then he read the American denial. Could they accept it at all? We were told by the plenipotentiary himself in this House that discussion took place and continued for weeks, over what? Over the trade question? Probably it did. Was that discussion inside or outside of their powers? It was a discussion that took place around the table in a personal way. Each one, speaking on his own responsibility, laid down a line of action, and others laid down another line of action, and our plenipotentiary expected that these propositions and counter-propositions should be laid upon the table in connection with the protocols. But it was ruled out of the protocols. Why? Because neither the one party nor the other had power to consider these propositions, and it was absurd to expect that these would come into a public document upon which they had no power to act, that they could bring into that propositions in regard to which they had no power at all. That proves to my mind that this proposition made at Washington was only made for a sham, and was brought before the Canadian people to lead them to believe that an offer had been made; and I am satisfied that on the public platforms in western Ontario I shall hear that the Canadian plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper, laid a proposition for extended trade on the table at Washington, and that the Americans would not agree to it. How could they bring it about when the others would not consider it? That is what they will say; and I want to say here in my place in this House that they must have known that that could not be carried out when they knew perfectly well that they had not legally the power to do it. I want now to draw the attention of the House to the question as it presents itself to me. I believe that a public trade policy must be based upon the lines along which the strongest capabilities of any country lie, just as it you, Mr. Speaker, or I, had a son whom we wished to educate; we would study his abilities and capacities, and, after learning what they were, we would educate him along the lines of his strongest abilities; and, as that is the true and proper policy in the education of a son, it is just as true in the development of a country. What are the great natural sources of wealth in this country? The first is the farming community. They stand pre-eminently higher than any other class of the community. We have a large quantity of magnificent lands, we have the hardy and sturdy pioneers who have gone to these lands and are working to develop them. There are 600,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada. They are the largest investors in property, the largest employers of labor, and the largest consumers of what is imported, and the demand is made that this House should adopt a policy which is in their interest, and which the Government have shown in the past they were favorable to in the interests of the farmers. It has been repeatedly stated in this debate that the farmers are well off. I live in an agricultural county, I live in one of the finest sections for agriculture that you can find in Canada, and I am satisfied that the farmers are not well off. They have large and heavy debts upon them; and this brings me to a

question which was brought up by the hon. the Minister of the Interior the other night. He tried to show that the farmers of Ontario and of Canada were not in debt, and to prove that he took the returns of the loan societies of this country, and showed that according to their report there are not so very many mortgages on the farms. Did not the hon. gentleman know that there is not one mortgage in five owned by the loan companies? Does he not know that the farmers have become so sick of the shaving and cheating principles of the loan companies that they will hardly accept any money from them? They are, of course, not all of that kind, but the farmers will rather pay a much larger amount for money obtained from other sources, and I believe that now for every one mortgage which the loan companies have, other parties, outside of those companies, have three or four. So his argument falls entirely to the ground, because the premises upon which he built the argument were entirely at variance with the truth. I may ask, how is a free trade policy to favor the farmers? We have been told by a good many hon. members on the other side that this does not afford any relief for the farmers, that it does not give them an enlarged market. If that is so the statistics which are placed at our disposal by the Government of the country do not tell the truth. We were told that on account of the United States exporting large quantities of the articles we had to send there, therefore the American markets were not ours. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) brought out that argument very strongly. He said the American market is now filled. They export largely of horses and cattle and other animals, and of the cereals of the country, and therefore that is not a market for Canadian produce. Let me give you what the Trade and Navigation Returns show in regard to our export. Of our exportation of horses, 97 per cent. goes to the United States and $1\frac{7}{10}$ per cent. goes to England; of horned cattle, 39 per cent. goes to the United States and 54 per cent. to England.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

An hon. MEMBER. What is the value?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Let me answer one at a time.

An hon. MEMBER. Answer the question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Which? That as to the value? There is a large number of horses that go to England that are superior to many that go to the United States, and, if the hon. gentleman knew anything about buying and selling horses, he would know that we send to the United States a great many that are lamed and ring-boned and old, which are bought up for markets in the United States, and consequently the prices are low. I will tell the hon. gentleman another thing. Last year we sent 326 horses to England and 18,225 to the United States. The average price for these, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, was \$121 for those sent to England, and \$116 for those sent to the United States. How is that? I challenge the contradiction of these figures, and the very gentleman who has asked this question will, I hope, look up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and show me if I have made a mistake when he speaks on this.

Mr. MASSON. The question of values refers to cattle.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is a gentleman who wants to know something about cattle. If that hon. gentleman is a farmer—

An hon. MEMBER. He is a lawyer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I thought he was some thing, and I do not think he would ask such a question if

he was a farmer, because every farmer here knows why our cattle fetch less prices in the United States than they do in England. Our best and fattest cattle go to the English market for beef; it is our stalkers from the grass field that go to the United States. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the stalkers would fetch the same price as those cattle which have been fattened and fed upon corn and oats for beef in the English market? There are many farmers around me, and I do not wish them to shield me one iota if I do not state what they know to be true. I think, if you study a little less law and more common sense, you would not ask such questions. Here is a list of several articles of export, showing the proportion going to the United States, and the proportion going to England:

| | To the United States. | To Great Britain. |
|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| | per cent. | per cent. |
| Horses..... | 97 | $1\frac{7}{10}$ |
| Horned cattle..... | 39 | 54 |
| Sheep..... | $81\frac{1}{2}$ | $15\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Poultry..... | 92 | $4\frac{3}{8}$ |
| Eggs..... | $99\frac{7}{10}$ | None. |
| Potatoes..... | $81\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 |
| Vegetables..... | 90 | $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 |
| Straw..... | 100 | None. |
| Hay..... | 90 | $\frac{4}{10}$ of 1 |
| Barley..... | $99\frac{7}{10}$ | $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 |
| Beans..... | $99\frac{1}{2}$ | None. |
| Apples, green..... | $25\frac{1}{2}$ | 73 |
| Wool..... | $91\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{3}{10}$ of 1 |

Now, in the face of these facts I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I would ask those who said that the United States was not a market for Canadian products, to consider these figures. They are not my figures; they are the figures put into the Trade and Navigation Returns for our use. Where are the men now who say that the United States is not the market for us? It does not matter to us whether they export these articles again, so long as they pay the highest price to us. If we have to send them there after paying a duty and freight, the farmers in this country will not realise the full benefit of having that market; but if, on the other hand, the duty is removed, then we would have a market where we would realise a higher sum for those articles than we are realising now. There is an hon. gentleman yonder, who, by his face, I should say, wants some information; he looks as though he could hold a good deal.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if I understood him correctly to say that nine-tenths of the vegetables go into the United States and only one-tenth to England?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes, our exports.

Mr. McNEILL. I am asking for information on that point—with regard to vegetables.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He will forget if, it is no use.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He may put it in his pocket. Some men have more room in their pockets than in their heads. Here are the figures I gave: $81\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of our potatoes go to the United States, and $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 per cent. go to England. Of other vegetables 90 per cent go to the American market and $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 per cent. to the English market.

Mr. McNEILL. What about our own home market?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. McNEILL. That is amusing to hon. gentlemen opposite. They do not realise the value of that at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I suppose I could not please the hon. gentleman if I tried. I suppose, if I told him about the home market, he would ask something about the foreign market, and here he would keep me running around after him, first into one corner, then into another. I do not think the bird is worth the powder, or the shot. Now, I want to make a few remarks upon some of those articles. We send to the American market 18,225 horses.

Now, it is said that we would not realise any higher price for horses. In the American market they require 2,500,000 horses a year. They require 300,000 horses to keep up the supply; we only send them 18,225; which is about one horse out of every 140 which the American market requires; therefore we are not in a position, by our present exportation, to dilute the American market to any marked degree, and therefore we command the price in the American market on account of the demand in that market. Very well; accepting that doctrine as the true one, if we send twice 18,000 horses, still what we do would not dilute the American market so as to affect the price. Then, acknowledging that point, the Canadian exporter will make all the duty. For instance, if a horse is purchased here and crosses the line, and has to pay \$20 duty, and goes to the American market and is sold there, he is sold at the same price as an American horse. If the duty is removed, and if we cannot affect the price in the American market by dilution, then we make exactly \$20, or, according to the price of horses last year, \$24.30 on the value of each horse; the farmer makes that profit on every horse he sells on the other side. But if, on the other hand, we were to send any such large number to the American market as appreciably to dilute it, then that would increase the supply a little above the demand, and the result would be a depreciation in the price, and the Canadian farmer would not realise as much as he otherwise would. But if we cannot alter the price by the number we send in, the Canadian farmer makes every dollar of the duty. The same principle is true in respect to everything else we send in. Now, last year the duties paid on horses amounted to \$443,000; that sum would have gone into the pockets of the Canadian farmer if the duty was removed, according to the principle I have laid down. There was \$195,000 collected in duties on sheep that went into the United States. There was \$9,900 collected on poultry that we sent in to feed those people over there who wanted our poultry. \$199,521 were paid in duty on potatoes; and I would ask my hon. friend who is looking me in the face, to consider the fact that in his own Province, that exports over a million bushels of potatoes, and pays 15 cents a bushel duty, the tariff takes that sum out of the pockets of the farmers of Prince Edward Island to-day. Then we export a large amount of hay principally from the eastern Provinces, and we paid last year \$139,000 duty on hay. On barley, which the Americans take from us to such a large extent—in fact they take it all,—we paid \$994,000 in duty. And just one or two words about barley. It is impossible to dilute the American market with barley. We have a special kind of barley that the Americans must have. We have the hard, white barley that they do not grow, and that is considered the best for malting purposes, and therefore the brewers demand that barley. If the buyers in the United States come over here and buy our barley at 60 cents, they pay 10 cents a bushel duty, which brings it up to 70 cents, the price of barley across the line.

Mr. TAYLOR. They must have it and they must pay the duty. If they want the barley they must pay the duty on it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I know that hon. gentleman has been a Conservative all the days of his life, and I suppose he will be so the balance of it. I just want to answer him by the leader of that party, a party that would have gone to wreck, head and heels, long ago if it had not him to guide it. He was the builder up of it, he has put the bulwarks around it, he holds it together, and when he dies I believe the party will resolve itself into its original elements. Now, Sir, if I answered that hon. gentleman in my own words he would, no doubt, on account of my being on this side of the House, declare that I was not sufficient authority, but when I place in opposition to his statement

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.)

the opinion of his own leader, surely, as a loyal follower of the hon. gentleman, he would accept the testimony of the First Minister. Would you not?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman say no?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not necessary to accept it if it is not correct. You gentlemen on that side of the House accept it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). On the 29th of August, 1877, the present leader of the Government addressed a large audience, and in the course of his speech he went on to prove that the Canadian farmer, and not the United States brewer, pays the duty of 15 cents per bushel on grain that is sent into the United States. He said:

"The Canadian farmer would raise his barley for, say \$1 a bushel. It would not be the brewer, who would pay the 15 cents; he paid \$1 for his barley, no matter where it was from, but the duty came out of the pocket of the Canadian farmer."

Surely the hon. gentleman is satisfied now. I am sure, rather than have his testimony placed in opposition to that of his leader, he will have the manliness to stand up in the House, beg pardon, and withdraw his opposition. There is another point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, and it is this, that notwithstanding a duty of 10 cents per pound is imposed on Canadian wool going into the United States, 91½ per cent. of our wool enters the American market. Will any one believe that if the duty upon wool was removed a larger price would not be paid in this country, and that instead of our wool selling at 20 cents per pound, at which it has been sold for a number of years under the auspices of the National Policy, and this for wool which has brought in the United States 30 cents per pound, a larger price would be obtained here, and the 10 cents per pound duty paid on exported wool at present would be retained in the pockets of our farmers in the shape of profits, in addition to the present profits they obtain, which amount to very little? On the articles I have enumerated \$2,268,971 duty was paid last year, and if I were to enumerate a large number of the other articles which paid duty, I could show that our people have to pay a very large sum, and that it behoves our farmers, who are at present suffering, to bring all possible influence to bear upon the Government in order to obtain treaty relations with the United States, so that our agriculturists might be able to keep these profits themselves. There is another large industry to which I beg to draw the attention of hon. members here, and of the people in the country, and that is the large lumber interest. That is a source of wealth that requires development, but it is a source of wealth that cannot be advantageously utilised until the wood is converted into cash. We have 9,500 mills in this country, which is a very small number compared with our extensive forests. We have 45,000 men engaged in the lumber industry in those mills, and in addition we have the men employed in the forests cutting down the trees, bringing the logs to the river and rafting them to the mills to be cut into lumber, and a number of men employed in shipping them to the markets of the United States. On every thousand feet of lumber shipped to the American market there is a payment of \$2 duty to be made, and this bears heavily on manufacturers of lumber in this country and those having timber limits. I desire to give the House the opinion of a gentleman largely engaged in this industry for a great many years. Mr. A. H. Campbell, of Toronto, President of the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario, said that he himself, out of his own pocket, had paid during the last nineteen years \$350,000 to have the products of his own industry placed in the American market. That sum was paid by a single individual, and if the amount paid by the trade throughout the country were

aggregated, the amount paid would be very extraordinary indeed. Again, I wish to point out that these are the great producers of natural wealth. What do I understand by natural wealth? Natural wealth is what is brought in, it having actually been made in another country and brought here to be circulated in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the lumbermen suffering badly now, too?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman says the lumbermen are suffering badly.

Mr. SPROULE. I said, are they?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) They are suffering more than they would suffer if we had a free trade policy with the United States. I suppose that is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman. They suffer to the extent of about \$2 a thousand on all lumber exported; that is the amount of the suffering at the present time. There is another drawback which I desire to mention. If we had a free trade policy in the United States in lumber the result would be that there would be a large number of planing mills established throughout the lumbering districts. Under the present tariff no finished lumber, no planed lumber can enter the United States without paying 35 per cent duty, and that is almost a prohibitive duty; but if the duty were removed, then our lumber would pass freely into the United States and increased profits would be obtained by our lumbermen, planing mills would be established in this country, increased employment would be given to skilled hands in those factories, and the result would be a "boom" in connection with our lumbering interest. Then, again, there would be an advantage because the machinery used in those mills and planing factories is largely brought from the United States. I am sorry to say it, but I am compelled and constrained to say, that the machinery for such mill work produced in this country is not equal, and not nearly equal, to the machinery brought here from the other side, and lumbermen would sooner pay the duty on the superior machinery than buy Canadian machinery at a much reduced price. That is the testimony of nearly all the mill owners and manufacturers of the country. Another advantage would be this, that our lumbermen would be able to send to the United States a larger portion of their rough lumber than they are able to send now. The duty of \$2 per thousand acts almost prohibitory in this respect, and only the best lumber is sent to the American market, while the rougher lumber is consumed here. Another advantage that would follow, if this free trade policy were adopted, would be, that a larger number of people would be engaged in this particular business and their wants could be supplied at a cheaper rate. Every lumberman almost has to be a merchant; he has to supply the men with clothes, boots, chains, hooks, with everything necessary for the work, and as he obtains the larger portion of his supplies from the United States, on which he has to pay a high duty, he would be able to obtain these goods at a cheaper price and he would thus be able to place a larger share of profit in his own pocket instead of in the hands of the Americans or of the manufacturers in this country. Now, as I have said, in order to develop our natural resources successfully we must develop them along the right lines. Another great source of wealth we possess is the mining interest. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that the Finance Minister delivered last year one of the most eloquent speeches on the Budget that he has delivered for a long time. He dilated very largely upon the extent of ore and the mining industries in this country, but notwithstanding that we see there is not a single blasting furnace in operation to-day in

the Dominion of Canada. Take the iron industry in Nova Scotia. We have the best iron in the world. There is no iron superior to it. It is purer than any iron thrown on the American market, because it contains less phosphates; and we have iron in Lower Canada, containing a large proportion of chromine, which is the best iron in the world for making steel, and only one iron can compare with it in this respect, that is, the Swedish iron. We have the coal lying side by side with the iron. We have the limestone in the same neighborhood which is put with the iron and coal for the purpose of melting it with greater facility; yet how is it that our industries are languishing while theirs on the other side of the line are prosperous.

An hon. MEMBER. The National Policy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The National Policy. Come with me to the iron mines south of Lake Superior and you will see that they have no coal or no phlox there, and that they have to take the iron ore 1,000 miles down to Pittsburg to the coal in Pennsylvania, still they can put that iron on the market and more than compete with us, notwithstanding our facilities. We have all the commercial facilities to take our iron into the foreign markets. The railroads are passing the mountains of iron in the eastern section of the country, and we have boats and ships lying within sight of those mines. Every facility and advantage lies at our doors; yet why is it that our mining industries lie dormant while those not half so well circumstanced in the United States are prospering to a very large extent? I cannot understand it in any way, neither have I heard arguments that would prove it on any other grounds than this, that our market is so limited that the consequence is that large sums must be invested in order to throw it on the market, and it does not pay for the investment of those large sums. The result is that we cannot get into the American market with our pig iron without paying \$6.72 per ton, which is a prohibitory duty on our mining industry, and which injures it in this particular way. Look at the copper industries of the country. I may say again that we have the best and richest mines of copper on the continent of America. We have a larger proportion of copper to the ore than they have in any other place on the continent of America. We have it more conveniently situated to the coal mines of Ohio and Pennsylvania than they have on the south shore of Lake Superior. Look at the Hector and Calumet Mine on the south shore of Lake Superior, and you will find that this mine gives employment to nearly 10,000 men and turns out 2,200 tons a day. Now, if you please, come with me to the mines at Sudbury Junction where the Canadian Pacific Railway touches on the copper district, and not a sound of a hammer is heard. We have mines here with a larger proportion of copper ore than the Americans have. Will any gentleman take a note of this and explain the reason why our ore being richer than theirs in proportion to copper, and we having better facilities than them, how is it that they are mining 2,200 tons a day while our mines are standing idle? The reason is because we have no market in Canada for the copper manufactured in our country. When we send copper ore into the United States we have to pay two and a half cents per pound on the copper in the ore and for the copper itself three cents per pound which is almost a prohibitory duty. The result of this is that the industry lies languishing and not a sound of a hammer or a pick is to be heard, while the busy hum of industry is found in the mines of the United States. Is it the lake between the two countries that makes the difference? Is it because the Canadian people are not as smart as the Americans or is it because we have not the same ambition or enterprise as they have? One Canadian is equal to an American, at any time, perhaps better, but the reason of this sad state of affairs is because we have not the facilities of

the great markets as they have. We have not the consuming markets into which we can sell, and the result is that our mines are lying dormant and not a single effort has been made to develop them, while on the other side there is every effort and every energy put forth to develop them to the extent which I have stated. In connection with mining there is another industry which might be developed in this country. We have nickel, and nickel is a very scarce metal on the continent of America. There is only one small nickel mine in the United States, and that is owned by a single individual down in Philadelphia. We have abundance of nickel in the north, and there is no attempt to develop it. It is selling on the United States market for \$1.30 a pound, and competent men say that it can be put on the market for 30 cents a pound, yet we have no investments in our country to work our rich nickel mines. We have nickel sufficient to make all the implements of war required by the States and England from the extraordinary and valuable nickel we have to the north of us, but this great storehouse of wealth lies idle, because according to our policy we have to pay 10 cents a pound on every pound which is sent to the American Union, and which is a prohibitory tariff at present prices. Then there is another great industry to which I will refer for a short time—our fishing industry. I will only barely mention that because it is one great source of our natural wealth. We have wealth in the sea of an extraordinary and illimitable character, and we should seek to bring that wealth out by giving to the marine fishermen an open market in which to sell the products of their toil, and by which they can realise a larger return for their toil than they have done in the past. If we had this open market more wealth and more competence would come to the poor fishermen than they have under the present restrictive policy. They could go to the United States market and sell their fish and buy those articles which themselves and their families required at home, and bring them back far more cheaply than by going to the American market as now selling under a protective duty, coming home with money, and going west to Montreal or some other city and buying what they require for their families. Such a policy increased the expenses both to themselves and to their families. I want to draw the attention of the House to this fact, and it is a fact which has been brought out by some of the speakers on the other side. They say that we have no geographical difficulties in this country to prevent an inter-provincial trade. They say that those difficulties can be easily overcome before the ingenuity of man in the present inventive age. There is nothing, they say, to prevent them from overcoming those difficulties. I maintain, gentlemen, that those difficulties can never be overcome to the full extent. They may, it is true, be overcome to some extent for a time, but the enormous expense required to overcome them eats up the profits of the parties who send their goods across them. Those difficulties will always hold. Take the Province of British Columbia—and there are a number of British Columbians here supporters of the Government, but if they are supporters of the Government they are not supporters of the interests of that great Province—that Province contains I suppose more natural wealth than any Province of its size in the Dominion of Canada. What is this great wealth comprised of? British Columbia has rich fisheries; it has immense limits of timber and has rich mines of iron and coal. I would ask those hon. gentlemen from that fair Province with the finest climate in Canada, where do they propose, in the future, to send the products of their hills, the products of their mines, the products of their seas? Will they send the products of those great natural resources across the mountains to the North-West Territories and Manitoba?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Very well, we will see. That man says "yes." I will bear that in mind for a few moments and deal with it when I come to it. We find that out of an export trade of \$3,000,000 in British Columbia over \$2,250,000 goes to the United States. The exportation of their coal, which is the best coal on the continent of America not even excepting that of Nova Scotia, must have a market somewhere. Will it come across the mountains into the North-West Territories? Have they not coal in the North-West Territories themselves? Have they not coal at Banff? Have they not coal on the Saskatchewan? Have they not coal on the Souris? Have they not limitless quantities of coal? And then, to think that British Columbia will send its coal thousands of miles across the continent—it is an absurdity. Will they send their fish across the Rocky Mountains to the North-West Territories? The people of the North-West have in that country all the fish they want. Great Bear Lake, Slave Lake, Lake Winnipeg, Lake Winnipegosis, the Lake of the Woods and Hudson's Bay are teeming with fish which they can more easily obtain than the fish of British Columbia. Will the British Columbians send their iron across the mountains to the North-West Territories? They cannot. Will they send their timber?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No, they cannot send their timber; they cannot send their coal; they cannot send their fish.

An hon. MEMBER. They do it now.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain that, as far as the fish business in British Columbia is concerned, I happen to know something about that, for I have been engaged in that business. I wish to state that we do not sell one case of fish to the United States. We sell some to Canada and some to Australia, but the principal part of our fish goes to England. We export about \$1,000,000 worth of fish, for the most of which we find a market in England, where it comes in direct competition with the fish of the United States which is put up on the Columbia River.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a correction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I know some gentlemen are never in the habit of telling the truth themselves, and they form the opinion that others do not. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is of that character. He is all mouth generally.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman should take that back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If I understood the hon. member from British Columbia, he told the House that they did not export any fish to the United States. You will find on page 736 of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1887, under the head of fisheries, the following statement: Export to the United States of fish from British Columbia in 1887, \$186,774 worth.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Will you allow me to explain?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He will have to wait for his turn to reply.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would have thought that the members for British Columbia would have understood something about their own far west country, for it is evi-

dent that I know a great deal more about the trade of that country than they do. I believe, Sir, if they knew a little more than they do about the interests of British Columbia, they would not support the present policy of the Government. I believe it would be well for them to devote their energies and their leisure hours to obtaining some information so that they will be at least prepared to discuss intelligently the interests and the trade relations of the little province from which they come; and when a western man who has never seen that sunny clime beyond the Rocky Mountains, speaks of their trade relations, they should not interfere with him, especially when he is a bashful and backward man as I am.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When you left the Chair, Sir, at six o'clock, I was speaking of the resources of the great Province of British Columbia. I had spoken of the vast treasures of wealth to be found in its lumber districts; I had spoken of the vast storehouses of wealth that are found in the waters surrounding that Province; I had spoken of the immense quantity of minerals that were found in its soil; and I had begun to speak of its treasures of coal. British Columbia possesses, as I have said, the best coal on the continent of America, not even excepting the good coal of the Maritime Provinces. The United States War Department, a few years ago, made a test of the different coals found on the Pacific slope. They found that 1,800 lbs. of Vancouver Island coal produced a certain pressure of steam; and that to procure a similar pressure, it took 2,400 lbs. of California coal, 2,600 lbs. of Oregon coal, and 2,400 lbs. of Washington Territory coal. That test established beyond dispute the fact that British Columbia coal will command the markets in the southern territories, and that the duty of 75 cents imposed on it, under the National Policy, is exactly the sum that must be paid by those who are developing the coal mines in that Province. Out of an output last year of 326,000 tons, 274,000 tons went to the markets of the United States, and no less than \$204,000 duty was paid to enable the producer to place that coal upon the American markets. Were it not for the duty that \$204,000 would have gone into the pockets of the coal miners of British Columbia. It is evident that if you have an article which is superior to a similar article possessed by your neighbors, the freer you can get that into competition with theirs the better it will be for you. If this duty on coal were removed, therefore, the consequence would be that the vast coal regions of British Columbia would be developed to a much greater extent, thus giving employment to a much larger number of hands, and greater investment of capital. As it is with coal, so is it with iron; there are very large quantities of the very best iron to be found in British Columbia, within 20 miles of these rich coal mines, with the streams of Georgian Bay intervening between the two, so that they are almost in juxtaposition with each other, and therefore the western Provinces of our Dominion, in a few years would supply the great western coasts of the United States down as far as Mexico with that particular mineral which is so largely required in those markets, and is not possessed by the States to the south of us in the same abundance and with the same facilities for its manufacture. Leaving British Columbia we come to the great North-West Territories and Manitoba, and the question arises, what are the great natural resources of that country? To what elements of industry is the energy and the skill of the people of that country to be applied, so as to develop its various interests and encourage the emigration which we all so much desire? The natural elements of strength in that country are the following: cattle raising, farming, mining, and fishing.

I would ask the hon. gentlemen who are in favor of a restrictive policy, if they will be kind enough to point out the markets in which the products of those industries can be sold to such advantage as they can be in the markets immediately to the south of us. If our coal mines of the North-West Territories are developed, they will certainly require markets in which to be sold; and unless they are developed the employment in developing them that would be given to the people, will be so much lost to that country, and the mines might as well have no existence there. But we are looking forward to the time, which I hope is not far distant, when the people of that country will get an open market in the United States, which they do not possess to-day, and which is to them an absolute necessity. Take the States of Michigan, Dakota and Montana, which do not possess coal. Is it not reasonable to say that there is in our North-West, a large coal district for which we must have an outlet, and what better outlet could we have than those places which Providence has not blessed with this natural wealth? Is it possible that the coal mines at Banff, Saskatchewan, and on the Souris, are forever to be restricted to supplying the home market only, when they cover an area of several thousand miles, and only wait for their development by the exercise of the intelligence and perseverance of the people of this country, to be sent south to the advantage of the neighboring States. Again our North-West is destined to produce a large number of cattle. Its rich pasturage is specially adapted for that purpose, but unless a market is furnished to the south of the line, these cattle will have to be sent over long distances to the eastern coast and thence to the markets of the old world, the long distance and heavy freights cutting away a large portion of the profits that ought to go into the hands of the producer. It may, however, be urged with some probability—although that has no effect on the matter—that there is no market for these cattle in the country to the south. But you know, Sir, that if we allow those cattle of high grades of breed to pass through and go into competition with the cattle in the American States, they will find a market there, and the American cattle will have to pass through to be shipped to foreign countries. We have, in the northern part of this continent, the best cattle, in all particulars, for breeding purposes; we have cattle far superior to cattle in the Indian Territory and the Territories further south, and entering into competition with the American cattle in the markets of Chicago and St. Louis and the other markets, the consequence will be that the Americans will pick out from the eastern bound trade the cattle most suitable to their own wants, and will allow the others to pass through, so that our herds will find a market there to the exclusion of the American cattle. Again, the cereals grown in Manitoba and the North-West are said to be ahead of any grown elsewhere; and it is a cause of a great deal of discontent in that country now, that the farmers have not a local market for their cereals in the country to the south. It is impossible for them to send their cereals to the eastern markets on account of the distance and of the high rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway which eat up all the profit, so that there is no encouragement to the farmers there to put forth the energies and the abilities they possess. The consequence is that a great many of them are resting on their oars, and their productive energy has been, to a large extent, thwarted by the restrictive policy of this Government. Another large and natural source of wealth of that country is its fish. That fish, which is caught in the various rivers and lakes that abound so extensively in North-West Territories, would be sent directly south to the people in the American States, who do not possess these natural advantages to the extent we do, were it not for the National Policy. It is well known that in Dakota, the people have not the advantage of having such fine fish as are caught in our

North-West Territories, and the same remark applies to the other States lying adjacent to that territory. And in this way a policy of reciprocity, or a policy of free trade is applicable to every one of these national sources of wealth which are possessed by that country. Then, also, there is a long stretch of rough country between Manitoba and Ontario which will continue to be rough for all time to come. Notwithstanding the efforts which have been made to overcome them, and they have been successful to a certain extent, these geographical difficulties will always continue to exist, and that adds to the charges made by the railway every time a train goes over that section, and the existence of that long section of rough country, which will prevent to a great extent the inter-provincial trade which would otherwise take place, is another reason why a southern outlet should be given to that country. If we come to Ontario and Quebec, we know that our relationship to the American Union is far more intimate than our relationship to any other portion of the world, and, if that country gives us a market, as it does, for a large portion of our export, it is evident to every thinking man that that is our proper and natural market. In order to show how large a market Ontario finds in that country, I may state that the total exports of Ontario last year were \$25,658,156, and that Ontario exported to Britain \$5,157,273 worth, and to the American markets \$20,271,313. That fact, which is taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, which I presume are correct, proves to a demonstration that the southern market, at least to Ontario, is the great market where the produce of that Province is sold, and, therefore, that the more freely we can get into that market, the more facilities that we can give in that direction, the greater will be the advantage to those who export to that country, and the more prosperous will the people be made as compared with the present system. In the Maritime Provinces you find the same condition of things, that the United States is the market for that part of the country. The total exports of Prince Edward Island last year were \$1,266,577. Of that, Prince Edward Island exported to Great Britain \$384,700, but to the United States, her natural market, notwithstanding the high restrictive tariff imposed on all articles crossing the line, she exported \$667,580 worth, or \$282,880 worth more to the American than to the British market. That also proves to a demonstration that, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, the United States is her natural market. Then again, Nova Scotia exported last year \$3,370,821 all told. She exported to Great Britain \$2,478,128, and to the American market \$2,733,930, or \$255,862 more to the United States than she did to the English market. Does not this also prove to a demonstration that the United States is the largest and best market for the Eastern Provinces. New Brunswick exported last year a total of \$4,787,798 worth. To the English market she exported \$2,403,379 worth of timber, much more than she sold to the Americans, but outside of the timber, her whole trade with England only amounted to \$200,000—that is, all the natural products of that country, consisting of hay, potatoes, oats and many other things of that kind—while that Province exported of these articles of produce to the United States \$1,200,000 worth, or six times as much as she exported to Great Britain. That clearly proves that that is her natural market. As the Hon. Joseph Howe said at one time, when he was asked to come into Confederation: No, if we do, we will lose our markets to the south of us; and, standing and pointing with his finger, as it may be supposed, over the Bay of Fundy to the New England States, he said: There is our market for our hay, there is our market for our potatoes, there is our market for our small fruits, there is our market for nearly everything the Nova Scotians produce, and, if I come into Confederation, the duties will be imposed and we

Mr. MACDONALD (Huren).

will lose the markets which appear to be, as it were, only across the street. That was the statement made by that eminent statesman from Nova Scotia, and, now that the question has been solved by the cementation of the Provinces, that is the statement that the Nova Scotians will make to-day. They will say, there is our market, and that notwithstanding the restrictions which have been imposed by the National Policy for the last few years. This policy has not brought prosperity to the people of Nova Scotia, but it has engendered a feeling of restlessness and a desire to go out of the Union into which that Province was brought by false solicitation several years ago. Now, I have shown you that this system of policy, which we on this side of the House put forth as the best policy, is applicable to every industry in the country and to the condition of every Province. I have pointed out how it will benefit the farmers, who are three out of every five of the inhabitants of Canada. I have pointed out how it will benefit the lumberers by giving them a free market to the south. I have pointed out how it will benefit the mining interests of the country by providing also a larger market for their products. I have shown also how it will benefit the fishermen by giving them the market which they want for their fish. I have shown how it would benefit British Columbia on account of her geographical relationships with the neighboring States. I have also shown how it would advance the interests of Manitoba and the North-West Territories in aiding the development of their natural resources. I have shown that it is the market for Ontario and Quebec. I have, therefore, proved that this is a principle which is applicable, not as the National Policy is to one particular industry, but is applicable to all the great industries of this country, and applicable, not only to the great industries of this country, but to the particular interests of each Province forming part of this Dominion, and, therefore, I think that efforts should be made by this Government to bring this matter before the United States Government in such a way that we may know the terms and conditions on which they will enter into reciprocal trade if they will, for the resolution which is before the House does not commit us to any particular line of action, and does not commit us to accept any conditions the United States may seek to impose upon us, but it simply expresses the view that we think it would be in the interests of the country to have reciprocal trade, and that it would be expedient that the Government should take steps to ascertain if the Americans are prepared to enter into reciprocal trade with us. Is there anything more reasonable? and still it is objected to. It may be said, and it will be said, in the country, that the United States will not accept of reciprocal free trade, that they have been approached on that subject several times, and have shown that they will not accept of it. I have five or six reasons to give why I believe that the United States are more willing now to enter into this arrangement than they ever were before. The first reason is one which will show the consistency of the American Government and the inconsistency of the Canadian Government. You will remember that in 1879 there was an offer placed upon the Statute-book, an offer to the United States that, if they permitted certain articles to go in free, or at a less duty than was then charged, the Canadian Government would allow similar articles to come in free or at a less charge than the tariff set out. The United States in 1883, in the Act passed in the 45th Congress, in the 2nd Session of that Congress, at chapter 121, placed upon the free list a number of the very articles contained in the schedule of our Act of 1879, and up to the present day the Canadian Government has not reciprocated. They placed fruits, trees, shrubs, vines and seeds upon the free list. Now, our apples are allowed to go in free to the United States; but instead of being consistent, instead of acting a manly part,

as the Canadian Government should have done, they have allowed apples to be charged 40 cents on each barrel that goes into the United States. Those coming from the United States are charged the usual duties by the Canadian Government, while those going from Canada into the United States go in free. 1884, '85, '86 and '87 have passed and the Government that were so patriotic, so devoted to the people of this country, when they wanted to maintain themselves in power, have not moved a finger to reciprocate with the Americans in any of these articles. I challenge contradiction on this matter, and if I am right, the Canadian Government should remove these duties and place these articles in the same position as they promised to do when they made that offer. There is another reason why I believe the United States are prepared. In 1886 there was a resolution passed in the United States Congress and it received two readings. That resolution bore particularly upon this question, and was considered sufficiently important to draw the attention of the English ambassador at Washington. The ambassador, Sir Lionel West, got a copy of that resolution and sent it to the Canadian Government for their consideration. That resolution found its way to the English Government, and notwithstanding all that, there was no attempt made to open up negotiations. This resolution received its two readings, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But someone will say: Well, it was killed there. Certainly it was killed there. Do you suppose the United States are going to carry through a Bill, come to the Canadian Government and say: We sue for reciprocal trade? No, they wait for the Canadians to take the first step, and it is right that they should, because we are the weaker and the smaller nation, and we are the nation that will receive the greater advantage from a treaty of that kind. This resolution has not been referred to before as indicating the willingness of the United States to negotiate in this matter. On the 5th January, 1886, this joint resolution was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that this Congress would look with favor and approval upon any action taken by the executive, dependent upon the Government, tending to a renewal of negotiations with the British Possessions in North America, by compact or treaty, having in view the reciprocal interests of both nations."

That was never taken notice of further than to place it in the public correspondence that took place between the two Governments. In the Fishery correspondence we find that resolution placed before the Canadian public, but not a single move was made, no power was given to the plenipotentiaries to negotiate a treaty of that kind. Then, we are led to believe that the Americans are prepared because not very long ago the President, in his message to Congress, stated that he believed it would be to the advantage of both nations and contribute to promote a feeling of friendship between them, if reciprocal trade was entered into. Then, again, the National Board of Trade unanimously passed a resolution, not very long ago, in the city of Washington, in favor of reciprocal trade with the Dominion of Canada. These facts show to the country at large that the United States, almost with open arms, are inviting us to appoint a commission and send it down to adjudicate upon the whole question of commercial relations between the two countries, and unite upon a reasonable and equitable arrangement which would be advantageous to the people of both countries, and contribute largely to the prosperity of Canada. Now, it is said by hon. members opposite that the National Policy fosters the manufacturing industries of this country. There are many manufacturers in this country who have testified that they are favorable to reciprocal trade with the United States. John Campbell, of London, a large manufacturer of waggons and carriages, says so. Mr. Waterous, of Brantford, a large manu-

facturer of steam engines, says he is prepared for reciprocal trade, and is able to compete with the Americans on equal terms. Then again, Mr. Raymond, manufacturer of sewing machines, says so, and this is one of the industries that it was promised would be fostered by the National Policy. Mr. Raymond says; I am prepared, yes, I am more than prepared to meet them in open market. I can sell equally as cheap, and I can sell a great many more, because the markets are large." And so I might go on from one to the other. Now, I come to an interest that is specially identified with my county, I mean the salt interest. That interest in my county, is the largest salt interest in the Dominion of Canada. Its exportation reaches within a few barrels of the entire salt exportation from Canada. Now, Sir, the National Policy has been the cause of almost entirely crushing out that interest. I know that those who are at the head of it in our county, who have been strong Conservatives, and have supported the party in power in all political meetings, and in every election that has taken place, but they say now that the National Policy has been the cause of the depreciation of the value of their property. In 1875 the price of salt in this county was from 86 to 95 cents per barrel; in 1887 the price was 50 cents per barrel. The Syracuse salt producers, on the American side, tried the crushing out process for some time, and sent salt into Canada and charged a certain price, and the price was the smaller the further away it was from the seat of production. The result was that our salt men competed in the United States with their salt men, and sold a large number of barrels, bushels and sacks of salt. But a few years ago salt depreciated in value over there, and now the restriction placed upon salt is such that it is impossible for our salt interest to send one bushel there. Twelve cents a hundred is charged upon salt going into the United States in sacks, and 8 cents is charged upon every 100 pounds that is sent in bulk, and the result is equal to a prohibitory duty, and our producers are blocked out of the United States market altogether. Now, let me show what the policy of this Government is doing for the salt industries in the east. No less than two hundred and eight million pounds of salt were brought last year from England. It was brought across the ocean almost for nothing. It has been sent down as far as the city of Montreal, and distributed almost through the eastern part of the country, and all the territory that our salt men have is the Province of Ontario. The consequence is that the salt wells that a few years ago were in full blast and paying large sums of money in wages to workingmen, and paying a profit to those who had invested their money, have depreciated in value, and a large number have gone out of the business, and a number have failed. Now let me give this House and the country the opinion of one of the oldest salt manufacturers in our county. He is an intelligent man, a man shrewd in business and one who knows exactly the ins and outs of his business, and with all that he is an intelligent Conservative, a man who supported the party in power for many years. He has gone upon public platforms and taken their part, I understand, and he supported the National Policy; and hear now what he says in regard to the salt interests under the National Policy. I speak of Dr. Coleman, of Seaforth, in the South Riding of Huron. He says:

"The salt industry of Ontario is in a very bad condition, indeed; in fact, its condition could not well be much worse. There have been many withdrawals from the business, and some bankruptcies. Most of our properties would sell at a low price, and some would not be taken off our hands as a gift. Most of the owners engaged in the salt industry worked and fought for the National Policy. But for years the National Policy did nothing for us, and when it did attempt to do something it only gave us legislation without any substantial benefit."

He further says:

"The assessment of salt property in this town was once over \$30,000 per annum. To-day it would not be assessed at half that amount."

That is the condition of the salt interest in the town where that gentleman is one of the principal salt man. He goes on to show the other side of the shield. He has shown what the National Policy did not do, and if it did not foster his industry it certainly did the opposite. That intelligent man goes on to say:

"We have several railroad lines. Their rates of carriage are not uniform and they will not interchange rates of mileage. We use a great deal of iron for pans, tubing, nails, grate bars, shafting, &c. On all these the duty, being very heavy, materially increases the cost of production. The same is true of belting, rubber and leather. I purchased nails in the Eastern States in November last laid down here in Seaforth at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Similar nails from Canadian firms cost me invariably $13\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound."

Now, will hon. gentlemen opposite say that things are as cheap in Canada under the National Policy as in the United States? Here is one of their own supporters, a Conservative, and who would probably support hon. gentlemen at this time, and yet he gives them the lie in their teeth because he is a practical man and understands what he says. This is one testimony; but if you go a few miles further to the west you come to the town of Clinton. We find there an intelligent man, Mr. John Ransforth, a Conservative who supported the Conservative party with the intelligence and vim characteristic of the man in every department of life. He is prepared to accept reciprocal free trade because the National Policy has destroyed his work. He says:

"It will thus be easily seen that to open the United States market to Canadian salt makers will not result in the extinction of the Canadian salt industry. On the contrary, we claim it will have the effect of developing it to an almost indefinite extent. The reason is obvious. The present condition of the salt trade is most deplorable. If means had been carefully devised to ruin the salt makers and supply Canadians with English salt, no more effectual way could have been found than by the National Policy."

Here is Sterry Hunt's analysis of salts: Canadian salt, $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent.; English salt, 1.69 per cent; Spanish salt, 1.43 per cent; Saginaw, U.S., salt, 2.00 per cent; Syracuse, U.S., salt, 1.15 per cent. Of all those salts, the Canadian is the purest. Supposing Canadian salt producers were at liberty under a reciprocity treaty with the United States to compete with Michigan salt on one side and Syracuse salt on the other, they having a purer article would be able to compete successfully with the American producers. Is it right and proper for the Canadian Government to prevent Canadians placing a better article on the American market? but when we have to pay 12 cents per hundred pounds in sack and 8 cents per hundred pounds in bulk on all salt going into the American market it is almost impossible, even with our superior article, to compete against the inferior article of the United States. Yet, in the face of these facts, the hon. gentleman who represents that section of country, I am sorry to say, considers the interests of other persons above the interests of the farmers and the salt producers. Salt is the principal industry in Goderich, and it is one of the principal industries in Clinton, which forms part of the hon. gentleman's constituency, his constituents being for the most part farmers, who have admitted on every side they would be benefited by a free trade policy; and notwithstanding that fact he rose the other night and made a long speech, flowery and eloquent no doubt, but we have often seen a great deal of wind without much rain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am very much pleased that hon. gentlemen opposite saw the wind too the other night. As I have said, the hon. gentleman did not take the part of those interests which are the most important in his county. He quoted some figures which he said I used here, and he declared that the farmers of the district were doing exceedingly well. He said according to my statement of prices the average products of the farm would reach \$620 in a year. But he made a little mistake in that, because I

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.)

have gone over the calculation and I found that instead of \$620 it was \$658, call it \$660. Let us see if a farmer could make any money out of that. A farmer owning 170 acres of land worth \$6,000, and I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to these figures because he was a farmer once himself.

An hon. MEMBER. A very poor one.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Perhaps he was like a man I heard of. A stranger was walking along a road and he saw a man on the fence. The stranger was astonished at the poor condition of the farm, and the man on the fence, afraid he would think he was the owner of the farm, said: "Sir, I am not so poor as to be owner of that property." Perhaps the hon. gentleman would say something of that kind too, if he were sitting on a fence and a stranger were passing his farm. Let me go on with the statement I was making. I want the hon. gentleman to note my figures to see how much the farmer makes out of an output of \$660. The hon. gentleman said I did not mention the sale of horses, cattle or sheep. If he was a practical man he would know that if a farmer sold the produce of the land he could not feed horses, cattle or sheep, because the produce must be on in one form or another, either in hay, straw or cereals or in cattle and horses. One man's labor on the farm would certainly be worth \$250 a year, a team with feed \$140, interest on \$6,000 at 4 per cent. \$240, wear and tear of implements, blacksmith's work, &c., \$50, seed grain for the farm \$30, threshing \$16, taxes on the farm \$30. We will now see how much the farmer will have, not including his own work. Those amounts come to \$756, and taking the produce of the farm at an average of several years during a number of which prices were exceedingly high, wheat at 99 cents, this would leave a deficit of \$90 after paying the necessary expenses and 4 per cent. on his investment. The hon. gentleman stated that that was a very fair showing for the County of Huron. If he is satisfied with that showing I am sure that we are not. I can explain very well why the hon. gentleman took that position, I can explain why he did not refer to the salt interest, because it comes under the National Policy. I can tell the reason why he did not refer to the farming interests of that county; and he has a reason which probably you do not all know. They are about improving the harbor of Goderich, and about building a new post office and a new custom house in Goderich. You do not all know that, and some of the hon. members sitting beside him do not know it either. According to the estimates we find that there are figures down there to the extent of \$18,000, and I ask you how can any man, if we are human, go against the genial leader of the Government, who is about to spend \$18,000 in the town of Goderich, which has supported the hon. gentleman so well. But he must remember this, that if he goes back again to that county, he will have to go to the town of Clinton, the town which elected him last general election. He will find some person there who will say to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter): "Why, Sir, you made a speech here last winter." "Yes Sir." "But my interests were never touched by you, I complained to you that my interests were neglected, the salt interest in which I am engaged was neglected. You know very well I have worked hard for you and that I have gone from door to door to collect supporters for you, but when you went to Ottawa you forgot all about me, because you were about to get \$18,000 for the town of Goderich." That is the position in which the hon. gentleman for West Huron (Mr. Porter) is placed. But, Sir, I will not detain the House much longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) Hon. gentlemen on the other side say "hear, hear." Of course we all know and I

often felt it myself that when I was getting the worst of it I was very anxious that my opponents should sit down and I think probably what is human nature on my side would probably be a good criterion to judge the gentlemen by on the other side. But, Sir, I want to say now a word or two in regard to the annexation and loyalty cries. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, without any boasting whatever, that I am as loyal to the Crown of Britain as any man who sits on the other side of the House. I tell those hon. gentlemen that I love my Queen and revere her name just as much as they can. I admire that stately Queen who has sat with such great dignity upon the British throne and who instead of the British crown reflecting honor on her, she reflects honor on it. I believe, Sir, we are as strongly attached to the mother country as any people can be, but at the same time although I am strongly attached to the country from which my forefathers came, the country which has given us our literature, the country to whose history we can turn with pride, I believe, Sir, that in this country of Canada we have the best form and system of government that is to-day to be found in the world. We have everything that is firm in the monarchical form of government, we have everything that is liberal and progressive in the republican form of government, and we have new principles added to these by the genius and political wisdom of the Canadian people. So that we are bound to say we possess the best government in the world. As far as our judiciary is concerned it is above all others in the world; it is not only above impeachment but it is beyond question. When we consider how much the security of our property and our lives depend on a just and proper administration of the law, the Canadian people have reason to be proud of the purity of the judiciary of Canada. We do not ask to join our fate with the Americans. Not at all. We unite with them as friends; we give what we have to them when they buy from us, and we want to buy from them what we want. Therefore this principle which we advocate does not alienate our affections from the crown of England. There are a great many possibilities, and I might go on for a long time discussing them. This question is so wide that one would hardly know where to stop. We know the great possibilities of this great Dominion of ours, and standing here, as we do, and looking forward to the list of years that are to come, we can foretell what the energy, the industry, the perseverance and the skill of the Canadian people is able to accomplish in the future. This is a great theatre of action, and who, looking forward through the long vista of the years to come, can foretell the great achievements under a wise and liberal trade policy, the energy, the industry, the perseverance and skill of the Canadian people are yet to accomplish. Long may this country, Sir, be a home and a refuge to thousands of the super-abundant numbers which the genius of Britain and other countries may send forth to inhabit, fertilise and civilise the untenanted portions of our vast dominions. Long may Canada be the Kianoor in the bright galaxy of gems that adorn the British crown. Long may this country be a land of liberty, loyalty and enterprise, ever increasing in wealth and population. Long may that happy connection between Great Britain and this Dominion in the bonds of mutual affection be an unfailing source of profit and advantage to both, and long may Canada rejoice in aiding and upholding the grandeur, the might and the integrity of the British Empire.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat ventured to make the remark, when a certain amount of applause proceeded from the Chamber, that he fancied and always had fancied during his experience in public affairs, that even when he was getting the worst of it his opponents desired that he should stop. I think I may very well say that the House has had the worst of it in connection with his speech, and that the

country has had the worst of it too. In opening my remarks upon this question I intend to tell a true story, *apropos* of the hon. gentleman's speech. A gentleman who was speaking at a political meeting in Michigan spoke for some two hours, and after the meeting he said to his uncle: "I spoke to-night." His uncle said: "I heard you." "I spoke for two hours," said the man. "I timed you," said his uncle. "What did you think of my speech?" said the man. And his uncle replied: "A sensible man would have said it in ten minutes, and a very sensible man would not have said it at all." But, Mr. Speaker, it is very amusing to hear the hon. gentleman lecture hon. gentlemen in this House in the amenities of debate particularly after the experience we have in the remarks he made to this House. With your permission I would give him a bit of advice across the floor of this House, and that is, "Doctor cure thyself." Now, in the course of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, he dwelt on a question, and I took down a few of his observations in order to prevent mistakes. He drew attention to the fact that a large amount of canned salmon or pickled salmon was sent from British Columbia to the United States, and he used that as an argument why it would be best for the people of British Columbia to have unrestricted trade with the United States, in order that they might gain the advantage. I state here as a merchant, knowing what I am saying and knowing what I am talking about, that the canned fish of British Columbia is an article of commerce which is not to be bought in the United States. I make that statement deliberately, and I defy contradiction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Take off the duty.

Mr. BROWN. I do not care; take it off if you like. I say the statement made that \$186,000 of British Columbia fish were exported to the United States and paid duty is not correct. I challenge any man on that side of the House to stand up and dispute what I say. They are silent. It is because they are unable to prove the hon. gentleman's assertion. They make these grave statements and let them go to the country, and when they are brought to book twenty minutes afterwards they are unable to substantiate them. Now, Sir, if all the statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat are as valuable as the one I have just effectually killed, then I think the country will know how to value his speech. The hon. gentleman has sneered at the National Policy, and has talked of the poverty of the farmers of Canada. He has told us that the records of the number of farm mortgages held against the farmers of Ontario are incorrect, because he says there are three or four private mortgages against them to every one that is recorded against them in public companies. I tell the hon. gentleman that he cannot stand up in his own county and say that. I tell him more—if he goes before his constituents in East Huron—and I know that county pretty nearly as well as he does—and even winks at annexation, they will send him were he ought to have been sent before, not to the Parliament of Canada to advocate annexation—to advocate a policy which in the end will result in nothing else than the annexation of this Dominion to the United States. I have done with that hon. gentleman for the present, simply because I consider I have heavier metal to fight. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) opened this debate, he threw across the floor of the House in a voice of sweet melody, the challenge that if hon. gentlemen on this side had the courage of their convictions, they would express those convictions in favor of the resolution which he proposed to move. Well, I have the courage of my convictions, and I am here to express what they are; and I know that in doing so I am backed up not only by the people who sent me here, but by the vast majority of the people of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman in opening

his remarks dealt largely with figures. I do not propose to weary the House to-night with figures, but I am obliged to use one table simply to correct a very wrong impression which has been conveyed by the speech of that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for South Oxford drew as usual a doleful picture of Canada. He has not done anything else for a great many years; it would be unnatural for him to do anything else, considering the manner in which he has spoken of the progress or want of progress in the country, and the scare he has sent all over the land. The hon. gentleman spoke of our small total export trade, and made a comparison between the years 1873 and 1878, showing a very small difference, and asked the House to look on this picture and then on that, and to declare with him that the country was not progressing. I hope the hon. gentleman did not intentionally omit the information which I am now going to give to the House and the country. Did he not know that in all the world from 1873 to 1887 in every department of trade, in every article that is grown or manufactured, there has been a great depreciation of value?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) I would like to "make an explanation regarding what I said about the exportation of fish from British Columbia. I want to read from the Trade and Navigation Returns to show that I was perfectly right. On page 736, under the heading "Fisheries," will be found the statement that there was exported to Great Britain \$664,139 worth and to the United States \$186,774 worth of fish from British Columbia.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has got up and held up his book. I do not hesitate to say that when I challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to contradict my statement, I set a trap for them, and have got the hon. gentleman in that trap like a rat. I say that those fish were not sent to the United States for consumption; they were sent there in transit on their way to other countries. Now, Sir, here is a book which I will hold up as high as the hon. gentleman did his. This is a volume of the Official Records of the United States for 1887, containing statistics of the foreign commerce and navigation of the United States. The people of the United States have all the salmon they require in their own rivers, and do not need to buy any from us, and they never do buy any unless it may be to supply some slight shortage, or for a picnic or something of that kind. I find by this book that the imports of fish; of salmon, for consumption into the United States, from British Columbia for the year 1887, consisted of one package of the value of \$4. Now, the hon. gentleman for South Oxford drew attention to the fact that the total trade of this country in 1887 was very little greater than it was in 1873. We knew very well that it was not the same amount; anybody could tell that; but it was the duty of the hon. gentleman as a statesman to have stated the quantities produced in the two years. If the prices in 1887 had been the same as they were in 1873, the exports from this country of these articles, instead of being \$18,000,000, would have been \$26,000,000. That is a fair statement of the case to put before the country. The hon. gentleman, by his language and manner, conveyed the idea that Canada was not progressive, that we were not raising more grain and cattle than we did in former years. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite know we are, and they must know also that all over the world there is a shrinkage in the values of all products, and Canada is not an exception to the general rule.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you claim that for the National Policy.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) if I did not misunderstand him, spoke of the provision in our Customs Act, for reciprocal trade in natural products

Mr. BROWN.

with the United States, and in his usual smiling way he said that it was a delusion and a snare.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. Exactly; that is what they say. I propose to show it is not a delusion and a snare. The provision in our Customs Act that we are ready to unite with the Americans in an interchange of natural products is so great a delusion and a snare, that we import from the United States articles amounting in value to \$10,000,000, upon which the duty amounts to \$2,000,000, and the Americans receive from us articles upon which they pay the duties to the extent of \$4,000,000. What an absurdity to seek to convey to the country the impression that an interchange of natural products with the United States, which, in the leading articles, represents a duty on both sides of \$6,000,000, is a delusion and a snare. The following is a schedule of the various articles:

| | United States Imports. | United States Duty Levied. |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Animals of all kinds..... | \$ 4,373,999 | \$ 874,800 |
| Hay, tons..... | 73,778,255 | 156,510 |
| Barley, bushels..... | 10,361,846 | 1,035,184 |
| Fish..... | | 314,919 |
| Lumber..... | | 1,117,920 |
| Vegetables..... | | 193,451 |
| Coal..... | | 248,706 |
| Peas and beans..... | | 59,774 |
| Total duty..... | | \$4,146,092 |

The great burden of all the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate, delivered in different strains and moods, is, from first to last: poor Canada going backwards, and everything indicating that unless hon. gentlemen opposite attain office this country is no place for anybody to live in. I have not the least doubt that at this moment the words of these hon. gentlemen are flying over the telegraph wires, and that the men who control American railways and who have American railway lands to sell are using these words on the other side of the Atlantic to induce people to settle in their country rather than to take up their abode in such a woe-begone place as Canada. We have it on the best authority that not a few of the dupes who have been carried over to Dakota in the years gone by, through the glowing pictures given of that country as compared with ours, are coming back to Canada where they can obtain better homes and have better prospects of success. Not a few of the dupes who have gone into Dakota and have been compelled to burn Dakota grass in their stoves to keep them from freezing, now regret that they ever placed any confidence in the statements, based, in many instances, on the doleful utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is only right, therefore, that on occasions like this men should come forward and give expression to what they really believe and what the people behind them believe, and that is what I am endeavoring to do to-night. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the lack of progress of this country. Why, there is no country under heaven that has made such progress in the last forty or fifty years as Canada has; there is no people, indeed, who enjoy greater blessings and privileges than do the Canadian people, and if you look back to history, you will find a constant and steady progressive movement has taken place in the advancement of the people. It is disheartening to hear hon. gentlemen, who pretend to be Canadian in sentiment, undertaking to convey to the people of the world the idea that this country is going backwards, and is not a place in which men can be successful. What is the position of the United States as compared with this country, since 1837? Business here has increased thirteen times in volume, and property has increased fourfold in value. Had the United States grown in the same proportion as we have in the last fifty years, comparing the ages of both countries, their population to-

day would be 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 more than it is. We have more than kept pace with them. Fifty years ago all that was known of Canada was about 450,000 square miles, to-day we have 3,470,000 square miles. Fifty years ago, we had only 4,000,000 acres of land under cultivation; to-day we have 30,000,000 under cultivation. Fifty years ago we had invested in banks only \$3,000,000; to-day our banks hold deposit receipts for \$110,000,000. Fifty years ago, the total circulation, including Government notes, amounted to \$1,750,000; to-day it is \$50,000,000. In 1837, we had 375 post offices; now we have over 7,000 and 52,000 miles of public mail route and travel. To-day we have perhaps the finest system of education on this continent. The problem of education has been solved in this country, as it has been in no country in the world. Do hon. gentlemen opposite tell the people that in their speeches? Do they tell them that this is a place where an emigrant can have his children well educated? Not they. Every section of our country is dotted with establishments of education and with magnificent temples of worship, and people coming from older countries can here worship their Maker according to their conscience as freely as they can in their own homes. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not dilate on these advantages. On the contrary, their whole policy consists in decrying the country. Before 1878 what did they do? They talk a great deal about the exodus from Canada, but I challenge them to-night to deny the fact that during the years before 1878, the first exodus from Canada of hungry men—starving men—who had to leave this country to get work and send money back to feed their families took place, and it was caused by the masterly inactivity of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in power. When the distinguished leader of the Government brought before the country a cure that relieved the land, instead of hon. gentleman being gratified to see that the evils from which the country was suffering had been removed, they growled and they grumbled and they have done nothing else ever since. They have been snarling at everything which has been done. Notwithstanding that this policy has done good to the country, they have had this nostrum and that nostrum, and I feel sometime that some of them must despise themselves for the lack of sincerity they have shown in offering to the country supposed remedies under what they call their policy. Nothing was ever like a policy in what they submitted. They have been grasping at every straw and seeking to catch the votes of the people by side winds. I may be permitted to say that the people are not so easily gulled. A great deal has been said of the farmers. I consider the farmer the least gullible man in this country, and there is nobody who knows better than the farmer, and none better than the farmers of that hon. gentleman's county, that the National Policy has been a grand thing for Canada; and nobody knows better than the farmer how to see through the misty mazes of the hon. gentlemen when they seek by catch votes to secure the approbation of the country. When they come forward and move a resolution in support of temperance, they put it in a shape so that the best friends of temperance—and the best friends of temperance in Canada have the honor to sit upon this side of the House—feel that they have to rebuke the mockery, to rebuke the hypocrisy, and to vote as one man, though they are sound and solid on the temperance question, against a resolution which on the face of it has the appearance of supporting the temperance principle. Do the hon. gentlemen imagine for a moment that the people of Canada do not see through a thing like that? They do see through it, and they will see through the scheme too. But the hon. gentlemen have done nothing for years but parading this sort of thing before the country. They are always telling the people of the great blessings they will enjoy, the great progress they will have, that everything will be turned

couleur de rose, that we here in Canada will be able to make a living without labor, as it were, all that is necessary to do is to come into this commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, and they will get \$2 a pair for broilers. This thing that they have been attempting to make the people of Canada believe it would be good for them to adopt reminds me of the story which was put into rhyme, and which did us good service in the last election:

"There was a young lady in Niger,
Took a ride on the back of a tiger,
They returned from the ride
With the lady inside,
And a smile on the face of the tiger.

If this scheme were carried out, the Americans would be the tiger, and we would be inside. The hon. gentlemen opposite, one and all, in the course of their observations, have had a sly dab at the National Policy. They have been all the time saying that the public, that the farmers, that the long suffering community would be relieved from the burdens of the dreadful taxation which the National Policy has imposed upon them. They know perfectly well that, since the introduction of that measure, the farming community of Canada have been able to get larger prices for their goods, because of the increased centres of labor. Speaking for the manufacturing city from which I come—and in speaking of that I speak of the whole country—I know perfectly well that, before 1878, when all the interests were suffering, the farmers in our neighborhood were suffering, as they had no market; but, since then, when these factories have been busy, and we have had our own market to ourselves, and we have had mouths to feed, the farmers in the neighborhood have got good prices for their stuff. Complaints have been made of the small imports into this country during the last few years. Why, that is one of the blessings which has come from the National Policy. We want to import less and to make more here. If our imports are so many million dollars less than they were, that difference goes into the pockets of the workmen of Canada for the labor expended on that. The hon. gentlemen ever since the National Policy has been introduced, have attacked the policy in the vilest manner. They have not only attacked the policy, but they have attacked the respected leader of the Government, who guides the destinies of this country, as the man who first proposed the National Policy. They have attacked him as well as the policy, but in his case character is always a shield against malignity and calumny, and the success of the National Policy is the best argument against all the attacks which those hon. gentleman may make. With the country prospering, the people happy, and no complaining in our streets, what more do we want? We cannot have continued prosperity. There will be instances of depression in business, there will be lulls in trade, there will be changes in the general run of business but that will happen under any circumstances. But let us remember the days before 1878, when these gentlemen were preparing their exodus, when, by their policy, by their inactivity, and by their refusal to do anything to relieve the country from the state into which it had come, people had to go, they were obliged to go. That reminds me of the incident of the ranchman in the North-West, who came from a ranche in the United States. Everything was not *couleur de rose* there. He came to a place near the Blood Reserve. Some of the fellows knew him, and said: "Hillo, Jack, what are you doing here?" "Well," said he, "down to our ranche the grub is not very good, and I thought I would change. The pay is not very good either. But, when they came down to flap-jacks and scenery, it was not very comfortable for me." Well, this fellow passed, and after a time another came along, and he was asked what was the matter, that all the ranche boys were coming along; and, says he: "It was all very well when he had

flap-jacks and scenery, but, when they stopped the flap-jacks, Jerusalem, I had to get, and I have got, and here I am." Before 1878 there was no work to do here, and men had to go away to get employment in order to send money back to feed their families. It is well known that, in the large cities of Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and elsewhere, there were men who were not only unable to feed their families, but were unable to educate their children, and had to take them from school. Now, things are changed, and yet hon. gentlemen decry this policy, not that they think they are right in their views or that they think the country is suffering from this policy, but it is simply another of the straws they are grasping at, and they hope they may catch some favoring wind and get back to this side of the House. But it is not very likely that they will come back to this side of the House for a long time unless they mend their manners toward the people. Those hon. gentlemen seem to think that it is time there should be a change in this glorious Confederation of ours, and that we should seek with the United States a reciprocal alliance which no one in the world can look at for five minutes without being satisfied that it is the entering wedge to annexation. I will read Mr. Hitt's resolution that was introduced into Congress at Washington:

"The House Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously voted to-day to report favorably Mr. Hitt's resolution to promote Commercial Union with Canada. It provides that whenever Canada declares a desire to establish a Commercial Union having a uniform revenue system by which internal taxes will be collected and like import duties upon articles from other nations, with no duties between the United States and Canada, the President shall appoint three Commissioners to meet a similar commission from Canada and prepare a plan for the assimilation of import duties and revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of the receipts in Commercial Union."

I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that should such a measure as this come to pass, in six months afterwards we would not know whether we were Americans or Canadians; we would rather be inclined, even in that short period, to say: Well, we will become Americanised pretty quickly.

Mr. MILLS. Am I, or am I not.

Mr. BROWN. Well, I am a British subject, and I hope that I will always continue to be so. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have made the depreciation of this country the burden of their song, and in all their speeches they have prepared the way for hearing from this side of the House of our devotion to our connection with Great Britain. They have sneered at sentiment. What they call sentiment, we on this side of the House call loyalty. The hon. member for Huron who spoke the other night, declared that there was a man in his county—I think he said that he was one of a great many—who was verily of opinion that unless we could get reciprocal trade with the United States we should have to have annexation, that we must ask to be taken into the United States. Very well, I would say to the hon. member for Huron, put that friend of his on the list, and if he has an inclination of that sort himself, let him stick himself on the list. Neither will be missed by the people of Canada in connection with this great question. I tell you, Sir, that when we lose sentiment in this country, we lose the grandest thing we have got in it. When hon. gentlemen come forward here and try to mystify the House with figures, when they sneer at sentiment, which we call devotion to our country as against the almighty dollar, I say there are men in this House, and in this country, thousands upon thousands of them, that will never tolerate any such computation of the question at all. Sentiment, Sir, has made this country as great as it is; sentiment has made the country from which we sprung, great; sentiment, which you choose to sneer at, crowned the heights of Alma; the sentiment that was taught at Eton and Rugby, that was instilled into the boys there, won Waterloo; sentiment that you choose to sneer

Mr. BROWN.

at, was what made the volunteers of Canada jump at the call of duty, and take that journey, at an inclement season of the year, to maintain the integrity of their country. Sneer at sentiment if you will; I tell you, Sir, that there is a band of men in Canada who will never surrender that sentiment, which is one of the proudest and grandest things that belong to us. I noticed in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, in this debate, the great care they took to sail close by the wind, so that we might not exactly catch their meaning, and so be able to pin them down; they tried to manifest indifference. Sir, there is no indifference in Canada, under which flag we sail; there is only one desire on the part of the people of Canada, except a miserable minority, and that is a desire to continue to sail and to live under the stainless flag of which we are so proud, the flag of our ancestors. And I tell you that whenever there is any attempt on the part of the public men in this country to haul down that flag and to replace it with another, 50,000 to one will be there to run it up again, to unfurl it high once more to mark their devotion to their country. Hon. gentlemen opposite always wind up their speeches by expressing devoted loyalty to their country, yet at the same time the burden of their speeches throughout has been that they will gladly go into any arrangement of a commercial character with the United States that will, as they must know, result in a political connection. No man living wishes to live in a greater feeling of amity with the United States than I do. They are a great people. The true American is as fine a man as you will find on the earth, and they are a people with whom we ought to live in the closest and most amicable relations. I do not think there are any people in the world who respect Her Majesty Queen Victoria more highly than the true American people—I am speaking of those who are descendants of the early British colonies. I am most sincere when I say that the Americans are a people with whom we should live in the greatest amity, with whom, we should have the freest commercial relations so long as they do not affect the status of this country as a part and parcel of the British Empire. We propose now to have the closest relations with the people of the United States, and our Government have put in the Customs Act a standing offer to interchange with the United States in natural products; but beyond that this country should not and will not go. The hon. gentleman who just preceded me spoke of the iron interests of this country, and said that there was a lack of furnaces in Canada for the development of the iron trade. He pointed in glowing terms to the prosperity of the iron industry of the United States. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last session, when I was advocating an increase of the tariff on iron in order to develop that industry in this country, drew a doleful picture of the iron industry in the United States, and said that we in Canada would reach the same position. However, my hon. friend from Huron says to-night that the industries of the United States are successful. Does the hon. gentleman know why; if he does not, I will tell him. They are successful in consequence of the fostering care of the American Government in the tariff they have placed upon iron. There was a time when not one bar was made in the United States, when every bar came from abroad, and to-day by the fostering care of the United States during a course of years they are not only making all the iron and steel they require in the country, but they are becoming shippers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All the iron and steel they require?

Mr. BROWN. They can, if they do not do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but I tell him they can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do they not ?

Mr. BROWN. Everything is not done in a minute. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is in just a little too great a hurry when he expects the whole iron industry of Canada to be developed into full bloom when it has only had proper protection for one year.

Mr. KIRK. Nine or ten years.

Mr. BROWN. Why, the policy, the only practical policy that was ever put on the Statute-book here to develop the iron industry was that of last session, which was the top stone of the National Policy. Give time and you will see the results. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that when the Act was passed the Government in its generosity and in its fairness to the importers of the country gave two months to admit the whole of the iron that was being brought from the other side or could be brought out. That resulted in an immense quantity of iron being brought here. That checked the operation of the iron works of the country, and to some extent probably is the reason why there has not been a movement to erect more furnaces. But that stock of imported iron is about used up now. As hon. gentlemen ought to be informed of the situation of the matter I have taken care to fortify myself with letters from all the large iron industries in the country, and I will read very small portions from them, and with the permission of the House and with the desire to shorten the debate, I will hand them to the *Hansard* reporters. I have letters here from the Hamilton Bridge Company, Hamilton Forge Company, Canada Pipe Company and Ontario Rolling Company, and all these letters say this: That they approve of the iron tariff, that they are using largely of Canadian iron, that they consider it first-class in quality, and that they look forward to the tariff passed last Session as the means of immensely developing the iron industry of Canada and the cause of the erection of furnaces so as to double the present manufacture.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the hon. gentlemen pass from the subject, I desire to say a word in case he should desire to refer more fully to the papers in his possession and lest he should not get them on record. I hardly think the suggestion he has made would be willingly assented to by the Debates Committee, or that the Committee would agree to it. In fact, I think it would be a very bad precedent to establish, that lengthy documents such as the hon. gentleman mentions should be handed in to the reporters.

Mr. BROWN. Then I will read them. My only desire was to shorten the debate, and as it is important to have them on record I will read them. Here is a letter from the Hamilton Bridge Company:

"We use iron of local manufacture very largely, and find it of at least equal quality to that imported, and the price as far as our experience goes is reasonable and not so high as the full tariff increase would warrant; we also have the great advantage of ordering and obtaining this material just when wanted, and without having to lay in large stocks. We are convinced that the tariff as it at present stands is a wise and far reaching measure, and one which has also an immediate result by causing the cost of material to be disbursed in this country instead of being remitted abroad to pay for the imported goods giving as it now does employment to many who otherwise would have to look elsewhere for work. You may remember that the iron bridge business is the direct growth of our protective system, it has had the effect of keeping out in many cases American structures of inferior design and material; this is shown by the number of bridges of American build, which we are now and have been for some time past replacing and renewing, and which had been erected in Canada previous to the National Policy advent."

Mr. MULOCK. What Bridge Company is it ?

Mr. BROWN. Hamilton Bridge Company. That company is erecting some of the grandest structures in Canada, on the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific Railways and almost every railway in the Dominion. The demand upon the company are so great that it is almost impossible for the

company to overtake their orders. Here is a letter from the Hamilton Forge Company:

"HAMILTON, 21st Jan., 1888.

"ADAM BROWN, Esq., M.P., Hamilton.

"DEAR SIR,—We now very cheerfully comply with the request made by you in reference to the general effect of the tariff changes in iron inaugurated last May.

"In the first place we respectfully submit that the extension of time given to importers by the Government enabled them to bring into the country a large quantity of the finished article, that otherwise would have been made in Canada, thereby increasing the stocks then held, and to-day this iron has not all gone into consumption; but we are assured the spring will largely reduce, if not wipe out altogether said stocks; we find even now a considerable number of orders coming from men who have refused in the past to buy at home choosing rather the imported article; but they are finding out that iron can be made in Canada equal in quality and finish to any foreign make.

"In our own business we have felt the good effects of the wise and judicious policy of the Government, notably during the past four months, having largely increased our output by running our force full time, both night and day, and within the past few days have started another furnace in our establishment with all the necessary equipment, capable of turning out about one car load more of finished bar iron per day, this will give active employment to twelve skilled men, beside day laborers. We have also increased the capital stock of our company for the purpose of further developing the business, and in the near future we propose placing another mill plant with a capacity 6,000 tons per year.

"In conclusion we have much pleasure in stating that we have never heard a consumer of iron complain of the tariff changes; moreover we desire to place on record the general feelings of satisfaction expressed by them in having their wants supplied promptly at home, without having as in the past to purchase abroad, and carry large stocks, and pay cash for them, they can now secure iron within a reasonable time, that at once goes into legitimate consumption, thereby giving a hearty and vigorous tone to business.

"The continuation of an iron policy, wise in its inception and having for its object the development of the mineral resources of this country, covering the whole Dominion of Canada, meets with our hearty approval, and must eventually lay a foundation broad and enduring, that will be materially helpful to every class of man living between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

"We beg to remain, yours respectfully,

"HAMILTON IRON FORGING CO.,

"THOS. D. BEDDOE,
Manager."

The Canada Pipe Company writes:

"The immediate result has been that my factory has been steadily employed during the past season, and will soon necessitate the increase to double its present capacity.

"I may say that another foundry for the same product is being built at the Londonderry Works in Nova Scotia, in which it is proposed to produce about double my capacity.

"The effect on the consumers has occasioned a small increase in price, but it has been my policy (and I also think that of others) not to ask the addition to the full extent of the increase in tariff, as what we want is steady work at a moderate profit, rather than the full advance in price.

"Of course, the extension of the time for admitting goods until the 30th June last year affected our business somewhat, but I could not see how that could be well avoided.

"Your respectfully,

"ALEX. GARTSHORE."

The Ontario Rolling Mill Company writes:

"We have not felt at all fully the effects, as yet, owing to the large amounts of material brought in under privilege to July 1st last; however, we knew last summer that we must expect this and governed ourselves accordingly.

"We are now beginning to feel the beneficial effects and expect that by spring we shall be called on to make far more iron than ever before.

"This feeling justifies us in making many improvements in way of increased capacity here. We may say that we shall be able to turn out by spring nearly double the tonnage we ever made here. We are also arranging to start-up the mill we have in London, either there or elsewhere, so that by May we can, if necessary, make in that mill about thirty-five tons per day. As we have explained to you, before our increased capacity, with that of the Forge Company and mills east, will enable Canadian manufacturers of bar iron to turn out more iron per year than has been used in Canada.

"We took the position last spring that under the advanced price of foreign iron made so by increased tariff, that it would tend to lessen the dissatisfaction of some importers and consumers; if we put our selling price down to a fair profit instead of holding it up to all the tariff permitted, and, also, show those who had before imported all their iron and disparaged our product in comparison with foreign iron, that we were disposed to forget all that, and treat them liberally as possible.

"We may say this policy has been followed out by us and the result is satisfactory, so far as we know. While this state of affairs has been brought about, as explained above, we hope the conditions existing between makers, jobbers and consumers, will not be disarranged by

further changes. We mention this, as we heard last fall that an effort would be made to have the duty increased on scrap iron this coming session.

"If that were done, it would necessitate our adding the increase to our price of finished iron, and that would raise a general howl over the country. We are firmly of the opinion that the tariff, as it applies to manufacturers of iron, should not be disturbed.

"We may say that it is impossible for us to make finished bars out of imported and domestic puddled bars, and sell, without loss, in competition with foreign bars.

"Should there be any further information that you wish, please let us know. We have not changed our opinion as to the wisdom of the policy of the Government on the iron question.

"We are, yours truly,

"ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS."

Now, Sir, to show you the opinion of those interested in industries there in which probably I suppose there are not less than \$5,000,000 invested and which is being increased every day, and to show you that they are satisfied with the policy of the Government on the development of the iron industry, that they believe the policy to be the right one and to show you that we can get all the iron we want in Canada, I will quote some of those expressions of opinion. The hon. gentleman said there was lots of iron in the bowels of the earth, and I need not point out that the object of the National Policy is to unearth it. We know very well that hitherto the policy of our Government has been to do all that it could to promote emigration of the proper kind to this country. I believe with the hon. gentleman that the farmer is at the bottom of the success of our country and I advocate the bringing of all the farmers that we can of the right sort, to this country, bringing them in to plough the furrows, to sow the seed, and to reap the golden harvest which will be sent to the rest of the world. That is what we want in this country and I wish to see as much of it as we can have. Let no man try to gull the country and to gull the farmers by telling them that the National Policy is not a benefit to them. I have here a number of telegrams which I have received from our city of Hamilton and from those interested in different industries there which are all against this policy and which are after this style.

"Commercial Union would kill our forge and preside at the funeral of our rolling mills. As loyal Canadians, we protest against the possibility of our tariff being arranged for us at Washington.

"T. D. BEDDOE.

"Mgr. Hamilton Iron and Forging Co."

"If Commercial Union should be adopted, it would utterly destroy the pipe industry and certainly lead to annexation. Don't let Washington dictate our tariff.

"ALEX. GARTSHORE,

"Canada Pipe Works."

"Under Commercial Union we would have to shut down our works entirely.

"ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS CO."

"Commercial Union would destroy our business in carriage and saddlery hardware and scales, and would seriously damage stove business.

"BURROW, STEWART & MILNE."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would effectually close the canning industry. In most cases farmers receive for their products twice the price paid in the United States, particularly for tomatoes.

"J. W. CUY KENDALL & CO.,

"Rising Sun Canning and Pickling Co."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would close every sewer pipe factory in Canada.

"CANADA SEWER PIPE CO."

"The furniture trade would be severe sufferers, more particularly the manufacturers, for the following reasons:—The American factories are now nearly all large stock companies with large capital, and have all the advantages in purchasing that capital gives. From their large output they have the division of labor so fine that the cost of production would be and is much less than we can hope to arrive at here with a limited production and output. Our manufactures are only now getting nicely on their feet. The large concerns could wipe them out before we could change our style of business to the change of market.

"J. HOODLESS & SON."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the country and ruinous to our business.

"OSBORNE-KILLEY MANUFACTURING MACHINISTS CO."
Mr. BROWN.

"We consider that Commercial Union would be most disastrous to our interests.

"HAMILTON COTTON CO."

The managers of the Wheel Works, who employ a large number of people, say:

"After considering the question of Commercial Union in all its different bearings, political, commercial and social, we are of the decided opinion that it is not for the interest of this country to entertain the idea. It is but the stepping stone to annexation. As far as our particular business is concerned, we are positive it would injuriously affect it, if not altogether destroy it.

"F. W. HORE & SON."

"Consider risk far too great; can make as cheap, but would have to make New York the chief distributing point for selling; can make fair living now, and no money consideration would make me give up our Canadian independence. When the Canadians show that they have no brains to make living without foreign assistance, by all means let them annex, and wipe themselves out as a miserable race.

"JAS. WATSON,

"Strathroy Knitting Co."

"We believe it would destroy the manufacturing part of it, and resolve us into traders or agents for western houses. Am writing.

"F. W. FEARMAN,

"Pork, Bacon and Lard Packer."

"We should have to share the market here with little prospect of entering the American market. The effect would be ruinous.

"B. GREENING & CO.,

"Wire Workers."

"Were unrestricted reciprocity or Commercial Union to come in force we would at once remove our business to United States.

"D. MORTON & SON,

"Soapmakers."

Now I have a telegram from the Bridge Company, a company that we are proud of, and a company whose structures have excited the admiration of all experts in bridge building in this country. Not only this Bridge Company, but the companies in Montreal and elsewhere, are entirely an outcome of the National Policy. And yet hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as if it were a mere nothing, and a matter of no importance to the company, wish to have this industry wiped away. Here is what the President of the Bridge Company telegraphs me on this question:

"Unrestricted Reciprocity would destroy our bridge business. American bridge shops are generally attached to iron works, where they have raw material at their hand, and have large capital and an unlimited field, but competition with them is such that few pay dividends. A large part of raw material used by us is imported from Europe, but we use all we can get made in Canada. Our work is preferred to either English or American.

"WM. HENDRIE,

"President Hamilton Bridge Company."

There is another point I would like to refer to, and I regret that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his seat as I made a special memorandum for him on this question. He represents a constituency in which the article of cheese is the great staple of the country. Canadian cheese has worked its way up from a very small beginning until to-day it occupies a position on the American market superior to the American cheese. Hon. gentlemen will be astonished when I tell them that I can remember when there was not a man in Canada who made boxes to hold cheese. I believe, Sir, that I saw the first box that was turned out to hold cheese, and to-day the export of cheese from Canada alone to foreign markets, to say nothing of the home consumption, exceeds \$7,000,000. Now, the point I want to make is, and on which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will have a little difficulty in explaining himself to his constituents, is that unrestricted reciprocity will put Canadian cheese on the same level with inferior American cheese and therefore it will bring no better price to the Canadians than to Americans. Hon. gentleman on the other side may laugh, but I tell you there is no doubt about it and it is a proper proposition to make and a good argument to use.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. BROWN. What is the use of talking. I have here a telegram from the president of the largest cheese concern in Canada on this question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is equal to saying the Canadians do not know cheese.

Mr. BROWN. Some of them do not know beans on the other side of the House. I asked the gentleman if he was president of the Cheese Association, as I wanted to have the highest authority. He answered:

"Yes, I am president of the association. No fixed prices can be given for cheese, as it depends on the supply and demand abroad. Think unrestricted reciprocity would not benefit us. Our cheese at present leads the market in price and quality, and any interference in the present mode of shipment that would be the means of our cheese being sent into the English market as American cheese would interfere with our high prestige against us."

That is the highest authority. This is from a man that leads the cheese organisation in the west.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) What is the name?

Mr. BROWN. His name is E. Caswell, he lives in Ingersoll, and he will see anybody from 7 o'clock till 9; he is always at his business. Hon. gentlemen seem to have been a good deal mixed in the last three or four weeks, and it is only now that they are getting the tangle taken out. Their opinions respecting this unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union have appeared in various forms through the press; but they seem now to be pretty well whipped into line, and I suppose before this debate is concluded they will all be of one mind as to what unrestricted reciprocity is and what commercial union is. But they seem to have a woeful forgetfulness of what they used to think, many of them, of the noble consummation effected by the Fathers of Confederation, which is making our country great, and which has already commanded the admiration of the world. Perhaps there is no country that has prospered so much, or that has made such satisfactory progress as Canada has done since the time Confederation was accomplished. I would just like to read an extract written at the conclusion of the first decade of Confederation:

"The Dominion of Canada has now completed the first decade, and can with pardonable pride review the history of those ten years while the future can be looked forward to with hopefulness and confidence. Every one acknowledges that Canadian Confederation has been a great success, and those who had the greatest doubts about the venture are now ready to confess that the plan was a wise one, and that the result has been all the most sanguine could have anticipated."

"Ten years have come and gone, and what do we see? Canada stretches from ocean to ocean, and in all her wide domains there is not a section of the inhabitants that is not loyal to her Government and deliberately and enlightenedly attached to her constitution. The idea of annexation is dead. The desire for it is to-day not spoken of as a factor in the politics of the continent. Its discussion is not thought of even in juvenile debating clubs when 'questions' are at a premium and there is a desire to have something that will 'draw.' Never was there a time in all the past when there was more neighborly cordiality between Canada and the United States, and at the same time less thought of or desire for a nearer political relationship than exists at present. Both fare on their way with mutual respect and with a growing conviction that each has a divergent destiny, with different habits, different national peculiarities, special modes of thought, and special civilisations which may have their own particular excellencies and their own shortcomings, but can never be amalgamated without mutual injury and loss."

"While the material progress of Canada has during these last ten years been very marked, her educational and religious progress has not been less noticeable. In every respect we have cause, not for boasting, but for commendable satisfaction. The past is full of encouragement. The future is full of hope. We may all address ourselves with renewed energy and alacrity each to our own proper work, with the full conviction that, individually, we can all help to make Canada flourish more than more in all which really characterises a free and prosperous people, and that as each and all cultivate what is really true, manly, moral, intelligent and religious, so will Canada flourish, and flourish long and ever progressively, sharing as she does and will the glorious, and helping to accomplish the destiny, of the mighty empire which after centuries of trial, and triumph is found to have nothing about it of age, but its matured wisdom; its gathered experience; its prudence without a touch of feebleness; and its true conservatism which is ever found in rational progress and timely improvement and reform."

19-1888-4

This splendid extract I have made from the *Toronto Globe*. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite have for the last ten years sought to disturb this great Confederation which has been the hope of the people of Canada, and which is full of inspiration for the young men of our country—something for them to live for, something for them to work for. But hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends have sought to neutralise all our hopes in the future of this country; they declare that there is no prosperity in store for Canada under its present rule and its present institutions. They declare that we must have our whole fiscal policy changed, no matter if the result may be that we must change the institutions of our country and seek for sustenance and support by allegiance to those of another. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as I have said, had their nostrums now and again. They have sought to excite ill will among the people towards the administration of this country. One cannot help being reminded of the scene of the witches in *Macbeth*, with all their toil and trouble, their boil and bubble, as they were mixing up the various ingredients in their caldron and say to each other,

"Round about the caldron go,
In the poisoned entrails throw."

The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite since 1878 has been as strange a mixture of heterogeneous compounds as that of the witches' broth, described by Shakespeare, into which they put:

"Fillet of a fenny snake,
In the caldron boil and bake;
Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting,
Lizard's leg, and owl's wing—

In these changes they have sought

"For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth, boil and bubble,"

Which after all has produced for them nothing but

"Double, double toil and trouble,
Fire burn and caldron bubble;"

And if they continue long the same kind of cookery, the people of the country will get tired of both them and their broth. We have a country well worth living for. I consider the people of the United States about the grandest neighbors anybody could possibly have, and we ought to cultivate the closest relationship with them. They spring from the same blood, and inherit the same laws—the best laws under heaven which have been transmitted to us by the best blood of our forefathers.

Mr. LISTER. And foremothers.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, foremothers; and your foremother was not very proud of you. We should cultivate the best sentiments between these people, and we are doing it; and I hope the day will never come when there will be any rivalry between that country and ours, but that rivalry which will produce the greatest good for humanity. I hope that this alliance of commerce between the two countries will be held sacred in the interests of peace and commerce. I may, with pride, quote to you the words of a distinguished statesman, one who has shed lustre upon his career in this country, one who has adorned the history of Canada. I refer to Lord Dufferin. In his great speech at Winnipeg, speaking of the United States and of the propriety of keeping on the best terms with that country, he said:

"But of no nearer connection does she dream. In a world apart, secluded from all extraneous influences, nestling at the feet of Her Majestic mother Canada dreams her dream, and forbodes her destiny—a dream of ever broadening harvests, multiplying towns and villages, and expanding pastures; of constitutional self government and a confederated Empire; of page after page of honorable history, added as her contribution to the annals of the mother country and to the glories of the British race, of a perpetuation for all times upon this continent of that temperate and well balanced system of government which combines in one mighty whole as the eternal possession of all Englishman the

brilliant history and traditions of the past with the freest and most untrammelled liberty of action in the future."

I will not detain the House any longer but I will close my remarks by asking the House if I could give any better advice to the people of Canada or to the hon. gentlemen opposite, in our discussions of all matters connected with our country, than to repeat the words of that same distinguished nobleman Lord Dufferin, when, following up the spirit of his address to the people of Manitoba, he used the following language which should be written in letters of gold, and be taught in the schools of our country :

"Love your country, believe in your country, honor her, work for her, live for her, die for her."

M. CHOQUETTE : Mon intention n'est pas, M. l'Orateur, d'infliger à cette Chambre un long discours, surtout dans une langue qui, malheureusement, ne sera pas comprise par un grand nombre de mes honorables amis. Mais je tiens tout spécialement à faire connaître mes vues sur l'importante question qui est maintenant devant la Chambre, parce que je représente un comté essentiellement agricole et qui a le plus grand intérêt à ce que ses vues soient connues par mon entremise dans cette Chambre et dans le pays.

Je tiens à exposer en quelques mots mes vues sur cette question, surtout pour répudier les avancées qui ont été faits d'abord par l'honorable ministre de l'intérieur qui a guidé le débat de l'autre côté de la Chambre, ensuite par un grand nombre d'autres députés, et spécialement par l'honorable député qui vient de prendre son siège, à savoir, que cette question de réciprocité n'est pas venue devant le pays et n'a pas été discutée devant le peuple lors des dernières élections générales.

Je ne sais pas exactement ce qui a été fait dans d'autres comtés, mais dans mon comté, je puis dire que la question a été spécialement discutée ; elle a été l'un des points principaux sur lesquels la lutte s'est faite. Une des raisons principales que j'avais pour mettre la discussion spécialement sur ce terrain, c'est que mon adversaire se donnait comme indépendant dans le temps, et qu'il disait ne pas différer d'opinion avec moi sur la question nationale qui était une des principales qui agitaient alors la province de Québec.

Et pour prouver son indépendance, il disait qu'il avait comme moi condamné le gouvernement sur la question du Nord-Ouest. Par conséquent, la discussion se trouvait pour ainsi dire resserrée dans des bornes étroites, qui était la seule question de protection et de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, je dis donc que la question a été discutée chez nous, et la meilleure preuve qu'elle a été comprise par la population du comté de Montmagny, comme de plusieurs comtés environnants, c'est le verdict qui a été rendu.

En 1882, nous avons aussi fait la discussion sur cette question-là. La question de protection s'est présentée aussi incidemment, et le comté de Montmagny qui, à tort ou à raison, — mais à tort suivant moi, — avait refusé mes services, et élu mon adversaire par 120 voix de majorité, s'est prononcé en ma faveur aux dernières élections et m'a envoyé représenter le comté et ses véritables intérêts dans cette Chambre, en m'élisant par près de 200 voix de majorité.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, supposons que cette question ne fût pas venue devant le peuple ; supposons que cette question n'eût pas été discutée devant l'électorat, les honorables messieurs de l'autre côté de cette Chambre peuvent-ils nous en faire un reproche ? Est-ce que nous n'avons pas le droit d'amener cette question devant la Chambre avant d'autres élections générales ? Est-ce que nous n'avons pas le droit de mettre devant la Chambre et le pays nos idées sur lesquelles, plus tard, le peuple pourra se prononcer et les ratifier ? Si nous n'avons pas ce droit, est-ce que le parti qui occupe aujourd'hui les banquettes ministérielles peuvent nous en faire un reproche ?

Mr. BROWN.

Lorsqu'on a imposé au pays la Confédération, M. l'Orateur, est-ce que cette question est venue devant le peuple ? Loin d'être venue devant le peuple, lorsqu'il s'est agi de se prononcer sur la question, lorsqu'il s'est agi de la faire approuver ou de la faire condamner par l'électorat, des provinces entières se sont prononcées contre, et cependant, la Confédération a été faite. Lorsque ces honorables messieurs ont amené devant la Chambre le bill des franchises qui changeaient pour ainsi dire la représentation, qui changeait dans un grand nombre de provinces le système représentatif, est-ce qu'ils ont craint qu'on leur fasse des reproches de ne pas s'être adressés d'abord à l'électorat ? Non, M. l'Orateur, ils ont présenté ce bill sans consulter le peuple. Et lorsqu'ils ont jeté les millions au Pacifique, et qu'ils sont à la veille d'en jeter encore, est-ce qu'ils sont allés devant le peuple demander d'approuver leur politique ?

Par conséquent, M. l'Orateur, supposons que la question n'aurait pas été discutée, bien que je prétende que pour ce qui nous concerne elle a été discutée, que le verdict a été rendu sur l'issue qui était soulevée, est-ce que nous n'avons pas le droit de venir devant cette Chambre exposer nos vues sur cette question, et demander plus tard la confirmation de ces vues au peuple ? Je prétends que oui, M. l'Orateur, et je suis convaincu qu'elles recevront dans le temps l'approbation de l'électorat.

Maintenant la question de protection sur laquelle on fait la bataille, cette question de protection telle qu'elle existe actuellement, a-t-elle été mise devant le peuple ? Est-ce que l'électorat a eu occasion de se prononcer sur cette question d'une manière franche et sincère, c'est-à-dire de se prononcer sur un tarif de 30, 35 et 40 pour cent ? Je dis que non, et je vais le prouver. D'abord je dirai ceci : c'est qu'en 1876, 1877 et 1878, lorsque les honorables messieurs qui occupent les banquettes du trésor étaient dans l'opposition, ils ont voulu mettre devant la Chambre et devant le pays des résolutions à l'effet de faire approuver la politique de protection. Eh bien ! ont-ils mis devant la Chambre ce qu'ils voulaient ? Ont-ils réellement exposé leur politique devant le pays ? Ont-ils dit au peuple, par l'entremise de la Chambre, par l'entremise de la presse, qu'ils mettraient une muraille de Chine entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis et qu'ils imposeraient un tarif de 30 et 35 pour 100 ? Non, M. l'Orateur.

Voici la résolution que l'honorable premier ministre proposait alors : —

Que cette Chambre regrette que Son Excellence le gouverneur général n'ait pas été conseillé de recommander un remaniement de tarif à l'effet non-seulement de rendre moins sensible la stagnation qu'on déplore dans le gracieux discours du trône, mais aussi d'offrir l'encouragement et la protection qu'il convient aux manufactures et aux industries en souffrance aussi bien qu'aux produits agricoles du pays.

Eh bien ! est-ce que dans cette motion la politique que le gouvernement devait inaugurer est exprimée ? Est-ce qu'il est dit qu'elle était la proposition que l'on voulait soumettre au peuple ? Est-ce qu'il est dit que l'on voulait lui imposer un tarif aussi élevé que celui qui existe actuellement ?

Prenons la résolution de 1877. L'honorable premier ministre actuel, alors chef de l'opposition, proposait alors :

Que cette Chambre regrette que la politique financière du gouvernement augmente le fardeau des taxes sur le peuple sans procurer comme compensation, aucun avantage aux industries canadiennes, et de plus que cette Chambre est d'opinion que le déficit dans le revenu devrait être comblé en réduisant les dépenses et au moyen d'un remaniement de tarif qui protégerait et favoriserait les intérêts agricoles, miniers et manufacturiers du Canada.

Voilà la résolution de 1877. Elle est à peu près dans la même sens que celle de 1876 ; on a changé les mots et on n'a pas fait connaître au peuple ce que l'on voulait.

Maintenant venons à la dernière session, en 1878. Voici la résolution que l'honorable premier ministre d'aujourd'hui a alors proposée :

Qu'il soit résolu que cette Chambre est d'opinion que la prospérité du Canada requiert l'adoption d'une politique nationale qui, par un rajuste-

ment judicieux du tarif, bénéficiera et favorisera les intérêts agricoles, miniers et manufacturiers du Canada.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, je dis qu'il n'y avait rien devant le pays, qu'il n'y avait rien devant la Chambre qui démontrait que le gouvernement voulait imposer les charges énormes qui existent actuellement ; et je dis qu'en allant devant le pays avec ces résolutions, et en imposant ensuite, après avoir été élus sur ces résolutions, le tarif énorme qui existe aujourd'hui, je dis que l'on a obtenu les votes du peuple sous de faux prétextes. Je dis que les honorables députés de l'opposition ne voulaient pas faire connaître leurs vues au peuple parce qu'ils savaient que la vérité leur ferait tort. Alors, s'ils ne voulaient pas sincèrement faire connaître quel était leur but, je dis qu'ils ont trompé le peuple et qu'ils ont obtenu le pouvoir sous de faux prétextes.

Et je dirai plus, M. l'Orateur ; pendant la campagne électorale, un monsieur John Boyd télégraphiait à l'honorable chef de l'opposition d'alors dans les termes suivants :

La presse ministérielle affirme ici que vous proposez d'élever le tarif généralement à 35 pour cent. Puis-je contredire ?

Voilà la dépêche adressée de Saint-Jean, dans le Nouveau-Brunswick au chef de l'opposition qui brigait alors les faveurs populaires, en lui disant : on dit que vous voulez faire telle chose, est-ce que je puis contredire ? On savait donc, M. l'Orateur, que si on ne contredisait pas cette assertion dans le temps, on perdrait des votes que l'on ne pourrait pas capter la confiance populaire et prendre la majorité dans le pays.

Alors qu'est-ce qu'a répondu le chef du gouvernement actuel ? Voici sa réponse :

A. M. JOHN BOYD, Saint-Jean, N. B.

C'est un absurde mensonge. Ni à London ni ailleurs ai-je été au delà de la résolution par moi proposée en parlement. Je n'ai pas parlé d'augmentation de tarif, mais de remaniement.

Eh bien ! voici trois résolutions mises devant la Chambre à trois sessions différentes ; et lors de la lutte électorale, pendant que le peuple était à faire la bataille, pendant que le gouvernement Mackenzie était à subir son procès et qu'on l'accusait de ne pas remanier le tarif, pour protéger les industries agricoles et minières, pendant qu'on l'accusait pour ainsi dire d'être traître à son pays, on demandait à son accusateur : voulez-vous, vous, faire telle chose ? Augmenterez-vous le tarif si vous arrivez au pouvoir ? Et le chef du gouvernement actuel répondait que c'était un absurde mensonge ; que jamais il n'avait songé à augmenter le tarif plus que le comportait les résolutions, bien que ces résolutions ne disaient pas un mot du tarif.

Eh bien ! je le répète M. l'Orateur, on a obtenu les votes sous un faux prétexte, et aujourd'hui les honorables messieurs de l'autre côté de la Chambre ne peuvent pas déclarer sans fausser la vérité qu'ils ont obtenu le pouvoir sous le couvert de la protection.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, plusieurs députés de l'autre côté de la Chambre ont dit dans le cours de ce débat, que cette question de protection était réglée ; que le peuple s'était prononcé en trois circonstances différentes : en 1878 et 1882, et 1887 ; que le gouvernement avait eu gain de cause, et que la protection devrait être maintenue dans le pays. M. l'Orateur, je fais objection à cet argument, et je dis que ni le gouvernement, ni les honorables messieurs de la droite n'ont pas raison de soutenir devant la Chambre ce qu'ils disent aujourd'hui, et voici pourquoi : en 1878 le système protecteur, tel qu'il existe aujourd'hui, n'a pas été discuté devant le peuple, et conséquemment ce dernier n'a pu se prononcer sur cette question. Qu'est-il arrivé en 1882 ? A cette époque il a fallu retourner devant le peuple, et expliquer la protection, sur les dépêches, les discours, les motions contenues dans les livres publics, et défendre la position que le gouvernement occupait. Que fit le gouvernement alors ? Comme il savait qu'il allait être condamné par le peuple, il a passé le *gerrymander bill* avant les élections, et lorsque les élections sont arrivées le peuple n'a pas pu encore se prononcer sur

la question, car on avait remanié les comtés de manière à faire disparaître les majorités libérales et à les transformer en majorités conservatrices. Par conséquent pas plus en 1882 qu'en 1878, la question de la protection n'a été portée devant le peuple sur son vrai mérite.

Maintenant en 1882 qu'est-il arrivé encore ? Est-ce qu'on est venu devant le peuple sur la même question franchement ? Est-ce que le gouvernement a soumis cette question au même corps d'électeurs ? Non, M. l'Orateur, parce qu'en 1882 ce n'était pas les mêmes comtés qu'en 1878 ? Mais en 1887, est-ce que le gouvernement a encore demandé aux mêmes électeurs de ratifier sa politique ? Est-ce qu'en 1887 c'était la même population qui devait se prononcer, soit pour condamner ou approuver la politique du gouvernement ? Non, M. l'Orateur, car là encore, afin de remporter les élections, on a fait le fameux *bill des franchises*, et c'est au moyen de ce bill que le gouvernement a pu se maintenir au pouvoir. Je dis donc que le peuple ne s'est pas prononcé sur cette question ni en 1878, ni en 1882, ni en 1887.

La réciprocité, voilà la question qui se présentera aux prochaines élections. Nous prenons les devants et nous voulons qu'alors il n'y ait pas de faux-fuyants. Nous voulons que les électeurs puissent se prononcer et déclarer si le régime protecteur doit être maintenu, ou repoussé. Nous voulons qu'ils puissent déclarer si la réciprocité doit, au contraire, être adoptée. Voilà la raison pour laquelle j'approuve la présente motion, et j'approuve surtout l'opportunité de la faire dès maintenant, afin qu'aux élections prochaines, elle soit parfaitement connue des électeurs qui auront alors à se prononcer.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, le système protecteur qui a été inauguré, le tarif actuellement en force, est-il, ainsi qu'on le prétend, de nature à satisfaire les besoins du pays ? Est-ce une chose que le peuple en général, sans distinction de classe peut approuver, sous prétexte qu'il est dans l'intérêt général du pays ? Est-ce qu'il est véritablement dans l'intérêt général du pays ?

Je dis non, M. l'Orateur. Il suffit de savoir que le mot protection est synonyme de taxe, pour dire que du moment que la taxe existe cela ne peut pas être dans l'intérêt du pays, car la taxe existe toujours aux dépens du consommateur. Ceux qui ont lu Bastiat ou quelqu'autres auteurs en économie politique, peuvent s'en convaincre facilement. Il s'agit seulement de prendre les auteurs qui ont prôné la protection, les auteurs anglais qui ont dit que le tarif protecteur devait être adopté, que c'était le meilleur tarif, et qui ont donné les mêmes raisons que donnent les honorables députés de l'autre côté de la Chambre pour son adoption. Et je citerai entr'autres "Sidgwick, Political Economy," à la page 489, qui dit :

"Of course such a duty—if needed and effective—imposes a tax on the consumers of the article protected."

Comme question de principe, je dis ceci : que du moment que vous mettez un tarif protecteur, vous imposez une taxe ; du moment que vous élevez le tarif, vous élevez les taxes aux dépens des consommateurs ou de ceux qui achètent, et de la même manière cette taxe est imposée au profit des producteurs qui sont représentés par les grands manufacturiers. Je n'ai pas été étonné d'entendre, il y a un instant, l'honorable député de Hamilton (M. Brown), lire devant cette Chambre une foule de télégrammes et de lettres venant de tous les manufacturiers qui se déclarent satisfaits du tarif protecteur. Mais, a-t-il lu une seule lettre ou une seule dépêche venant d'un cultivateur ou d'un ouvrier, d'un consommateur enfin ? Non, il n'a lu que des dépêches et des lettres de ceux qui bénéficient du tarif protecteur.

Je ne veux pas blâmer l'honorable député d'Hamilton, (M. Brown), ni ceux qui lui ont adressé ces dépêches, car, si j'étais manufacturier je ferais peut-être la même chose. Mais, nous députés, qui sommes ici pour défendre les intérêts généraux du pays et non pour favoriser une classe ; qui sommes ici comme les représentants de la grande majorité,

les consommateurs, si nous voulons être de bons citoyens,—et je considère qu'il n'y a de bons citoyens que ceux qui veulent le bien du plus grand nombre,—notre devoir est de protéger le plus grand nombre, c'est-à-dire ceux qui achètent et qui consomment. Par conséquent, je dis que ces lettres que vient de lire l'honorable député ont peut-être leur raison d'être, au point de vue des intérêts manufacturiers; mais je défie qui que ce soit de produire devant la Chambre des lettres ou des dépêches venant de cultivateurs ou de ceux qui consomment; venant de la classe pauvre ou agricole.

Or, s'il n'y a que les producteurs, que les manufacturiers qui profitent de ces droits protecteurs, les classes pauvres, les classes agricoles en souffrent, et il est de notre devoir de remédier à cet état de choses. Le remède est dans le traité de réciprocité. Les classes pauvres pourront alors acheter là où il leur plaira et où elles trouveront à meilleur marché. Je dis donc, M. l'Orateur, que les droits imposés pour protéger les manufactures est une taxe. Et je ne comprends pas l'inconséquence des honorables messieurs de l'autre côté de la Chambre, qui, après avoir établi ce tarif protecteur, se lèvent de leurs sièges pour demander des enquêtes contre ces combinaisons formées par les manufacturiers. Ils font comme Saturne, qui, une fois que les enfants étaient nés, les dévorait. Ils imposent un droit pour protéger les manufacturiers, et à la session suivante, ils disent qu'ils ont fait une combinaison et qu'il faut les combattre. Le mode de les combattre, M. l'Orateur, ce serait de permettre la compétition. Ce serait d'empêcher, d'enlever les droits énormes en faveur des manufacturiers au moyen desquels ils forcent la classe pauvre et la classe agricole d'acheter chez eux et au prix qu'ils demandent.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, cette question de la protection n'est pas aussi nouvelle qu'on veut le faire croire. Du moins, les honorables députés de l'autre côté de la Chambre n'ont pas toujours été de cette opinion. Il n'y a pas bien longtemps qu'ils sont pour la protection. Ils leur fallait un mot d'ordre pour capter la confiance populaire, et, en 1878, ils ont inventé ce mot qui a eu le résultat que l'on sait dans cette Chambre.

Il a été lu de nombreux documents dans cette Chambre depuis le commencement de ce débat, et surtout hier au soir par l'honorable député de Pictou (M. Tupper), dans son discours où il y avait beaucoup de fleurs mais bien peu de fruits. On a fait beaucoup de citations pour tâcher de mettre en contradiction les opinions des chefs de ce côté-ci de la Chambre; pour montrer que nous étions inconséquents, pour montrer que le parti libéral n'avait jamais eu de programme établi et qu'aujourd'hui on prenait ce mot parce qu'il faisait notre affaire.

M. l'Orateur, c'est une arme à deux tranchants que de rappeler le passé! C'est une arme à deux tranchants que de venir accuser d'inconséquence les honorables députés de ce côté-ci de cette Chambre; de les accuser d'avoir des idées contraires à celles de dix ans passés.

Mais est-ce que les honorables messieurs de l'autre côté qui ont eu, eux aussi, des chefs qu'ils ont respectés et avec beaucoup de raison,—car les chefs dans le passé étaient aussi honorables et aussi distingués que ceux d'aujourd'hui,—est-ce que ces chefs-là n'ont pas aussi changé d'opinion? Est-ce qu'ils n'ont pas donné une opinion contraire à leur opinion dans le temps? Est-ce qu'ils n'ont pas dit, il n'y a pas plus que dix-huit ou vingt ans, que d'adopter la protection ce serait mettre dans le pays le taillant de la hache qui détruirait nos industries nationales? Est-ce que sir George Cartier, en 1871, n'a pas dit cette chose-là après avoir été obligé de voter contre des taxes qu'il avait imposées en 1870 sur le lard, les patates, le charbon, le blé et d'autres produits. Qu'est-ce que disait le Grand Manitou conservateur à cette époque? En janvier 1871, un grand banquet était donné à Québec à ce chef distingué. On lui demandait d'établir un programme politique parce qu'il devait y avoir des élections quelques années après, peut-être dans un

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

temps très rapproché. Le chef s'est exécuté de bonne grâce. Il a fait un discours remarquable; remarquable surtout parce qu'il contredit carrément cette politique de protection que l'on vante tant aujourd'hui, cette politique que l'on maintient toujours pour ainsi dire sous de faux prétextes. Ce grand chef conservateur disait ceci,—et je regrette que la majorité de l'autre côté de la Chambre ne puissent pas comprendre le français, je regrette que ceux qui nous font un reproche d'avoir changé d'opinion ne puissent apprécier le langage de l'ancien chef conservateur. Voici ce que disait sir George Etienne Cartier en 1871, à Québec, dans une ville essentiellement libérale, dont l'un des quartiers a l'honneur d'avoir pour son représentant en cette Chambre notre chef si distingué, celui qui saura toujours, nous l'espérons, prendre les intérêts de la classe agricole, de la classe pauvre, de la classe des consommateurs.

Sir George Cartier disait alors :

Les industriels demandent des droits protecteurs. Cela est absurde avec la protection poussée trop loin, vous tuez votre commerce extérieur comme cela est arrivé aux Américains, et il nous faut avoir recours aux taxes directes. Nous ne ferons pas une telle folie. Nous avons adopté la politique d'imposer un droit fiscal, et non un droit protecteur On demande un tarif protecteur. Mais lorsque vous protégez les manufactures, vous limitez la vente de vos produits à vos nationaux. Si les Etats-Unis n'exportent pas davantage, c'est que la protection élève trop le prix des effets.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, voilà sir George Cartier qui disait à Québec : adopter la protection ce serait une folie, c'est absurde, il est impossible d'y songer. Et cependant, lorsque cet homme a disparu, lorsque ceux qui prétendent le représenter et continuer son œuvre, lorsque ceux qui veulent le suivre et marcher sur ces traces, viennent dire tout le contraire, je ne dirai pas que c'est une folie, je ne dirai pas que c'est une absurdité, car je les crois sincères, je crois qu'ils veulent réellement l'intérêt du pays, mais si c'était une folie en 1871, cela ne peut pas être bon aujourd'hui. Les temps ne changent pas si vite. Avec les siècles les choses peuvent changer, mais ce n'est pas en dix ans qu'une folie peut devenir une chose raisonnable.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, je dis donc que ces honorables messieurs ont grand tort de parler d'inconséquence. Jamais nos chefs n'ont été inconséquents à ce point. Ils ont pu changer d'opinion; tout le monde est libre de changer d'opinion. Tout le monde sait que le temps, les circonstances, les besoins du pays peuvent modifier la manière de voir sur la politique fiscale du pays, surtout dans un jeune pays comme le nôtre. Mais il n'appartient pas aux honorables membres de l'autre côté de la Chambre de nous taxer d'inconséquence sur ce point.

M. l'Orateur, la protection, suivant moi et suivant le grand chef conservateur est une mauvaise chose, et il doit y avoir un autre système financier qui soit une bonne chose; il doit y avoir un autre système pour administrer les affaires du pays et le rendre prospère. Ce système, c'est celui de la réciprocité. Et ce système, M. l'Orateur, n'est pas nouveau non plus. Sur ce point, les honorables messieurs de l'autre côté de la Chambre se contredisent dans leurs discours, dans leurs écrits et même dans l'amendement maintenant soumis à cette Chambre.

Mais voyons si la réciprocité est une bonne chose. Et si c'était une bonne chose lorsque le peuple était jeune, lorsque notre population n'était pas considérable, lorsque nos ressources étaient minimes, pourquoi ne serait-elle pas bonne aujourd'hui? Pourquoi ne l'adopterions-nous pas aujourd'hui lorsque nous voyons par les documents publics et par l'histoire qu'elle a été avouée par tous les chefs conservateurs? Est-ce que ce serait parce que c'est le parti libéral qui la propose qu'elle est mauvaise? Je dis, M. l'Orateur, qu'un député qui voterait sur une question aussi importante par esprit de parti serait indigne de la position qu'il occupe. Et lorsque je viens ici combattre la politique du gouvernement je ne le fais pas par esprit de parti. Le peuple, leur a donné le pouvoir et nous nous y soumettons volontiers. Nous les

aiderons lorsque nous pourrons les aider ; mais lorsque leur politique sera mauvaise nous les combattrons comme nous le faisons aujourd'hui. En 1847, il a été question du traité de réciprocité sous le gouvernement Sherwood-Daly dont faisait partie l'honorable premier ministre d'aujourd'hui, comme receveur général. Et à la page 24 de Turcotte, un écrivain conservateur, voici ce que l'on trouve au sujet de la réciprocité :

La province allait entrer en concurrence avec les peuples plus riches et plus avancés qu'elle, mais, pour lutter avec avantage il fallait lever tous les obstacles qui pouvaient entraver son commerce et accorder l'entrée libre dans les ports canadiens à tous les bateaux étrangers.

Ainsi, en 1847, sous un gouvernement conservateur dont l'honorable premier ministre d'aujourd'hui était un des membres, on disait que le seul moyen d'avancer le pays et de le rendre grand et prospère, c'était d'ouvrir ses portes à deux battants au commerce des Etats-Unis, et d'ouvrir ses ports à tous les vaisseaux étrangers.

En 1854, sous un gouvernement conservateur encore, on trouve ce qui suit à la page 251, de Turcotte :

Le commerce prit une nouvelle extension que la réciprocité commerciale avec les Etats-Unis allait encore augmenter. Déjà, en 1854, le commerce de va et vient atteignait le chiffre d'environ \$50,000,000.

Par conséquent, M. l'Orateur, en 1857, on avocassait la réciprocité ; en 1854, on la demandait, et en 1865, lorsqu'il a été question du ministère de coalition de Taché-Macdonald et Brown on faisait un article spécial du programme pour engager les provinces à adopter le système de la Confédération, d'avoir un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. Et un des motifs qui a milité en faveur de la Confédération a été que les provinces réunies pourraient avoir un commerce plus étendu.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, si en unissant les provinces on trouvait que le commerce serait meilleur ; si en unissant les provinces ensemble on faisait disparaître la barrière qui retardait le progrès du pays, en faisant disparaître la barrière commerciale qui existe aujourd'hui entre le Canada et les Etats-Unis, nous arriverions au même résultat.

Mais il y a plus que cela, M. l'Orateur. Sous le gouvernement McNab-Morin, dont j'ai parlé il y a un instant, et duquel faisait partie l'honorable premier ministre actuel, on a constaté alors que le commerce était dans un état alarmant ; que l'émigration était considérable ; que le pays allait plutôt à reculons que de l'avant. On a alors formé un comité spécial sur l'émigration, lequel je trouve dans le *Canadian Pamphlets*, N° 25. Ce comité nommé par le gouvernement conservateur, était composé de députés conservateurs. Voici les raisons que l'on donnait pour la formation de ce comité. A la page 2 du rapport de ce comité il est dit ceci :

Quand une ancienne nation, par la surabondance de sa population comparée à l'étendue et aux limites de son territoire, se trouve trop à l'étroit et gênée sur le sol natal, l'émigration qui se fait d'une partie de sa population est une cause de bien-être, un bienfait non-seulement pour elle-même, mais encore pour les pays nouveaux où elle se dirige, et pour l'humanité. Mais quand un peuple, jeune encore, peu nombreux, sobre et courageux, habite un vaste territoire dont la superficie comme la fertilité du sol sont suffisantes pour contenir librement et alimenter abondamment une population cinquante fois plus nombreuse, alors son émigration est un vrai malheur, une vraie calamité publique. Une telle émigration, n'ayant pas de raison d'être dans des causes légitimes, ne peut donc qu'être le résultat, la conséquence de quelque vice radical que la société doit se hâter de découvrir afin de ne prendre aucun temps dans l'application des remèdes que commande une telle situation.

Voilà les raisons que l'on donnait pour la formation de ce comité spécial, composé de conservateurs. C'est qu'il y avait dans le pays un vice radical qui empêchait l'extension du commerce d'une manière aussi complète que le permettaient nos ressources, notre population, la fertilité du sol, c'est-à-dire, de nos mines et de nos forêts.

Et ce même comité, à la page 10 de son rapport, disait :

L'opinion de la plupart des hommes politiques du jour semble être tellement en faveur du libre échange que toute manifestation contraire pourrait paraître injustifiable et opposée à la prospérité du pays.

Ainsi en 1854 des députés conservateurs réunis en comité de cette Chambre disaient que l'opinion publique était tellement en faveur du libre-échange, que ce serait une absurdité, et même que ce serait passer pour traître à son pays que de proposer une autre politique. Le pays était jeune, la population n'était pas très considérable, et cependant, dans ce temps-là, tout le monde voulait du libre-échange et de la réciprocité. C'est donc parce que cela avait quelque chose de bon ; parce qu'on prévoyait que le pays ne pouvait grandir qu'à l'ombre de ce drapeau.

A la page 11 du rapport de ce comité, on trouve encore ceci :

Votre comité croit donc qu'il est de la plus haute importance, pour la prospérité du pays, que la réciprocité dans les droits comme dans le libre-échange devrait exister entre cette province et les Etats-Unis ; qu'avant il devrait être imposé sur chaque article importé des Etats-Unis les droits qui sont imposés sur les articles de même nature exportés d'aucune partie du Canada ;—que notre tarif soit modifié de manière à assurer au manufacturier cette protection légitime qu'il a reçue et qu'il reçoit encore dans d'autres pays où sa position est à peu près la même que celle qu'il occupe aujourd'hui dans le nôtre.

Le comité recommandait donc en 1854 le libre-échange complet avec les Etats-Unis. Mais il concluait, naturellement avec beaucoup de raison : si vous ne voulez pas donner la réciprocité, tâchez de faire quelque chose pour les manufactures, et pour empêcher l'émigration. Cependant on remarquera qu'il demandait en premier lieu, non pas la protection, mais la réciprocité complète.

Or, M. l'Orateur, l'expérience est une leçon. Si le passé peut être de quelque utilité pour juger l'avenir, il me semble que ceux qui depuis 1847 à 1878 ont proclamé la nécessité absolue d'un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis, ont par là déclaré que la protection est une folie.

Je dis donc que nous sommes placés à un même point de vue, et même à un meilleur point de vue qu'eux, puisque notre pays est plus grand, nos ressources plus considérables, et que si cette politique de réciprocité devait être adoptée alors, je ne vois pas pourquoi aujourd'hui nous ne l'adoptons pas.

Une autre preuve que la réciprocité est une bonne chose, et la raison que je vais en donner se trouve dans le rapport du même comité, qui dit qu'une des causes pour lesquelles le pays ne progressait pas, et la colonisation ne faisait pas de progrès, c'est qu'il y avait de grands propriétaires qui accaparaient les terres publiques pour les revendre à des prix exorbitants ; ou qui, après les avoir laissés exploiter par des colons de bonne foi, s'en emparaient ensuite. Et à cela, ils attribuaient la cause de l'émigration. En effet, à la page 6, ils disent :

2° L'une des principales causes de l'émigration résulte de la concession de vastes étendues de terres qui ont été faites autrefois à un seul individu ou à des compagnies.

L'histoire se répète. Autrefois c'était les grands propriétaires qui tenaient les petits propriétaires sous leur talon, et aujourd'hui ce sont les grands manufacturiers qui tiennent la population, les classes agricoles, les consommateurs sous leurs pieds.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, une autre raison que l'on donne encore à l'encontre de la proposition qui est devant la Chambre, c'est que si cette politique était adoptée, on arriverait infailliblement à l'annexion. Personne ne s'est prononcé pour l'annexion dans cette Chambre, bien qu'un grand nombre de députés—et moi-même pour un,—ne trouvent pas que l'annexion soit un épouvantail. Nous sommes bien comme nous sommes, nous devons y rester, et je ne vois pas pourquoi nous changerions notre allégeance. Mais, si pour une raison ou pour une autre, la constitution venait à changer, je ne vois pas pourquoi on ne pourrait pas y remédier. Le pays est prospère, nous sommes contents. Mais je dis que cette question n'est pas en jeu et ne peut pas être un épouvantail. Et les observations qui ont été faites par l'honorable député de Perth-Nord (M. Hesson) : Que les Canadiens qui sont aux Etats-Unis ne sont bons

qu'à faire des scieurs de bois ou des porteurs d'eau,—ne sont ni plus ni moins qu'une injure lancée à la face de nos frères de l'autre côté de la frontière. Car nous savons qu'un grand nombre d'entre eux se sont distingués et occupent les meilleures positions municipales et autres chez nos voisins.

Je présume toutefois que si l'honorable député qui a lancé cette injure à nos compatriotes allait aux Etats-Unis, il ne pourrait être autre chose qu'un porteur d'eau ou un scieur de bois. Et peut-être pourrais-je en dire autant de ses électeurs, car s'ils étaient capables d'être autre chose, ils ne l'auraient pas envoyé ici pour insulter nos compatriotes comme il l'a fait. Par conséquent, M. l'Orateur, il n'est pas question de l'annexion. Il est question seulement,—et c'est la seule proposition devant la Chambre,—de modifier le tarif; de faire un traité de réciprocité qui soit de nature à favoriser nos intérêts et faire prospérer notre pays; qui soit de nature à assurer plus de protection, non aux manufacturiers, mais à la classe agricole, à la classe pauvre; et je dis que toutes ces considérations que l'on donne contre la motion de l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir R. Cartwright) sont des contradictions, car enfin, dans l'amendement, on dit que l'on veut la réciprocité. On l'a dit même dans la proposition qui a été faite lors du traité des pêcheries. Mais, M. l'Orateur, si nous avons besoin de réciprocité pour les pêcheries, lorsque nous sommes plus prospères que les Etats-Unis; lorsque notre commerce de pêcheries est plus considérable et plus prospère que celui des Etats-Unis, je prends le traité des pêcheries comme une autre preuve à l'appui de la proposition que nous faisons, et pour dire que vous feriez bien d'adopter cette politique-là.

M. l'Orateur, on demande d'abolir la barrière qui empêche l'échange de nos pêcheries, et cependant je trouve, dans une brochure écrite par l'honorable député de Gaspé (M. Joncas), qui a secondé l'adresse en réponse au discours du trône,—que nos pêcheurs gagnent \$42.00 de plus par année, par tête, que les pêcheurs anglais, et \$13.00 de plus que les pêcheurs des Etats-Unis.

Or si nous sommes si prospères, et que nous voulons avoir un traité de réciprocité, c'est donc parce que l'on sent que notre prospérité et notre commerce s'agrandiront, que nous ferons encore plus d'affaires; que notre population sera plus à l'aise avec la réciprocité sur la question des pêcheries. Et pourquoi alors, sur les produits agricoles, sur tout ce qui se vend ou s'achète n'aurions-nous pas les mêmes avantages?

Par conséquent, je dis donc qu'en discutant cette question au point de vue politique, les honorables députés de la droite ont admis dans le passé, et admettent aujourd'hui que la proposition qui est devant la Chambre n'est ni plus ni moins que l'adoption de la proposition faite par l'honorable ministre des finances à la conférence de Washington. Et je dis que le fait de voter contre cette proposition équivaut à un vote de non-confiance dans l'honorable ministre des finances.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, une autre raison que l'on donne encore à l'appui des prétentions émises de l'autre côté de la Chambre, c'est que nos revenus diminueront. J'admets que c'est le cas. J'admets que nous perdrons peut-être six à sept millions de revenus. Mais si nos revenus diminuent, c'est parce que les taxes diminueront; c'est parce que le consommateur aura moins à payer. Si le trésor public perd sept millions, c'est donc sept millions de moins qui seront versés par ceux qui achètent dans le pays.

De plus, on dit qu'il faudra avoir des taxes directes ou d'autres moyens de remédier à cet état de chose. Il n'y aura pas besoin de taxe directe; mais on fera ce que l'honorable premier ministre disait lorsqu'il était dans l'opposition: on diminuera les dépenses. Je me rappelle que l'ancien ministre des finances, sir Leonard Tilley, disait que nous ne devrions pas dépenser plus que \$22,500,000 ou \$23,000,000; et que lui, lorsqu'il serait ministre des finances il ne dépenserait pas plus que cela. Et il ajoutait que l'honorable

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright,) était un extravagant, un homme qui dépensait trop.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, en admettant que nos revenus diminueraient de \$7,000,000, on nous demande \$35,000,000 cette année, et si les honorables ministres peuvent administrer avec \$22,000,000 ou \$23,000,000, il me semble qu'ils pourraient administrer les affaires du pays avec \$28,000,000.

M. l'Orateur, je n'ai pas l'intention de retenir la Chambre plus longtemps, et je terminerai les quelques remarques que je viens de faire en disant, pour ce qui me concerne, que cette question a été discutée dans mon comté; elle a été posée aux électeurs et la victoire a été en faveur de la réciprocité. Par conséquent, je n'hésite pas à me prononcer immédiatement, et de dire que si j'étais appelé à recommencer la lutte dans le comté, ce ne serait pas par deux cents voix que je serais élu, mais par quatre ou cinq cents.

Je dis de plus, M. l'Orateur, que le traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis a été avoué de tout temps; lorsque nous étions dans une position bien inférieure que celle que nous occupons aujourd'hui; et, s'il a été trouvé bon dans le temps, il doit l'être encore aujourd'hui.

Lorsque je me lève dans cette Chambre pour appuyer la proposition qui nous est maintenant soumise, je ne le fais pas par esprit de parti. Je ne veux décrier ni ma province ni mon comté, et j'appuie cette proposition parce que je la crois dans l'intérêt de mon pays, de la classe agricole et des consommateurs. Je suis un des plus jeunes dans cette Chambre, mais j'aime mon pays. Je suis loyal à la Reine, comme n'importe qui. Je ne veux pas que l'on m'applique ces paroles du poète:

“Ceux qui jeunes encore sont froids pour leur pays,
Quand ils deviendront vieux seront ses ennemis.”

Voilà pourquoi, M. l'Orateur, je travaille pour son avancement et pour sa prospérité. Et quand je ne serai plus je veux que l'on dise de moi: que je l'ai aimé jeune, adoré vieux.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I shall not attempt to reply to the admirable speech which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. So far as I am concerned, at all events, the speech of the hon. gentleman is perfectly unanswerable. But I shall ask for the indulgence of the House while I offer a few observations on the very important matter which is now under consideration. The discussion which has now taken place upon this question differs in one important respect, at least, from the discussions to which we have been accustomed to listen to in other sessions. I have heard every session, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, the condition of this country described by hon. gentlemen opposite in very much the same language and the same way that they have described it on this occasion. I have heard the poverty of the country referred to; I have heard it also alleged that the burden of taxation was so great that the people of this country were obliged to leave it and find homes for themselves in the United States. On former occasions, however, hon. gentlemen opposite suggested no remedy for this state of things. They informed us that while a Conservative Government was in power in this country, it was impossible for Canada to make progress or prosper, but they never told us how a change of government would afford any relief. They never told us what policy they would adopt if they were entrusted with the reins of power, which would bring about a better condition of affairs in this country. It is in this respect that this discussion offers a striking contrast to the discussion to which I have referred. They have discovered now that it is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States that we require; they have discovered that if this policy should be adopted in this country, it would remove every cause of complaint, and, I presume, satisfy the wants and aspirations of us all. I feel that it is to be regretted, at least for the credit of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this particular remedy was dis-

covered at some time when they could have fairly claimed to have been the originators of this movement. It is a matter of surprise, to many of us at least, who sit on this side of the House, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution, did not discover at some former time that this was the real and only remedy for the evils under which we labor, considering the very close investigation which he is every year accustomed to give the financial condition of this country. It is a matter of surprise, too, that this has never been the result of the philosophical searches of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is a matter of still greater surprise that the hon. gentleman who, at the present time, leads the party opposite in this House, not very long ago, I believe, should have doubts as to the advisability of adopting this policy; it is a matter of surprise that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) not very long ago should have felt a preference for commercial union rather than unrestricted reciprocity, and that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies,) when addressing his constituents in Charlottetown, should have pronounced unrestricted reciprocity—a scheme which, if it is not entirely analogous, is, at least, very nearly akin to the scheme which is now under consideration—as wholly impracticable. In some manner or by some process, which is unknown to us on this side of the House, these hon. gentlemen, apparently, since this session commenced, have harmonised their views upon this subject. It is a mystery to those of us who are on this side of the House how this has been accomplished; and I assume that it will remain a mystery unless one hon. gentleman who is in the secrets of the party shall hereafter enlighten the country, and make himself famous by writing the history of the rise, and progress, and collapse of this extraordinary movement.

An hon. MEMBER. Especially the collapse.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Especially the collapse. To give honor to whom honor is due, I assume we may fairly attribute the origin of this movement to Mr. Erastus Wiman, the advocate of commercial union. Mr. Wiman, as we all know, is a gentleman of very distinguished abilities. If I am correctly informed, he was a native of Canada, but for some years back has taken up his residence in the United States. He has evidently formed the opinions he now entertains in regard to the conditions and wants of his native country as the result of the ideas which he has imbibed and the influences by which he has been surrounded in the land of his adoption. Mr. Wiman has more advanced views on this question than hon. gentlemen opposite. He advocates a scheme of commercial union. He not only desires free trade, but he desires that all Customs restrictions should be removed, and that a uniform tariff should be adopted and the gross Customs receipts should be divided between the two countries on the basis of population or on some other basis that may be agreed upon. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to go that far. They draw the line at unrestricted reciprocity; and, while they desire free trade, they desire that each country shall have the privilege of regulating its own tariff as it chooses. It is not difficult, of course, to account for this difference in the opinions of Mr. Wiman and hon. gentlemen opposite, for these gentlemen have not enjoyed the same advantages as Mr. Wiman has; they have not lived in New York, they have not been surrounded by the influences by which he has been surrounded, and they have not had the same opportunity of having their minds enlightened and their views enlarged that he has had. I had some expectation, and I think the country would have expected, that these gentlemen would have pointed out some reason why we should prefer unrestricted reciprocity to commercial union. For my own part, I have been unable

to discover what advantages we, as Canadians, would have under unrestricted reciprocity that we would not have under commercial union. I can see many disadvantages to Canada under either system. In the first place, as has been pointed out already, the effect upon our revenue would be very serious indeed. The direct loss, as has been stated, would amount to upwards of seven millions of dollars. The direct loss would be even greater than this, and it is impossible accurately to estimate it, because we cannot form a correct estimate of the extent to which our foreign imports would be reduced if this policy were adopted. One thing, however, I think, must be evident to any person who takes even a superficial view of this question, and that is that Canada would be in a better position under commercial union than she would be under unrestricted reciprocity, at all events as far as revenue is concerned; for we must all admit that, if a fair tariff were maintained and we had a fair division of the revenues of the two countries, we would have a larger amount of money to provide for carrying on the government of the country and to provide for our governmental expenses than we would have under any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity. Then, there is the disastrous effect of this policy upon our manufacturing industries, which has been already referred to. I shall not dwell at any length upon that branch of the subject. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that it will injure our manufacturing industries, but they make this admission in the mildest manner possible. They tell us that it may be expected that some of the manufacturing industries of this country may be injuriously affected if this policy is adopted. Why, Mr. Speaker, our manufactures would not simply be injured; they would be practically annihilated; for everyone knows that the manufacturers of the United States, with their enormous wealth, with the capital they have at their command, with their long experience, with the skill they have acquired, with the great influence—almost amounting to control—which they are enabled to exercise, not only in the markets at home but in the markets abroad, and even, to some extent, over the means of transportation, places them to-day in such a position that they can bid defiance to any competition that the manufacturers of this country could possibly offer them. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the course of his remarks, used a most extraordinary argument in connection with this branch of the subject. The argument was very ingenious, but it was equally fallacious. That hon. gentleman referred to the growth of manufactures in the United States and he made a comparison between the growth of the manufactures in some of the newer States and in some of the older States. He instanced Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and California on the one hand, and Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania on the other hand, and as the result of that comparison he says:

"Taking the old manufacturing States which produce more than one-half the goods produced in the whole Union, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, I find that the increase during the same period was \$315,000,000, or about \$50,000,000 less than in the eight new States I have mentioned, and that the ratio of increase was 21.6 per cent, against 64 per cent. in the new States. This is a striking result, and it demonstrates that the ratio of increase in manufacturing is more than as rapid again in those new States, and the newer they are the more rapid the increase; the most rapid increase was in Minnesota, 228 per cent., the increase in Illinois was over 100 per cent., and in California over 74 per cent."

He goes on further and refers to several cities in the western States, Buffalo, Detroit, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and several others, and goes on to say:

"Statistics show that the ratio of increase is many times more rapid in these cities of the west than it is in the older cities of the east. In view of these facts, I think that we are needlessly alarmed, that there is no ground for the alarm that exists in the minds of some men, that the manufacturers of the Dominion are not capable of competing with those old manufacturing centres in the eastern States. The results in the western States give the lie to such assertion. We may disabuse our minds of any fears as to our abilities to compete with those centres and

to successfully maintain and sustain our manufacturing interests. The fact of it is, Mr. Speaker, that our manufacturers, as well as our lumbermen, our farmers, our fishermen and mine owners, need the blessings of continental free trade."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that argument proves anything it proves this, that it is no disadvantage to a new country to have free trade with a country where older manufacturing industries are established, and, if that argument is sound, if there is no disadvantage for the newer cities and States to have free trade with the older manufacturing States of the Union, it would have been no disadvantage to them to have free trade with Great Britain and free trade with the world. If the principle the hon. gentleman lays down there is sound, the United States have not built up their manufacturing interests by the policy of protection which was adopted in that country, because those interests would have grown as rapidly, if not more rapidly, if they had maintained from the first a policy of free trade with Great Britain and the world. That is simply an argument in favor of free trade, and I cannot better answer the argument of the hon. gentleman than by using the language which he used in this House in 1876. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said:—

"It may be safely assumed that no country has attained to greatness in manufactures without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has notably been the case with Great Britain herself, and I think the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of the nation, is incontrovertible. We have had an illustration of this in the United States. * * * The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their industries have been fostered and promoted until in 1870 their products reached 4,253 million dollars, giving employment to 2 million operatives, and disbursing over 775 million dollars."

The opinions which the hon. gentleman held in 1875 were sound. I can congratulate him upon the soundness of those opinions, but I cannot so heartily congratulate him upon his change of opinion since. But since the hon. gentleman has lost confidence in his former opinions, I could refer him to the opinions of another hon. gentleman, the very able leader of the party on that side of the House, in whose opinions he should, at all events, have a great degree of confidence. I would refer him to the celebrated Malvern speech, which has already been referred to in this debate. The leader of the Opposition, on that occasion, acknowledged that the protective policy which had been adopted in Canada, had resulted in bringing into existence new manufacturing industries. He admitted that these industries owed their continued existence to the continuance of that policy, and, as the leader of the party, he gave his pledge, and that pledge was not only for himself but for the party which he led, that the manufacturers, at all events, had nothing to fear from that party, that if they were entrusted with the control of the government of this country, no radical change would take place in our fiscal policy; in any reductions which they made in the tariff, they would have a due regard for the manufacturing interests of this country. It appears that the hon. gentleman has not only lost confidence in his opinions, but both he and all the gentlemen with whom he is associated on that side of the House, have lost all respect for the solemn pledges of their leader made a little more than a year ago; for every person knows that if this policy were adopted, the manufacturers which owe their very existence, in this country, to the adoption of a protective policy, would be utterly destroyed, for they can only be continued in existence by maintaining a protective policy against the United States as well as against the world. Now, Sir, this policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States will not only be disastrous to our manufacturing industries, it will be equally disastrous to the trade of this country. This has already been referred to—indeed, every branch of this subject has been discussed at so great length that it is needless to dwell much upon it now. I wish to confine my remarks, on this branch of the subject, almost

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland.)

exclusively to the foreign trade of this country. One of the objects of the National Policy has been to extend and develop our foreign trade, and that has been done to a large extent. It is specially exemplified in the sugar trade. In 1878, as we all know, we imported but 6 per cent. of the sugar consumed in this country from the country of growth and production. In 1887 this condition of things was entirely changed, for we now import upwards of 90 per cent. of the sugar consumed in this country, direct from the country of growth and production. And when we recollect that the consumption of sugar in this country last year amounted upwards of 230 million pounds, the importance of this trade will be apparent to every one. Then take another leading article of commerce, the article of tea. Before the introduction of the National Policy, we purchased our tea largely in the United States, and last year we imported into Canada direct from China and Japan, and other tea producing countries, upwards of eleven million pounds, and from the United States only half a million pounds. Now, I cannot conceive it possible that under any system of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union that discriminating duty of 10 per cent. could be maintained; and if it is not maintained, we hand back the tea trade of this country largely to the wholesale importing houses of New York and Boston. Then, in 1837, we imported of woollen manufactured goods from Great Britain upwards of eleven million dollars worth, and of cotton manufactured goods, upwards of four and a half millions. If unrestricted reciprocity were adopted, this trade would nearly all, if not entirely, be transferred to the United States. Indeed, Sir, without enumerating further, we may say that our entire foreign trade would be gone. When we consider the value of this trade, when we consider the important influence it has in building up our maritime cities, in furnishing traffic for our railways, in furnishing employment for both capital and labor in this country, we can form some conception of the enormous losses which would be incurred if this policy were adopted. For my own part, I can see no advantages sufficient to compensate us for this enormous loss. Hon. gentlemen have endeavored to support their position in various ways. They have referred to our geographical position, to the proximity of the United States, to the large population of 60,000,000, and to their enormous trade. But this point does not really touch the question. The real question under consideration now is whether these 60,000,000 of people are our customers, or our competitors. With regard to our geographical position, that branch of the subject has been so ably dealt with, and the arguments so fully and so successfully met by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it is not necessary to refer to it further. It has been said that we need the United States as a market for our agricultural products, that the United States is the natural market for the products of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a position which hon. gentlemen cannot successfully maintain. Why, the United States are, and have been for years, the competitors of the Canadian farmer in very many leading classes of agricultural products in our own Canadian market. In beef, pork, in wheat, rye, peas and beans, in live stock, butter, lard and cheese, they are the competitors of the Canadian farmers to-day in the markets of Great Britain and in every other foreign market to which these exports are shipped. With regard to other classes of agricultural products to which reference has been made, horses, barley, hay, sheep and wool, the imports at the present time are utterly insignificant, and, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, the imports are so small that they do not affect, to any appreciable extent, the value of these articles in the markets of the United States. That reciprocal trade with the United States in farm products would be an advantage, no one can deny; but this is due to this cause, that agricultural pro-

ducts especially are affected by local and exceptional causes. A drought in any particular year may enhance the value of particular classes of agricultural produce; the failure of a crop may have the same effect; the movement of population, the growth of cities, the establishment of new mining or manufacturing industries may, for any particular period of time and in certain localities, give enhanced value to agricultural produce; and to that extent, and to that extent alone, it would be advantageous to the farmers of Canada to have free access to the markets of the United States. But it is contrary to every principle that governs trade and commerce, to assume that while the United States are exporting every year, and exporting every year in larger quantities, almost every class of agricultural produce, they can offer to the farmers of Canada a certain permanent or profitable market, while everything we sell must simply go to swell the volume of their exports to foreign countries. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has referred to our mineral wealth. He told us that if the barriers of trade were thrown down American capitalists would come into this country, that our iron and copper mines would be developed, that new lines of railway would be built, and in a short time we would become large exporters of iron and copper ore to the United States. I doubt very much the conclusions at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. I do not for one believe that the results he anticipates would follow if his policy were adopted. But, even supposing for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman is right in this anticipation, if he pretends to assert that it is in that way that the mineral wealth of this country can be developed to the greatest advantage of the people, I take direct issue with him on that point. I claim that the mineral wealth of this country should be used for the benefit of the people of this country, that by a moderate protectionate tariff we should offer every inducement to foreign capitalists to come here and establish new manufacturing industries, to furnish employment for our own people and enlarge the home market for our farmers, and we all know the home market is the most profitable market they can have. This, Sir, is the policy which the present Government have adopted in the past. It has been successful so far, and it promises to be far more successful in the future than it has been in the past. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the growth of trade during the existence of the old Reciprocity Treaty, which extended from 1854 to 1866. Now, it must be apparent to every one that that can in no way be taken as an index of the probable results of reciprocity at the present time. It must be remembered that that was an exceptional period in the history of the country. It must be remembered that during the existence of that treaty the people of the United States were for five years engaged in civil war, that during that time upwards of two millions of their people were taken away from agricultural and industrial processes and forced to do duty on the field of battle, that the ordinary business of the country was neglected and the regular growth and development of the country was arrested. It must be remembered, too, that the values of all commodities were unduly inflated, that especially the prices of the exports from Canada to the United States were enormously enhanced, and the large profits which the people of this country gained by having free trade with the United States during that period could not be realised again except under similar circumstances. To-day, the condition of things is entirely changed. During that period the United States were importers of coal. In 1865 they purchased from Nova Scotia some half-million tons of coal. Last year, such has been the development of the coal mining interests of the United States, that they not only supplied their own wants, but exported to the Province of Ontario alone 1,130,000 tons of coal, and that in the face of the duty of 50 cents per ton. If that duty were removed to-day, if we had free trade in full with the United States to-day, it would be a dis-

advantage instead of being an advantage to the people of Canada, for the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia would find that coal from Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and Illinois not only had full possession of the eastern markets of the United States, but they would find, I fear, that they, the Nova Scotians, would be kept out of the markets of Ontario and Quebec. Then the development of the agricultural resources of the United States has been wonderful since the close of the war. Since that time in the United States the people have built long lines of railway connecting the east with the west; they have carried into the rich agricultural districts of the west hundreds and thousands of settlers, they have placed in their hands the best and most improved agricultural implements and machinery, they have furnished them with easy, speedy and rapid communication between the agricultural districts in the west and the centres of population in the east and the seaports on the Atlantic coast. The development of their agricultural resources has been far more rapid than the demand of the home market warrants, and the exports of the country are every year increasing. In Canada, too, the condition of things has entirely changed. We, too, have built long lines of railway. We have deepened our canals, improved our water communication and to-day we have communication between the different sections of this Dominion which is not excelled, even if it can be equalled in any country in the world. We have, too, opened for ourselves new markets, we have established new means of communication with those markets, and if we continue to go on in the direction in which we are going, the time is not far distant when the people of Canada will have easy access to all the markets of the world where our products can be sold, or where any demand for them exists. Under these circumstances, while we are not as dependent upon the United States for the sale of our products as we formerly were, while reciprocal trade with the United States may be very desirable, it is no longer necessary to our progress and prosperity. I am not opposed to reciprocal trade. I should be very glad if our commercial relations with the United States were very much extended, I should be very glad if many of the restrictions which now exist were removed, I should be very glad if we could have free access to their markets for the products of our farms, of our fisheries, of our mines and of our forests, I should be very glad too if we could have the advantage of the coasting trade, and I believe, the Government of the country would be fully justified in making any reasonable concessions to obtain those advantages. But while I am in favor of a reciprocal treaty or a treaty for reciprocal trade, which is fair in its terms, which can be honorably obtained, which is mutually advantageous to both countries interested, I for one can never give my consent to a proposition such as that now before the House. It involves the loss of our foreign trade, the destruction of our manufactures, it would practically compel us to purchase almost everything we require in the markets of the United States, and finally it would make us dependent upon them for a market for our products. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the course of his remarks referred to the present position of the finances of the United States. He told us that the Secretary of the Treasury if he had the authority of Congress might provide for the required expenses in three different modes. Each of the modes which the hon. gentleman proposed involved a very large reduction of the tariff and very large additions to the free trade list. Now, I am very much inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman's opinions and I believe that there are good grounds for entertaining those opinions. A measure has been introduced into Congress during its present session, which, together with the remarks of the President of the United States, would indicate that legislation in that direction may be looked for

at no distant date. But, Sir, there is no reasonable man who can contend that if the free trade list is enlarged in the United States it will be enlarged in the direction of the admission of all the natural products of Canada and of everything which under any circumstances we could sell to the people of the United States. If that opinion is well founded no government can be justified in purchasing those advantages at so great a cost as is proposed in this resolution; when the United States will be compelled by force of circumstances and with no concessions on our part to open their markets in the no distant future not only to Canada but to the whole world. Then, Sir, there is another view of this question and a very important one to which I wish to refer, and that is the practicability of the proposition now before the House. Sir, I believe that the hon. gentleman would be obliged to demonstrate far more clearly than he has done in the course of this debate that this proposition is practicable before it will receive a very serious consideration from this House or from the country. I do not believe, Sir, that it can be shown to be practicable, and the history of our trade negotiations with the United States fully justifies this opinion. The treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866 was terminated not by the desire of the Canadian people but as a result of the action of the American Congress, and that action has since apparently met with the full approval of the people of that country. When the Hon. George Brown, in 1874, went to Washington to negotiate a treaty for reciprocal trade, he was prepared to make large concessions, he was prepared to offer much more advantageous terms than they had under the former treaty, and yet his proposal did not receive even respectful consideration. There has been an Act upon our Statute-book since 1879 providing for, and giving the government of this country authority to remove the duties from imports to the United States on the natural products of this country, if reciprocal privileges were granted to Canada. To that invitation for reciprocal trade we have had no response. If we need any further proof to establish this point we have it, Sir, in what took place in the course of the recent negotiations at Washington, when the representatives of Canada and the representatives of Great Britain were given to understand in plain and unmistakable terms that no such treaty could be entertained, and that the representatives of the United States would not even ask for authority to negotiate for a treaty which involved any change in the existing tariff of the United States or which interfered with the power of the Congress of the United States to regulate and alter their tariff at any time they chose. Now, Sir, if we are going to Washington to-morrow to propose a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States the proposition which is now under consideration is the one of all others which would be least likely to find acceptance. This is a proposal to establish free trade between the two countries, not only in products and manufactured goods, but at the same time it proposes that each country should be free to regulate its own tariff as it may choose. Look for one moment at the effect of such an arrangement upon the trade of the United States. Take for instance the effect upon the sugar trade. If under such an arrangement as that, the Parliament of Canada chose to reduce the duties on raw sugar or remove them altogether our refiners could import raw sugar into this country, they could refine it in Canada and they could sell it in the markets of the United States. The only way the people or the Government of the United States could prevent that result would be to reduce the duties on raw sugar until they corresponded with the duties that prevailed in this Dominion. The same principle applies to every class of imports used in our manufacturing industries which can be brought from foreign countries either in their raw or partially manufactured state. But, Sir, to suppose that the people of the United States would place themselves

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland.)

in the position that they might be at any time required to alter or reduce their tariff in consequence of any action which might be taken by the Parliament of this Dominion is to my mind simply preposterous. It is utterly inconsistent with the dignity, and independence, and self respect, of an intelligent, and proud, and prosperous people. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) expressed sound opinions I believe when he addressed his electors in Charlottetown last fall. The same principle precisely applies to the proposition which is now before the House that apply to the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity which he was then considering, even after the explanation which he has already given to us. I do not know, Sir, of any better way to express my view upon this question than to refer again to the language which he admits he used with regard to the proposition there. He then said: "Unrestricted reciprocity is something the people of the United States are not such arrant fools as to accept; it is impracticable." Unrestricted reciprocity, Mr. Speaker, can mean but one of two things. It means either free trade with the world or political annexation with the United States. If adopted it must lead either to one or the other of those two results. It is utter folly to assume that while we remain a portion of the British Empire, we can maintain against Great Britain a discriminating tariff. There would be no advantage whatever in closing our market against British manufacturers if we opened them free to the manufacturers of the United States. There would be no addition to our revenue and there would be no commercial advantage. It would be simply maintaining a discriminating tariff for which we could give no excuse or justification. If we grant this privilege to one, we must in common justice grant it to the other. Free trade with the United States means free trade with Great Britain, and free trade with these two countries means free trade with the world, and free trade with the world means direct taxation. We must, Sir, accept that as the inevitable result of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, or we must accept the other alternative—political union; for it is equally against common reason and common sense to assert that we can maintain an unjust and unnecessary discriminating tariff against Great Britain, and that the people and Government of that country will at the same time entertain the same friendly relations and feelings towards us which exist at the present time. While, Sir, all our interests are closely identified and allied with those of the United States, annexation must follow as an inevitable result; and if the results which were predicted by the hon. member for South Oxford should be realised—if the effect of this policy should be, as he said it would be, to open up Canada as a field for American enterprise—if we are to bring American citizens here, people with American sympathies and with a strong preference for American institutions and the American form of government, it must be evident to any reasonable man that political union with that country can be but for a very short time delayed. Now, Sir, when this scheme comes to be studied and to be thoroughly understood by the people of this country, it will be seen to be not only subversive of the best interests of the people of Canada, but repugnant to their feelings. The people of Canada, Sir, are loyal British subjects. We belong to different races and different creeds, for we have sprung from different nationalities; but whether it is Norman or Anglo-Saxon blood that flows in our veins—whether we are of those who have crossed the Atlantic to find a home in this western world, or whether we are the descendants of those who more than a hundred years ago crossed the border line and laid the foundations of St. John, Toronto and other cities along the American frontier, we have chosen Canada for our home largely because we have a preference for British institutions, because we desire to enjoy the protection of the British flag, and because we are willing for our part at

any rate to maintain a united British Empire. This feeling, I believe, is universal in this country, with but few exceptions. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) not long ago declared himself to be in favor of annexation; but when he made that declaration, he found no sympathy from either political party in the city he represents. Those who supported him, as well as those who opposed him, censured and rebuked him for his conduct. He was even called upon by those who had elected him to resign his seat in this House, because he was told that he did not represent the feelings or the sentiments of his constituency. But, Sir, I have this to say for the hon. gentleman, that his advocacy of annexation is frank, candid, and consistent; and I believe that if a man does believe in annexation, and desires to see it accomplished, it is better for him to go about it in that way than to advocate it under the guise of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been said to be mere sentiment. It has been referred to by several hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate, and some of the leading members of this House have told us that we should regard this question simply from a business standpoint. I for one do not concur in that opinion. It is true, Sir, this sentiment of loyalty is a mere sentiment, but it is a sentiment which has a firm and strong hold on the people of this country, and it is one which will largely influence their decision in the present instance. It is a sentiment, Sir, which has been fully recognised by both political parties in this country, and it is a sentiment to which I believe we have in this case not merely a right, but to which it is our duty to appeal. The National Policy had for one of its objects the fostering and strengthening of a loyal sentiment in this country. That policy has been successful in establishing new industries, in developing our resources, and in extending our trade; but it has done more than this. The National Policy has made the people of this country self-reliant. It has given them a confidence in their own country and in its future growth and greatness. It has led us to appreciate at their true value the vast resources which this country possesses, and it has given us a true appreciation of the powers we possess to provide for their development. This policy, Sir, has been the means of creating a national sentiment in this country, a feeling of national pride; and while it has brought prosperity, it has at the same time attached us more strongly to the land in which we live, and also strengthened the bonds that unite us to the mother country. I am, Sir, but expressing my own personal convictions; but I desire to say that I for one, at least, believe that the veteran leader of the Conservative party in this House owes in a very large degree the popularity which he enjoys and the success which has attended his political career to the fact that in all his acts and utterances and in all his public policy, he has shown himself to be thoroughly and honestly in sympathy with this sentiment which so strongly predominates among all classes in this country. I believe, too, that while those who oppose him in this House have no better policy to offer, while they have no better claim to power, while they have no better proposition to submit for the consideration of this Parliament or this country, than a commercial treaty with a foreign power, which would involve the loss of all we have gained in the last ten years—aye, which asks that we shall yield up that full freedom of self-government, which is our pride and boast as a portion of the British Empire, which asks us to terminate our national existence, which, though young, is full of vigor and vitality, which has been happy and prosperous in the past, and is full of hope and promise in the future—when their policy is one that involves the loss of our very identity as a Canadian people, and our ultimate absorption into the American Republic, in my opinion at least they can have

no hope whatever of gaining the confidence or support of the people of this country.

Mr. BARRON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not move the adjournment of the debate. We have been adjourning rather early the last few nights, and if we really want to bring this debate to an end some day or another, I think we must sit longer. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, will have time to make his speech now, and I hope he will not make his motion.

Mr. JONES. I understood that there was an understanding arrived at between the hon. gentleman who is leading the House and the leader of Opposition that the question was not to go on after half past eleven or the neighborhood of 12 o'clock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not this evening.

Mr. JONES. The hon. leader of the Opposition has left the House under that impression.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. There was no such understanding this evening. There was an understanding last night, which was kept, but this evening there is time for another speech, and I hope the hon. gentleman will go on.

Mr. BARRON. I did not intend to speak to-night, when I rose to my feet, but simply to move the adjournment, in consequence of what I understood to be the understanding between the leader of the Opposition and the Government. The leader of the Opposition certainly gave me to understand that the hon. gentleman who is now acting as leader on the opposite side of the House agreed that after 11.30, the debate would be adjourned, but if the hon. gentleman insists on my going on, of course I must accede to his wishes. But I hope, however, the hour being very late indeed, that the House will be as indulgent with me as possible, because I know how tedious it is to have to listen to speeches on a subject which has been pretty well threshed out. Hitherto the all-important question before the House has been dealt with almost completely from a Dominion or Federal standpoint, except in one or two notable instances: I refer to the singular speech of my hon. friend for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), the other night, in answer to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I did expect that hon. gentleman would have delivered a speech from which we could learn something, but it did seem to me that the hon. gentleman was actuated throughout his speech more by some personal political motive than by any other. I will make another singular exception, and that is the speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who charged against the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. MacDonald) that he was pretty well mixed. But I will leave it to this House to judge as to which of the two was most mixed. I do not propose to deal with the subject before us altogether from a Dominion or Federal standpoint, because I think it is better, from this time forward, at all events on the part of junior members, that they should deal with this all-important question from a local or provincial standpoint as it affects local interests. When I remember that my constituency has, probably more than many constituencies represented in this House, a deep interest in the motion under discussion, I feel it is my bounden duty to rise on this occasion and give my reasons for supporting the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is also another reason why I think it is my duty on this occasion to speak to this motion, even at this late hour, and that is this: Since the last session of this Parliament, I have taken great pains to ascertain the views and wishes of my own people on this great trade question, and I was gratified to find that by giving my vote as I intend to give it, when the time comes,

I shall be thoroughly in accord with the great majority of the people in my own riding. I was not only pleased, but I confess, I was a little alarmed, to find the extent to which the farmers were willing to go, in my riding, to gain access to the American markets. Another reason why I consider it my bounden duty to address the House on this subject is that my own constituency is very much interested in this subject. The people there belong almost exclusively to the great leading interests of farming and lumbering. I want first to draw the attention of this House for a little while to the importance of this subject, so far as the farmers are concerned. I understand the issue before the House to be this, as embodied in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, the greatest good to the greatest number; while that presented by the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is, the greatest good to the fewer number. Now, if we start out with that proposition, and I think it is a true proposition, we should try to ascertain who compose the greater number in this country. I think we can come to no other conclusion, at all events so far as Ontario is concerned, than that the farming population is the greatest in number and in wealth. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I think, stated this afternoon, in his very able speech, that there were some 600,000 farmers in the Dominion. Will the House spare me a little time while I make a comparison between the farmers and all other classes, as regards number and wealth, in the Province of Ontario. In that Province more people are engaged in the farming industry than are engaged in all the other industries put together. The exact figures are these: In 1886, the number of farmers in Ontario was 1,144,520, and the number of people in all other lines of life, 674,506, leaving a majority of near half a million engaged in the farming industries over other industries. I have found on several occasions that the argument has been used, that while it is quite true the farming population in Ontario is numerically very much greater than all the other people put together, yet the wealth of the manufacturing industry has to be considered. Before dealing with that, however, let me say that in the county I have the honor to represent, there are 21,563 farmers or 12,717 more than the entire population engaged in other industries. Now, as to the question of value, I find that in Ontario the value of farm lands, buildings, implements and live stock, foot up to the enormous sum of \$959,499,911, or ten times greater value than the manufacturing industry in that Province. It is only fair that I should say here, because I desire to be accurate, that I have no accurate statistics as to the real value of the manufacturing industries in Ontario, but I find that, in 1881, the values of manufactures throughout the entire Dominion are about \$60,000,000. Taking \$60,000,000 from that, and allowing \$100,000,000 as the value of the manufacturing industries in Ontario, I find that the value of the farming industry is a little more than ten times as great as that of the manufacturing industry, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite bowing down and worshipping their Mammon and forgetting the interests of the most valuable industry in the Dominion, the farming industry. I will refer to another industry in which I am not interested personally, but as a representative of the people, and that is the lumber interest. I have no accurate statistics as to the value of the lumber interests, but I find that we exported up to the 15th June, 1887, for the year prior to that, the immense value of \$9,165,987, upon which, as I will explain in a moment, Sir, my constituents, at all events, pay the enormous amount of over \$500,000. It must be admitted therefore that the removal of the American duty would give an impetus to that trade. When we consider the two great industries, farming and lumbering, I do not see how it is possible for any hon. gentleman to vote against the

Mr. BARRON.

motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, which is calculated to promote these interests, and to vote instead for the amendment which is calculated to help a similar industry—that of the manufacturers. Let me say here, and I will be as rapid as I possibly can, that I intended to speak on this motion, because I do think the interest of the farmer is served by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. Take the case of barley. As has been stated to-night already, we exported last year 9,437,717 bushels, the value of which was \$5,245,000; but I ask hon. gentlemen, did the farmers get that 5½ millions? They did not, because they had to pay in duty, \$943,000.

Mr. RYKERT. Who paid the duty?

Mr. BARRON. That was answered this afternoon out of the mouth of the leader of the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. If the hon. gentleman had been in his seat this afternoon, I think he would not have interrupted me now, because it was shown that the leader of the Government stated in Cobourg, in 1878, when he was trying to deceive the people with his National Policy, that it was the farmer in this country who paid the duty.

Mr. RYKERT. What do you say?

Mr. BARRON. I say he does, and for this reason—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What do you say, Rykert?

Mr. RYKERT. I will tell you by-and-bye.

Mr. BARRON. So I find that the farmer loses on that item \$943,000. Then, take beans. We exported an amount valued at \$206,000 to the United States. The farmer had to pay in duty no less than \$19,000. The value of the export of peas was \$331,349, but the farmer did not get that. He received that less the sum of \$40,000, which he paid in duties. Rye was the same, and wheat the same, and hay the same.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). He got the rye in drinks.

Mr. BARRON. No, the farmer is not so fond of taking drinks as my hon. friend who has just interrupted me. Take the case of horses, and I refer to that, because it shows how foolish it is to attempt to force a trade in any particular direction. Last year we exported to the United States the enormous number of 18,225 horses, of which the value was \$2,214,338, but the farmer had to pay in duties \$442,000, and the comparatively small balance of a million and a half was all he got. From Ontario alone, last year, we exported 8,454 horses, the value of which was \$1,136,039, but the duty which the Ontario farmers paid was \$227,207, so that all they got for their horses was \$908,831. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should endeavor to cultivate the trade in horses with Great Britain. Any one who takes an interest in horseflesh knows that Great Britain never wants for cavalry purposes more than 4,000 horses in any one year. If that is so, what is to become of the balance of the horses which we want to export? Are these hon. gentlemen aware that the whole number of horses that we sent to Great Britain last year was 329, with a value of \$38,000? In other words, the Ontario farmers paid in duty on the horses they exported to the United States eleven and a half times more into the American treasury than they received for all the horses they sold to Great Britain. I think that is a serious matter, and, when hon. gentleman opposite wish to make the farmer sell to the wrong party, I think that is an unanswerable argument to prevent their doing so. I shall not waste the time of the House by going into the question of horned cattle, but I may say that I find that Ontario last year sent to the United States, 45,765 horned cattle, the value of which was \$887,000, the duty on which was \$177,000. Again the farmers did not get the value because they lost the amount of the duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that that quantity of cattle was sent to the United States for consumption?

Mr. BARRON. I say those cattle were sent to the United States. If they went in bond, they would not pay duty, and the cattle I speak of did pay duty. I say again, in regard to sheep, of which 363,000 were exported last year, the value of which was \$974,000, but the farmer only received \$779,000, because he had to pay the enormous sum of \$194,000 in duties. I will summarise and will not go into detail, and I am sorry that I was asked to speak at this late hour, because I feel that I cannot do myself justice or do the House justice, but, in fine, we find that, in lumber, barley, beans, peas, hay, horses, horned cattle, and sheep and so on, that we pay \$3,672,845 in duties, or a little over \$2 a head for every man, woman and child in the Province of Ontario. I say this is a very serious thing indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask if the hon. gentleman takes the amount of duty off the price of the article exported, because he seems to have done it all along.

Mr. BARRON. I listened to the Minister of Marine with a great deal of attention—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. BARRON. I admit that I did not listen with very much attention to the interruption of my hon. friend, but I did listen to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. I listen to speakers on both sides of the House in order to learn all I can, and the hon. Minister said, if I understood him, that it was perfect nonsense for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to advocate such a motion as he did, because he did not follow it up by proving that it would be advantageous if his motion was introduced and carried out in this country. I ask if experience does not prove something, and I ask the hon. gentleman how he can say that unrestricted reciprocity, such as you made it on the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will not bring about the good results he says it will when he thinks of the item of eggs. I find, Mr. Speaker, that Canada exported of eggs last year nearly 13,000,000 dozen, valued at \$1,821,364. Now, I want again to point out, from an Ontario standpoint, the vast importance, at all events, to the farmer, of unrestricted reciprocity. I find that Ontario exported to the United States, of that nearly 13,000,000 dozen eggs, the enormous amount of 9,228,096 dozen, the value of which was \$1,305,642. There was no duty on eggs, and that accounts for it. Why, the value was more than the export value, to the United States, of beans, peas, rye, wheat and hay altogether, by over \$300,000. The export value in eggs was more than the export value of horned cattle; it was more than the export value of sheep to the United States; it was nearly as much as the export value of horses. Now, I said a moment ago that experience teaches, and it would be unfair for me to put forward this argument unless I drew a comparison. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House that on the 1st January, 1870, the duty of 10 per cent. on eggs, on the other side, was removed. Well, Sir, I find that for the last six months of the existence of that duty upon eggs, the export value from Canada to the United States was the small sum of \$5,403; but the very moment that duty was removed, the export of eggs increased with such enormous rapidity that during the first six months after the 1st January, 1870, the value reached \$290,820, and since the removal of that duty the export value of eggs was, in 1887, 337 times greater than it was in 1870 under the 10 per cent. duty. Now, I do think that this small item of eggs, the little article generally given as pin money by the farmers to their wives, affords a complete answer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is sufficient to show, to my mind, at all events, that if we adopted the policy of the hon.

member for South Oxford and secured unrestricted trade with the United States, a very great increase will be brought about in the export of all our agricultural products. Remove the duty on barley. In 1896, if the export value of barley increased in the same ratio that the export value of eggs has increased, the value will amount to the enormous sum of \$13,114,920, in place of the five million odd dollars in 1886-87. Remove the duty on horses, and the export value in 1896, at the same ratio of increase as took place in the case of eggs, will reach the sum of \$5,530,840, in place of the two million odd dollars in 1886. Remove the duty on horned cattle going into the States, and in 1896, at the same ratio, the value will be two million odd dollars in place of \$387,000. Remove the duty on sheep, and in 1896, at the same ratio, the export value will be nearly two million dollars in place of \$974,482 in 1887. Now, what does this mean? Why, the very moment we get unrestricted trade, I undertake to say that the value of our exports will immediately increase by 30, or 40, or 50 per cent. Now, Sir, remove the duty on lumber. I see hon. gentlemen in this House who are engaged in that business, and though I only know of it professionally, I defy them to deny that the removal of the duty on lumber would be a great benefit to the lumber trade in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. They propose to remove it now.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman used to think it would be a bad thing, but now when he sees the other side are going to do it he says it would be a good thing.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I did not. I said that they proposed to remove the duty.

Mr. BARRON. Well, if he does not say it would be a good thing I am astonished at his ignorance. Remove the duty on lumber and the export value thereof would be, in 1896, twenty million odd dollars, in place of the nine million odd dollars in 1887. Now, have I any justification for this prophecy?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BARRON. Some hon. gentleman says "no." All I can tell him is that he had better read the history of Canada under the Reciprocity Treaty. Does he not know that the volume of trade between Canada and the United States, from 1854 to 1866, increased from over \$20,000,000 to something like \$84,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. During the American war.

Mr. BARRON. There he is again. The American war broke out in 1860. But to satisfy the hon. gentleman, I will make a comparison prior to the time the American war broke out. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not say that the war broke out before the Reciprocity Treaty. Well, comparing the five years before reciprocity with the five years after, I find that our export trade to the United States increased after that date by 124 per cent., and the import trade increased by 85 per cent., the increase in the average volume of trade being 100 per cent. Now, I want to draw the attention of the Ontario members to this fact, that of the entire exports to the United States of over \$32,000,000, Ontario exported \$20,000,000 of that amount, showing, I think, that by reason of her contiguity to the United States we are deeply interested in cultivating trade with that country. I was going to touch upon some other items, but by reason of the lateness of the hour I shall have to forbear; but I shall ask the House to bear with me while I endeavor to answer one or two of the arguments made by the Minister of the Interior. First of all, let me say that I believe the farmer is not as prosperous in Ontario as he was a short time ago. I find that the prices he has been getting have been from year to year becoming less. I find that in 1883 fall wheat was \$1.05; it has been gradually decreasing until 1886 when the

price had fallen to 73 06 cents. I find the spring wheat in 1883 was \$107, It too has been falling, until in 1886 it had reached the small sum of 72.5 cents. I find in the case of barley the price in 1882 was 57 cents per bushel, it had fallen in 1886 to 5.13 cents. In the same year, 1883, oats were 38 cents, in 1886 they had fallen to 32 cents. Rye in 1883 was 62 cents, in 1886, 52 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been paying 40 cents a bushel for oats all winter.

Mr. BARRON. Then the hon. gentleman knows better than the books. Peas in 1883 were 71 cents, in 1886 they had dropped to 52 cents. Since 1883 there has been a falling off in fall wheat of 30 per cent., in spring wheat of 32½ per cent., and in barley of 10 per cent. Let me make a comparison. Let me state what the total value of those crops was in 1886 and what the total value was in 1882. I find in the last year, 1882, the total value of those crops, fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats, rye and peas, was \$89,682,065, whereas in 1886 it had fallen to \$58,000,000 odd. I take my own county because that is what I am interested in.

Some HON. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think hon. gentlemen should keep order, as I do not think it is very courteous to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BARRON. I do not think it is very courteous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They forget the fact that I am, practically speaking, a young member, and the further fact that I was forced to continue this debate when I did not wish to speak - when I desired to speak on another occasion when I would not be so hurried; and when the House would be more inclined to listen to me that it is at present, on account of the lateness of the hour. I find that the value of all field crops in my county in 1886 was \$2,585,647, but the average for the five years between 1882 and 1886, was \$2,710,144. So far as my own county is concerned, I am sorry to say the value of the various crops has declined under the National Policy. I will take the case of farm land. In my own county in 1886 the value of farm lands was \$12,464,395. That was less than it was in 1885, when it was \$12,5-2,876; whereas, in 1885, the value was \$22.27 per acre. In the year following 1886 it had fallen to \$22.11 per acre, the average for the five years from 1882 to 1886, being \$23.15, and so on, with regard to farm buildings. I will not enlarge on the figures for the reason I have mentioned. The total value of land, buildings, implements, live stock, &c., in my county as compared with the different periods was as follows: 1886, \$18,428,136; 1885, \$18,642,995, or \$32.99 in 1885 as compared with \$32.69 in 1886. Next, take the assessed value, in regard to which I desire to make a comparison, because the Minister of the Interior the other night tried to make a point, and he did apparently make a point, although he received the Roland for his Oliver from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when he stated that Mr. Blue's book showed the value of the farm lands had increased in Ontario by twenty million dollars in 1886 over 1885. I have no doubt that so far as he went the hon. gentleman cited those figures correctly, but if he had studied them a little further he would have found that the increased value was altogether made up by the fact that the Ontario Government had opened out new districts, Algoma, Nipissing and Parry Sound, and the fact that settlers had taken up farms there would explain the large apparent increase. Let me take the case of the assessed value of rural property. In 1873 it was \$195,387,274; 1878, \$368,910,409, or an increase during the Mackenzie régime of \$73,523,135. Now, what has been the increase during the time hon. gentlemen opposite have held the reigns of power? Take from 1880 to 1885, and I take this period because I have taken five years under the

Mr. BARRON,

Mackenzie régime. In 1880 the assessed value of rural property was \$374,774,517; 1885, \$416,515,457, or an increase of \$41,740,940, while under the Mackenzie régime the increase was \$73,000,000; or in other words under the régime of Mr. Mackenzie the rural property increased by \$31,000,000 odd more than it increased from 1880 to 1885 under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. But hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of saying, I think the Minister of Interior did paint it in very glowing colors, that Toronto had increased its assessed value and Montreal also, and the hon. gentleman asked, what did that mean? He said, increased population. Let me take the two together, rural and urban, and make a comparison. I find that between 1873 and 1878, under the Mackenzie administration, the increase was the enormous sum of \$224,560,925; but under hon. gentlemen opposite between 1880 and 1885 it only increased \$77,271,994. In other words, under the Mackenzie régime the increase in the assessed property in Ontario, taking city, town, village and farm altogether, was \$147,288,931 more than it was between 1880 and 1885 under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon gentleman repeat the first figures respecting the value of real property. I understood him to say that the increase under the Conservative régime was only \$42,000,000.

Mr. BARRON. \$41,000,000 odd.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What was the urban and rural increase, was it \$73,000,000?

Mr. BARRON. \$77,271,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) The remarkable fact is that Toronto alone increased during that period about \$46,000,000.

Mr. BARRON. In other places there were decreases, and Toronto, as the hon. gentleman well knows, has taken in suburban places. I propose now to take up the question of population. I find, Sir, that the number of ratepayers between 1873 and 1878 under Mr. Mackenzie increased by 36,864 in the Province of Ontario. Between the years 1880 and 1885 they increased only by 12,666. The ratepayers therefore in our Province increased three times as many under Mr. Mackenzie as they did under hon. gentlemen opposite from the years 1880 to 1885. They may say that the ratepayers of the cities and so forth increased faster under their Administration than under that of Mr. Mackenzie. If they will allow me, I will give a few figures from the book quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance himself. In 1873, under Mr. Mackenzie, the urban rate-paying population was 112,065, and in 1878 it was 147,164, or an increase of 35,099. I find, Sir, that under hon. gentlemen opposite, from 1880 to 1885, in 1880 the rate-paying population was 151,680, and in 1885, 182,191, or an increase only of 30,511, whereas under Mr. Mackenzie, it increased by 35,099. Now, Sir, I will show, I think, from statistics, and allow me to say in this connection that I found the Statistical Record a most useful book. The population of Ontario, according to that book, in 1881, was 1,925,228. I have no means of finding out from the Dominion returns, at all events, what the population was in 1886, but I do find, from looking at Mr. Blue's book, quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that in 1886 the population was 1,819,026, or a decrease, taking the figures of the hon. gentleman opposite for the year 1881, and comparing them with Mr. Blue's figures in 1886, of 104,202.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do you believe that?

Mr. BARRON. Do I believe it? Mr. Speaker, I admit that I have not the opportunity of knowing, and if I had I would take means the hon. gentleman opposite do not take to stop that exodus. I can tell you that judging from my own county that I can believe it, because I do know as was said here by some hon. gentleman in this House that young

men have left my riding and gone to the United States where they earned money and sent it home to pay for their farms. The Tory organ in Lindsay last week told us that a gentleman who went to the North-West and distinguished himself, a gentleman who wears the Queen's uniform, and a young man, has left the town of Lindsay to take up his residence in St. Paul. I can tell hon. gentleman though they may not believe it, but at all events I conscientiously believe it, that the population in the Province of Ontario is not keeping up to its proper amount and that it is not keeping up to the natural increase of the population. I see my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior laughing. I hope he will be good enough to bear with me a little while as I will finish soon and I do not like to very much longer detain the House unnecessarily. Referring, Sir, to the iron industry I must say that it lies undeveloped in my own riding. We can remember the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance last year when he spoke of the large iron deposits in the township of Sawdon which is in my riding. We recollect that on that occasion, that by reason of the increased duty which he then proposed that the iron industry would become progressive and would be a valuable industry in our country. Has this been the case? No. How is it possible that an import duty can increase the output from our mines in this Canada of ours? The hon. the Minister of Finance said last session that the total consumption of iron in Canada was not more than 350,000 tons which he said would require about 750,000 tons of iron ore. Now, Sir, suppose one of our mine turns out the same quantity as one mine does in Michigan which would be about 2,300 tons of ore, if one mine turned out that and no more it would supply as hon. gentlemen can see the whole demand for the Dominion of Canada. And if one mine did supply the whole demand then I would ask how are other mines to be worked in other portions of the Dominion of Canada? How are the iron mines of my riding to be worked if the Londonderry mines down in Nova Scotia can supply the whole demand for the Dominion of Canada? I am not alone, Mr. Speaker, in my want of faith in the prophecy of the hon. the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentlemen opposite must be aware that the rank and file of their own friends have not emphatic belief in the policy of that hon. gentleman. Why, Sir, we see them going now to Mr. Mowat and asking him to initiate a policy which the hon. gentleman here has failed to do. They have gone to Mr. Mowat and asked him to bonus the mines in order to establish an iron industry. Let me read a resolution of the Board of Trade in Lindsay the other day. The President of the Board of Trade, a most worthy man, who is the President also of the Conservative Association for South Victoria, is a Conservative, the Vice-President I find also is a Conservative, the mover of the resolution is a Conservative, the seconder of the resolution is a Conservative also, and having no confidence in the hon. gentlemen opposite they go to Mr. Mowat and say to him in so many words: "We have tried the hon. the Minister of Finance in his policy, and we find that policy wanting and now we come to you." The resolution I refer to as passed by the Lindsay Board of Trade is as follows:

"Resolved, that the Board of Trade of the town of Lindsay hereby petition the government of the province of Ontario to give such assistance by way of grants of hardwood lands to any parties who will undertake to erect and operate smelting works for the reduction of the ores of iron or other metals as will aid in the permanent development of mining and reduction of ores in the Province, with such restrictions as may be deemed necessary in the public interests. And resolved further that a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary to the honorable the Minister of Crown Lands.

Not only do we find the rank and file going to Mr. Mowat in this respect but we find the first lieutenant in Ontario of the hon. the Premier, asking Mr. Mowat across the floor of the Ontario Legislature to bonus those industries in order

to bring iron to the surface and to work that industry. Now I shall hurry on and very soon finish.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARRON. I find my hon. friend crows over there, but I will not detain the House long. I want to refer to one matter. We have again and again been told that hon. gentlemen opposite are all the time willing and anxious for reciprocal trade. We see it stated in the public press, and especially in the commercial papers, that there is a statute on our books inviting the Americans to give us reciprocity. Now, Sir, if there is one thing which is a monument more lasting than brass to the legislative insincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, it must be this statute. What does it say? That any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds, grains, fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables, plants, trees and shrubs, &c.—I shall not waste the time of the House in reading the whole section—may be admitted free. Although they put that on the Statute-book in 1879, and although these articles have been going into the United States free, hon. gentlemen opposite have maintained a tariff whereby the people of this country pay on trees valued at \$41,921, a duty of \$10,779, and on seeds valued at \$52,759, a duty of \$5,411. The total value of all these articles enumerated in this statute which are imported into this country is \$744,181, on which the people have paid in duties the enormous sum of \$133,471—articles which hon. gentlemen by statute declared should be admitted free into this country when the Americans removed the duties from them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the people of this country pay that duty?

Mr. BARRON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then how does the producer on the other side pay the duty as well?

Mr. BARRON. There is no duty on the other side on these things; they are allowed in free. I did not say that they paid the duty on the other side. The point I desired to make was this, that hon. gentlemen are imposing a duty on articles coming into this country which are admitted free into the United States, contrary to what they agreed to in their own statute.

Mr. BOWELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly inform me whether in quoting the figures in reference to our exportation of cattle, he took them from our returns of from the American returns.

Mr. BARRON. From our returns.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I would like to know how he could know that they paid the duty.

Mr. BARRON. Now, a great deal has been said to-night about the effect this policy would have on our relations with Great Britain. I do not believe Great Britain would object to it at all. Will you let me read a letter which was written by Mr. John Bright to Mr. Aspinall in reponse to an invitation from the latter gentleman to attend a reciprocity convention at Detroit in 1885. Mr. Bright said:

"The project of your convention gives me great pleasure. I hope it will lead to a renewal of commercial intercourse with the British North American Provinces, for it will be a miserable thing if, because the yare in connection with the British Crown, and you acknowledge as your Chief Magistrate, your President at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free, as if you were one people living under one government."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very dear and affectionate ties with the old land, and I should be sorry indeed if the day should ever come when the interests of the two countries would conflict; but I do not think I would be doing duty to the people whom I have the honor to represent here if I regarded my own private feelings and convictions, and for-

got my duty to them. Though I should be sorry indeed if such a day should ever come, at the same time if it should come, when the interest of the two countries should conflict the interest that I should vote for would be the interest of Canada. We have heard a great deal about loyalty—yes, lip loyalty. I confess I have no sympathy with the loyalty of some hon. gentlemen opposite, such, for instance, as was displayed the other night by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I must say that I have no sympathy with that kind of loyalty which is always considering the interests of the few and forgetting the interest of the many—that kind of loyalty which is always looking after the interests of the manufacturers, as in the amendment which has been moved by the hon. minister of Marine, and forgetting the interests of the vast mass of the people. I confess I have no sympathy with that kind of loyalty which is always affecting a zeal for the prerogatives of the Crown and forgetting the liberty of the subject. Before closing, I wish to say a few words regarding the reply of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). I am sorry to have to charge that hon. gentleman with not dealing fairly with the hon. member for East Huron. I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite say of a person who is found only to tell half the story. It will be remembered that the hon. member for East Huron, referring to the exports of fish from British Columbia to the United States, cited the value as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, at \$186,774. The hon. member for Hamilton got up and cited what? He cited the Commerce and Navigation returns of the United States. I do not know, Sir, whether that was a very loyal thing for him to do, to refuse to take the Trade and Navigation Returns of our own country, made up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and to prefer to take those of the United States. But even in doing that, it would have been fair and proper in that hon. gentleman to have read all and not a portion only. Did he not say in answer to what the hon. member for East Huron said that the export of fish from British Columbia to the United States was only one barrel?

Mr. BOWELL. He did not say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, worth \$1.

Mr. BOWELL. Salmon.

Mr. BARRON. Well, I take salmon, does not the hon. member for Montreal East think it would have been fair in him to have said, also \$20,458 worth of other kinds of fish. I do think that the hon. gentleman, when he quoted at all, should, in justice to the hon. member for East Huron have gone a little further and given us exactly what the book he was reading from did really contain.

An hon. MEMBER. *Suppressio vero.*

Mr. BARRON. My hon. friend says *suppressio vero*. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite know what that is.

Some hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BARRON. If the hon. gentleman does not know I will tell him. It is suppression of the truth.

Mr. CURRAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him that it is *suppressio veri*.

Mr. BARRON. I told the hon. gentleman what the meaning of the phrase is.

Mr. HICKEY. It was Prince [Edward Island led him astray again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Prince Edward Island did not lead him astray. He understands a little more classics than you do.

Mr. HICKEY. He did not quote it correctly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made the quotation correctly. You did not know if it was correct or not.

Mr. BARRON. I will close my remarks because I know you are all tired. I desire to say that we should take the example in England in more respects than one! It will be in the recollection of some hon. gentlemen, especially the hon. Minister of Customs, as a matter of history, that in the year 1843 England imposed a discriminating duty in favor of the British Colonies, and that in the year 1848 that discriminating duty was removed, and all imports into that country, foreign or colonial, were placed on the same footing. It will be in the knowledge of hon. gentlemen that complaints were then made in Canada from all sources—from the Governors in Council, and from the different Boards of Trade, and what was the answer made by Mr. Gladstone? I refer to his answer, because I think it expresses the sentiment we should recognise to-day, of Canada for the Canadians. He said:

"The interests of Canada have occupied the place to which they are justly entitled in the deliberations of Her Majesty's Government upon this important subject and upon others which are akin to it. At the same time I need hardly point out to your Lordship that there are matters in which considerations immediately connected with the supply of food for the people of this country and with the employment of its population must be paramount."

Just as Mr. Gladstone said then, in answer to the protest of Canada, so say I now that no matter what the effect may be—though I should be sorry indeed that it should have any prejudicial effect on Great Britain—still, no matter what the effect may be, if it is in the interest of Canada that we should have unrestricted reciprocity such as is pointed out by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, I believe, in all earnestness and sincerity, that we should legislate solely for the interests of Canada, no matter whether these conflict with the interests of Great Britain or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BARRON. I say yes, and I say that I believe our axiom should be that which the right hon. the first Minister gave to us in 1878, of "Canada for the Canadians." I say that, while we must always remember the rose, the shamrock, the thistle, and the fleur de lis, we must not forget that upon our land there grows a noble forest tree, and upon the branches of that tree there grows a maple leaf, emblematic of a true people who believe in the truest sentiment of loyalty, that is loyalty to the true interests of the people.

Mr. CURRAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m., Wednesday.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, March 21, 1888.

No. 20.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 21st March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments of the court in the following cases:—

County of Quebec, wherein O'Brien and others were appellants, and the Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron was respondent, the appeal being quashed for want of jurisdiction.

Quebec West, wherein M. A. Hearn was appellant, and the Hon. Thos. McCreavy was respondent, the appeal being dismissed.

Montmagny, wherein P. A. Choquette was appellant, and Laberge *et al* respondents. In this case the appeal allowed, the judgment of the lower court was reversed, the preliminary objections being allowed and the election petition dismissed.

I have received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates relating to the elections in the Electoral Districts of Brome, Missisquoi, Shefford, and the East Riding of Elgin, respectively, in all of which the petitions were dismissed, or the sitting members declared duly elected.

I beg to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of William Frederick Roome, Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Middlesex.

KENT ELECTION.

Mr. GIROUARD. In answer to the enquiry made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) yesterday, as to when the papers in the County of Kent election case would be printed, every effort has been made to have them printed, and it is only this moment they have been given to us. They will be distributed at once, and the committee will be called for Friday.

REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 55) to amend "The Representation Act," as respects certain constituencies in British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

20--1888--1

Mr. BAKER. This is the same Bill that I introduced last year and in the Session before last, and, as there is supposed to be luck in odd numbers, I thought I would introduce it the third time in the hope of carrying it. The object of the Bill is to place certain islands, which I conceive to be in the constituency of Victoria, in that constituency, for at present a doubt exists, though the Minister of Justice has given a decision that the islands belong to the district of Vancouver. The object of this Bill is to remove any doubt as to the constituency in which these islands are actually situated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The only reason for the introduction of this Bill is that the necessity for any particular distinction being made between the electoral districts in British Columbia and those in any other part of the Dominion, has passed. There is no longer any necessity for any extended period of time between the date of issuing the proclamation and the date of nomination, or between the date of nomination and the date of election, and there are simply three clauses to expunge anything which makes an exception in favor of British Columbia. The Bill does not in any way affect Gaspé, Chicoutimi or Saguenay. I leave those districts to take care of themselves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the purport of the Bill.

Mr. BAKER. This is simply to extend to the Province of British Columbia the same right or privilege which has been extended to the Maritime Provinces, so that, in cases arising either in the County Court or Supreme Court, where the amount exceeds \$250, whether it arises in the County Court or in the Supreme Court of the Province, the parties may have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PURSE SEINE FISHING.

Mr. KIRK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) to make further provision respecting Fisheries and Fishing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. KIRK. The intention of the Bill is simply to prohibit the use of purse seines in fishing. It is not necessary to give the reasons just now. I will do that when the Bill comes up for the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Government when we may expect the Election Bills. They are not yet down, though a whole month has elapsed, and it is most desirable that they should be before the House and that an opportunity should be given to consult the country in regard to them before the Easter holidays.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think I may say that they will be down early next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For the sake of convenience, I would ask if the Government have decided yet on what particular day they propose to adjourn for the Easter vacation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to renew this question when the First Minister is here, and I think he will then be able to give him an answer.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. CURRAN. I trust that hon. gentlemen will consider the apology I owe to them for intruding upon them at this late period of the debate as having been expressed, and I shall at once proceed to discharge the duty that now devolves upon me, in the first place, by alluding briefly to the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) before the House adjourned last night, and then dealing with the question in a general way as briefly as the importance of this debate will allow. Yesterday, this House had the pleasure of listening to a speech from my hon. friend the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), which, for pith and point and power, has seldom been equalled in the halls of the Dominion Parliament of Canada, and the hon. gentleman who followed him, and whom I am now following, I think, by the speech which he delivered last night, made the most ample confession that the speech of my hon. friend from Westmoreland was absolutely unanswerable, and that the arguments he adduced could not be met by him in any way whatsoever. From the beginning to the end of the speech delivered by my hon. friend from North Victoria, he carefully avoided any single argument adduced by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. He

Mr. KIRK,

made no attempt to refute his speech, and he did not even mention the hon. gentleman's name from the beginning to the end of the address which he delivered. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman told us that it was not his intention to address this House upon the question in a general way, that he was going to confine himself not merely to a Provincial view of this question, but was going to confine himself in a very great measure to the view, as I understood it, which would concern his own constituency. Now, I consider that, in discussing a question of this kind, any such line is entirely at variance with the interests of the country at large, is entirely unworthy of the position occupied by a representative of the people in this House, and should be looked upon by the people of this country as utterly untenable when the question before the House has for its object, as has been stated by the mover of this resolution, a complete economic revolution in our country. But the hon. gentleman certainly made a few statements that, to my mind, and the minds of those who surrounded him, must have appeared simply astounding. He told us that the National Policy was a policy for the benefit of the few to the detriment of the majority; and to prove that the farmers were oppressed by it, he said that the number of farmers in Ontario, according to his computation, were 1,144,520. Now, that is an astounding figure, one which I think it will be difficult for the hon. gentleman to carry out by statistics; because, after all, it is not merely in the Province of Quebec that the farming community like to sing

"Vive la Canadienne, et ses jolis yeux doux."

The fact is that the farmers of Ontario have a weakness for the fair sex also; they are not all bachelors, and if we make a computation of five in a family, according to his statement it would give 5,722,600 persons as belonging to the farming community in Ontario, or more than the whole population of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman also told us that the trade of Ontario and the Dominion, in horned cattle, would be vastly benefitted by unrestricted reciprocity. He did not tell us, however, what the effect would be to-day under unrestricted reciprocity; he did not tell us that when United States cattle are scheduled in the British market as Canadian cattle, they are not kept in quarantine, or in any way detained, and not slaughtered; but he led this House and the country to suppose that he, who was speaking, as he said, not for the country at large, but simply for one agricultural constituency, was not aware of the importance and vital interest at which he was striking, a vital interest to every cattle raiser in the vast Province from which he comes. There are other things which he stated in reference to barley, lumber, and so on, to which, he said, he would invite gentlemen on this side of the House, engaged in trade in those particular articles, to reply; but I shall leave it to some hon. gentlemen who will follow me to deal more particularly with that branch of the subject. He told us, however, that experience was good for something, and I agree with him there, and before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to establish what experience teaches in connection with this question, not with reference to the constituency that I represent only, nor with reference to the constituency that the hon. gentleman represents, but how this scheme will affect the people of the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and I believe that the experience that I shall bring to bear on this subject will be satisfactory to the overwhelming majority in this House. We have also had allusion made, in the course of this debate, to the terrible state of things in this country at the present time, by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and that hon. gentleman's sympathies went out so far, almost, as to cause him to shed tears over my native city of Montreal. He quoted from the speech of Mr. Drummond, at the Board of Trade the other day, concerning the assumption by the

Government of the Lake St. Peter debt. He did not tell us that that was the occasion of the speech, but he sought to make it appear to the people of this country, not that that section of the country which is supplied from Montreal as a great distributing centre, would be improved by the assumption of that debt, but that by unrestricted reciprocity the great end which those people are now clamoring for, would be attained. He did not tell us that he was one of the persons who stood up in this House only last Session and denounced the idea that the Government should assume the debt of Lake St. Peter. He did not, for one moment, refer to figures to show that inter-provincial trade has done a great deal for the St. Lawrence route, and he never, for one second, pointed out that he was bound during the present Session, as a patriot, to relieve the suffering city of Montreal, and to change his attitude from that which he occupied during the last Session of this Parliament. We have had the same story repeated over and over again with reference to the want of statistics, we have had statements made that the country was going back, was going to the dogs, that the children were not attending school, that the country was far from being in a prosperous condition. I do not intend at this moment to enter, at any length, into the discussion of that branch of the question; it has been already amply dealt with. I will merely give some statistics from the Roman Catholic institutions of Lower Canada, since these are considered of such immense value by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have a statement from one of the school commissioners, who act jointly with the clergy, because there are both clergy and laymen on the Catholic School Board of Montreal. He sends this statement:

"I send this statement to show the progressive increase in the school attendance. From 6,405 in 1877, it increased to 7,005 in 1881. From 7,316, in 1882, it increased to 9,932 in 1884. This is the attendance at the Commissioners' Schools. There are, of course a great many other schools independent of the Commissioners', but the report of the Commissioners shows an increase in school attendance from 6,405 in 1877, to 9,332 in 1884, or 55 per cent. in seven years."

Now, we have also had from my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Rigault) a complete answer to the charges that were made by the hon. member over this resolution. I can supply figures, with reference to the City and District Savings Bank, perhaps the best institution to judge by in this country, as the deposits there do not average more than \$200 each. At the time the National Policy was inaugurated, there were but \$3,000,000 deposited in that institution, by about 20,000 depositors. To-day, the deposits in that bank have swollen to \$8,600,000, by about 40,000 depositors. Those facts and others to which I might point, the fact that when the National Policy was inaugurated we had 15,000 dwellings, shops, and other buildings vacant in Montreal and to-day we have not one single house fit to live in or one tenement unoccupied—show that all the lamentations on the other side of the House are entirely unfounded and gratuitous. Leaving that branch of the subject, and proceeding as rapidly as I can to the general consideration of what is now before us, I cannot do so without referring to one or two speeches that have been made here, and which I think were calculated to do great harm in this community. It was sought by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint) a few days ago, and by the hon. member for Monmagy (Mr. Choquette) last night, to impress upon a large section of the people of this country, upon the whole French Canadian people, that there were members on this side of the House who were their enemies and who had launched forth against them on the floor of Parliament observations to the effect that the French Canadian people who have emigrated to the United States were hewers of wood and drawers of water. Mr. Speaker, I feel that every hon. member who heard the observation made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is aware of the fact that his interruption was as regards the speech of the hon. gentleman,

the introducer of this resolution, where he said that if we were to carry out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity not a French Canadian but the whole Canadian people would become hewers of wood and drawers of water to the people of the neighboring Republic. But whilst we deprecate the introduction of such subjects into a discussion of this kind, whilst we deprecate appeals to national sentiment and national prejudice, it is fair, it is right perhaps that we should show, if there be any such thing as fanaticism in this matter, where that fanaticism lies, that we should point out to those interested in knowing what is the object and design of the great apostles, and of the leading apostle perhaps of this great movement now said to be on foot. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, and the House to the statement made in the public press by Mr. Goldwin Smith, only a few months ago, when urging the people of Canada to adopt a policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. He said:

"It is said Quebec is against commercial union. If she is it is not on any commercial grounds. It is because the dominant and tithelevying priesthood of Quebec want to keep its domain in a state of isolation and shrinks from any increase of intercourse with the religious equality and free opinion of the American Republic."

That was the statement published and sent broadcast through the country, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite trying to fight an imaginary foe, while they have a real and genuine one right before them if they wish to attack him. Perhaps it may be said that this was a slip of the pen, that Mr. Goldwin Smith, the apostle of this new political gospel that is going to regenerate the Dominion of Canada, did not really hold such sentiments. Let me read to the House what he said on September 6th, 1887, only a few months ago:

"While I have watched the action of the unifying forces which draw us toward our kinsmen in the United States, I have also watched the growth both in bulk and in intensity within our own political border of a French nationality as alien to us as anything can well be, which seems fatal to our hope of a really united Canada."

That is the statement made by this apostle of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. There is an opponent whom hon. gentlemen opposite can fight if they feel disposed to fight with some one, and lest there should be any mistake as to the position of this great statesman, who has come here to do so much for Canada, whose words and whose writings and publications have never once been repudiated, either by the smallest or the largest man on the other side of the House, I will read a further quotation to show exactly what his sentiments are respecting one and a half millions of the inhabitants of Canada. He said:

"In truth our one chance of modifying the French element and arresting its growth into an alien nationality, appears to be to open it to the full influence of the English-speaking continent, which may be strong enough for the work of assimilation, while that of British Canada alone has proved to be too weak. The very reason which makes the ecclesiastics of Quebec recoil from commercial union with the Republic ought to make us the more ready to embrace it."

This statement was also published broadcast throughout the country; and yet we have hon. gentlemen opposite rising and working themselves into a terrible rage in regard to an imaginary insult, but not one of them has a word to say in condemnation of the utterances of this great commercial unionist and unrestricted reciprocity advocate, nor have his words, as I have already said, ever been repudiated or condemned by a single leading man on the other side of politics. Having thus dealt with that episode of this debate, it now becomes my duty to examine as to what is the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite. In my opinion they must feel very much in the position of the pagan priests of old. If they never speak when they meet, they must smile on one another when they consider exactly the kind of notions with which they are trying to bamboozle the people of Canada; how they must wink at one another when they take into consideration the various trans-

mogrifications through which they have passed in only one short year. Now, it strikes me that the hon. gentleman who has charge of this resolution must have been studying the works of the late lamented Artemus Ward. We know that Artemus tells us in his book that among the greatest objects of interest he possessed was one wax figure which did very good service indeed. In the morning he exhibited it in the character of George Washington, in the afternoon it was made to do duty as Louis Napoleon, and in the evening it was exhibited to an admiring audience as Judas Iscariot. We have had a similar process going on on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had the policy of hon. gentlemen exhibited to the people as quite a harmless little object, it had no harm in it, there was nothing connected with it that would for one moment disturb the great industries that had been inaugurated in Canada and that had grown up under the National Policy. By their policy that other policy which has become fixed was not for one moment to be disturbed. That was proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of the Province of Ontario, and during the last election, lest there should be any mistake upon the minds of those who were engaged in manufactures, the then leader of the Opposition was brought all the way down to Montreal to make his profession of faith there, face to face with those engaged in the great manufacturing industries of the country. And the then leader went there lest there should be any mistake about it, lest there should be any misinterpretation, and he said in effect: "I am not going to have any mistake or misinterpretation, and I will just read you my Malvern speech over again." That was the first phase, and the next one, a little while after, is, that we find Mr. Goldwin Smith, we find Mr. Wiman, we find the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, we find the hon. gentleman who sits beside him, and we find a whole host of gentlemen on the other side of the House in a new transformation scene with their policy of commercial union. Commercial union was the only thing that would save the land they said, commercial union was their policy and they were going to stand or fall by it. In fact I heard the hon. gentleman who has proposed this unrestricted reciprocity resolution declare at Hastings, in the County of East Northumberland, in the month of January last, that as a Privy Councillor he was prepared to advise Her Majesty the Queen to sanction the introduction of commercial union as the policy of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing.

Mr. CURRAN. That will not do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will do.

Mr. CURRAN. That will not do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I call upon the hon. member to withdraw the statement. The hon. gentleman wholly misunderstood and misinterpreted me if he says I said anything of the kind. I said nothing of the kind. What I stated in my address and what I said was the same as I said here the other night, that I would most undoubtedly advise Her Majesty, if she called on me for advice, to adopt the policy laid down in this resolution—in the words of this resolution.

Mr. CURRAN. There was no unrestricted reciprocity then. Nobody was talking of unrestricted reciprocity at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRAN. Very good: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I am going to make my own statement too.

Mr. CURRAN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We accept your statement.

Mr. CURRAN. Exactly. At that time the *Toronto Globe*, that gave inspiration to my hon. friend the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and on the strength of which article the hon. gentleman no doubt made his great speech—on the 14th of September, the *Toronto Globe* had declared in the most emphatic language that nobody but a fool would think of unrestricted reciprocity. It could not be carried out. It would not be accepted by the Americans. And that article is there in black and white to refer to. The official organ of those gentlemen on the other side has declared that, and any one can see it who wishes to take the trouble to read it. That, then, was the position of affairs only a short time ago. But still later what was the condition of affairs? Surely gentlemen on the other side will not deny that which has taken place here in the presence of several members of Parliament. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) put upon the Table of Parliament a resolution to be proposed by him embodying commercial union as the policy that ought to prevail for this country. But, gentlemen, was he not sat upon? Did he not have to clear out of this resolution? Had he not to allow this policy to fall in order that gentlemen opposite might come before the country with the policy which only a few months ago was declared to be utterly unworthy of the consideration of sensible men? Now we are told that there is a very marked difference,—a very, very marked difference indeed—between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. What that difference is in the results I would like somebody to show, because we have not seen it pointed out yet. One thing is certain, that unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States means, so far as those two countries are concerned, commercial union; that is, free trade between them. Nobody can deny this. Unless they should I will again quote the gentleman for whom I have a great weakness, Mr. Goldwin Smith. Speaking on the 27th September last:

"He made a speech," says the *Globe*, "of an hour's duration in which he clearly showed the general advantages that would ensue to Canada by the adoption of commercial union, which practically meant unrestricted reciprocity or absolute free trade between Canada and the United States."

This is Mr. Goldwin Smith's definition of the thing, and the other day, in a letter written for the purpose of fortifying the hon. gentleman who has proposed this resolution and written for the purpose of giving them nerve to go on and carry out their views, he said—on Saturday last only:

"There seems to be a nervous disposition to drop the name 'Commercial Union'—"

Mind you, those gentlemen never had that name before, they never had that policy; but he says here he must avoid it because there seems to be a nervous disposition to drop the name "Commercial Union." Mr. Smith continues:

"—and to adopt unrestricted reciprocity in its place. I should myself have preferred continental free trade, had we not been told that the phrase 'Free Trade' would raise theoretic questions which were not involved and which it was our policy to avoid. Commercial union, as I understand it, differs from unrestricted reciprocity only in more clearly including mutual participation in the fisheries and coasting trade. It was adopted, I believe, in direct contradistinction to political union and made for the special purpose of guarding against any such idea."

You see they want to throw dust in the peoples' eyes.

"However, the name has now become thoroughly current in England, in the United States and in Canada, and is imbedded in all the literature of the question. An attempt to change it will look like the hauling down of a flag, and would not propitiate opponents who are already crying out that unrestricted reciprocity, like commercial union, is annexation in disguise."

That is a statement of their own apostle. It is the statement of their own adviser, the man who does all the writing for them, and tries to get up the sentiment in the country. They may try to shuffle out of it as they like, but

there they stand, convicted by their own best witness. Now, up to the present time, they have had in this House a very strange discussion on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been told that they are now proposing to introduce an absolute economical revolution in the country, a revolution, which it is admitted, is going to ruin a great many people, and which, the hon. gentlemen opposite say, cannot be helped, because there is no great revolution of this kind can be carried out without hurting some one. We are to risk all the invested wealth in manufactures in this country, which have been fostered under the National Policy—wealth that was put there under the solemn promise of Parliament that that would be its policy. We are to do away with all that for a prospective benefit; and what argument have we had on the other side to bring us to that frame of mind? We have had statistics, we have had gentlemen of great skill and ability taking a number of figures and tossing them about, endeavouring to make it appear from their standpoint that such and such results must flow from their speculations. But strange to say, Sir, on a question of this kind which involves such mighty interests, we have not had one appeal to history. Not one parallel has been cited from the history of the past, at least not on the floor of this House, although it was done in some parts of the country. Now, I think that state of things is not to be found anywhere else. When any great movement of this kind is proposed in any deliberative assembly in the world, something has been done to show what have been the results of like movements in the past. Not to weary this House with examples, I shall merely draw your attention to the great speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, in 1846, when he introduced his Government of Ireland Bill. On that occasion he went over the whole history of Europe. He took every country and showed how such a measure of his had been carried under such and such circumstances, going from Norway and Sweden down to Austria and Hungary, and showing by historical parallels what they might expect to realise from the measure he had laid before the House. We have nothing of that kind here, Mr. Speaker; but throughout the country, when these gentlemen were talking commercial union, although they deny it now, there was a parallel sought to be drawn between the position of Canada and the United States, and the position of Scotland and England at the time of the Scottish union. Is there a gentleman in this House who has not read their speeches, and who does not remember this argument having been advanced, not only by Mr. Goldwin Smith, but also by the hon. gentleman who has proposed this resolution? Now, I do not think it necessary to detain the House very long in discussing a question which must be familiar to all; but I will take this opportunity of showing that there is no parallel whatever between the two cases. Whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say, Canada is not a beggarly country; Canada is not a country that is reduced in any way to great straits. The people of Canada to-day are in a fairly good condition at any rate. We have no mendicancy here to speak about; we have no people in the throes of despair. Every honest man who wishes to earn an honest day's pay by an honest day's labor can earn that honest day's pay.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CURRAN. Well, if you have any in your constituency, I have none in mine; and throughout the length and breadth of this country, there is no honest, sober, industrious man, who wishes to work for his living, who cannot make a good living.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do a million native born Canadians leave Canada, then?

Mr. CURRAN. I am going to tell the hon. gentleman in a few moments if he will allow me. I am going to point

out to him that a million native Canadians would never have left Canada if Canada had the good fortune to adopt the National Policy ten years before we did. There are three French Canadians in the United States to every one of any other origin, and the great majority of those went there, many of them taking their wives and families with them to work in the factories, and they have remained there and form a very large portion of the industrial population of the United States. That is the reason those people have gone there, and if they have gone there, and if they have gone since the adoption of the National Policy, it has been because that policy has not enabled this country even to the present day, although it is making great strides, to recover from the soup-kitchen policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, to continue my argument, although hon. gentlemen do not evidently like the reference to Scotland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We object to calling Scotland a beggarly country, and I think the Premier would do the same.

Mr. CURRAN. I am quoting from Lecky's history:

"The commercial clauses of the union laid the foundation of the material prosperity of Scotland, and they alone reconciled the most intelligent Scotchmen to the partial sacrifice of their nationality. The country was, indeed, reduced to a condition of chronic famine, and the emancipation of Scotch trade had become a cardinal object of every patriot. * * * The Treaty of Union, however, as it was finally carried, was drawn with great skill and with much consideration for the weaker nation. It provided that the land tax should be so arranged that when England contributed £48,000, or rather less than a fortieth part, that in consideration of the heavy English debt by which the taxation of the whole island would be increased, an equivalent of about £400,000 should be granted to Scotland."

Which was equal to six years of the annual revenue of Scotland, both from excise and customs. Now, I contend that there is no parallel whatever between the case of Canada and the case of Scotland at the time of union; but I think I can establish a parallel which cannot be denied. I think I shall be able to show that these hon. gentlemen who have been going about the country asserting that Canada is in the position of Scotland, and that this country would be benefitted to an enormous extent by the influx of American capital, and by the opening of their market to us, are merely repeating here the arguments that were adduced by Castlereagh in the Irish Parliament in order to induce the people to give up their national parliament, and become commercially as well as politically united with England, and enjoy the great benefits of unrestricted reciprocity. If anybody will take up Barrington's historical sketch of the Irish nation at the time of the union, he will find the *ipsissima verba* of those gentlemen falling from the lips of Castlereagh himself; and I think the spirit of that unfortunate statesman, which must be in a very tropical region just now, must be still more disturbed by the fact that these gentlemen are plundering and plagiarising his ideas, and not giving him credit for them. "The rise and fall of the Irish nation," by Barrington, sets forth, in a very concise form, the arguments used at that time. He says:

"At present, it must suffice to state the abstract points on which the arguments of Government for annexation were founded, and those by which they were so ably and unanswerably refuted: First, the distracted state of the Irish nation; secondly, the great commercial advantages of the union, which must eventually enrich Ireland by an extension of its commerce, the influx of British capital, and the confidence of England in the stability of its institutions, when guaranteed by the union. Thirdly, the Government presses with great zeal the example of Scotland, which had so improved, and became so rich and prosperous after its annexation; a precedent which must convince the Irish of the incalculable advantages which must ensue from a similar incorporation.

Those are the very advantages which are set forth by hon. gentlemen opposite, to be derived by us from unrestricted reciprocity:

"The enormous commercial advantages that would arise if we had access to the great markets on the other side, and the enormous amount of capital that would flow into the country from the more wealthy

people with whom we are asked to have that unrestricted reciprocity. What does Mr. Barrington say about this? The second ground of argument used by the supporters of the union, great commercial advantages, appeared still more fallacious. Its deception was too palpable to deceive the most ignorant of the people."

In the same way, the argument used here in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, based on the same supposition, is too palpably deceptive to hoodwink even the most ignorant man in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Barrington goes on to say:

"The crafty prediction that English capital would flow into Ireland when a union was effected, was a visionary deception. The third and most deceptive argument of the supporters of the union, because the most plausible, was the precedent of which, at that period, flowed in full tide upon the public of Scotland, and the great advantages derived by her in consequence of her union. Of all the false reasons, misstated facts, fallacious promises and unfounded conclusions that any position ever was attempted to be supported on, the arguments founded on the Scottish precedent were the most erroneous, and no deception was ever more completely and fully detected than by the speeches made in the Irish Parliament in 1799 and 1800, and on several able pamphlets. First, as to the matter of fact, Scotland and Ireland in their relation with England, stood on grounds diametrically opposite to each other on every point that could warrant a union on the one side, or reject it on the other."

And the writer goes on to point out that, in point of fact, never had Scotland, up to that time, representative institutions such as existed in Ireland and such as exist in Canada to-day. Therefore, there is no parallel whatsoever in that case. But we have, I say, in the first place, with regard to the comparison and the parallel I am about to draw, the contiguity of Ireland to England and that of Canada to the United States. We have, in the second place, a similarity as regards population. They were then something over 4,000,000 in Ireland, and we have 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 people in Canada to-day. In the third place, the Irish Parliament had adopted the protective tariff, just as we have adopted the protective tariff of the National Policy; and we have the other point, that the people of England desired to make Ireland a slaughter market for their goods, just as the people of the United States desire to make Canada a slaughter market to-day. I contend that we have more ground for a parallel. We have in the history that preceded the union of England and Ireland, exactly a parallel case in the conduct of England towards that country as compared with the conduct of the United States towards us. For years the people of Ireland were anxious to have free commercial relations with the people of England, just as for years the people of Canada were knocking at the doors of our neighbors and asking them for free commercial intercourse. That commercial intercourse was refused by England. Laws were passed by the British Parliament striking at the woollen industries of Ireland; and England refused to have commercial intercourse with Ireland until 1782, when by the aid of the volunteers and the political exigencies of the period, Ireland obtained her own independence, and her industries began to prosper by the adoption of a national policy for the protection of her home industries. These industries were thus brought to the highest state of perfection. On the other hand, while the United States could not pass laws which would have operation in this country, they did pass legislation which was intended to affect us in a most detrimental manner. They abolished our first Reciprocity Treaty, the Elgin treaty. Our hon. friends opposite sent the late Hon. George Brown down to Washington to ask not merely reciprocity in natural products, but to a large extent in our manufactures as well. But the Americans refused to have anything to do with him. They later on refused to renew the Washington Treaty and last, but not least, as an evidence of the spirit that actuates them in their dealings with this country, they passed a law of non-communication, thus showing that a large section of that people were disposed, if possible, to crush Canada and make of her a slaughter market for their surplus productions. Therefore

Mr. CURRAN.

I claim that the parallel is established on all those points so completely as to defy contradiction. Now, we have in Canada to-day certainly as large a number of manufactures and as varied a series of industries as any country could expect to have in the short time during which the National Policy has been in force. Now, I would ask what was the effect in the past of the national policy upon the Irish people during the existence of the Grattan Parliament. I will take my quotations from the Loyal Repeal Association's report, which Daniel O'Connell presented to the people of Ireland in these words:

"Fellow countrymen, I dedicate these reports to you. They were written by one of yourselves for the benefit of all. They have met the approbation of the National Repeal Association, and therefore I have no hesitation in recommending them to your perusal."

Later on, he proceeds to state in a general way that which I shall endeavor to prove from the statistics I hold in my hand—that from the year 1782 until the breach of the union, Ireland increased in prosperity, her commerce largely extended, her agriculture augmented, her manufactures improved and increased, her people daily became more prosperous and her gentry and nobility became enriched by the prosperity engendered on every side. What were the particular branches of trade and commerce that were specially benefited by this national policy in Ireland. I shall begin by making some quotations from section 1st, entitled the woollen manufactures. It goes on to speak of the early woollen manufactures of Ireland, and to show, what I have already pointed out, that the jealousy of the neighboring country was aroused by the great progress that Ireland was making, and it gives here an extract from the address of the Lords, stating that the growth and increase of woollen manufactures in Ireland had been and would be ever looked upon with great jealousy. And they asked that this may be the occasion of very strict laws "totally to prohibit and suppress the same." These laws having had their effect, the National Parliament was called upon to re-establish those industries, and what did they do? The report goes on to say:

"After the glorious era of 1782, when, by an unparalleled effort of national energy, Ireland had shaken off the shackles from her trade, and achieved her legislative independence, the rapid advances she made in commercial and manufacturing prosperity are undeniably recorded. In ten years after, there was found to be in the city of Dublin sixty master clothiers, having 400 looms engaged in the making of broadcloths, 100 in the making of cassimeres, and employing 5,000 persons on these fabrics. A stronger proof of the prosperity of these times, and of the deep interest which England has or ought to have in Irish prosperity, cannot be adduced, than the fact that, although home manufacture was thus extensively promoted, the market of England had to be resorted to for supplying the demand arising from the better condition of the people. In 1782, the quantity of broadcloths imported into Ireland was 352,830 yards, and in 1790 the quantity of broadcloths imported was 653,899 yards. Meantime, the fostering guardianship of the Irish Parliament was constantly devoted to the encouragement and protection of the native manufactures. In 1785 they granted a sum of £5,000 to be expended in distributing looms, carding machines and other implements, and the establishment of woollen markets, and a further grant of £4,000 was made to pay apprentice fees with children to manufacturers. Other extensive grants were periodically made for the encouragement of cotton and silk manufactures."

And so on down to the end of the chapter. When we come to the particular places in which these industries sprung up, and where thousands upon thousands of people, under the national policy which was then inaugurated, found employment, and found plenty and prosperity for the country at large, we find that in Dublin:

"It is ascertained from authentic documents that in 1800 there were in Dublin 91 master manufacturers in the woollen trade, and these 91 master employers kept 1,122 looms busy in the making of broadcloths, druggets and cassimeres; and the total number of hands employed in all branches were 4,938."

What was the result, only a few years afterwards, of that unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries, with all the barriers removed? They had gone in, as we are now asked to go in, with the neighboring nation. There was a protective policy in England at that time, as there is one on

the other side of the line now. They were invited to go in, to have all the wealth of England poured into their lap, and to have their manufactures increased, to see them raise their tall chimneys to the skies, and to obtain prosperity throughout the length and the breadth of the land. What was the result?

"There are not more," he says, "than 250 woollen weavers employed in Dublin and its vicinity, and their average earnings for the last three years amount from 8s. to 10s. per week, making allowance for periods of idleness. At present—that is in 1840—there are not more than 12 master manufacturers, and the aggregate number of persons employed by them 682, in all branches.

Then the wool combing business employed a host of men in a separate manufacture altogether. The carpet manufacture was a most prosperous industry.

"At the period of the Union there were in Dublin 13 master manufacturers, having 109 looms, which gave employment, between weavers, spinners, dyers, helpers, &c., to 720 individuals."

They go on to say that the result of this unrestricted reciprocity with England, this commercial union with England, had effected the trade so much that it could hardly be said to exist at all. That was many years ago, and to-day it does not exist at all. In regard to the stuff and serge manufacture, they say:

"We find that at the period of the Union there were in Dublin 25 master manufacturers, having 1,120 looms, which gave employment to an equal number of weavers, and about 370 additional operatives, being 1,491 persons. At present there is but one master manufacturer of this article in Dublin."

That is, at the time these reports were printed. Then they say:

"Another branch of the woollen trade was the flannel manufacture, the principal seat of which lay in the county of Wicklow; and it flourished to such an extent as to induce the Earl of Fitzwilliam to erect at a cost of £3,500, an extensive market place in the town of Rathdrum, which he called Flannel Hall, solely for the exhibition and sale of this article. There were 12 fairs held annually at Rathdrum, and the average number of pieces exhibited at each fair was from 1,000 to 1,100 pieces. This manufacture gave employment to at least 1,000 looms, and, allowing for preparatory processes, many thousand persons. In some years after the Union, the manufacture began rapidly to decline. It was ascertained that in 1823 there were only 400 looms at work, 300 in 1833, 200 in 1827, 150 in 1823, and 100 in 1830. In this latter year (1830) The Flannel Hall was closed, and in 1832 only 30 looms could be counted, and in two years afterwards there was not a vestige of this formerly important and remunerative branch of industry. The flannel manufacture also gave employment to a class called 'finishers.'"

And they were wiped out as well as the rest. I may quote to you from Cork and its vicinity to show that there were 41 employers in the year 1800, engaging 457 looms, and, allowing for operatives of various classes, the number of persons deriving wages was at least 2,500 in the city of Cork. "In 1834, there were only two master manufacturers left who were employing 256 persons. The trade is now completely gone. The extensive factory of Mr. Lyons is converted into a bleaching green," as the result of this commercial union.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is what Nova Scotia says.

Mr. CURRAN. We will see what this book says as to unrestricted reciprocity, and we may hope that Canada will guard against the same thing. To go on to Limerick, it says:

"About 40 years ago there were in Limerick more than 1,000 woollen weavers, who were in constant employment, and in the enjoyment of comfort and independence. At present there are not 70 weavers in the city, and even these are scarcely able to provide a scanty subsistence."

In regard to Bandon, it says:

"This town was famed for its manufacture of camlets, cord and stuffs. The camlet trade was originally the staple of the town and neighborhood, and flourished about 50 years ago. The manufactured article was almost entirely exported to Lisbon, from whence the most remunerative returns were always made, producing over £ 00,000 a year. In 1835 a small mill for spinning woollen yarn, used in the manufacture of a fabric called Welbore, had been erected in Bandon, but the number of hands employed in it is inconsiderable, and the demand not sufficient to enable the proprietor to keep the concern regularly at work. The village of Enniskean, about 7 miles west of Bandon, gave

employment at one time to several combers; at present there is not one in the place. In fact the only branch of the woollen trade in existence in this district is that of freize for the country people."

The whole of the great industry, the finer work which gave employment to the skilled hands, had entirely disappeared at the time of these reports. In Kilkenny:

"At the period of the Union, there were no less than 16 manufacturers, principally engaged in the manufacture of blankets, for which fabric Kilkenny gained an unrivalled character. These employed among them all 333 looms, and in the various processes of the woollen manufacture there could not have been less than 3,000 altogether employed. At present there are not more than 100 employed. In 1800 there were 40 of the looms engaged in making superfine blankets, then technically called 'twelve-quarter blankets.' But such was the effect of the Union that in three years afterwards everyone was thrown idle, and has since remained so. According to the returns appended to the Revenue Commissioners' report above referred to, there was in Kilkenny in 1822 twelve master manufacturers, employing among them 925 persons. The merino factory produced superfine cloths, which sold so high as from 26s. to 34s. per yard. The value of cloths made at this factory has reached £40,000 in one year."

These were the industries which were to be more progressive and more prosperous under the Union with England.

"Carrick-on-Suir was famous from an early period for its ratteens and freizes, having largely experienced the bounty of Parliament up to 1793 or 1797, in nurturing these manufactures. Even the finer descriptions of cloth were made here with a success."

He goes on to give the same tale of woe with regard to that industry as with regard to all the others. He says:

"However, immediately after the Union, advantage was taken of a want of a domestic legislature, and influence was put to work whereby the standing order for obliging the military on the Irish establishments to be clothed here, was not only evaded, but in a short time totally rescinded, and supply thrown open to the competition of overpowering British capital and machinery. Mr. Moore retired; his successor followed his example, and from 400 to 600 persons were by that step immediately thrown out of bread. Henceforth the manufactures of Carrick presented but a sickly and faded existence. The amount of capital then invested exceeded £50,000; at present there are but 100 persons partially employed, and the wool-combing business has already altogether disappeared."

In Roscrea, they were exactly in the same condition:

"About 1800 the manufacturers became centred in the hands of a few master manufacturers, and one of them employed beyond 600 persons, about three or four hundred more may have been engaged by others. This trade continued to flourish till the period of the peace, and soon after 1815 began to decline."

And so it goes on. Mr. Crotty, was examined before the Assistant Inquiry Commissioners in 1834, and he gave the following testimony:

"Six years ago 1,000 persons, of whom 600 or 700 were females, were employed by me in Roscrea or its immediate neighborhood. The females spun the worsted, and the men combed and wove the wool; the latter earned 1s. 8d. a day at combing and about 1s. 1d. a day at weaving; the women could not make more than 1s. d. a day; but even this small sum being well applied, and for the most part to their own clothing, had a marked effect upon their appearance in general; all are completely destitute and the husbands are wandering about looking for work."

That has been the effect of unrestricted reciprocity with a great market and a rich country, in so far as the woollen industries are concerned. The cotton manufacture in Dublin is exactly in the same condition. We find that the same results have happened with regard to this great industry in Ireland, from the effects of unrestricted reciprocity. The condition of the cotton manufactures in Dublin at the time of the Union was as follows:—

"There were fifty-five master manufacturers engaged in the fabrics of cords, calicoes, checks, shawls, fastians, muslins, dimities, &c., and several of them also combined the business of spinning."

"There were from 40 to 50 minor manufacturers, keeping from five to ten looms going, as undertakers for the larger manufacturers. The total number of looms kept in work by the foregoing are computed upon the most accurate account, to have been 8,000, and the number of operatives to whom they gave bread in the various processes, was upwards of 14,000."

Now, these people were all wiped out. In calico printing the same result took place, and I want to point out particularly to hon. gentlemen here what the direct result of it was, and what the direct result would be here with regard to certain manufactures. What happened with regard to

calico printing? The calico printing was an important industry. They tell us:

"This particular branch has been carried on to a great perfection, so much so that the Irish prints have often commanded a preference in the London market."

And yet he says:

"It is a humiliating reflection that these very choice prints must be represented as London prints to secure a sale with the better classes, nay more. Within the last four or five years our printed calicos have been extensively exported to the American market, and put up in boxes, and labelled in imitation French packages, and then sold as French goods."

That was the effect of unrestricted reciprocity with this great and prosperous country, that was overflowing with capital; the effect was that these people actually had to put false labels upon their goods; they could not label their goods as their own, and in order to get rid of the little remnants that were left, they had to sell them almost under false pretences. In Bandon, the same thing took place in regards to cotton prints. There were 2,800 cotton weavers engaged in the manufacture of the various branches. In Belfast the cotton trade is entirely wiped out. In 1799:

"There were 2,000 calico looms at Balbriggan at full work, making calicos for printing. There were also from 400 to 500 cord looms in that town, and the adjoining parishes of Ardeath, Clonaboy, and Garristown. There were several eminent manufacturers here. Now there are only 226 looms employed in Balbriggan, and the average earnings for each does not exceed 6 shillings per week."

That was the result at the time this book was published. They had been reduced down to that extremity, and now I am told they have disappeared. Now what took place in the silk manufacture, an industry that was carried to the highest perfection? The tales given here with regard to that industry are appalling, and ought to cause serious reflections to those hon. gentlemen who are advocating unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. By a report made at the time it appears that in 1775 the artisans of the various classes employed numbered 5,840.

"In some years afterwards, the trade suffered a very considerable depression, which arose chiefly from the general use of muslins; but it was afterwards revived and the imports of raw silk nearly doubled. At the time of the Union, after various fluctuations, we find its condition to have been as follows:—

"There are 72 master manufacturers, engaged in various fabrics of broad silk, tabbinets, velvets, silk waistcoatings, handkerchiefs, crapes, persians, lining silks, modes, sarsenets, &c., and ribbons. The custom was to give out the materials to the weavers, who wove it in their own residences, the members of their family assisting in the preparatory operations. Besides the foregoing employers, there were innumerable minor undertakers, then termed "Chamber Masters," having from two to six or eight looms, and among the entire there could not have been less than 2,500 broad looms. In the ribbon line there were from 800 to 900 single hand looms, and 200 engine looms. In the ribbon branch there were at least 1,500 people employed; in the broad silk line, at least 5,000. In both not less than 6,500 persons were employed. The fourth report of the Irish Revenue Commissioners, state the number of looms in 1833 at 1,500, and the number employed from 3,000 to 4,000. In 1834, by an accurate account taken, the numbers were found to have fallen to 537. In 1838, by the report on hand-loom weavers, they are stated at 400, viz., 310 on broad silk, 280 on tabbinets and tabbereas, 30 on velvets and 32 on ribbons. At the present day the whole number of broad looms in actual work is 250, viz., about 170 on tabbinets, and the residue on velvet, waistcoatings and serges, together with ten or a dozen ribbon looms. There were besides, within the year subsequent to the Union, seven proprietors who carried on the business of silk throwing, and who gave employment to 230 females, earning from 2s. to 7s. per week. Some years ago, large capital was expended in establishing silk throwing mills in the Liberty, with improved machinery. Within the last six years, they employed upwards of 200 females. The mills are now silent."

In the hosiery the same result took place, and we have now at the end of this report the remarks made by the great statesman to whom these reports were dedicated. He says:

"Political economists have been much puzzled to fix upon tangible reasons for the wide-spread miseries of Ireland. At one time they will have it that Ireland is not suited for manufactures and can prosper only as an agricultural country; at another, that her miseries and failures are owing to her turbulent spirit, and the insecurity for life and property consequent thereon; at another, all mischiefs must be owing to excessive population. Then, again the religion of the people is arraigned as the sole cause of their poverty—with a thousand other equally wild and

Mr. CURRAN.

fallacious theories; while almost universal Ireland proclaims that all her woes and miseries are owing to the hateful union which took away her resident nobility and gentry, deprived her of the countenance and care of a Domestic Legislature, and subjected her to every species of impoverishment and neglect. One of the most fatal effects of that measure upon our trade and manufactures has been the premature withdrawal of the protecting duties; whereby Ireland, emaciated by the drain of her resources for four-and-twenty years, was suddenly left open to a fruitless competition against the overwhelming capital and influence of England."

That is the conclusion of this report which, I think, must have produced an effect upon the minds of every hon. gentleman here. But let us find what was the effect upon the people? How did the people fare when the bloated manufacturers were disposed of? The people had, no doubt, been told that the farming interests of the country were suffering, that there was a lot of bloated manufacturers and monopolists living upon the vitals of the people of Ireland, and, if these were swept away, the people would prosper, that their misfortunes would disappear, that great wealth would tumble into their lap, and that the agriculturists of Ireland, and all those who were not interested in those protected industries, would be benefited by the change. We have a report stating the result of this change of policy. In the report of the Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers for that year, we find the following appalling statements:

"The mass of human misery which fell under the province of this charity to relieve, has been unparalleled. In the year 1826, 6,497 families, containing 24,262 persons, have been relieved; hundreds were on the eve of perishing from actual starvation, and the dreadful weight of fever and other malignant disorders, the consequence of the poverty and want which arose principally from a general stagnation of trade and want of employment in various branches of manufacture, particularly the woollen, cotton and silk, in that part of the city called the Liberty. It is impossible to describe the appalling state of privation in which these poor artificers were found by the inspectors.

"The committee were reluctantly obliged to lay aside innumerable cases of distress, which were entirely out of their power to relieve, and early in the spring vast numbers of the artificers in the branches of trade above alluded to, were seen in the streets in the deepest state of despondency. Their appearance exhibited evident proofs of poverty and starvation."

Another report says:

"Even the employers themselves felt the depression; and many were involved in the common ruin—they could hold out no longer. The Roomkeepers' Charity was at last obliged to be resorted to, and applications were numerous from persons who had heretofore been in very comfortable circumstances."

Another report says:

"There have been local causes of distress which operated to increase our numbers considerably, pressing with peculiar severity in 1825 and the immediately following years. About this time a very serious, and in its progress at least, a very distressing change was taking place in many important manufactures in the city. These manufactures had given employment to multitudes in Dublin, and although many families have emigrated to England to obtain work, yet they have left behind them multitudes, more particularly females, deprived of their usual mode of employment."

"It is not for this committee to follow these manufactures through their different gradations, as they fluctuated, or as they declined; this committee has simply to put forward facts and it does so when it states, that of forty-five establishments that had been engaged in the woollen manufacture (in 1821), all, with the exception of twelve houses, and their dependencies of human labor, had ceased to exist; and that in the summer of 1829, of what little that remained of those who derived their maintenance from these manufactures—3,289 persons in the silk trade, 1,969 of the cotton trade, and 1,193 of the woollen trade, making altogether 6,451 persons,—were all out of employment, and in the extreme state of destitution."

We have it upon the authority of these reports that there were employed in those various manufactures at the time when the people were sought to be induced to change their fiscal policy along with their political status, not less than 150,000 people who were directly making their living and acquiring a competency out of the manufactures of the country. But, as I said a moment ago, the people of the country at large have been told that if the present state of things were changed the people would have the wealth distributed among them, and the agricultural classes would benefit largely by the change. Now, what was the result in Ireland? I find it was described as follows:

"The number of agricultural laborers in Ireland is computed by the Poor Law Commissioners, at 1,170,000, and they assumed that one half of these, being 585,000, are out of employment for thirty weeks in the year; and as these have 1,800,000 dependent on them, the two numbers make 2,385,000 persons to be provided for thirty weeks in the year.

I do not wish to read at greater length the reports upon this point; but we have in this volume evidence that must convince every man who has the slightest regard for the experience of history, and when we hear the tale of woe it should be one of warning to the people of Canada when they are told that the only thing they have to do is to go into commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with our great neighbor alongside of us. The industries of Ireland and everything connected with Irish prosperity was engulfed in the prosperity of the larger nations; and are we to be told after the experience of the past, after what we have seen in this country, when Canada was made a slaughter market for surplus stocks of manufactured goods on the other side of the line—are we to be told, does it require any one to tell the people what would again be the result if our markets were thrown open? Why, the result would be what it was formerly only in a more acute degree. It may be said that that misery which came upon the people of Ireland could never prevail in this Canada of ours. But such a statement cannot be made in my presence; I have seen what can result. I have seen in Montreal with my own eyes strong men and willing men, with good stout hearts, who were willing and desirous of earning their living, obliged to go to the soup kitchen and there ask for that charity which they were obliged to accept to their humiliation. We have seen men who have been earning previous to the advent into power of hon. gentlemen opposite, as has been stated on public platforms by workingmen in Montreal, over and over again, men earning \$2 and \$2.50 a day, and what was left open to them? To earn 60 cents or 70 cents a day, digging in public works around the canal basin, endeavoring to earn a miserable subsistence. Some of these were workingmen who had organised before that time and had held mass meetings to establish hours of labor, men who previous to the downfall of the Government led by the present Premier had stated that workingmen must work only eight or nine hours a day, and yet afterwards when hon. gentlemen opposite had assumed the reins of power and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) directed the fiscal policy of the country, these workingmen were going about saying: "For God's sake give us work for any number of hours either day or night in order to save our wives, children and ourselves from starvation." That was the result. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen opposite to tell us that the question of unrestricted reciprocity has sunk down deep in the hearts of the people. But I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that so long as the mover of this resolution is in public life never again will the people accept from him the fiscal gospel that is to lead them to salvation. And now that we have heard from one hon. gentleman opposite and from another, what has been the burden of the song? Has it been one of hope, of aspiration? Why, no. It has been a wail, and that wail has been echoed and re-echoed from one mouth to another all along their line until finally the people of this country, listening to their wail, have grown weary. We have been told, and told with a great deal of force, all that our country offers to us in the future. We have been told by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in the course of the most elaborate speeches, that great benefits would accrue to us from the union with our neighbors; but their preaching is entirely at variance with what they say their practice will be. We know that we have a great country. We know that the advantages of this country have not been by any means overdrawn by the beautiful pictures that have been presented to us by the various speakers during this debate. We know very well the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot take from the hearts of the

Canadian people the hope that is in them that this country is going to be great and prosperous. We know that we have to-day as good a country to live in, as fair a country to live in, as any people on the face of the earth. We feel that to-day we are in the golden age. Whatever changes may come, whatever changes time may bring, there is one thing perfectly certain: it is that we can never be freer, never be happier, never be better off than we are to-day. It is needless to enter into any lengthy observations with respect to this country. We admit its wealth not only above the soil in its great fertility, not only on the soil in its magnificent returns as to husbandry, and not only beneath the soil in mines and minerals. We have hope for our country, and we have great aspirations for its future. We do not mind what may be the political grievances of those who have various political views; our desire is to remain as long as we can as we are. The position that we now occupy may be too beautiful to last, but at all events as long as we can make it last we shall make it last. It is not our desire to destroy the good feeling which exists between us and the people on the other side of the line. We feel that we have a destiny of our own; we feel that when we shall have passed from our present position that we shall pass under other conditions to a position among nations and as a part of a great Empire. We feel that Canada is our home and that all our interests are centred here. We do not desire to have the arguments prevail which have been set before us by the other side, but we mean this and simply this, that we shall not sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. We are not, Mr. Speaker, to be lured away by the fact that we are to sacrifice all our hopes and aspirations for a change in the tariff of wheat. No, gentlemen, we have a higher and a nobler prospect for this country and for ourselves. We feel in this country that we have:

"Here in Canadian heart and home and name
This name which yet shall grow
Till all the nations know
Us for a patriot people,
Loyal to our native earth,
Our own Canadian land,"

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the very able speeches which have been made on this question from the opposite side of the House and from this side of the House too, and I begin to feel very nervous in rising to make a speech. We have had a great deal of professional talent and we have a great deal of professorial talent as well, so that you will hardly expect me to occupy the time of the House for a very long time. I wish just to touch on a few points and leave the remainder of the argument for somebody else. Reciprocity has been a part of my political faith for the last 40 years and as I grow older my opinions grow stronger in favor of reciprocity, in favor of free trade, if possible; but if free trade is out of the question I will go for reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this reciprocity treaty might have been carried eight years ago, but I think there have been obstacles thrown in the way as has been shown by the gentlemen on the other side of the House to obtaining reciprocity. That is to say we have a large national debt. Eight years ago we had a revenue of some \$18,000,000 and an expenditure of about the same amount. In Canada to-day we have an expenditure of \$36,000,000 and a revenue of about the same. I want to say that this National Policy was introduced in this House not fairly and squarely as protection, but it was introduced as a readjustment tariff. Hon. gentlemen who are supporters of the present Government stated positively before the country that there was no idea of placing protection on the country, but that it was simply a readjustment of the tariff and that it was done for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity. I remember well when the hon. the Finance Minister speaking at Charlotte-

town, P.E.I., declared to the people: "Gentlemen of Charlottetown, if you want reciprocity support us in the National Policy for two years and I will guarantee you reciprocity then." Eight years have passed over our heads since that time and what is the prospect now? There is no more prospect; indeed not as much of obtaining reciprocity now than there was then. I would rather this discussion on reciprocity had been cut off altogether at present or that it had taken place after the discussion on the fishery negotiations. The hon. the Minister of Finance has been at Washington, and perhaps, he has opened the door to our obtaining our wants. It appears that the commissioners have removed certain irritable matters connected with the fishery negotiations and in my belief it is a very opportune time for the people of Canada to let the people of the United States know what our views are. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just read a letter here to show that what I say is true. Here is a correspondence between the right hon. the leader of the Government and Mr. Boyd:

"Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"The Government press here state that you propose to raise the tariff generally to 35 per cent. Can I contradict this?"

"JOHN BOYD."

This reply came promptly this morning as follows:—

"TORONTO, 19th July.

"To JOHN BOYD, St. John.

"It is an absurd falsehood; neither at London nor elsewhere have I gone beyond my motion in Parliament, and have never proposed an increase, but only a readjustment of tariff."

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Now, I am in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I believe we can obtain reciprocity now. The only objection to reciprocity appears from the other side. They say: "We are willing to have reciprocity, only do not touch the National Policy." I have listened to every speech delivered from the other side of the House, and the whole cry is: "Don't touch the National Policy." That National Policy was put on the country not for the purpose of raising money for revenue, but merely for the purpose of readjusting the tariff and of compelling the Americans to give us reciprocity. Well, I do not think the other side of the House have carried through their policy. Now, I will make some remarks on the speeches I have heard from the other side of the House and let me say that I think my friend the Minister of the Interior made a very moderate speech from his standpoint. He said in one place that the prices assimilate very much between the United States and Canada, quoting I think as proof of this from the Toronto and Buffalo markets. I do not suppose he was far out of the way in the statement he made there and I am not going to object to it. I am going to come to that by-and-bye when I allude to the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is said there is only one step between the sublime and the ridiculous, and when I listened to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) yesterday I found that he pitched a tune here and that tune was "God save the Queen." If there is any gentleman in this House who can pitch the tune any better than he has done, we should all join in on both sides of the House and sing it well. But is that the question? It calls to my mind a thing that happened in my experience. I was once Commodore of a Regatta Club. We had a regatta in the harbor and the first day was for sailing boats and the second day for rowing boats. The band on the cutter struck up the music before we started on the regatta. I had an eight-oar gig and I had to get up a crew for hard practice in order to win the race. I knew a Bostonian who had been for many years the stroke oar of the crew, and when the band on board one of the yachts struck up "Rule Britannia," I was quite surprised that this man fainted. I said: "What is the matter, Peter?" And he said: "I am very faint." I said:

Mr. WELSH.

"What made you faint?" "Well, sir," says he, "the last time I heard that tune of 'Rule Britannia' I will tell you where it was. It was out in Van Dieman's Land and I went on shore in a boat to the convict's settlement. I saw six convicts chained to a wheelbarrow wheeling dirt up a plank and singing 'Rule Britannia.'" I claim to be just as loyal as any man in this House, but if you bring the farmers and fishermen of this Dominion to wheel dirt up a plank, you cannot expect them to whistle "Rule Britannia." I am not going to be very positive in any of my statements, and if any of them are not correct I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will correct me at once. Now, I say that 75 per cent. of our population are engaged in agriculture and fishing. How many are engaged in manufactures,—in those home industries hon. gentlemen talk so much about? Are there more, on the average, than ten in every hundred? Well, if we have to bear the heavy burdens of protection for those ten men, the ninety have to pay the cost. More than that, if we could get the proposed reciprocity arrangement with the United States, those ten men engaged in industrial pursuits would profit more than they have ever profited yet, because now they must manufacture only goods enough to supply the home demand, but under reciprocity they would have larger markets and larger scope for their energies; and I for one feel that the manufacturers of this Dominion are of that Anglo-Saxon race who are able to compete with the world, if you only give them a chance. But while you are protecting them, as you say, I believe you are doing them an injury. My hon. friend from Halifax said the other day that the principal cotton manufacturer in New Brunswick is anxious to have this resolution carried through, so that he may be able to extend his business. Now, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) last night, gave us one of the strongest proofs of our need of freer commercial intercourse with the United States, that have been given on the floor of this House. I have always understood that our blue books were intended to be quoted from, and were accepted as authorities by hon. gentlemen opposite. But what did we see last night? We saw the hon. member for Hamilton get up and ridicule the use of these blue-books on the floor of this House, and where did he go to get the information to contradict one of our own blue-books? He had to go to the United States. I compliment my hon. friend on proving our case. As to the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Curran), I tell you I was astonished. God bless my soul, if you want any man in the world to advocate our cause in this House, he is the very man who has done it. He says the union of Ireland with England has ruined the country, and the union of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with Canada has ruined us all. Allow me to warn the Government that if they want to bring Newfoundland into Confederation, they should keep the hon. member for Montreal Centre out of the way. If you do not, they will be sold; and if there is a warning for the people of Newfoundland on the face of the earth, they got it to-day in my hon. friend's speech. Gentlemen, these are facts, and it is for you to say whether they are true or not. I state to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House that if I say anything they do not agree with, let them say no, because if they do not say no, I will say they all agree with me, everyone of them. Now, some time ago my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke in this House about these duties, and here is the statement he made:

"You have upwards of 40,000 carpenters upon whose tools, food and clothing, you propose to lay a duty of at least 20 per cent.; what compensation have you given them? Their wives and children, for whom they must provide, number 160,000; how are you helping them? It is not in your power to give them any help. To them your policy is worse than the policy of the 'fly on the wheel.' You can do nothing for them. You are doing much that is to their detriment. Let us see, Sir, what the Finance Minister does for the blacksmiths of Canada. In 1871 there were 15,694. Now there cannot be less than 20,000. They represent a population of 100,000 souls. What have you done for these peo-

ple? You have taxed their tools 30 per cent.; you have taxed their steel 10 per cent.; you have taxed their iron 17½ per cent.; you have taxed their horse-shoe nails 30 per cent.; you have taxed their coal 50 cents per ton; you have taxed their bread and meat; everything they wear; you have taxed all they use to make their houses decent and their families comfortable. There is not one of them whose burdens will not be increased by at least fifty dollars a year." And this is his closing argument:

"This is a tariff to make a very few rich and a great many poor."

Now, I was always opposed to the National Policy, and I oppose it still. We hear a great deal on that side of the House about the difficulties of getting commercial reciprocity, and the injury it will do to the National Policy. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, just says: "Anything you like, only don't touch the National Policy."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WELSH. I think so. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine speaks with mathematical precision; and I do not think the hon. gentleman had any trouble in crossing the *pons asinorum*. But let me tell that hon. gentleman that there are a good many asses' bridges that he has not crossed—bridges in marine's strategy, if not in farm strategy. What does the hon. gentleman say? He said that he visited Prince Edward Island last summer; he paid it a night visit, as I understand—and if I am not correct in what I state, I hope the hon. gentleman will contradict me. He visited the Island about seven o'clock in the evening and left in the morning. I do not know why he went to Prince Edward Island, but he seemed to have found out something during his visit, for he referred, in his speech, several times to Prince Edward Island. He found out that we had a savings bank, and that we had \$2,000,000 deposited in it. I do not know why he came to the Island, and why he should have visited it at night. I wonder if he had any design on that money. I do not know what else he came for, but the hon. gentleman will explain in due course, I have no doubt. As a sign of the prosperity of the Island, he quoted the amount we had in the savings bank. Did he tell you, Sir, who the depositors were? No, he did not; but, at all events, I will say this, that any one who points to money lying idle in a savings bank as a sign of the commercial prosperity and activity of the country, does not know what he is talking about. It is not a sign of commercial prosperity that a large amount of money should be lying idle, but it is a sign of commercial activity and progress when money is in active circulation and bearing a fair interest. Let us take up some of the statements of the hon. gentleman and see whether they will hold water; let us see whether they will bear out the mathematical precision with which the hon. gentleman sought to invest them. He found out something else during his short visit to our Island. And what do you think it was? Oh! he said, the Canadians are still marrying and giving in marriage; we hope for better times, there is some chance for them yet. "Coming events cast their shadows before."

Mr. FOSTER. In your case they have not cast any shadow yet.

Mr. WELSH. When the hon. gentleman has consummated that alliance, of which he has given us a hint, it will take some of the mathematical precision out of him. He also spoke about the farmers, and the rapid rise of values in land, and he contended that if we had commercial reciprocity the value of land in the Island would not improve. Were the hon. gentleman a school-master, and were he to tell that to a lot of school boys, they would chase him out of school. The idea that reciprocity would not improve the value of our lands is too absurd to be seriously entertained for a moment. It would improve them, I say, probably 300 per cent. And my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior also gave us his views on this question, and I will deal with both those hon. gen-

tleman together. They told us that the farmers in this country were well off, and that the farmers in Prince Edward Island in particular were making fortunes. I will give my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior 100 acres of the choicest land in the Island, and I will call it the Interior farm. I will give the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries 100 acres of the best land alongside it, and call it the Marine farm. And a little way off, with a wall between, I will take 100 acres myself and call it the Reciprocity farm. Now, I am going to state what is the truth, and I am sorry to have to say it; but if those hon. gentlemen, who talk so glibly about the prosperity of our farmers, had to work their lands and support their families, even if they had the finest crops, and obtained the highest prices that were paid last year in the island, when for their potatoes, after hauling them six or seven miles through a foot deep of mud, they could only get 18 cents, and for their oats 26 cents, they would find the reality considerably different from the picture they draw here. The hon. the Minister of Marine spoke of some statement made in this House as "atrocious blunders." Will that hon. gentleman tell me he could support a family on the produce of his farm, when he could only get 18 cents for his potatoes and 26 cents for his oats? Would he call that prosperity? While I, on my Reciprocity farm, would be getting 27 cents for my potatoes and 45 to 50 cents for my oats. This is what reciprocity means in the Island. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may have crossed the *pons asinorum* in college, but he certainly has not crossed it in farming. He has a good deal to learn in that line yet. I speak a little warmly on this subject, but I am a farmer myself, representing a population of 55,000 people, most of whom are engaged in agriculture, and I must say that those 55,000 will compare favorably with any 55,000 people on the face of God's earth. I would be negligent to my duty, I would be ashamed to hold up my head in this House, if I were to sit silent here and not give utterance to my sentiment. What is the reason that six members from Prince Edward Island are sent to this House opposed to the Government? What argument can be stronger than is afforded by their presence here? I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, we must have reciprocity, or the people will become impoverished. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) made the statement, that while previous to 1878 the people of the Dominion could not get employment, now every man in the Dominion is employed. I said "no," and the hon. gentleman hedged himself by referring back to Montreal, his own constituency. He ought to have apologised for the statement he made with reference to Prince Edward Island, but he did not. He hedged himself back, and I am glad he got into his own shell. I am now speaking for the people I represent, and in that respect we are on an equal footing. I do hope that things will come right. My hon. friend took up another important point. The farmers he said went away in the winter to earn money for their families, and came back on their farms in the spring. I pity the farm, when the farmer has to leave it; when he has to leave his wife and children, his cattle, his oxen and his sheep; what is to become of them in his absence? I suppose they are to live during the winter like the bears, by sucking their paws. My hon. friend must know that no man can farm on that system, and if he has found out instances of that kind, he has discovered more marvellous things than I ever could find in Prince Edward Island. I know of no farmers on the Island who leave their farms in the fall to work abroad all winter and come back in the spring, and therefore I can refute that statement as far as my knowledge goes. The Minister of Marine said, in that speech to which I have referred:

"The other section of the people went away because they wished to earn ready money, they went into the industrial centres in order

to earn it. They found no industrial centres in Prince Edward Island. If after the farming season had passed, and they wanted to earn something for the crowded family, the quickest way they could find to earn it was to take boat and rail and go down to the manufacturing towns of Maine, to the manufacturing towns of New England, and earn their wages during the winter, coming back in the summer to work upon their farms."

Now I hope the hon. gentleman will look over that and consider it. Now, I am going to come to another little matter, and we will have a little talk about that. Here is something of the marvellous kind. The hon. gentleman goes on and says:

"Sir, in the former time ships went to the country for raw sugar. The raw product was taken to Great Britain, and British ships took the freights upon it. That sugar was carried on British railways to British refineries, and British railways had their profits. British workmen worked up the sugar, and the wages were paid to British people."

What sympathy was there for England there?

"Then it was put in cars and steamships and sent to St. John, Halifax or Montreal with the maximum of cost; and that, Sir, went into the figures upon which the total imports were based. That was the case with 95 per cent., if I mistake not, of the sugar consumed here. To-day of the whole sugar consumed in this country 96 per cent., if I mistake not, comes raw from the places where it is grown; it is brought into our own country, it is carried upon our own railways, worked up in our own refineries, and all the added cost put upon it goes into the pockets of our own people."

Cheer now. Cheer, boys, cheer. Here is the statement of the Minister of Marine, who says that all this goes into the pockets of our own people. I will show where it goes—

"That, of course, makes a vast difference. So it is with the cotton trade and the woollen trade."

And so he goes on.

"Well, Sir, there is another question that is necessary to be put: If our trade is decreasing, how do you explain this fact? In 1875 the total registered tonnage entering into and out of the ports of this country, excluding coasting vessels always, was 9,537,000 tons, in 1876 it was 9,911,000 tons, in 1887 it was a little more than 14,000,000 tons. Did the vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves?"

By-the-bye, that puts me in mind of something. During his visit to the Provinces, I believe the Minister of Marine found the waves very yeasty. I am told that he found the waves so yeasty that he did not stay there very long. I am told that he threw up everything except his pay, he was so disgusted with the yeasty waves. That may be so or it may not be, but at all events he did not stop there long. He says:

"Did the vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves, making port now and then for the purpose of getting entered and cleared; or were they here on business and to carry on the commerce of the country? The latter evidently."

I say it is a most extraordinary thing and I apply to every hon. gentleman on that side of the House as well as on this side that we should have more tonnage now than we had five years ago when our imports and exports are decreasing. How does that tonnage become manipulated in this manner? Will the hon. gentleman have the candour to explain that in the right manner? I think I have the right clue to this. A steamer goes from Montreal to New Brunswick, she is entered at the port in New Brunswick, she goes to Nova Scotia and she is entered there, she goes to Prince Edward Island and she is entered there, and so on, so that one ship is made to represent half a dozen. Why does not the hon. gentleman get up in a candid, honest manner and explain these things? Why should he leave these matters open to have them explained in this fashion? I know that I have had to send vessels of my own three different ports within a few miles of each other, and they are entered in each of these ports, and they may be entered in half a dozen ports in a year, and thus this increased tonnage would appear. It is impossible that we can employ increased tonnage when our exports and imports are decreasing. Now, what about this sugar, the price for which goes into the pockets of the

Mr. WELSH.

people? Before I touch on that, however, I want to refer to a paper, the *Prince Edward Island Agriculturist*, of Summerside, of the 12th March, which gives a summary of the prices in the markets of Prince Edward Island, as follows: White oats, 28 cents a bushel; black oats, 27 cents a bushel; early rose potatoes and shenangoes, 20 cents a bushel, and so on. Now, there is no man who would dare to challenge that statement in regard to the prices of produce in Prince Edward Island. Now, we will come to the matter of sugar. I find by the returns that there were 200,466,000 lbs. imported into this Dominion last year for home consumption, at a cost of \$486,062, which would be equal to about 2½ cents a lb. I find that the duty amounted to \$316,752, or nearly 1½ cts. a lb. There is a little over 4 cents a pound on the sugar landed here duty paid. That sugar is sold for about 7 cents, I think, in Canada. Where do the other 3 cents go? Will any hon. gentleman tell me? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine says it goes into the pockets of the people. I tell him that it comes out of their pocket. Can any one deny it? I have bought sugar in England, good brown sugar, not refined, for 2 cents a pound.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WELSH. Who says "no?"

An hon. MEMBER. Echo.

Mr. WELSH. I would be very sorry to make a statement in this House that would not dare contradiction. I say that you can buy refined sugar in Glasgow for 4 cents a pound. What did they do in Montreal when these combines put up the price last summer? They sent to Scotland and brought out the sugar and paid the high duty on refined sugar and undersold the combines, and yet we find a gentleman of his high position in this House to-day telling the five millions of people in this country that that money goes into the pockets of the people of this Dominion. I say no, it comes out of their pockets, and I hope I have convinced the hon. gentleman that the people of Prince Edward Island are laboring under great disadvantages. They are not in a state of rebellion, it is true, but, if they were treated in the manner in which that hon. gentleman treats them for long, they would give you more trouble than the North-West does. I may compliment some of the members of the Government and especially the Minister of Public Works, with whom I have had a great deal to do since I have been on the floor of this House, and I may say that I have been treated by him in the most courteous, honorable and gentlemanly manner, and I believe he would stretch a point if necessary to benefit the people. If the other members of the Government would do the same, it would be better for them. When a man comes here representing the people, and places their wants before the Government, I like to see the members of the Government treat him with respect and consideration, and look into the wants of the people, and try to redress their grievances. But, Mr. Speaker, these high and mighty men that we have in the departments keep us dancing at their heels, or waiting in the ante-room, and we can get no satisfaction out of them. I must say that I for one, will not give them a chance of doing it again if I can help it. Well, now I come to the Marine Department, and there is a lot I want to say about that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let him down easily.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) to-day made a shout about our shipping. Well, there is a most extraordinary thing. The United States have protected their shipping until it was almost nowhere. They were the second flag in the world, and since they adopted a policy of protection their ships are almost wiped off the sea. What is the result of our National Policy to our

shipping interests? Our marine interest, I think, is second to none in this country, but since the National Policy has been in operation, our shipping has fallen off to the amount of 6 million dollars. The earning power of 6 million dollars has been lost since that policy was introduced. I believe this to be a fact, and as no hon. gentlemen contradicts me, it must be allowed to be a fact. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made no effort to assist us. The Government of this country, while protecting every other industry in the country, are neglecting the marine industry. We are handicapped in various ways. Where do those ships that we have left, find employment? Will the Minister of Marine or any hon. gentleman on that side answer me—where do the ships that we have now get employment? Seven out of ten get employment in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WELSH. I say, yes. Who is it that denies it? I will take his name down. Now what do we see on the Intercolonial Railway, that great national highway. That railway has got more work than it can perform, and it appears that the more work it has, the more money it loses. It is a most extraordinary thing. I think there must be some lack in that railway when, although the work is increasing, the loss also is steadily increasing. What is the loss to the taxpayers of this country on the money invested in railways? From a rough calculation that I have made it amounts to over \$14,000 a day. That is the amount of money the taxpayers of this country have to pay in interest on the money invested in railway. I think if that Intercolonial Railway was left to its ordinary traffic, a fair, profitable traffic, it would pay, but they undertake to bring coal up for less than it costs, and they are running the railway at the expense of the people of this Dominion in order to ruin the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence, and to injure the laboring population of Montreal and Quebec. We have plenty of ships, and if the Government had let the ships perform this work of bringing up coal, to Quebec and Montreal—

Mr. MITCHELL. It is only the Tories who do that.

Mr. WELSH. Oh, you shut up. Now, I am going to ask my hon. friends opposite, if they lived down in Prince Edward Island how they would like to pay a duty of 15 cents on potatoes, a duty on oats and on most everything else we have to sell? If this duty was taken off don't you think that the poor man would have a little more money in his pocket and be able to support his family better? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, my heart bled last November in Prince Edward Island. I had a ship loading with potatoes for the United States. I have seen poor farmers come hauling twelve bushels of potatoes seven miles through one foot of mud, and getting only 18 cents a bushel. I thought to myself, I don't know how you support your family, I know it must be hard. And yet this glorious protection! Hurrah! We are a happy people, and all that. Rule Britannia! Yes, rule Britannia! How can you expect these people to whistle "Rule Britannia" who have such hard work to make both ends meet? I do not want to go under the flag of the United States. I am proud of being a British subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, "hear, hear." But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have not heard any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House refute a single statement made by hon. member from South Oxford. His resolution stands there still. Now, the Minister of Marine has moved an amendment. Let me read it:

"That Canada, in the future as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion, which was adopted in 1879, and which has

since received, in so marked a manner, the sanction and approval of the people."

Now, is that not just the way every hon. gentleman on that side has spoken? National Policy and Protection. If the Americans will give us anything for nothing, we will take it; and if they will not, we won't have it. Now, I know the people I represent expect something different. I would not dare to go back to the county I represent and tell the people I had done nothing towards getting them a better market. I trust that better times will come for this Dominion; I believe better times are coming for this Dominion, and that a change is going to take place. I do not know in what way it will take place, but I believe it will come. I hoped, before this debate came on, that the Minister of Finance would have laid the fishery negotiations before the House. I have considerable faith in that hon. gentleman, and I believe he was the right man in the right place. I trust that before long a brighter era will dawn upon the people of this country. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) spoke of the farmers of his district, and I think he spoke fairly and well as to the wants of the people. I have not yet heard the hon. members for Manitoba express their opinion as to what that Province requires. I do not know whether New Brunswick sends any farmer as a member of this House; if it does, I should like to hear his ideas in regard to this matter. If there is a farmer here from Nova Scotia I should like to hear from him; if there is a farmer from Cape Breton I should like to hear his ideas. I know very well my ideas on the question, and every hon. member must know that before any of us were born Prince Edward Island was known in history as the garden of British North America. We grow immense crops there, and if we had reciprocity the quantities of our root crops would be more than doubled or trebled. The value of our lands would increase; our farmers' sons would not go away to the United States and to other places but would stay at home, and there is plenty of land in the Island for three times the population we have there. How can you expect young men to stay at home when a farmer cannot give his son sufficient for his labor to provide food and clothing; but give the farmers fair prices for their produce, and their sons would have an opportunity of settling and remaining in the country. Do you think under such conditions they would want to leave? No; there is in every man's breast a feeling that if he can by any possibility make a living and prosper in his native home he will not leave it. I hope the House will give the matter fair consideration, and I hope also that the Government, who have listened to me very attentively, will consider the wants of Prince Edward Island. As I told them last year, we are suffering, we are laboring under great disadvantages, we are shut out from the world during five months of the year, our business has all to be done within a few months, and moreover our harbors, our piers and other works are not attended to in any respect whatever. In fact, we are almost totally neglected. Because Prince Edward Island sends here six members to represent her wants and grievances here is she to be coerced?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) does not like coercion. What did we see here a short time ago? A Conservative paper in Prince Edward Island denounced the Government in stronger terms than I have denounced them, and there was good reason for it. Do not tread on the worm or it will turn. If the Government had treated that Province fairly I would not have been here, and I doubt if one of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy seats on the floor as Island representatives would have been here. I bring our wants to the notice of Parliament, to the attention of hon. members from every

section of the Dominion, from British Columbia to the confines of Great Britain, and I hope they will be attended to as they ought to be. I am satisfied that if this resolution is carried and we have reciprocity, a new era of prosperity will come to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WELSH. Some hon. gentlemen say "no." How do you know? I say I hope so—I believe it. You may not believe it; I cannot answer for you, and you must answer to your own consciences for your own belief.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved second reading of Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I promised an hon. member who desired to oppose this Bill that it would not be taken up this evening, and I therefore hope it will be taken up at another time.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It must be taken into consideration that if other Bills are read the second time to-night they will take precedence before this Bill in the committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not be alarmed, the Session will not be very short.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman forces us to go on with the Bill we shall have to discuss it for the hour, and it will be better for him not to proceed with it. There might be an understanding arrived at that would prevent any opposition to the second reading, and I would certainly advise my hon. friend not to insist on taking the second reading now.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Then, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that if the Minister proposes to object to the Bill, there is no use in moving its second reading. Under those circumstances of course I am obliged to submit, and I submit with the best grace I possibly can.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is better, perhaps, that the Bill should stand over. I had some little experience in North Renfrew last summer—not a satisfactory experience as far as results are concerned—but, I got my experience in another way as to how public business is done and as to how elections are carried and the influences that are at work there. It has just struck me in connection with this bill, and with what people said, that it would be better let it stand. My hon. friend I had the honor to meet, but did not succeed in beating; yet I discovered that there are ways which are dark which my hon. friend understood, and that certain things were reported to me to have been exercised on certain influential men in that county which this Bill looks to me to be the outcome of. If the hon. gentleman takes up that bill I hope he will give us a little information on it. I do not want to take him by surprise, but I propose to make some little enquiries about the objects of this Bill, and about the promises made to individual members forming part of the chartered names in that Bill. I trust that the hon. member will be able to give us some satisfactory information.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) I trust when this Bill comes up for second reading that I shall be able to give such explanation to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as will satisfy him and this House that it is a perfectly proper Bill. I desire to resent the insinuation which the hon. gentleman has made regarding my conduct in the election. If there were any ways that are dark and tricks that are

Mr. WELSH.

vain, the hon. gentleman himself knows more about them than anybody else.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may be all very fine for him to say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will get order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot, you have spoken.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will any person move the adjournment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want the right hon. gentleman to understand that he cannot choke me off when he likes, and he will find that out too before the Session is over. I simply want to say in reply to the hon. member for Renfrew, (Mr. White) that I heard some remarks in connection with the intended improvement of the Ottawa River, and about things which had been guaranteed to certain gentlemen in that riding.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Did you hear them from me?

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear them from you? You are too cunning to tell that. You know your own interest and you know how to go about it. You know the old Pontiac railroad in which you got \$11,000 or \$12,000 and you did not tell about that. You even denied it. However, I wish merely to give notice of this to the hon. gentleman that I may not take him by surprise.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman could ever take me by surprise. I shall always be prepared with every measure I submit to this House to defend it if it requires defence. I certainly am ready for the hon. gentleman either here or in any other place that he chooses.

Motion withdrawn.

MERCHANTS MARINE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN. I ask the favor of the House to resume the adjourned debate for the second reading of Bill (No. 11) An Act to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its charter and to provide for the winding up of its affairs. I believe the gentlemen who objected the other night have withdrawn their objection and are satisfied that the Bill should have a second reading.

Mr. MITCHELL. I took exception to the second reading of that Bill on the ground that another director and myself who were in the House never heard anything about it. Since that time the president of the company has written me a letter explaining that it was an oversight he had committed and explaining the nature of his Bill. I therefore withdraw the objection.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting Bonds or Branch Lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Searth.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone on whom it devolves to answer the extraordinary speech made by the hon. member who addressed us before recess, is entitled to the fullest sympathy of both parties in this House, for there was no point on which the hon. gentleman did not touch, there was no point which touching he did not adorn, and no point which, having adorned, he had better not have left untouched. It seemed to fall in very much with the fancy of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House; it seemed to be something after their own hearts; they enjoyed it, and I am sure we also enjoyed it to some extent. It was a heterogeneous mass of statements. The hon. gentleman ensconced himself in a coat-of-mail by assuring us that unless we said "no" to every statement he made, it was intended that we should say "yes." He wandered over every point that had been taken up in the exhaustive debate which has been in progress in this House during the last five or six days. He told us—and that makes it difficult to answer any of his points—that we must not think he is always addressing us, because he is often conning the matter over to himself, or he is musing over it, or he is still on the *pons asinorum* over there, and unable to get off. He was able, in the midst of his lucubrations, to give advice to the hon. Minister of Marine and to forecast his future. He was able to give advice worthy of Mr. Weller with reference to widows and matrimony. He was able to view the whole Dominion from the Garden of Eden, with an adamite or pre-adamite instinct, and he considered that the whole tariff of this Dominion should be managed on the basis of pleasing Prince Edward Island. Last session we have heard a great deal of Prince Edward Island. In fact, I thought of moving a resolution, after hearing so much about Prince Edward Island, that Ontario is still a part of this Confederation, and intended to remain a part of it. He said what do you say of this policy? Why, there are six members from the Garden of Eden who are all here ready to represent it; there is not a single man from that Island sent to oppose it; and how can you men from Ontario and the far west oppose it? He might have added that there were sixteen members from Nova Scotia out of the twenty-one whose views might be heard. But my hon. friend, with a charming innocence, viewed the whole Dominion through the little eyeglass of Prince Edward Island, and seemed to consider that outside of that there was no creation. However, I must give him credit for his honesty of purpose. He stands forth, Sir, as a noble man who will not be tampered with, for when in the Garden of Eden the temptor held forth to him the promise of alliance or office, when the third party stood forth and tried to help him, he scorned the proffered aid, and I have no doubt the third party on this occasion, or the gentleman who represents the third party—for they are one, in a unity that can never be broken—was disappointed. It was a grand compliment to my hon. friend when the leader of the third party made the first advance known in history to take him into his ministry. Perhaps, I am doing my friend injustice, for I remember the other day a distinct offer being made to the gallant member to enter the Cabinet. At least it seemed to me a kind of insinuating serpentine way of doing it, when he suggested that perhaps he was speaking like a future Minister. Well, Sir, I cannot understand how that party could be

driven to seek extraneous aid. I am sure his views run so closely on a line with those of the Opposition that the two may be merged in one, so that the Government are placed in the terrible predicament of having to face not only the whole Opposition party, but Jupiter Tonans in addition. I must leave to others who live in the immediate neighborhood to answer those points, because I am unable to deal with them. I have never been in the Garden of Eden; I never saw the serpent; I never saw the act, so that I am unable to deal with those matters. But, I believe, the hon. gentleman who rose up, at the same time as I did, and who so courteously yielded the floor to me, will be able to deal more particularly with the points brought forward by one of the hon. six from Prince Edward Island. I am relieved from replying to the hon. gentleman because his arguments all proceeded from the one ground on which we have slipped in the last day or two in dealing with the question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, and consisted of a steady, continued attack on the National Policy. Now, I am a young member of this House, but I think it is unreasonable, nay, it is positively indecent for them, thirteen months after we have returned from our constituencies where the National Policy was endorsed by the people, to bring up the question again to be discussed. In the name of common sense let us leave something as settled, so that the mercantile community may not be deranged and capitalists may not be deterred from investing their capital in the Dominion of Canada. I had hoped that this question, which is the greatest that has been brought before the Dominion Parliament since Confederation, would have been discussed in a spirit free from party spirit, and that both parties would have entered upon it with a determination really to sift it and see what was good in it for our common country, and if we found anything valuable in it to adopt it. I reciprocate very heartily the declarations made by one or two members on this side of the House that they desire to enter on this discussion in that spirit. But when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford in his opening sentence declare that this was a party question, and that he intended to consider it on that basis, I was more than disappointed. I should have thought that an hon. gentleman accustomed to party warfare, as he is, would try to hedge a little more than he did, and would have tried to see if there was no means which he might be able to open a door for others to join him on a broad basis. But he seems to have no conception, he seems to have no idea of a party acting in a body for the common welfare. He seems, on the contrary, to have ever before him the charm of office and to direct all his actions accordingly. Now the hon. gentleman said that he voiced the opinions of the Liberal party in this Parliament. I question very much whether he did really voice the opinions of the whole Liberal party. I recollect well the time, not very long ago, when the leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Blake), in his celebrated speech at Malvern, told us that he was not speaking as a private person, but that he was, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said of himself, fully impressed with the weight of the words he was about to utter. I can recollect that well; and I can recollect also of his telling us, when he went in for a partial adoption of the National Policy, that he was voicing the opinions of the whole Liberal party, including, as I understood, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I should like to have had from the gallant knight the first exemplification in his speech of thorough unrestricted reciprocity in this regard; I should like him to have been in the position to tell us that he voiced, not only the opinions of the Liberal party in this Parliament, but that in this Liberal party he included the hon. member for West Durham. Apparently he was not able to say so. The debate had proceeded but a short time when we found a variance in the party. We found that the hon. member for

North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had a very different idea of reciprocity from that which was held by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). They had a lively minute between them. It is not for us to arrange family quarrels, and it is proverbial these things will occur in the best regulated families; but although it may be that in a multiplicity of councillors there may be wisdom and prudence, I have never heard the pretension advanced that there is wisdom in a multiplicity of leaders. It would have been better for the Liberal party, if, before they came to this House and asked us to undo all that has been done in the last eight years—it would have been better for them if, before they came to this House and asked us to uproot this policy which, happily for the country, has its roots too deep to be torn up by them, they had been able to compound their own differences and have presented here a solid and unbroken front. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) opened as usual with this prolonged wail of, woe, woe, woe is the day of lamentation; and he told us, do you not know that you have lost \$500,000,000? Well, I said to myself, God be thanked that I live in a country that has been able to lose \$500,000,000, and is still able to have its banking capital overflowing, its deposits in savings banks overflowing, a railway communication unequalled in the world, and a canal system unsurpassed. I said if my country can afford to lose \$500,000,000 in those five years, and still be able to be in that position, what a wonderful country it must be. However, after the hon. gentleman had told us that the country had lost \$500,000,000, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), actually informed us that the increase in the value of farm lands in Ontario between 1873 and 1878 had been \$160,000,000. We were told also that, in 1886, the increase was \$30,000,000, and that between 1883 and 1887 the increase in Ontario in the value of farm lands amounted to \$106,872,301. Then came the wail about the loan societies, and then the wail about the decrease in the rate of interest; and one hon. gentleman assured us that if the loan societies show they have less money loaned out than in previous years, it is because the people will not have anything to do with them on account of their outrageous charges. Now, I am a director of one of the largest loan companies in this country, and in another that does a very large business. And I boldly deny *in toto* the charge that respectable loan companies—I know not what kind of loan companies my hon. friend may have been connected with—charge exorbitant rates. The truth is the rates have fallen one and a-half to two per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the farmers will not go to the loan companies, but that still their mortgages are larger than ever. Where, then, do they get the money? I know how difficult it is for companies now to place their loans, and how they are obliged to give larger and larger percentages, year after year, to those who place the loans; and yet despite all that, despite the fact that rates of interest are going down, the farmers, we are told, are increasing the load of their indebtedness. Well, if they are, my experience tells me that while the farmers may be diminishing their loans which they have made from the various loan companies, they are having them taken up by their own brother farmers, at lower rates, thus saving the commission paid to the companies. We find that the whole mortgages of the loan societies for the whole of the Dominion amount to only \$81,798,288, which is only about 8 per cent. of the farm value in Ontario alone, and we have learned also that of the payments in default, including capital and interest, there was in 1886 only four-sevenths of one per cent. in default, or 70 per cent. less than in 1880. I am tired and sick to death of hearing our countrymen maligned; and then I find that, not content with mourning the condition of our own fair and beautiful coun-

Mr. COCKBURN.

try, the gallant knight from South Oxford must needs with his lips full of mock loyalty to the grand old mother country depict to us the sad condition in which he says she lies. What were his words. He tells us:

"I know that, in what I now say, I am but expressing the views of some of the ablest and highest of British statesmen, when I say that one great peril that threatens the British Empire in this day is the state of most dangerous isolation into which she has come. What is her position to-day in the view of some of the ablest of her statesmen? It is that she has not a friend of a high class power in the world to-day."

Then he goes on to tell us that she is hated by France on account of her action in dealing with the Egyptian question and with the Suez Canal question. He tells us that she is not favored by Germany, that Austria and Hungary look on her with an unfriendly eye, and that Russia is ready to pounce on her. He represents her as prostrate before us, and he says: There is your mother country lying prostrate; let us put a finishing blow to her; let us see if we cannot ruin her commercially; let us throw in our lot with those who oppose her, and see if we cannot direct a deadly blow at her vitals. Then, when he has depicted England in this miserable depleted condition, he says: Now is the time for Great Britain to form an alliance with the United States. He seems to have the extraordinary idea that the United States are in the business of knight errantry, to hunt up distressed females or nations and form alliances with them. He seems to think that the United States are willing to forego the Munroe doctrine, and that seeing England in this condition, bloodless and almost lifeless, they will make it their business to leap into the rescue and save her from an untimely end. He seems to think that out of a philanthropic sentiment, they will depart from the Munroe doctrine of non-interference in European conflicts and complications with which they have no concern. But, not content with that, he then proceeds to deal with Canada and with reciprocity, and to point out the position which it occupies. Now, I am not going to deal with this question of unrestricted reciprocity, but I simply want to show that, from the figures given by the hon. gentleman himself, the question is really outside of practical politics. I am not going to read any documents or to make any quotations to show what effect it will have on our trade, but I simply wish to take the statements given to us by the hon. gentleman himself, and then to ask you what you consider will be the chances of unrestricted reciprocity? He tells us that it is notorious that:

"Our position in comparison with that of the United States has, in 20 years, been reversed, and reversed enormously to our detriment. Twenty years ago our taxes were one-third of the taxes of the United States; 20 years ago our debt was one-third of the debt of the United States."

Then his eyes glistened with joy as he said:

"To-day, by the last returns I have here, our debt is two and a half times, as nearly as may be, greater per head than the debt of the United States; and the necessary taxes which the United States require to raise for the purpose of carrying on their government are one-third less than the necessary taxes the people of Canada require to pay. Then, Sir, the European market, to which we formerly looked, is dwindling for us, so far as we are concerned."

He tells us also that the United States is in this happy position, that:

"It would be in the power of the United States Secretary of the Treasury, if Congress gave him the authority, to raise either the whole of the customs revenue in either of these three ways: He might maintain the existing tax on sugar and impose a very small income tax indeed, and raise all the revenue he wanted; he might maintain the tax on sugar and impose a very small *ad valorem* duty and raise all the revenue he wanted; or he might maintain the present taxes on a very few articles and make his trade list free."

So much for the United States. That is the position he says they are in. They are in a heaven-born position; everything perfectly smooth—everything moving nicely—a mere stroke of the pen will free them from duty—in one year they raise enough revenue to cover the whole debt of the Dominion of Canada—and then he turns to Canada, and

says that Canada is in a wretched plight. As the member from Prince Edward Island told us, our young men are fleeing from Canada as from a plague. The hon. gentleman tells us that three out of four of our immigrants leave us, that one out of four of our population fly from us, that nothing can save us from a revolution except, perhaps, unrestricted reciprocity. That is the figure he presents to us. There is no hope, he says. He sees none. We may be able to hold on, but, unless we get this unrestricted reciprocity, this commercial union, Canada as a nation will cease to exist. I ask you, putting these two sides of the question, the view he gives of the United States, as successful under every aspect, as a people bounding with joy and with success, is it rational, is it common sense for us to imagine that these people are going to join their fortunes with ours and to be dragged down by us into the gulf of despair? If we were prosperous, if we were, as he says we were twenty years ago, there might be some reason in the proposal, but that we should go to them and say: Gentlemen, have mercy on us, we are on our last legs, we know not what to do, we are poor miserable sinners, look down with mercy on us and lift us from the quagmire into which we are sinking—is it reasonable to ask people to make a bargain, and such a bargain with you, when he tells you that the people of that country are bounding towards free trade, that they are in a position to compete with the motherland, that we are not in a position to compete with the motherland, that we are dragged down by duties; when he tells you all this and asks you to go to the United States and beg them to join with us, he is asking what no American citizen will consent to for a moment. I had the pleasure of being in Washington lately for four or five weeks, and I was so far honored as to have a seat on the floor both of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and there I had an opportunity of conversing more or less intimately with friends of my wife's family, and there we were able to speak freely on various matters, but I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that I have yet to meet the man in the United States who is prepared to discuss this fad of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, except on the well understood basis that real political union is to follow.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What does Mr. Bayard say?

Mr. COCKBURN. You have the letter of Mr. Bayard. Is he so abject in his poverty that, Lazarus-like, he is going to be content with the very crumbs that fall from the table, and to imagine that they are equal to the sweet bread and the piece of solid roast beef which is on the table. You must be hard run when, out of a polite expression from the Secretary of the United States, you imagine that to amount to a solemn invitation. If you imagine that, if you met a friend on the street who said: I should be glad to see you some day at my house to dinner, he would find you there every night. Have we no dignity? Are we so low that we must crawl in the dust to men who are no better than ourselves, men of the same blood and of the same race? When hon. gentlemen opposite tell me, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, that he considered one Canadian equal to six immigrants, and when we know that we have expended \$500,000,000 and scarcely feel it, it is enough to prove that we belong to a country of which we have a right to be proud, and we have no right to go round and take Mr. Bayard's coat tails and say: Do you mean that statement to be an invitation to us? Let us have more pride in our own country. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be unhappy unless they are miserable. There is an ecstasy of woe and there is an ecstasy of joy, but for the first time in my life I have seen the two combined in one. The debate has been exhaustive, and it must have been doubly exhausting to them on account of the conflicting emotions which they have experienced in regard to what caused us

joy, the bounding up of our revenues, the increase in the wealth of our farmers, the development of our railways, the glorious future which awaits us. We are now in the position which the United States were in twenty-five years ago, but we are always tearing up the plant to see whether it has sprouted yet or not. We must have faith in our country, and it is only when you have faith in your country that you can hope to make a great country. No country is ever proud of its men unless they were first proud of the country; and unless the men in this contest for national life—unless you have in yourselves the spring of national life, unless you are true Canadians, proud of your position, proud of your ancestry, proud of the great country from which you are sprung, on the highway to become an auxiliary kingdom of that great country, you will never rise to the dignity of your position, you can never make the country grander than yourselves. Water can never rise higher than the source from which it came. I say, therefore, that the hon. gentleman opposite has given us no ground to believe that the United States themselves would accept this proposition of unrestricted reciprocity, or reciprocity, rather, restricted to one of the powers, or of commercial union. The thing is impossible, impracticable. The beauty of the thing is that these gentlemen argue all along that the United States, those 60 millions of people, those people who are enjoying a god-like existence, who pay their \$2 for their broiler and 80 cents for their butter, and care not a cent what a thing costs, who are wallowing in wealth, when we come before them in rags and tatters, then, forsooth, they will open their arms and clasp us in their embrace. The absurdities! Now, with reference to the point I wish to bring forth that reciprocity is impossible, I shall show that there is, in Great Britain, all the market that we can desire. I find that the British exports for 1887 were \$1,800,000,000, or nearly \$6,000,000 for every week day. I find that the United States exports were \$692,000,000, or 38 per cent. of the British exports. I find that the total exports and imports of the British Empire amounted to \$800,000,000, and the total exports and imports between Great Britain and foreign nations amounted to \$2,210,000,000, or a total of \$3,000,000,000 of trade, or \$10,000,000 every week day, against a total of the United States of \$1,382,000,000, or \$4,450,000 per week day. I find that the United Kingdom imported of wheat and flour, \$130,000,000, of which Canada sent \$3,000,000; that they imported of butter and butterine, \$40,000,000, and we supplied only \$600,000, a quantity that is not one week's supply for the British market. I think, therefore, that there is room for us to enlarge our output in that market. Of live animals for food, Great Britain took 35 million dollars worth, and we supplied 20 per cent. Can we not supply more of bacon and ham? We practically supply nothing. That market is exclusively in the hands of the United States. In cheese we do well, because we supply 6 millions out of the 20 millions imported by Great Britain. In new fruit we do wonderfully little, because we send them only \$41,000 while they import 17 millions. In eggs—that is the great point. I do not wonder those gentlemen think so much of eggs. I think they have this idea imbedded into them. It seems to be an extraordinary thing that if you only keep eggs long enough at 14½ cents a dozen, they will become broilers of \$2, and I am sure the eggs will be no staler than the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, certainly they could not be more rotten. Well, then, we have before us the export of eggs into the United States, and, to use the grand words of the gallant knight from Oxford, let me be exact, "\$1,820,948 and no cents." Why, gentlemen, the whole of that import is not the import of six weeks for the mother land. Last year they took 15 million dollars worth of eggs; they took for every month a million and a quarter dollars; and if we could only get broilers up in England to the same price that they are at Mr. Wiman's house in New York, you would then

be able to make enormous fortunes, and every farmer would be prosperous, and live and die in the bosom of his family and be happy ever afterwards. Now, Sir, for ham. We do very little in ham; but in England they take 10 million dollars' worth. In beef we do little, although they take 10 million dollars' worth. In fresh butter we do nothing. The Yankees do the butter—and the butterine, perhaps; but 10 millions are taken there. In fresh mutton we do nothing, although England takes \$7,500,000. In preserved meats we ought to do a great deal, but we do very little indeed, although there is a market there of 5 millions. In fish we do only \$1,900,000, about one twenty-fifth of the market, although they take 7½ millions, and we allow ourselves to be beaten in this market by the United States. Now, I say here is a market before you, a market in which we are not brought into competition with the people of Great Britain. We are talking about our market with the United States. It is not a market in the sense of exchange, talk of 60,000,000 of people who will furnish us a market, as if there were sixty millions of imbeciles resident in the United States who do not know how to manage their own business, who, as soon as 5,000,000 stalwart Canadians walk across the border, will clap their heads across their knees and find a refuge in the Atlantic or the Pacific, or in the bosom of the anywhere. We forget that in taking in this market of 60,000,000, we are only making a market of 65,000,000, and that that ground is already occupied by these people, and so far from extending our interests, we would inevitably contract them. Is there any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House—I will give them credit, at any rate, for looking after their own pecuniary interests; I think, in a matter of that kind, they would be singularly patriotic—I ask is there any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, who, supposing a treaty of this kind were made to last 5, 10, or 20 years, would be prepared to invest his entire property in machinery, implements, and all that goes to constitute an active factory in Canada, and depend upon the American market when, by putting this same investment, we will say \$1,000,000, in the United States, he could, whatever turned up, be always sure at least of the possession of a market of 60,000,000 of people? Do they expect that the United States, in their career of prosperity, verging, as we are told, towards free trade, will make such a treaty as that for 1, or 5, or 10, or 20 years, I do not care whether with Canada or with any other country? You will find that the United States can enter into no treaty of such a kind. They distinctly refused to enter into such a treaty with the British Commissioners recently. It has been their settled policy, and it will remain their settled policy. They will not tie their country down in this way, especially at a time like this, on the eve of a Presidential election. My hon. friend opposite said this was a nice time to bring forward this question. Why, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says a child in arms would have known better. Those hon. gentlemen brought three or four months before the general election a much greater question before the people, and if a child in arms should be able to decide the one, a child unborn should be able to decide the other. So much, then, for the British markets and the opportunities which it offers us. We find there a market which, compared with the United States market, furnishes on imports alone an advantage of 62 per cent. There is another aspect of this question which has not been examined in the House, and to which I desire to direct the attention of hon. members. I have prepared tables of the total values of imports of merchandise entered for immediate consumption and withdrawn from warehouses for consumption for the year ending 30th June, 1887. I find that the total value of United States imports free and dutiable was \$683,218,980. Now, let us see how

Mr. COCKBURN.

this immense volume of trade is distributed and let us compare together the manner of distribution of trade in the United States with the manner of distribution in the Dominion. In regard to the American trade we find that out of \$683,000,000 odd no less than \$450,070,946 or 65·85 per cent. is entered in the port of New York. Boston follows next with \$61,000,000; the two together represent 75 per cent. of the total imports of the United States. Then comes San Francisco with \$40,000,000 or 5 per cent., Chicago with \$12,000,000, a beggarly percentage of 1·77. We have been told by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to look at those great and rising towns on our southern border—look at Chicago, Buffalo, Detroit and Cleveland. I have looked at them and this is the result: Chicago imports only 1·77 of the total imports; Buffalo, ·82; Oswego, ·59; Detroit, ·26. Here are the figures:

TOTAL FREE AND DUTIABLE.

TOTAL VALUES of Imported Merchandise entered for immediate Consumption, and withdrawn from Warehouse for Consumption, during the Year ending 30th June, 1887.

United States—\$683,418,980.

| Name of Port. | Entered for Consumption. | Percentage. |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| New York..... | \$450,070,946 | 65·85 |
| Boston..... | 61,018,330 | 8·80 |
| San Francisco..... | 40,330,100 | 5·90 |
| Chicago..... | 12,112,275 | 1·77 |
| Buffalo..... | 5,650,656 | ·82 |
| Oswego..... | 4,021,464 | ·59 |
| Detroit..... | 2,522,551 | ·36 |
| Pittsburg..... | 1,211,107 | ·17 |
| Niagara..... | 354,641 | ·05 |
| Sandusky..... | 53,661 | ·008 |
| Erie..... | 29,682 | ·004 |
| Cleveland..... | 726,438 | ·10 |

Let us now look at Ontario, the figures in regard to which are as follows:—

TOTAL FREE AND DUTIABLE.

TOTAL VALUES of Imported Merchandise entered for immediate Consumption, and withdrawn from Warehouse for Consumption, during the Year ending 30th June, 1887.

Dominion of Canada—\$105,639,428.

Ontario { \$42,671,419, consumption.
\$ 8,016,822·16, duty.

| Name of Port. | Entered for Consumption. | Percentage. |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Belleville..... | \$326,923 | ·31 |
| Brantford..... | 366,955 | ·34 |
| Berlin..... | 746,025 | ·70 |
| Brockville..... | 552,197 | ·52 |
| Clifton..... | 1,007,985 | ·96 |
| Oronwall..... | 8,6477 | ·76 |
| Fort Erie..... | 744,983 | ·70 |
| Galt..... | 320,575 | ·30 |
| Guelph..... | 554,104 | ·52 |
| Hamilton..... | 4,405,765 | 4·17 |
| Kingston..... | 1,167,304 | 1·10 |
| London..... | 2,690,409 | 2·45 |
| Ottawa..... | 1,766,996 | 1·67 |
| St. Catharines..... | 746,180 | ·70 |
| St. Thomas..... | 371,308 | ·35 |
| Sarnia..... | 528,611 | ·50 |
| Toronto..... | 20,611,305 | 20·00 |
| Windsor..... | 922,871 | ·77 |
| Woodstock..... | 313,307 | ·30 |

Quebec { \$43,765,740, consumption.
\$ 9,788,437·70, duty.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------|-------|
| Montreal..... | 37,821,183 | 35·50 |
| Quebec..... | 3,381,857 | 3·20 |
| St. John's..... | 399,072 | ·38 |
| Sherbrooke..... | 945,860 | ·90 |
| Sutton..... | 299,097 | ·28 |

Nova Scotia { \$6,854,287, consumption.
\$1,757,400·92, duty.

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|------|
| Halifax..... | 4,856,089 | 4·75 |
| Pictou..... | 336,644 | ·31 |
| Yarmouth..... | 450,696 | ·43 |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------|--|
| New Brunswick { \$5,653,021, consumption. \$1,347,205.26, duty. | | | |
| Name of Port. | Entered for Consumption. | Percentage. | |
| Fredericton | 342,638 | .32 | |
| Moncton | 691,050 | .65 | |
| St. John | 3,575,781 | 3.38 | |
| St. Stephen | 592,358 | .56 | |
| Manitoba { \$2,012,183, consumption. \$ 508,947.62, duty. | | | |
| Winnipeg | 1,936,872 | 1.83 | |
| British Columbia { \$3,626,139, consumption. \$ 883,421.53, duty. | | | |
| Victoria | 3,087,493 | 2.92 | |
| New Westminster | 381,939 | .36 | |
| Prince Edward Island { \$604,218, consumption. \$153,861.46, duty. | | | |
| Charlottetown | 505,536 | .48 | |
| North-West Territories { \$152,421, consumption. \$ 13,609.18, duty. | | | |
| Fort McLeod | 452,421 | .43 | |

Here is the summary: That 75 per cent. of the whole United States imports are entered at New York and Boston alone; that the great city of Chicago commands only 1.77 per cent. of that trade, that Buffalo on our border, that is set up for our imitation commands only .82, and Cleveland .10, and Detroit .36; while the Canadian trade is distributed throughout the whole Dominion so that nine of our ports show proportionately a larger amount of imports than are to be found entered at Chicago. At no less than 27 of our ports are the imports larger than at Detroit. Out of those 27 no less than seven import absolutely not relatively, greater values for consumption, while 15 of them show imports relatively of greater value for consumption. I draw attention to Detroit, Buffalo and Cleveland as being great cities on our border, and because we have been taunted with the immense progress that they have made, and as they have been held forth to us as examples for us to follow. We see by this table while the proportion of population in the United States as to Canada is as twelve to one, its import trade is only six and a half times as much as ours; so that under commercial union or reciprocity we would be offering them a market of 5,000,000 of people, each of whom consumes imports to the value of \$22 per head in exchange for a market in which the people consume only \$11 per head of the population. We can, moreover, hope to displace a very limited portion of the foreign products. We cannot hope to displace more than a limited portion in a country of such vast extent, for it is well known that there are series of circles within which trade has to be done. We do not do trade with St. Louis or New Orleans but with nearer cities, and while we would be giving up our market where the consumption per head is \$22 per head for imports we could only hope to displace a very limited amount of their foreign produce, they meanwhile hoping to displace a very large amount of ours to our detriment. We see this conclusion, that we would receive only \$1 for every \$2 now paid to us. We would in fact suffer an annual loss of \$5,000,000. Then look again at another fact. Imports and exports must follow the same lines. A ship that come to discharge her cargo at a certain port does not go to another port to take home her cargo, unless she fails to obtain it there. So that they could discriminate against our shipping—that shipping which has been spoken of so lightly amounts to 210,000 tons for each 1,000,000 of inhabitants. They would discriminate in favor of the shipping of the United States, which amounts to only 70,000 tons for each 1,000,000 of inhabitants. Our market would be New York. We saw the effect of that long ago when the Mackenzie Government took off the differential duties on tea, and at once the great importing houses of Montreal transferred their business to New-York and converted their large establishments in Montreal into

mere offices. So soon, however, as the differential duties were restored they dropped their offices in New York and resumed their large establishments in Montreal. I think these are pretty nearly what our Yankee friends are offering us. Hon. gentlemen who are not connected with the south as I am, and who, perhaps, have not had their attention drawn to it, are, perhaps, not aware of the fact that within the last eight months no less than \$100,000,000 have been invested in the south for the development of industries there in copper, iron and so forth. Those industries are beginning now to fall behind and the manufacturers are seeking for some means of falling upon some other market and they are living now upon the promises of our friends. Mr. Townsend has brought forward a grander proposal of a Zollverein of the whole American continent which is to take in not only the greenhorns of the Dominion of Canada but of the South American Republic as well. This continent is to be one vast Zollverein, one unrestricted reciprocity, one commercial union, and the whole manufacturing is to be done by our Yankee friends for the benefit of the Americans and the American Republic. That is the way Mr. Wiman and others with their wist interests in America are trying to regulate that the whole trade of this country should go to the Americans. If you can break up this system of united patriotism for our own interests such as we have in Canada, if they can get 75 or even the whole 100 per cent. of our trade in the city of New York the property of Mr. Wiman and others on Staten Island will become of a value greater perhaps than one can imagine. I understand this. I see in those manoeuvres of Mr. Wiman and others a deliberate attempt to entrap us into a scheme which I am sure the farmers of Canada are much too wise to fall into. The last point to which I wish to draw attention is the great difference between our imports since we adopted the National Policy and the time previous. I shall read you—and the mere reading I think is sufficient to prove the statement—the quantity and value of the under-mentioned articles of raw material imported into the country during the fiscal year ended the 30th June, 1879, and the year ending 1887. I bespeak the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this, because if they consider those figures they will see at once the style of the revolution in our trade and the basis of the foundation upon which our Dominion is resting and which we are determined shall continue:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the quantity and value of the undermentioned articles of raw material imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended 30th June, 1879 and 1887 respectively:—

| Articles. | Imported into Canada. | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | 1879. | | 1887. | |
| | Quantity. | Value. | Quantity. | Value. |
| | Lbs. | \$ | Lbs. | \$ |
| Bristles | | 31,581 | | 72,731 |
| Fur skins | | 125,526 | | 478,149 |
| Grease for soap stock | | 69,021 | | 100,534 |
| Hides, raw | 1,202,890 | | | 1,961,134 |
| Rennet | | 19,656 | | 25,716 |
| Silk, raw | | 35,556 | | 143,521 |
| Wool, unmanufactured | 4,976,758 | 841,173 | 12,038,693 | 1,875,651 |
| Broom corn | | 78,717 | | 133,392 |
| Hemp, undressed | | 199,179 | | 535,759 |
| Tobacco, unmanufactured | | 744,302 | | 1,328,703 |
| Cotton wool | 9,720,708 | 984,047 | 30,971,070 | 2,933,877 |
| Dying or tanning articles | | 99,253 | | 144,594 |
| Gutta percha, crude | | 133,214 | | 398,587 |
| Jute cloth, not pressed | | | | 127,061 |
| Copper in sheets | | 65,449 | | 144,091 |
| | Tons | | Tons | |
| Pig iron | 15,503 | 231,811 | 48,558 | 613,946 |
| Total 16 articles | | 4,851,375 | | 11,017,446 |

That is not exactly what I want to draw your attention to, for there is something beyond that. I ask gentlemen who

are familiar with manufacturing what value they will place on the crude article and what value is represented by the article when manufactured? They tell me it is as one to three, and when gentlemen on the other side begin telling us and flaunting in our face that the imports in such a year amounted to so and so and this year only amounted to so and so, I say God be thanked for this, because it is to me a direct proof that we have changed our mode of importing goods, and that formerly what we imported as a finished product we now import as the crude material, and in its manufacture we give employment to men and children and enable our own people to enjoy the fruits of honest labor. Those figures which I have read show us the change has taken place for the better in our country, and show us that money is earned and spent in this country, making the homes of our farmers and our artisans comfortable. However little gentlemen opposite may think of our farmers—for they have denounced them before the whole country as bankrupts, and have told us they are in the hands of mortgagors and that they are bankrupt, I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite have insulted the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. To return to this point, I wish again to draw your attention to the difference between the imports of articles in 1879 and 1887, and to point out that this difference represents to our artisans in the labor market a gain of \$18,489,234 in solid gold. This money has been earned by our artisans and by our farmers, and it has gone to grease the wheels of industry in the Dominion. It ought, I think, to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite from going down on their knees and from cringing to a foreign, a hostile power I might almost say. We are now, as those returns show, very much in the same position in which America was not very many years ago. I ask you, have you ever found an American who was ready to decry his country the same as some people do in Canada, or who was willing to go back, as he might have gone with some feeling, to the mother country? Look around you and see if ever the Americans sought to ally themselves with a foreign country? Have you ever found, in the Senate of that country, a wail of lamentation on the condition of their country? I say that looking to the United States they should take example from its people who are proud of their country, and they have no more reason to be proud of their country, God knows, than we have to be proud of ours. I think that in morals, in stamina, in intellectuality, in descent, in vigor, in manliness of character, in all that constitutes a man, we can stand up before them and say: "I, also, am a man." But hon. gentlemen opposite cringe and say: "We are not men; we are in a miserable plight; for God's sake come and take us out; we have no saviour ourselves, we cannot save ourselves." Look at the progress we have made since 1879, in eight short years, which are in the history of a people but as a speck in eternity. Do not think you can create a nation and call it into existence by a mere fiat? We have now been confederated five and twenty years, and thanks to Heaven, we have had at our head a man who fully appreciated the greatness of his country's destiny, who never hesitated when the occasion came to stand forth for Canada first, Canada last and Canada forever. I was ashamed to hear a man tell us the other evening that when it pleased God to gather him to his fathers, then we should become disorganised, and they should have a chance of coming into this Garden of Eden, the garden for which they have been longing for so many years, the garden they saw before them but fourteen short months ago, and laid out so pleasantly with Ministers and portfolios that never came into existence. They have my sympathy. I can only hope that as they grow older they will grow wiser; that as they see the country progressing and Canada leading in the van, they will take a more hopeful view of our future. They can see now for the first time the opening up of our great North-West; for let us remember, while there

Mr. COOKBURN.

have been exoduses in every country in the world, we have not had a fair chance beside the United States until the last two years of taking our immigrants directly into our land of promise. Hon. gentlemen might have known that in the history of the development of our population there was something else to consider than this mere misgovernment they talk about. They might have thought that this same flight of people to the United States took place at the time that country was groaning under taxes infinitely heavier than ours, and with a debt infinitely heavier than ours, a debt that did not represent public works and works of improvement, but simply the price paid for shedding their brothers' blood. I hope when hon. gentlemen opposite take all these matters into consideration, they will reflect and come to the conclusion to stop seeking madly, in their eager desire to clutch office, to grasp at every straw that presents itself. Otherwise they will do harm to a little party that I consider essential to the welfare of the country; for in every state there must be two parties. But to continue the course they took before the last election and that they are taking now, can only result in destruction to the party and in injury to our own country.

Mr. Mills (Annapolis) and Mr. Ellis rose at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Annapolis rose at the same time as the hon. member for St. John, and I presume he has the floor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It takes two of them to one.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The fact is, on this question we are almost two to one in this House, and the hon. gentlemen opposite must expect a double speech from this side once in a while in order to give an opportunity to all who wish to speak. I will not weary the House very long, simply because we have had a large number of speakers, and spent a good deal of time over this question. Members from the Maritime Provinces have been challenged now and again by some hon. members opposite as to what their people think of unrestricted reciprocity. I am happy to state that I am here to-night representing one of the finest constituencies and one of the fairest valleys in the Maritime Provinces; and I also represent some of the finest and most intelligent farmers in those Provinces or in the Dominion of Canada for that matter. One of the members from Prince Edward Island who has lately taken his seat gave the House some idea of what it was to be a married man. If I mistake not, he stated that after a man became married, he would lack some of his mathematical precision. Well, I should say, judging from the speech of that hon. gentleman, that he had been rather too much married, especially when he began to talk about that little Marine farm, that little farm of the Interior, and that little farm of Reciprocity, which he was going to set up in that Garden of Eden, Prince Edward Island. He said they would sell on the Marine farm and on the Interior farm potatoes for 18 cents a bushel, and oats for 26 cents a bushel, "but on my Reciprocity farm," said he, "I will get 70 cents for my potatoes, and 45 cents or 50 cents for my oats." Now, he must have rather taken advantage in some way of the marine and interior farmers, for if he is going to get 70 cents for his potatoes, or 45 or 50 cents for his oats, with a duty of only 15 cents on the one, and 10 cents on the other, taking for granted that the farmer is going to pay the duty, I would like to know how he brings 18 up to 70, and 26 up to 45 or 50. I think that shows that the hon. gentleman, according to the principle he laid down himself, has been rather too much married. He also says that shipping has fallen off since the National Policy was introduced. Well, perhaps it has fallen off. I know that fewer ships have been built in Annapolis and King's and other places along the coast. But the reason simply is that wooden vessels had to give way to iron

steamers. We are no longer shipping in wooden bottoms but in iron bottoms, and we cannot account this change as an evidence of lack of progress. I remember the time when we used to build ships in Annapolis and send them out to the different ports of the world, and for years the only thing we would see of those ships would be the drafts sent home. Not much of that business is done now, simply because iron steamers are taking the place of wooden vessels. So, I do not think the hon. gentleman has made much on that point against the National Policy, for it is impossible to pretend that it is owing to the National Policy there has been a falling off in ship-building. Now the National Policy was accepted by the people in 1878. Previous to 1878 the people saw they had a know-nothing Government to deal with. Deficit after deficit was being rolled up, and the laboring classes in the country were without employment. The National Policy was introduced as a means to furnish work to the laborers, and to be an incentive to business and progress in Canada. The people accepted that policy in 1878, and when they were asked again for their verdict in 1882, they again gave their verdict in its favor. Between 1882 and 1887, the Opposition party accepted the National Policy. They tried all kinds of policies for themselves. They tried one policy in Nova Scotia, they tried another in New Brunswick, they tried another in Quebec, they tried different policies in every Province throughout the length and breadth of Canada. They had not a single policy to cover the wants of a large majority of the people, but they had resort to different policies in the different Provinces in order, if possible, to gain an election in each. Notwithstanding that the members of the Opposition, by the mouth of their leader, in his celebrated Malvern speech, accepted the National Policy as their policy, the Canadian people would not trust that policy in the hands of those hon. gentlemen who were taking it up at the last moment, when they saw the policy was being successful, but decided to continue their confidence in those who had inaugurated it. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not catch the people in 1887, and when, on the 22nd February the returns come in, that celebrated majority, which was heralded in the *Morning Chronicle* and telegraphed all over Canada, especially to the North-West Territories and those constituencies that had to make their elections later, was found to have dwindled down to a feeble minority. Hon. gentlemen opposite, seeing that they had been defeated at every turn, seeing that the people will not trust the National Policy into their hands, have been, with the assistance of some people over the border, framing a policy that would catch the votes of the electors in the far distant future. That policy has become commercial union. One of the exponents of the Opposition in Nova Scotia boldly stated upon the hustings, at one of the bye-elections, that heretofore his party had no policy. They had, he said, no real genuine policy, but they have got one now, and it was commercial union. This was to be the panacea for all our evils; this was to be the remedy for all our hungry looks, and they tried the commercial union fad for all it is worth. They boomed it in Nova Scotia upon every hustings, in every bye-election, and it failed. They have evidently not come to a decision to take up another policy until they met here two or three weeks ago, because it is a notorious fact that an hon. member of the Opposition had upon the Order Paper a notice that he would move a resolution in favor of commercial union. That notice has disappeared from the Order Paper, and this resolution of unrestricted free trade with the United States has come up in its place, evidently showing that the Opposition only combined upon this policy two or three weeks ago. Now, they say it is absolutely necessary that we should adopt this new policy. They say Canada has been ruined, that the majority of Canadians are farmers, and that, therefore, we must take care of the farmers in preference to the other classes

engaged in other industries. I go in "hotly," to use a slang phrase, for protecting the farmers in every way possible. I am the son of a farmer, and I believe in protecting every individual when it is necessary he should be protected. But I contend that, so far as the farmers of Annapolis and King's are concerned, they need no protection. I was fairly astounded when I heard the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) state here that the farmers of the Maritime Provinces had no hope, but were in despair. I would like to see him come down to Annapolis and to King's and tell the farmers there that they are in despair. I believe I can prove to this House that this statement of the case is not correct, and I will prove my assertion out of the mouth of the farmers themselves. I will prove by the farmers themselves that they are not hopeless for the future, and that although they are willing, of course, to enter into trade relations with any country that will be of benefit to them, rather than sacrifice their own country, rather than sacrifice the industries of Canada, they will do very well and get along successfully without the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this policy of theirs is universally accepted by their party, but I rather think there was some disagreement somewhere when we were told by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that he would not advocate the abolition of all railway subsidies and public works, and that he would not advocate direct taxation in any measure. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that, even if it leads to direct taxation he will prosecute this policy, and he says that direct taxation is not such a bugbear as it is at first supposed to be, that taxes by assessment are a great deal better, that the poor man will be able to pay taxes more equitably under the system by which taxes are imposed now. I take a decided exception to that, and I say, and I think I can prove, that the poor man is not taxed at the present time, but that it is the rich man, that it is those who enjoy the luxuries of life, who are being taxed now and not the poor man. If the taxes were imposed under the assessment laws, and especially under the assessment laws of Nova Scotia, I am quite convinced that it would be the poor man who would bear the burden of the taxes, and not the rich man. I say that it is upon the luxuries of life that the taxes are now levied, and these are some of the items. First, there are jellies and jams, \$21,853. Surely the poor man can do without those. Jewellery, \$482,043. The poor man can do without those. Musical instruments, \$389,699. The poor man can do without those. Optical instruments, \$56,783. Well, the poor man does without those, even if he needs them. Paintings and drawings, \$73,117. Perfumery, &c., \$21,999. Pickles and sauces, \$160,282. Silks, \$2,305,392. Fancy soaps and powders, \$76,579. The poor man will make his soap from lye and soap grease. Spirituous liquors, \$1,617,044. There is no need for the poor man to take those. Tobacco, \$111,313. There is no necessity for the poor man to indulge in tobacco. If he must have it, let it be upon his own head. Watches, \$503,565. Books and printed matter, \$1,003,766. Baking powders, \$102,517. Printed music, \$60,561. Christmas cards, \$81,168. Surely the poor man can do without these. Carpets, \$13,052. Watch cases, \$26,569. Cider, \$13,524. Cocoa and chocolate, \$50,145. China, \$185,498. Embroideries, \$134,097. Fancy goods, \$1,579,988. Foreign fruits, \$1,609,252. Furs, \$634,021. Gloves, &c., \$363,097. Gold and silver goods, \$238,431. All of these show that it is not the poor man who bears the burden of the taxes but the rich, and those are the people who should pay the taxes in this Dominion. If you were to have direct taxation, and that as carried out by the assessment laws of Nova Scotia, it would be the poor man who would pay the bulk of these taxes. In Annapolis county, this is the way in which it works, and I know that it is the same in every other county in Nova Scotia, particularly when you get a Grit revisor on the assessment list, who will put every

poor man he wants to vote for his side on the list at \$300 personal property, no matter whether what he owns is worth \$175 or not; but, if there is a rich man who owns \$75,000 worth of property, he is assessed at about \$2,000. These are facts, and I defy contradiction, and it is well known in the Province of Nova Scotia that that is the way in which it works. In that case it is the poor man who pays the tax, and not the rich man at all, and, therefore, it would be a great evil for this country to have the taxes levied in that way. As far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I do not think that that Province, and especially my constituency, and the constituency of the member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman), and the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), would like to see the abolition of the railway subsidies. This is the time when Nova Scotia should be regarded with reference to railways. Railways have been constructed throughout every Province with the exception of the Maritime Provinces, and now is the time when we should have railway subsidies if they are to be given to us at all, and I do not think the hon. members opposite from Nova Scotia would agree to have the railway subsidies abolished. The same thing is true with regard to public works and public buildings. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the time had come for something heroic to be done, that there was a crisis at hand, that Canada was ruined, that the whole earth was becoming sick and famished in Canada while everything was green and beautiful in the United States, and it rested upon the member for South Oxford to do that heroic thing, whatever it was. He says the National Policy is a failure and Canada is ruined. Do you think for a moment that you are going to make the people of Canada believe that? Do you think that you can make them believe that this fair Dominion of ours is ruined? Do the people who have to deal out the funds to us when we want to make a loan on the London markets think that Canada is ruined, and that is the true test of the ruination of any country? If your credit is not good, that is the test of ruin. If a person applies for a loan on real estate, what is the first thing the person to whom he applies does? He enquires into the character of that party, he enquires whether the farm is of sufficient value to warrant the loan, he asks whether that man is able and willing to pay his interest when it is due, he enquires into everything that should be enquired into, and he enquires very particularly because these money lenders are people who have their eyes open to all these matters, and are very determined that their money shall not be lent out on worthless security. What do the lenders of money in London say? We know that Canada is the first of the colonies of Great Britain as far as her credit is concerned. Her credit was never better than it is to-day, and still the hon. member for South Oxford says we must do something heroic because Canada is being ruined. It is the most absurd statement that any man could make. Then they say that there is no inter-provincial trade. I have heard that stated time and time again, and I heard it stated throughout the length and breadth of Annapolis county. The Attorney General and other members of the Local Government said that there. They said: When do you find the ships of the Maritime Provinces turned towards Upper Canada, as they call it, that is Ontario and Quebec? They hardly acknowledge that Nova Scotia is in Canada at all. I tell them that we have inter-provincial trade, and that it is increasing year by year and day by day. To be sure, the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), crept behind the fact that we had no actual statistics of inter-provincial trade, and he thought he was safe in reference to that and could make almost any assertion he liked in regard to inter-provincial trade. There was a gentleman, however, in St. John, N.B., who looked into this matter very thoroughly. He corresponded with the different establishments throughout the

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

Maritime Provinces, and he discovered the facts as accurately as could be done without appointing a commission and going to each of these establishments separately to get the figures. His statement does not relate to the Maritime Provinces, but to Nova Scotia alone, and here are the amounts of goods that Nova Scotia sent to Ontario and Quebec in 1885:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Sugar, refined..... | \$1,104,354 |
| Iron..... | 474,221 |
| Coal..... | 790,000 |
| Cotton manufactures..... | 288,000 |
| Skates..... | 36,500 |
| Nova Scotia Forge Company..... | 87,000 |
| Canned milk (Truro Co.)..... | 12,000 |
| Hats..... | 14,000 |
| Woodenware, Round Hill Co., Annapolis... | 3,600 |
| Leather..... | 44,000 |
| Fish, over..... | 35,000 |
| Cordage, about..... | 40,000 |
| Woollen goods..... | 6,000 |
| Total..... | \$3,144,675 |

These figures are for 1885, and have materially increased for the last few years. When the Attorney General of Nova Scotia saw fit to go down to the county of Digby in a bye-election, he stated upon a platform that there was nothing sent up to Ontario and Quebec from the Maritime Provinces. Very impolitely, I confess, there was a gentleman present from Digby, a merchant. "You lie, Sir," says he, "for I sent \$10,000 worth this year, and I expect to send as much more next year." So in the town of Digby alone \$10,000 worth of fish was sent to the Upper Provinces. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jones) at this moment corrects me, and says there are \$18,000 worth sent off from Digby alone to Ontario and Quebec. There is also the item of oysters, which, it seems, is becoming quite a trade between Nova Scotia and the Western Provinces. Thus it will be seen that Nova Scotia sends *per capita* to its population, \$6.66 of goods to Ontario and Quebec, and they, in return only send \$2.15 *per capita*, although Attorney General Longley has often exclaimed against the Montreal and Quebec drummers coming down to Nova Scotia and getting the money out of the people. So I think that demonstrates beyond doubt that the contention of the hon. member for South Oxford about the lack of inter-provincial trade, is incorrect. Then they talk about the exodus. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen where in the world there is not an exodus? When in the history of Nova Scotia, when in the history of New Brunswick, when in the history of Canada, when in the history of New England States themselves, was there not an exodus towards the West, or an exodus toward some other country? Even as far back as 1853, the Hon. Joseph Howe had to meet this question of an exodus. He was leader of the Government at that time, and those who were on the Opposition benches, in order, I presume, to burn up the old gentleman's clothes, politically, on that occasion, thought they would find an exodus somewhere, and they got a committee, and that committee made an investigation, and they did discover an exodus. They went so far as to say that the exodus amounted to this: If the present system is maintained—the policy of the Government at that time—the population will be thinned down to the aged and infirm, and others who, in consequence of poverty, and the peculiarity of their circumstances, have neither the means nor the ability to leave the country. That was the kind of exodus that they kicked up in 1853. It was a far greater exodus than the hon. gentlemen opposite dare to assert takes place from Canada to-day. They admit that there are some people living here to-day who are not aged and infirmed. How did that venerable and eloquent gentleman at that time meet these people? He made a speech from which I will read an extract, and after that speech there was not another word said about the exodus. He entirely

snatched them, as I am convinced the hon. gentlemen opposite will be snatched after this question has been fully ventilated:

"I read this report with deep sorrow and regret. I feel humiliated to see a Nova Scotian seeking to put on the journals of the Legislature what I believe to be a piece of systematic misrepresentation and defamation of his country. We may see in the newspapers denunciations of the position, character, commercial resources and advancement of our Province; and I believe these have greatly disheartened our people, setting them at variance with their condition and country, and leading them to believe that there is something abroad and beyond our borders infinitely superior to anything that can be found at home. This, however, does not justify a Legislature in stamping with the seal of official authority these aspersions; in sapping the springs of vitality and energy that alone are left to quicken or animate them; and by a steady, persevering system of self-abasement inducing an utter absence of all hope. Sir, I believe that this Province is as progressive, as forward in the race of civilisation and improvement, as half the countries that may be compared with it on the face of the earth."

Cannot the words of that old man, eloquent, be repeated as at the present time? Can we not also say that Canada is as progressive, that she is as well looked after, that she is as far advanced in the race of civilisation, as any other country in the world, aye, and more than the majority of the countries in the world? I consider that Canada was never in a more progressive state than at the present time. Do these hon. gentlemen think that the people of Canada are going to forsake the substance to grasp at the shadow? Do they think the people of Canada will imitate the dog that was crossing the stream with a bone in his mouth, and grasping at his own shadow that he saw in the water, he lost the bone? No, the people of Canada have more faith in their country. It is the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition that have no faith in their country. They look with hungry eyes upon this country, they are hungry themselves, they are undergoing a famine. All the world to them is sick and famishing. Hungry is the air around them, hungry is the sky above them, and the stars of heaven, like the eyes of wolves, glare at them, so ardent are they to creep over to the Treasury benches. Now, they tell us that there is a depreciation in real estate. I do not believe it. I do not think that the majority of the people of Canada believe it, and I will do the hon. gentlemen opposite the credit of saying that I do not think they believe it themselves. I would like the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) to go down into the counties of Annapolis and King's and attempt to buy a farm. I rather think he would need another fee of \$47.50 an hour to buy it. So far as the Annapolis valley is concerned, I know it is not true, and I think what can be said of that valley can be said of the Province of Nova Scotia, that real estate has not depreciated in value. Perhaps in some localities, for local reasons merely, there may be a depreciation. Take, for instance, the rock bound coasts of the Bay of Fundy, in my constituency, or the county of the hon. member for King's. Property over there may have depreciated in value, and why? Simply because we have got the iron horse rushing through the valley and diverting trade from those great waters and consequently there is a depreciation in property there. But where, there is the depression in one section of the country there is a bulging out in another. How can hon. gentlemen opposite say that our farmers are in despair? I have said what I think of this matter, but I will now show what the farmers think about it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared, and he rolled it under his tongue as a sweet morsel, that we have no statistics with regard to these matters and the only information we can get is from the reports of agricultural societies throughout the Provinces. When I heard the assertion of the hon. gentleman in regard to the condition of the farmers I said: Can this be true? If it is true it is beyond all my experience. I decided to examine the reports of the agricultural societies and ascertain what they said in regard of this question. In the Province of Nova Scotia there are about

92 of those societies, and if the hon. gentleman can take those reports from 1881 down to date and find anything in them that is indicative of despair I will relinquish my position in this House. It is just the opposite that is the case. The Nictaux Agricultural Society reports:

"Resolve to expend 10 per cent. of their funds in books on agriculture. They take now a number of books on 'Apple Culture,' 'Farm Drainage,' 'Hain's Talks on Manure,' 'Manual of Agriculture,' 'The Farm and Stock Manual.'"

"A. BECKWITH,
"Secretary."

That does not look as if the farmers of Nova Scotia were going behind, and if farming did not pay they would enter some other business. The farmers of Nova Scotia are not fools. But farming in Nova Scotia does pay, and therefore they are making themselves perfect in farming, and in Annapolis and King's counties they are entering into it as an art. Paradise Agricultural Society reports:

"Everything apparently prosperous. No complaints. A largesum of money expended in bonuses to parties buying thoroughbreds. The directors reported that they and the members of this society dwell with pleasure on the interest manifested, and the advances made in the past, in the improvement of stock and general farm crops. We are pleased to report favorably on the condition of the crops, the autumn being exceptionally favorable in the ripening of the fruit, for which our orchardists are realising fine prices both at home and abroad."

"WALLACE YOUNG.
"ARTHUR MORSE."

"The meeting adopted this report."

"B. R. BALCON.
"E. S. MORSE."

That does not look like despair! The Eastern Annapolis Agricultural Society reports:

"Good crops; good harvest season."

"JOHN CONLON,
"Chairman of Directors.
"A. B. PARKER,
"Secretary."

No despair about these people; they have faith and hope in their country. The Laurie Agricultural Society—headed after the hon. member for Shelburne—reports a gradual improvement in the breeding of shorthorn Durham, and also that they have good reason to believe that it will only be a short time before scrub bulls will be scarce in the eastern end of this county. It adds:

"The members of this society have sold cattle and calves this year which have been reported and as yet have had no equal in the county. Cattle weighing 3,950 lbs., and girth, 8 feet. Calf 5 months old, girth, 4 feet, 6 inches. Cattle here in ten years, since the organisation of this society, have improved 50 per cent."

"A. A. FORD,
"Secretary."

Annapolis Agricultural Society:

"The president, Joseph A. Bancroft, Esq., reported that there had been some progress made in agricultural matters. This society has had the advantage of the valuable services of G. B. McGill, Esq., a graduate of the agricultural department of the Normal School of Truro. A lot of agricultural literature purchased, also thoroughbreds."

In Antigonish county there is the Bayfield Agricultural Society. It reports:

"Thoroughbreds purchased, and agricultural literature."

North Grant Agricultural Society's report is replete with satisfaction and bright hope. Their stock is improving, also their crops, and they are investing largely in agricultural literature. In Cape Breton county, Sydney Agricultural Society reports importations of thoroughbreds, and adds:

"We are satisfied that industry and close application would make this a first class farming and stock-raising county."

"DUNCAN MCKENZIE.
"R. McDONALD."

Then there are reports from Stirley Agricultural Society, Agricola Agricultural Society, Earltown Agricultural Society, Brookfield Agricultural Society. In Digby county, we have a report from the Hillsburgh Agricultural Society. Weymouth Agricultural Society says:

"On the whole, we have abundant reason for thankfulness to the Beneficent Ruler of the universe for the many rich blessings which have crowned the year."

There are also similar reports from Guysborough county, Halifax county, Hants county, Inverness county. In Lunenburg county the Bridgewater Agricultural Society says:

"Are pleased to report a continual growth."

The Centreville Agricultural Society reports:

"Thoroughbreds and works on agriculture."

There is a report from Chester Agricultural Society, also from Lunenburg Agricultural Society, which says:

"Sent crops to Indian and Colonial Exhibition."

Similar reports come from Balmoral Agricultural Society, Lower Stewiacke Agricultural Society, Springside Agricultural Society, Londonderry Agricultural Society. For Cumberland county we have reports from Malagash Agricultural Society, North Shore Agricultural Society, Wentworth Agricultural Society, Maccan and Nappan Agricultural Society, Amherst Agricultural Society. Minudie and Beaconsfield Agricultural Society reports:

"Thoroughbred stock and books."

Wallace Agricultural Society says crops a good yield; prices of cattle and sheep improving, and end with gratefully acknowledging to the Bountiful Giver of all good our peace and prosperity. Among the agricultural societies, Annapolis, 1886, Clements Agricultural Society reports:

"Recognising the kindly providence of another year, we acknowledge our obligations to the Giver of All Good for health, peace and prosperity in our midst."

"C. RENDY,

"President.

"W. V. VROOM,

"Secretary."

Clarence Agricultural Society reports that:

"All their bills, owing to former extravagance, are paid, and they want an exhibition."

"ADALBUT WILKINS.

"Z. W. ELLIOTT."

The Clements Agricultural Society report prosperity and an advance of price in turnips, and close their report with this:

"We are reminded of the general good health which we, as a community, have enjoyed, and for the peace and plenty which surround us, and humbly and gratefully acknowledge our thanks to the Giver of All Our Good."

"C. RENDY,

"President.

"DOWE ROTHE,

"Vice-President.

"W. V. VROOM,

"Secretary."

The Central Agricultural Society, King's county, reports:

"We are thankful we can again report a year of prosperity, with good crops and fair prices."

Take every one of these reports, and I challenge any hon. gentlemen to go over them with me and to find in any one of them during the last three or four years anything contrary in any respect to what I have stated. But I can show even a better report than that. I can show the report of the Agricultural Society of the County of King's, its 97th annual report, for the society has been in existence 97 years. It would well repay hon. gentlemen who remember the base libel that has been telegraphed through Canada and the United States, that the farmers of the Maritime Provinces are in despair and without hope, to read the whole of these reports. The report of the King's County Agricultural Society, speaking of the potato crop, says:

"For years the crop that overshadowed all others in this valley, since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty, and the imposition of a duty in 1866, have gradually taken the second place—apples now leading. In the political agitation which has recently visited us, there is no doubt that potatoes and reciprocity were greatly mixed up in the minds of our farmers. The old days of a dollar a bushel held a fond place in their memories. Reciprocity for King's means simply a free market in the

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis.)

United States for potatoes. This, it is believed, would be a panacea for all our ills; but we should remember that times are changed, and were potatoes free to-day, it is morally certain that the price could not exceed a-half a dollar unless the potato bug or rot destroyed our neighbor's crop. The product of their own farms in the different States is now sufficient to keep the price down to something like the value of the article, and they are also now brought over to the United States from Europe. Our farmers must make up their minds to raise them for about 30 to 35 cents, and this can be got without going down on our knees to beg reciprocity from the United States Senate. This crop rotted badly last season in some localities, but there was an average crop of sound tubers which are not rotting in the cellars. Returns for last year (1885), show that fully 230,000 bushels were shipped from this county; and, for 1886, 40,000 bushels were shipped in November, and vessels are now loading at different ports. The price is 30 cents. The varieties grown are: Prolifics, Burbanks, Early and Bolton rose; Beauty of Hebron, and Garnet Chili. The last named variety is entirely free from rot."

He tells of the prices of turnips, pears, plums, small fruits, live stock and apples, and it will well repay any one to read that, but I will not weary the House with it. He refers to the prices of all farm products, and says:

"If all farm products were compared with those of other places: Hay, \$10 to \$12; potatoes, 30 cents; oats, 40 to 50 cents; apples, \$1 50 to \$3 50; beef, \$5 to \$7; butter and eggs, 18 to 25 cents. These prices compare favorably with those of any farming State in the Union, and the price of purchased supplies is equally favorable. In the States granulated sugar is quoted at 6½ cents by the barrel. In Halifax it costs 6½ cents; and circle A, equally white, and as good for any purpose, 6 cents. We pay less than half the prices paid in New York for our tea and coffee. Flour was never cheaper; cottons, boots and shoes, nails, everything manufactured, cheaper in proportion than our farm products. On the whole, the year has been a decided success, agriculturally, in King's. We have lived twenty years without reciprocity, and nearly as many years as a Province of the Dominion, and I fail to see 'blue ruin' in this county in the face of the above facts."

Does that look like despair; does that call for any heroic method?

"With buyers from New York and Montreal coming down here to buy our apples in preference to their own; with London, Havana and Bermuda open markets for our farm products, and with the international, intercolonial and interprovincial trade which we now have, and that which will be built up in the future as a happy result of the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, we can live twenty years more without reciprocity, if necessary, and still advance and prosper. I have no patience with those narrow minded pessimists who are continually crying out there is something rotten in the state of Canada; who can see nothing but ruin in the country, and are preaching discontent among the people. Where is this ruin? Who and what is ruined? Look at our churches and school houses, our houses and barns, our improved breeds of cattle, sheep and swine; our farming tools and implements, our fine horses and carriages, our pianos and organs, our tweeds and silks, instead of home-spuns and linsey woolsey; look at the source of wealth which procures and maintains all these things—our broad acres of dyke, fertile uplands, and productive orchards; try to purchase one of these farms, and compare the price with that of even ten years ago. Count the people's money in the savings bank, their life insurance policies, the cash spent for missions and benevolent purposes, for business and pleasure, for rum and tobacco, and then talk about ruin if you can."

This is the report of a farmer, and the report of the King's County Agricultural Society, and the report was adopted and accepted by them.

Mr. KIRK. Who writes that?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The directors of the King's County Agricultural Society, and it was reported in the journals of Nova Scotia in 1887, and the Nova Scotia Government is a Grit Government, your own friends. I may just say here that I have had a report from Annapolis that the apples sent to London not to the United States by the last steamship have realised the highest price in the market, 40s. sterling per barrel. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that this is the only report from that county, but I will give him a still later one for 1887 which has just come from the Legislature which is now sitting in Halifax, and from the same Grit Government down there. I will turn again to the same society, the King's County Agricultural Society, and it is the 98th annual meeting this time. I will only take some extracts from it, and I will place it in the hands of any hon. gentleman present who may read the whole of it if he likes:—

"I will reiterate here that there is no place in the whole world where both the climate and the soil are better adapted to agricultural pursuits than in King's county, and indeed throughout this whole valley. The

farmer is absolutely certain year by year of a fair return from seed sown and labor expended."

"Our crops as a whole are a good average. The hay crop is fully a third more than last year, and the apple crop a third less, but both are of exceptionally good quality."

"Too much attention cannot be given to the dyke and hay crop in our district. It is really our most important crop, and, indeed, may be said to be the most important crop in our Province. Three thousand acres of dyke, the most valuable land outside of cities on this continent, and a large area of upland, are exclusively devoted to this crop in our district, and upon the product of these acres the wintering of our stock depends, and upon the stock depends the proper fertilisation of our orchards, and the land planted with other crops. And this is largely the case in the whole Province. The last census gives one-fourth of the cleared land in Nova Scotia occupied by the hay crop, and also more than half of the land cropped. Grass grown for hay covers 520,000 acres of the most valuable land, yielding about 600,000 tons, worth nearly \$6,000,000. These figures will give you some idea of the value and importance of the hay crop. I would remark just here that our farmers could make a large saving in their fodder if the hay-cutter was more extensively used, and the straw cut with the hay and fed with provender and meal, as is done in the old country. The straw would then become as valuable as hay, the stock would eat less and thrive better. This is no theory, but a fact which is being proved in the experience of some every winter."

"Oats.—This, the only grain crop raised to any extent here, will be ten per cent. below the crop of '86 in quantity and quality. Farmers know that it does not pay to raise wheat when prime flour can be bought for \$5 25 per barrel."

"The potato crop is far away our most important 'root crop,' and every precaution should be taken to preserve it from evils, especially as our potatoes, like our apples, are the very best grown in the world—dry, mealy, and excellent in every respect. The principal varieties grown are: Prolifics, Burbanks, Farmers' Pride, Beauty of Hebron, Prince Alberts, and Garnet Chili. The last-named is the soundest growing potato raised here, but does not command quite so high a price as the white varieties."

"Next to potatoes, turnips and mangolds are raised in quantity for feeding to stock in the winter; the drought last year prevented the seed from germinating and threatened to destroy the crop altogether, but a second sowing came on nicely and there is a good crop. Parsnips and carrots are an average crop."

"Small Fruits.—If small fruit growers could plan to irrigate in dry seasons, I believe it would pay. Strawberries must have plenty of moisture after the fruit once forms. Currants, gooseberries, and raspberries yielded fairly well, and they are beginning to occupy an important place with some of our farmers. Mr. Newcomb, at the Landing, sold sixty dollars worth of raspberries of the Red Antwerp variety from a small patch. Mr. Jones marketed 60 bushels of gooseberries, and a quantity of raspberries, and red and black currants, which, with his strawberries, will probably exceed in value all the other products of his farm. There is money in this, there is no doubt, for there seems to be no difficulty in finding a ready market at 8 to 10 cents a quart."

"Tomatoes.—Mr. Patterson, of Acadia Villa, made an experiment of this popular and delicious fruit. Off one-sixth of an acre he sold \$60 worth, finding a market in Wolfville and Halifax, and had as many more green and ripe left. He thinks he could double this off the same land by ripening earlier, but at \$60 the returns would be \$360 from one acre. Here is another chance for our farmers. I have observed that tons of tomatoes have been raised in different parts of the country this year. Mr. Patterson's were very smooth, deliciously-flavored tomatoes, and were preferred in Halifax to the American tomatoes even at double the price."

"Apples.—The apple has become the most valuable and important of all the products of our valley. The farmer, who, fifteen or twenty years ago, planted an orchard in spite of the opinion of many around him that he was doing a very foolish thing, and wasting valuable land, because there would never be a market and remunerative price for his apples, was a wise man in his day and generation, and has to-day a fortune and an independent income. I am told this same Mr. Byrnes who raised the plums, sold his whole orchard at \$2.50 a barrel, and will realise \$2,000 for this season's crop, and like results are being realised on a smaller scale all through this district and this valley."

"These are a few of the new orchards, and there is scarcely an old one that is not being enlarged; fully double as many trees have been planted this year as were growing the year previous, and if we keep on doubling the area of our orchards yearly, the valley will soon be a magnificent orchard from end to end, and, in another decade, we shall have the 1,000,000 barrels for which there is already room in the English market, and, with ocean steamers loading at Kingsport and at Horton Landing next season, when our wharf will be built, the freight and expenses should be reduced one-half. The yield of our orchards this year will fall short of the immense crop of '86 at least one-third, but the quality is superior and the price one dollar a barrel higher, so that the returns will fully equal those of last year. Gravensteins sold last year for \$1 50; this year the price for the Boston market and in Halifax was \$2.00—\$3.00. Other varieties were sold for \$2 and \$2.50, and latest quotations from London range from 14—16 shilling for Greenings and Baldwins up to as high as 28 shillings for Ribstons."

"Prices.—The prices of all farm products are good, and everything manufactured much cheaper in proportion than the produce of the farm, and this happy state of affairs must bring prosperity to our farmers, and hence to all classes who are more or less dependent on the farmer. Hay is worth \$9 to \$12; beef, \$5 to \$8; oats, 40 to 50 cents;

apples, \$2 to \$3; butter and eggs, 18 to 25 cents; potatoes, Chilis are being shipped at Wolfville for Bermuda (at 40 cents, and I have no doubt 50 cents will be paid for them to go to Montreal and United States."

The next is the report of the Yarmouth County Society, and you know there are a great many men in Yarmouth supporting the opposite side of the House, and surely they would not report anything but that was true. With reference to the exhibition the report says:

"Fruit was very fine, but there were not as many entries as in 1886, there being 199 as against 245 last year. Had all our growers contributed as they might, we would have had such an exhibit as would have surprised our neighbors from Annapolis. We are told by our fruit growers that it is useless to increase the apple crop, as we have no market; our answer to that is to cut out your soft fruit, graft the best kinds of hard and long keepers, and the day is not far distant when steamers will be at our wharves to carry the surplus stock to England or elsewhere."

"We confess that we were disappointed at the show of manufactured articles; while it is encouraging to be told that our mills are being run day and night to fill orders, that Montreal merchants are waiting for the Yarmouth tweeds; that the product of the cotton mill goes to every part of the Dominion; that the organ factory has 24 men at work and, in addition to supplying the local demand, is filling orders for Ontario; that the harness makers are so driven with custom work that they have not time to make a set of harness for exhibition, yet is discouraging to those who have labored to aid in making a reputation for our county and exhibitions not to receive the hearty co-operation of the manufacturers."

"Among the few firms who always aid is 'The Burrell-Johnson Iron Co.;" this company has never allowed any demand upon their time to interfere with their making their annual show, and the large exhibit of new and improved stoves, filling as it did, about 200 feet in length, aided much to make our exhibition complete and attractive. We hope that our next exhibition will be a more complete illustration of our motto, Typical Industries."

"Your committee is of the opinion that fisheries had better be eliminated from the prize list. Under the head special, we find evidence of thought and inventive genius. Mr. Sherman and Mr. Grant both exhibit agricultural implements, which are adapted to the use of farmers, and, if some capitalist would co-operate with such men, there might be another workshop established which would furnish employment, and keep more of our young men at home."

I do not think there is anything very discouraging in those reports that would warrant any gentleman in saying there was a necessity for some heroic measure, if we wish to save Canada from being ruined. Now, perhaps, hon. gentlemen opposite will contend that I have not given sufficient proof to support my contention that there is considerable progress down there. Well, I can give them further proof. I can give them the speeches of the Lieutenant Governors of Nova Scotia, from 1883 to the present, and every speech is redolent of the fact that the people in the Maritime Provinces are progressing in agriculture. In 1883 the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia said:

"I congratulate you on the progress of the Province during the last year. The conditions of trade have steadily improved throughout the world, and the industries of Nova Scotia have enjoyed a fair share of the prosperity thus created."

Some hon. gentlemen are not content when they are in the cold shades of Opposition that a fair share of trade and progressiveness should be enjoyed by the country. They want to go in leaps and bounds to use the language of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and I will show that hon. gentleman in a few moments in what way the farmers of Prince Edward Island have progressed by leaps and bounds. I will show him that their progress in agriculture has been by leaps and bounds up to the present time, notwithstanding any assertion of his to the contrary. The Lieutenant Governor continues as follows:—

"An abundant harvest, fortunately combined with a brisk and steady market for agricultural produce, has made the year one of more than usual prosperity to that great body of the people which is engaged in agricultural pursuits. During the year a special branch of this industry—for which our western valley is peculiarly fitted—has been placed on a footing which warrants the belief that, in the future, the produce of the orchard will form an important feature in our provincial exports. In this branch of agricultural industry the Province has no reason to fear competition from any quarter."

And it was in 1883 the Americans thought fit to take off their duty on this particular branch of agriculture, but, not-

withstanding that, there has not been any greater trade with the United States than there was formerly. In fact, I think the contrary is the case, and that the increase of trade has been with England. Then, speaking of the progress of the fishery business, he says:

"I am glad to be able to inform you that the fishery—another of our leading industries—has, on the whole, been attended with success during the past year."

And this is put in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor by a Grit Government, of which Attorney General Longley and Premier Fielding are the leading members. The Lieutenant Governor says further:

"It is with much pleasure I am able to inform you of the great development of the mining interests during the year. A brisk demand for the produce of the collieries has swollen the output of coal beyond that of any former year, and, from the preparations that are being made at the various mines, we may anticipate satisfactory results from the operations of the year upon which we have entered. The development of a business which not only affords employment to the large classes employed in mining and in shipping, but at the same time contributes to swell our local revenues, is well worthy of our fostering care and attention."

I wonder what developed that coal trade in Nova Scotia, if it was not the National Policy. Then I have extracts from the speeches of the Lieutenant Governor in 1884, 1885, 1886 and 1887 which I will hand to the reporter, as I do not wish to weary the House with reading them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman proposes to hand in his extracts to the *Hansard* reporters. That would be establishing a very vicious practice, one which was objected to the other evening. I am not objecting to the hon. gentleman more than to any other hon. gentleman, but I wish simply to state that an understanding was arrived at long ago not to allow this practice, which would be very mischievous. In a discussion of this kind, we would have no means of knowing what the extracts contained, and no opportunity, when listening to the hon. gentleman, of answering what he has not seen fit to read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course if the objection is taken, it is well taken. Of course it is contrary to the practice of Parliament for hon. gentlemen to hand in extracts of that kind. They should be read if they are to be put in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We did last year, in one or two cases, allow tabulated statements to be handed in to the *Hansard* reporter by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but on these occasions the statements could not be intelligently followed if read, and it was thought necessary to have them printed. That rule would not apply to extracts generally.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If the hon. gentleman had been in his seat at the time, he would have heard that it was at the request of an hon. member on the opposite side that I thought of putting the papers in the hands of the *Hansard* reporters. I will, however, proceed to read them. In 1884 the Lieutenant Governor made the following speech:

"I congratulate you that we meet under circumstances which claim the expression of our gratitude as a people to the Supreme Governor of the Universe."

"The year has been one of gratifying activity in many of the branches of industry in which our population is engaged. If the commercial outlook for the moment is less satisfactory than might be desired, we may reasonably hope that by the exercise of that industry and prudence which so largely characterise our people the prosperity of the Province will be fairly maintained."

I have not the extracts of 1885, but the speech then was of the same congratulatory nature. In 1886, the Grit Government of Nova Scotia put in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor a speech of which this is an extract:

"A more than usually favorable season enabled our farmers to gather an abundant harvest. The output of our coal mines was but little less than that of the previous year and the product of our gold mines was larger than for many years before."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis.)

"I notice with pleasure that the important industry of fruit growing is receiving increased attention. Efforts which have been made during the year to establish and extend the reputation of our fruit in the markets of the mother country have met with gratifying success; collections of the products of our orchards were placed in competition with those of other countries and won the highest praise."

In 1886, this was placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor:

"The varied industries of our Province were prosecuted during the past year with considerable vigor, and the results in some departments were highly satisfactory. The agriculturists, who form the largest part of our population, were favored with a good season and an abundant harvest."

"Our fishermen were fairly rewarded. Mining operations have been extensively carried on and the outlook for the present year is encouraging."

"I notice with pleasure increased activity in gold mining operations. Old districts are being extensively worked, new ones are being opened up in several sections of the Province, and there are many indications that practical miners and capitalists have great confidence in the gold mines of Nova Scotia as a field for industry and investment."

Then there is the following extract from the speech of the Lieutenant Governor in 1888:

"In welcoming you to the scene of your legislative duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the fair measure of prosperity enjoyed by your Province during the past year, while in some quarters exceptional conditions have operated unfavorably, as a rule the labors of our people, in the various branches of industry, have been remunerative, and there has been an improvement in business which, it is hoped, will continue."

"I have particular pleasure in calling attention to the activity that prevailed in mining, an industry of great importance not only because of the capital and labor engaged in it, but also because of its value as a contributor to our provincial revenues."

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of an address was placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island in 1886. He said:

"It is most gratifying to observe the steady progress that is being made by the Province in agriculture, stock raising and other industrial pursuits. This advancement was well evidenced at the exhibition which took place last autumn. A wider field for competition will shortly be afforded at the Colonial Exhibition which opens in London next month and in which I am pleased to know this Province will participate."

And here is an extract from the *Monetary Times* of February, 1886, which shows the condition of Prince Edward Island:

"The figures for Prince Edward Island are very striking. If statistics can be relied on the trade of the Island it must be in an uncommonly healthy position."

Is not this indirect contradiction to what we have heard from some hon. members from Prince Edward Island and from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and from the members of the Opposition generally who have spoken on this. These are not my assertions, though I know them to be true, but I take them from the mouths of their own friends, from the mouths of the Grit Governments, the Grit farmers, the Grit manufacturers of Yarmouth, because that statement was accepted by the Agricultural Society of Yarmouth, and that constituency sent an hon. member here on the other side of the House with a majority of 500 or 600, and it was about the same for the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Borden). So, out of their own mouths I have convicted them. A great deal has been said about the population of Nova Scotia and of the Maritime Provinces generally. I contend that the population of the Maritime Provinces has increased in a much larger proportion than the population of the New England States, and I have statistics here to show that that is true, and these statistics have not been controverted. From the years 1830-31 to 1881, we will see what the increase was in those fifty years in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island. In 1830-31, those States had a population of 1,953,717, and in 1881 a population of 4,010,026 or an increase in 50 years of 2,056,309. Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island had a population in 1831 of 1,065,215, and in 1881 of 4,141,424, or an increase in 50 years of 3,076,209. The New England States had doubled in that time while the

population of Canada had quadrupled. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will say that is not a fair comparison. We will divide the States and compare Maine with the Maritime Provinces. In 1831 Maine had a population of 399,455, and in 1881 of 648,436, or an increase of 248,981 in 50 years. The population of the Maritime Provinces in 1830-31 amounted to 275,379, and in 1881 to 869,495, an increase of 584,116. Maine in 50 years had increased 62 per cent. while the Maritime Provinces had increased 212 per cent. in the same time. Then, if you take Maine and compare it with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for 20 years from 1860-61 to 1881, you will find that Maine in 1860-61 had a population of 628,279, and in 1887 a population of 648,436, an increase of 20,157 in 20 years. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1860-61 had a population of 582,940, and in 1881 of 761,714, an increase of 178,774. Maine which 20 years ago had 45,000 more people than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, now has 113,000 less, and in that has increased only 3 per cent. while New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have increased 30 per cent. I could make another comparison between Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, and Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The former increased 31 per cent. between 1860 and 1880 while the latter Provinces increased 169 per cent. in the same 20 years. Does that not show that we are increasing fairly in proportion with the rest of the countries of the world? I say that we are, and that, in view of these facts, we can only come to the conclusion that it is a bit of political pettifoggery which brings forward this resolution. I say that my constituency, like the constituency indicated by the report of the Agricultural Society of King's County which I have just read, would like a reciprocity treaty with the United States, but they see that it is utterly impossible to get a reciprocity treaty. They know, and every sensible man knows, that nothing short of annexation will give us a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The United States people, and the United States papers, and the United States politicians all say the same thing, which was conveyed in the coarse language of Senator Frye, "Conquest I know, annexation I know, but what the hell is Commercial Union," or unrestricted reciprocity? They know very well what it would be to come over with sword and bullet and wrest our fair Canada from us, and join us to them body and soul, but they know nothing of Commercial Union or unrestricted reciprocity. Have not hon. gentlemen tried time and again to get a fair system of trade with the United States? Did not the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when leader of the late Government, assert upon the floor of this House that time and again we have been knocking at the doors of the United States for fair reciprocal trade and have been refused? Has not the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) often asserted that it was not the proper thing for us to go cringing to these people, asking for commercial favors? We all know that it is impossible, in any department of life, to get anything if you go humbly cringing and kissing the feet of the party of whom you want a favor. What would unrestricted reciprocity do? It would ruin Canada's credit, it would have a tendency that way; I do not say it would ruin it, because I think that the parties who control the money market of England understand the true motive of the resolution before the House. It would be a nice thing, I admit, if the amendment of the senior member for Halifax could be realised. The shipping of our Province would be benefited by it, there is not a doubt about that. But how are you going to get it? It puts me in mind of a little boy that had been trying to take charge of his mother's house. He found that he could not take charge, and he received a spanking and was set back in the chair and was told to sit there until the rays of the moon came in through the window. He thinks of nothing else until he sees the

rays of the moon. Then he commences to blubber and says: "Mother, give me the moon to play with." The hon. gentleman's resolution, asking the United States for reciprocal trade without annexation, is like the boy asking his mother for the moon to play with. Therefore I shall not vote in favor of that amendment, neither shall I vote in favor of the resolution, but I shall record my vote in favor of the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ELLIS. The country the hon. gentleman has described is one of the most beautiful on the face of the globe. It is fertile and productive in every way; but still the hon. gentleman says that a treaty would be desirable. He does not deny that, he cannot deny that. But, Sir, I regret to find that the fertility of the soil and the genialty of the climate do not touch the hon. gentleman himself. In the list of articles that he mentions, which the poor man need not use, he includes a number of things which I think any man might expect to use. Musical instruments, the hon. gentleman says, the poor man may do without. He would not like the poor man to have Christmas cards, and a variety of other things. I take it that anything that a rich man might use in this country a poor man might have too. I do not understand why the poor man should come between the hon. gentleman and his nobility. What is he doing but drawing a line between the rich and the poor, providing that a certain line of articles can be used by the rich from which the poor shall be excluded. I think that is the absolute result of the hon. gentleman's argument. Now I wish to deal with this question without reference to personalities, as it refers to the Province of New Brunswick from which I come. Most of the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question seem to assume that the Province of Ontario was the whole of this Confederation; they seem to have lost sight entirely of the fact that nearly 900,000 people live east of the confines of Ontario. We have heard a good deal about the Ontario farmer, as if, provided that the Ontario farmer was happy, all the rest of the country must be happy too. Now, I will endeavor to show the House that that is not the case. I shall use official statistics, so far as they may be reliable. I have not consulted the statistics of Canada for 20 years. Last evening, I found out in this House that probably the American statistics were more reliable; however, I have taken Canadian statistics, and I will take my stand upon them. Now, I do not present these figures for the purpose of showing any difference between the National Policy and the policy which preceded it. But this fact does come out, that for 11 years after New Brunswick and Nova Scotia entered the Confederation, the balance of trade, that is to say, the trade of the world in which we were concerned, was in our favor, and we were able to import more goods for consumption than we exported.

UPPER PROVINCES.

FIRST PERIOD—1868 to 1878 inclusive.

| | Exports. | Entered for consumption | Imports. |
|---------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Ontario | 255,837,000 | 398,764,000 | 408,779,000 |
| Quebec | 417,975,000 | 435,803,000 | 444,221,000 |
| | 673,812,000 | 834,567,000 | 853,000,000 |

Surplus entered for consumption over exports. \$160,755,000
do imports over exports..... 180,188,000

MARITIME PROVINCES.

| | Exports. | Entered for consumption | Imports. |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Nova Scotia..... | 75,629,000 | 103,038,000 | 110,502,000 |
| New Brunswick..... | 64,468,000 | 89,062,000 | 90,204,000 |
| Prince Edward Island..... | 7,318,000 | 7,957,000 | 7,866,000 |
| | 147,415,000 | 200,057,000 | 208,572,000 |
| Surplus entered for consumption over exports..... | | \$52,642,000 | |
| do imports over exports..... | | 61,157,000 | |
| New Brunswick, exports..... | \$64,468,000 | | |
| do imports..... | | 90,204,000 | |
| | | \$25,736,000 | |

In other words, we are able to buy in the markets of the world 61,000,000, representing the surplus of our imports over our exports. Take the case of New Brunswick alone. We exported \$64,000,000 worth, and we imported \$90,000,000 worth, leaving a balance in our favor of \$25,000,000. Take the second period. The figures for Ontario are: Exports \$226,815,000, for domestic consumption \$339,671,000, imports \$346,964,000. Province of Quebec, exports \$361,938,000, domestic consumption \$364,593,000, imports \$425,366,000. The total was exports \$628,753,000, consumption \$704,264,000, imports \$772,530,000. The surplus of goods entered for consumption in that period of nine years, the second period, from 1878 to the close of the last fiscal year, by the Upper Provinces over exports was \$76,511,000 and over imports \$143,777,000. Look now at the Maritime Provinces and see how we were affected by this condition of affairs. The figures for the Maritime Provinces are as follows: Nova Scotia exported \$77,323,000 and was able to buy in foreign markets only \$69,284,000. New Brunswick for the same period exported \$59,676,000, entered for consumption \$53,602,000, imports \$52,792,000. Prince Edward Island, the position of which is far worse than that of any of the Provinces, exported \$14,195,000 and entered for consumption \$7,102,000, importing only \$6,926,000. The totals for the Maritime Provinces were: exports, \$151,194,000; home consumption, \$129,938,000; imports, \$134,110,000; less per cent. as against exports, \$21,205,000; as against imports, \$17,084,000. The effect of this is that, while during eleven years we were able to buy in the markets of the world, in this later period we have not been able to do so, and so far as we are concerned the trade has been entirely lost. I take now the tonnage of ships. I will not say that the extinction of our tonnage is due to the National Policy, but I am entitled to point out that the condition of affairs in the country is such that it should engage the attention of the House, and while it is very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to come here and sing songs of rejoicing, they who do so know nothing about the condition of the Maritime Provinces. They take mere off-hand statements, but if they want to know the facts they must examine matters for themselves. A great deal has been made as to what happened under the Mackenzie Government. In 1873 the tonnage of New Brunswick was 277,000 tons. This amount increased during the term of the Mackenzie Government to 335,000 tons; in 1879 it reached its highest point 340,000 and it has since fallen to 255,000 tons. We built and registered in 1874, 42,000 tons of shipping; 1875, 33,000 tons; in 1886 we built and registered only 4,931 tons. The industry of ship-building was one of the great industries of New Brunswick. Nothing has taken its place. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, referring to the maritime fishing industry, made a statement to the effect that something like 100,000 tons of shipping

Mr. ELLIS.

were built in the Maritime Provinces. In New Brunswick alone we have built in times past that much shipping. In 1864 the value of the ships we built was \$3,900,000, representing over 90,000 tons, and that was in New Brunswick alone. The total decrease in the shipping of the Maritime Provinces last year was 40,000 tons. That is really a complete displacement of property. The value has so much decreased that it is almost impossible to give the property away. I do not, of course, mean to convey the idea that you cannot give property away, but the property has declined in value so that the owners are glad to obtain a very small proportion of its cost. Taking the low rate of \$20 a ton for 40,000 tons there appears to be a decrease of \$800,000. I recollect that sometime ago an estate, winding up in St. John, placed in the market ship property which cost at the very least \$100,000 and they were glad to obtain \$20,000 for it and extend the payments over a very long period. I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement made by Mr. Fairweather with respect to losses sustained in the fishing industry. He is probably known to many members, he is a prominent Conservative, a member of the Board of Trade, and a man of undoubted character, and any certificate I could give him would be unnecessary. Mr. Fairweather in enumerating the causes of the difficulties that have come upon the Province of New Brunswick, says:

"Unremunerative shipping property—310,000 tons is about New Brunswick's amount. This at a cost value (low enough) of \$30 per ton comes to the sum of \$9,300,000. In years past the yield from vessel property was 20 per cent. I place it at 10 per cent. annual return on the investment and find that a sum of \$930,000 per annum came to us in St. John from our ships and vessels in prosperous years. At present profits are almost nil, or say not much over a fourth or a fifth of the above sum."

He further says:

"Our ship-building—I pause before the magnitude of the loss we have sustained in the decadence of this industry. Within my recollection I believe there have been times when from 75 to 100 ships of an average of 500 tons (many 1,000 tons and larger) were in course of construction in a radius 50 miles of St. John. You can estimate what the number is to-day and the loss of employment and the non-circulation of money which is involved. What class of the people of this country was not benefited by our ship-building trade? We cannot name a class that was not advantaged directly or indirectly thereby. If I ask you to set down for yourselves what you may think is a sum correctly representing our annual loss through the decline of ship-building it is because I am unable to form an estimate that at all satisfies me of its correctness."

Mr. Fairweather estimated the loss of ship-building to St. John at not less than \$1,000,000 a year. It is impossible for an industry to decline to such an extent without having an effect upon the population. I desire to call the attention of the House to the question of population, although I know hon. gentlemen opposite do not like it, and although I may say with respect to this matter of population in this country there has always been a kind of feeling that the country ought to have more people and would have more people than really has had or than it will have within a period which any man can imagine. I remember, Sir, in 1862 when the Intercolonial delegates were in England that they told the Colonial Secretary in the State paper which they laid before the Colonial Office, that in 15 years the population of the old Provinces alone would be somewhere between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 of people. That was in 1862, and I do not think, Sir, we have more than 4,800,000 to-day. Now, Sir, take the entire population of our Province. In 1851 it was 193,800, and it had increased 25.84 per cent. from 1840. Between 1851 and 1861 it increased 30.05, and in 1871 it reached 295,000. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the descent and the decline in our population are to be dated from the time that we entered Confederation. It is impossible to say at this moment whether there is any increase in the Province of New Brunswick in the period since the last census was taken to the present time. We have no Government statistics and the only way you can reach any idea whatever in regard to

the population is from the school returns. The total number of children at school in 1880 was 69,000 and in 1887 we find from the returns just submitted to the Provincial Legislature that it was 68,583 or a decline of 1,009. These are the official figures. I do not say you can draw from the man inference either one way or the other, as there may be circumstances which would prevent in one year a larger attendance or as large an attendance of children as in another. They seem to me to show at any rate that there is no increase of population at all. Taking each period for which we have actual census returns by counties the population of the Province increased some 36,000, I think it is, and nearly one-half of the increase is in three counties alone. The county of Carleton (N.B.) represented by my friend on the left, and the county of Victoria, represented by the Minister of Inland Revenue, rich and fertile counties, have increased their population, but that increase of population and the wealth growing in that community, is due, I take it, to the fact that there is an excellent underground system of railways with the States. These counties lie alongside the American border, and they have opportunities there for trading with the States on the principles of unrestricted reciprocity, of which some gentlemen are so much afraid. In no other counties of the Province has there been such a large increase of population. The population of Westmoreland increased 8,000. This is a good agricultural county represented by a gentleman who spoke last night. But Sir, the main reason for the increase in that county is that the Intercolonial Railway works are there. A large amount of public money has been spent there, and the spending of that money in the county has as much influence, I take it, as anything else in increasing the population. In addition to that Sir, there is a large number of Acadians in the population and I think they do not move as much as our own people do; at least I mean the people of English birth, for I do not desire to draw any distinction. The county of Albert, represented by an hon. gentleman who is not now in his seat, has a population of 10,000 and it increased only 1,500. In the city of St. John, which I represent here, the population has fallen off, and it was inevitable that the population of the city of St. John should decrease. It was 28,805 in 1871, and the decrease in the business of the city has reduced the population by 2,700. There is a slight increase in the county, but the whole increase in the city and county of St. John where there were 52,100 people in 1871 amounts only to such an extent as to give a population of 52,900 in the year 1881. That represents the entire increase in one of the first commercial cities on the Atlantic coast of Canada. Now, Sir, what earthly use is it for hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Ontario, hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Quebec to get up in this House and tell us that the condition of things is perfectly satisfactory. Have those gentlemen no interest in the Maritime Provinces? Have they not a common feeling with us? Have they no desire to make us feel that we are part of the country? I would ask the hon. gentlemen to take the matter home to themselves and consider the condition of things as it stands with us. In the county of Sunbury one of the finest agricultural counties in the Province, situated on the banks of a noble river, and where there is excellent land, there is no reason in the world why the community should not have increased in population if there was a fair opportunity for the people to dispose of their products. But the farmer has no opportunity. He has to leave his house and home, and I know numbers of houses, Sir, in various parts of the Province of New Brunswick where people have left their houses untenanted and unoccupied. I have myself taken refuge in them when on fishing excursions, and somehow like the old stories in the fable it looked as if we might expect the master of the house to return at any moment. The county of Queen's had

a population of 13,847 in 1871, and that, Sir, is a fine county, just as fine as the county of Sunbury, with a large water board, as it is situated on the lake and on the river St. John. Its population is now 14,000, or an increase of about 100 in ten years for one of the finest counties that we can meet with anywhere in Canada. Perhaps it is not as fine as the county represented by my hon. friend who spoke last and which county possesses peculiar excellence, but I do not see where we can get a better county.

Mr. GILLMOR. Have you got the returns for Charlotte there?

Mr. ELLIS. I think Charlotte has increased as the opportunities for smuggling are as great there as in the other counties. In 1871 the population of Charlotte was 25,882, and it has increased only to 26,000 in 1887 or about 200. I do not care to particularise that county, but it, too, has opportunities of very great excellency. It seems to me that there is no reason whatever if there was any opportunity for the people to encourage trade why the population does not increase. But, Sir, the population goes away. They are to be found in all parts of the United States. Hon. gentlemen come here and give disquisitions about people moving westward; but they are to be found in all parts of the United States. You can find many of them in the New England States. In Boston there are more of our people from New Brunswick to-day than there are in Fredericton, the capital of the Province. Now, Sir, that is not a state of things which ought to be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite. Probably someone may get up and explain it away, and may think it is all right, but I tell you it is not all right. This condition of things is producing dissatisfaction in the Province and it will have the effect either of taking the Province out of Confederation altogether or causing the Government to do something to stop the evil. There is nothing more appalling than to take up the census of Canada and see what a large number have left the country. The hon. gentleman read a paper, showing that in 1853 or some other year there was a great exodus, and argued from that fact that the same thing was going on every year; and the next moment he turned around and showed from a speech made by Mr. Howe that there was no exodus at all. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the other evening had to admit that men who had the benefit of the highest education we could give them left us. Well, Sir, if we cannot keep the educated men in the country, what is the use of keeping the country together? What is a country for if not for its people? I do not say that there are not always people moving about over the earth, particularly with the facilities we have to-day; but when such an immense number leave the country as are going now, you are face to face with a fact that should arrest the attention of the Government at once. Taking the United States census of 1880, and looking at the selected occupations, I find that among the Canadians in the United States there are 2,617 engaged in school teaching, 930 clergymen, 559 lawyers—I suppose they can be well spared—and 1,352 official employes of the Government of the United States—I presume of the States Governments—about as many as we have in Ottawa. There are 2,219 iron and steel workers from Canada in the United States. When is the iron policy we adopted the other day going to bring these people back? There are 5,570 Canadians engaged as official employes of the railroads in the United States. Now, I will not pursue that branch of the subject any further; I merely call the attention of the House to the facts, and I leave hon. gentlemen to draw their own inferences. Now, I would like to ask hon. members who have discussed this question if they can suggest any idea as to how the trade we have lost is to be restored to us. Mr. Fairweather undertook to show that there was a Canadian trade—a trade with the Upper Provinces. The figures

have been referred to before. I do not know under which king to serve; but the hon. Minister of Marine the other night got up and said that Mr. Longley stated in Halifax that there was a trade of \$12,000,000, that the Upper Provinces sent goods to that value to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. My hon. friend from Annapolis stated to-night that Mr. Longley said nothing of the kind, but went through his county and declared that there was no trade at all. I do not know which of these gentlemen is the more truthful; I do not know either very well.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I rise to an explanation. What I said was that Mr. Longley went through my county and stated that the Maritime Provinces had nothing to send to Quebec and Ontario, but that they were flooded with Montreal and Quebec drummers—

Mr. KIRK. That is true.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis)—and that we were purchasing \$12,000,000 of goods from those people.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman certainly did not make that explanation in that way before. However, as long as we can get two gentlemen on that side to agree, we have something accomplished. Mr. Fairweather was very anxious to show that for the loss of trade that had occurred a trade had grown up, and I believe that his statement was correct, so far as I can judge from the figures. He claimed that the Maritime Provinces sent \$1,270,000 worth of goods to the Upper Provinces, and he gives a statement of how he makes up that amount. He says, for instance, that we sent \$1,695,000 worth of sugar. Well, Sir, we do not produce sugar; we do not grow sugar. That is no export from the Maritime Provinces. It is true, the sugar may come in there and be manipulated, or it may be simply carried over the railways for the benefit of the dealer in Montreal; but the amount of profit our people can make on it is exceedingly small; in fact, I think there is no profit at all. I recollect that last year a sugar refinery in Westmoreland got into difficulty with its creditors, and they had to take payment for its debt in the stock of the company. Then, we sent to the upper provinces, \$474,000 worth of iron. I do not know whether it was Londonderry iron or not, but it did not go from the Province of New Brunswick. \$760,000 worth of coal was sent, which did not go from the Province of New Brunswick, because we do not produce any coal. \$750,000 worth of cotton was sent. None of these things are produced in the Province of New Brunswick. Mr. Fairweather goes through a number of items in the same way; but I have gone carefully over the list and I cannot find more than \$300,000 worth of goods that have gone from New Brunswick to Ontario and Quebec, and even that, I think, is a large estimate. A portion of that amount represents fish, and that trade has not been a profitable one. Then Mr. Fairweather undertook to show that there were \$12,000,000 worth of goods came from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to the Maritime Provinces, and he calculated that of this, \$3,150,000 was food in various forms—flour and oatmeal I presume. What effect would a reciprocity treaty with the United States have upon this? I presume it would have no effect. I presume it would make no difference to you if we bought the same amount from Ontario and Quebec, whether there was reciprocity or not. But if you argue that reciprocity would take trade away from you, then it is clear that we are being taxed on \$3,150,000 worth of food. Now we have a great regard for you, but we do not care to pay a tax on the food you send us. Then there is \$2,000,000 worth of clothing sent from Montreal, and a considerable amount in other articles. With regard to the trade in boots and shoes, \$2,000,000 worth came to us from Ontario and Quebec. Well, before we had that trade with Ontario and Quebec, we made our own

Mr. ELLIS.

boots and shoes. There were then factories in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in a most flourishing condition, and whatever the reason may be, I do not pretend to say, but certainly all these factories without exception are closed. That is a position of things which is neither gratifying nor satisfactory. So with regard to clothing. A few years ago, we made all our own clothing, but now the trade has passed into your hands. Is it a profitable trade to you? I think not. Any one who knows anything about the trade knows that almost all who have ever engaged in it have been obliged to close out without meeting their liabilities. The conditions of trade have been such that the trade has not been profitable, and Mr. Fairweather himself does not say it is profitable; he only hopes it will become profitable. There is a long course of carriage, and the fact of it is that within the last five years the failures in the Province of Nova Scotia alone have amounted to \$8,750,000, and the assets are not the quarter that amount. That is due to the fact that we have lost a remunerative trade and are not able to keep up a trade which is unremunerative. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called attention to the business done in the sugar trade. Now, I do not know anything of the profits made on sugar, but I know that so far as the great bulk of raw sugar for the Montreal refineries in the Upper Provinces is concerned, it does not pass over our railways, but is landed at the port of Boston and carried thence over railways to Montreal. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the benefit that arose from the fact that these goods came in the way they do. But I take it, the profits to our shipping on the carriage of the goods if they came from England—and I presume our ships could carry clean sugar as cheaply as raw sugar—would be greater, and, so far as the railways are concerned, it makes not the slightest difference to them whether they carry clean or unwashed sugar. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in endeavoring to make a statement with regard to the trade of the country, called attention to the registered tonnage. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) also dealt with that subject, but I would like to call your attention, Sir, for one moment to the condition of things in that regard. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries produced a statement of the registered tonnage arriving and departing from our ports, and he said it showed an increase between 1880 and 1887, on an average, of 3,000,000 tons a year. Now, when a Minister of the Crown undertakes to make a comparative statement he ought to be fair in his statement, and I regret the hon. gentleman is not here when I call the attention of the House to his unfairness. He took the short period from 1875 to 1879, in which there were two very poor years, so as to bring his average up to 3,000,000 of an increase. If, however, he had taken instead any corresponding period of years, if he had taken the years from 1870 and made a comparison he would have reduced his average by three-quarters million. But, the hon. gentleman asked in a very of a jaunty manner: "What have these vessels been doing?" Do they come in and go out, he asked, just for the mere fun of the thing. Well, in the year 1875, when the amount of tonnage was comparatively small as contrasted with other years, there were 9,537,000 tons entered inwards and outwards, there was brought into the country \$201,000,000, worth of goods. Now, I do not say that all these goods were brought by vessels. Of course the railroad did a part of the work, but last year when the tonnage was 14,000,000 there were only \$202,000,000 worth brought in. So that the hon. gentleman's figures really prove nothing, so far as the trade is concerned, because they are made up of vessels entering into and departing from our ports. I find on examination of the figures, which the hon. gentleman gave, that the lake tonnage of 1870 was 5,510,000 tons; in 1871 it was 7,310,000; in 1872, 6,320,000; and in 1887, 5,169,000 tons, or 2,000,000

less in 1887 than in 1881, showing a constant decline since 1871 in the lake tonnage of Ontario. In the Province of Quebec the following is a statement of the vessels entered in and out:—

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| In 1884 | 3,107,000 |
| 1887 | 2,993,000 |
| 1886 | 1,188,000 |
| Last year | 1,185,000 |

The hon. gentleman partly suggested an explanation of this, but at the port of St. John, and others in the Maritime Provinces there are steamers engaged in carrying people away from all parts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the United States. Undoubtedly these vessels carry freight, but their principal business is in carrying passengers. The tonnage of foreign steamers which entered the port of St. John in 1887 was 270,175. About one-third of the whole shipping that entered the port of St. John was foreign steamers. I do not know that we had any foreign steamers except American steamers, with the exception perhaps of one Spanish vessel. I find also that the totals for the last two years for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have increased very much, and the explanation of that is that the vessels we compel to enter inwards and outwards but do not allow to trade, go to swell up these returns; so I think there is nothing whatever in the statement the hon. gentleman made in regard to the increase of trade. In addition to the decline of trade, the taxation of the country has increased. I know that hon. gentlemen do not like to hear anything about the fact of the increase of taxation, but you Sir, can easily understand that, with the increase of population, or rather with a population that does not increase, with a declining trade, taxation becomes more heavy on those who remain. I remember in 1867, when the Hon. Mr. Tilley, who was afterwards Minister of Finance and is now the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, undertook to persuade us into Confederation, he told us:

"There would be no increase of taxation; the Canadian tariff would not necessarily be introduced into New Brunswick. In a few days he would publish an estimate showing that the expense of the Confederation would not exceed \$11,000,000, which was about equal to \$2.75 per head of the whole population. He would put it forth to the world and defy successful contradiction."

And again:

"They would fully meet the entire expenses of the Federal Government by a tariff of only \$2.75 per head on the population."

Well, the interest on the debt alone now is about \$2.70 a head, so that the amount which the hon. gentleman stated would be sufficient for all the purposes of Confederation is now taken up by the payment on the public debt. In 1867, the gross debt of the Province of New Brunswick was \$5,923,000, or about \$20 a head on the people, taking the assumed population of 1867. From the figures submitted here, the present debt is \$48 a head. Making a calculation as near as I can, I think the share of the net debt chargeable to that Province will be about \$16,000,000. In addition to that we have the provincial debt, which would bring it to about \$17,500,000, the annual charge for which would be about \$900,000, against \$330,000, when we closed our provincial accounts and entered into Confederation. There is no objection to a debt if you are able to pay, but we are not able to bear the burden the debt imposes upon us, and we are not able to meet the payment to-day of even the smaller burden of the debt with which we went into Confederation. The consequence is that a chronic state of dissatisfaction has grown up in the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. KIRK. And Nova Scotia.

Mr. ELLIS. My hon. friend says it is the same in Nova Scotia. I know every part of New Brunswick, and I am satisfied as to the feelings of the people in regard to that

matter. It is true, when an election is to be run, that a gentleman may be sent to support the Government, because the people take the condition of things existing, and make the best possible bargain they can. There is a constant effort on the part of the government—of any government—I do not desire to refer so much to the form or the individuality of the present Government, as I do to refer to things generally. I remember that last year Mr. Everett, whose seat is now occupied by my hon. friend here (Mr. Skinner) addressed a meeting in Carleton, where I live myself, which forms a part of the city of St. John, last February, and said:

"The people looked forward to the time when this would be the great winter port of Canada. Carleton offered grand facilities for the handling of freight, and in that part of the city necessary grain elevators and warehouses would be erected. In a year or fifteen months elevators would be seen on our harbor front, and steamers would be here taking in cargoes of grain for the mother country."

I live on that side of the harbor, and not far from the harbor front, but there was not a sign of the construction of a grain elevator there when I left. On the day before the election, the Government organ, the *Sun*, said:

"We want elevators and other terminal facilities. We have asked for an engineer and the engineer has been sent."

The hon. the Minister of Public Works will understand that.

"If the Government is strong enough in the next House to defy Mr. Blake, all may be well."

The Government was strong enough to defy Mr. Blake, but, unfortunately for us, all is not well. But, however humiliating the spectacle may be of seeing the public men of the country going through the constituencies and promising at election times that this and that work shall be undertaken, it is far more humiliating to come to this Parliament and to hear these things thrown up to the Government and to hear them reproached not only with the fact that their pledges are unfulfilled but with the fact that they were made at all. If Mr. Fairweather's statement as to what we buy from the upper Provinces is correct, we have to get money somewhere to pay what we do pay. What is the condition of our foreign trade at the present time? Our foreign trade is principally carried on with Great Britain and the United States. In 1881, we sold to all the countries with which we dealt \$6,406,000, and in 1882, \$7,474,000. But there has been a decline, and in 1887 the Province of New Brunswick only sold \$6,149,000 worth, so that there has been a decline in our foreign trade since 1882 of more than \$1,300,000 worth. That is so far as our exports are concerned. Our imports are in the same condition. We imported in 1881, \$6,000,000 worth, and from that time to 1887, with the exception of one year, there has been a decline, and in 1887 the amount was \$5,653,000. Look at the movement of that trade. In 1881 we sold more than half our exports to England. We sold \$3,265,000 out of a total of \$6,406,000. In the same year we sold to the United States \$2,324,000. Up to 1884, we sold in England a larger proportion of our goods, but there has been a steady decline until the amount has fallen from \$3,800,000 to \$2,600,000. On the other hand, our trade with the United States has increased until it has gone up to \$2,340,000. As we do not sell so much in England, neither do we buy so much from that country, hon. gentlemen who are so very patriotic with regard to buying from the mother country ought to take up this matter and regulate it. They are face to face with the fact that in the important Province of New Brunswick, founded, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) said last night, by the United Empire Loyalists, trade has declined with Great Britain and has materially increased with the United States. Now, I would like to call attention for a moment to a peculiarity of our trade. The river St. John flows through American territory as well as through British territory. The

dwellers on the upper portion of the river reside in the State of Maine, and they have the right, and it is proper that they should, to navigate the river, as every man should living upon it, who pays his lot and part towards maintaining the works on the river. The people living on the American territory cut their logs—or rather we cut them for them, and they are rolled into the St. John River and floated down stream to the booms, 80 miles from the mouth, where they are collected indiscriminately, and the logs of my hon. friend on my right, if he were a lumbermen, would float alongside of the logs of a man who might be an American. The people who are engaged in cutting, and the horses that are employed, belong to New Brunswick, and but the customs authority, as is probably perfectly right, makes a distinction between goods that are raised in Canada and goods that are produced in the United States. They practically all are produced in the United States, so far as that is concerned, and when these logs reach the mouth of the river they are sawn there. Now, I want to call the attention to this matter of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place, because he spoke the other night in a rather contemptuous way about the people of Canada being hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans; and I know that it would make his patriotic soul feel sad if he were to understand the condition of things in New Brunswick to-day. The principal industry at the mouth of the St. John River now is the manufacture of the American logs into lumber. The rate of duty charged in the United States on all our lumber is \$2 a thousand, but on the American log there is no duty, and gentlemen who are wrestling with the question of who pays the duty, may take this in their calculation. These logs, cut on American soil, were cut by our people, and manufactured in the mills at the mouth of the river, and they enter the United States free of duty; but the man who may be fortunate enough, or unfortunate enough, to be a British subject, who owns a British mill, when his logs go into the United States, has to pay \$2 a thousand duty. Now, there is one thing sure—the man who puts lumber into the American market pays the duty in the first instance; whether he ever gets it back again I cannot tell. The practical result of this industry at the mouth of the St. John River is that mills that years ago were built by British capital, and were employed in manufacturing lumber for the British market, have passed into the hands of Americans to-day, and the Canadian people are hewers of wood—or sawers of wood—and drawers of water for these Americans who own mills at the mouth of the river. Now, I desire to call attention to the export of lumber from New Brunswick to the United States. As I said before, in the year 1881, the whole quantity amounted to \$2,334,000, and in the customs returns \$1,583,000 is put down as the products of New Brunswick, and \$750,000 as the product of the United States. We are compelled now to depend upon this trade in some way, and the goods not the produce of New Brunswick have grown from \$750,000 to \$1,334,000 in the period between 1881 and 1887. What would be the effect under reciprocity? The discrimination between these goods would be swept away, and the Canadian lumber on the River St. John, no matter where the lumber went, would have the benefit of the market; he would be put on equal ground with the American. Now, the duty levied upon cut lumber amounts to about 35 per cent.; I think our lumbermen speak of it as about \$4 a thousand. We are compelled by the conditions of trade simply to cut the lumber up in the rough and sell it that way. What we want, and what we must have, by some means or other, is the lumber trade of the United States, that is, we will have to get the right in some way to get our lumber to the United States market after we manufacture it at home, not simply to take it away in the rough, and carry it, as you do sugar, with all its dirt and impurity. We want to profit from the product of

Mr. ELLIS.

our own labor upon this lumber before we carry it to the markets of the United States. Moreover, the trade which we do with other countries is declining, for a variety of reasons. At one time we carried on quite a trade in lumber along the Mediterranean ports, but the conditions have changed entirely, and we sell far less lumber in the Mediterranean ports. The lumber now required there is served to the smaller ports of Italy, Spain and France, and is carried there in small steamers from the various forests of Europe, and that lumber is gradually driving our lumber entirely out of those markets. The trade we once did, to a considerable extent, with France, has gradually declined. In 1882 our exports to France were of the value of \$494,000—more being sent from New Brunswick than from any other Province; they have fallen to \$160,000. Our exports to Italy and Spain were of the value of \$98,000 in 1882, they have fallen to \$50,000. It is the same with different countries with which we do business. We have lost the trade, and we do not therefore obtain the profits. I desire to call attention to the changes that have taken place in our transatlantic shipments. I have a statement of the lumber trade of New Brunswick, and I may explain that part of this lumber may come from Nova Scotia, but that has been the case year after year and does not make a difference in the proportion. The lumber is brought down in small vessels to St. John. In 1883 the shipments were of the value of \$404,000,000, in 1887 they had fallen to the value of \$257,000,000, they have in fact fallen steadily; in 1881 there were \$404,000,000; 1884, \$331,000,000; 1885, \$289,000,000; 1886, \$272,000,000; 1887, \$252,000. Thus it is apparent that the trade has decreased one-third, and it will steadily decrease, as we are not able to place the goods on the English market on as advantageous terms as our rivals, because the competition year by year from the ports in the Baltic, the wood of which is cheaper and more suitable and more rapidly transported. The statement was made by the American consul in St. John that we sent to the United States last year about fifty millions of lumber in the form of laths, shooks, &c., on which there was a duty paid of \$100,000. I do not know whether the consumer ever got it back or not, but I state the fact that it was paid; and as the Americans at the mouth of the river do not pay any duty, there is that much duty as against us. Now, with regard to the condition of our home trade. The exports of the country are grouped together under the heads of mining, fishing, agricultural products, and so forth. I have prepared a statement showing each class, and I will summarise it. The total exports of New Brunswick, of the mine, in 1887, amounted to \$132,016, of which we sent \$118,354 to the United States. Our total fish exports amounted to \$729,060, of which \$554,538 went to the United States. The products of the forest \$4,498,572, of which \$1,812,529 went to the United States, and this item is growing constantly. The next item is products of the farm. Whatever may be said in regard to the question as to who pays the duty, we find this in New Brunswick, that we can do better by sending our farm products, and perhaps our fish as well, to places of exchange rather than to the places of consumption, because the goods we buy in exchange suit us better than if we were obliged to send our products to distant markets. The products of the farm amounted to \$101,164, of which \$96,115 went to the United States. Of animals and their products to the value of \$339,374, the United States took the value of \$336,566. Of our manufactures \$301,059, the United States took \$151,463. Under the head of miscellaneous, \$48,644 all practically was sent to the United States. What we, in St. John and New Brunswick maintain, is that if our markets were enlarged, if we got a better opportunity to extend our trade, this trade would increase. It is the only profitable trade we have. I desire to call th

attention of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to a remark he made the other day with respect to protection afforded to exports of manufactures. If the hon. gentleman will look over the table of exports he will find that the manufactures that are exported are scarcely protected at all, in fact, that it is not our protective manufactures which are exported. The great bulk of our exports are exports manufactured from the raw materials of the country. In New Brunswick, for example, we export manufactures under the heading of hemlock bark, which is used in tanning. The gypsum which we manufacture, the grindstones we make, the granite, we polish, all these are natural products of the country in a state of manufacture, and these are the goods we can sell. At the present time we dispose of them in the markets of the United States under very great disadvantage. If those markets were open to us there was practically no limit to the quantity we could send in there. Take the article of red granite, which is found extensively in a natural state in the Province, and particularly in the county of Charlotte. There is a heavy duty on the manufactured article entering the United States; the granite is of very little value in its raw state, it is the labor that gives it value. Our merchants are continually told that if there was some arrangement made by which they could get their goods into the American market on satisfactory terms they would be able to do practically an unlimited trade. As regards the trade of St. John, I have here a statement, which the American consul was so kind as to prepare, of the shipment to the United States from that port for the five years ending December, 1887:

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 1883—Produce not American | \$ 415,812 26 |
| American lumber | 816,670 48 |
| Total | \$1,232,482 74 |
| 1884—Produce not American | \$ 411,318 19 |
| American lumber | 775,294 27 |
| Total | \$1,186,612 46 |
| 1885—Produce not American | \$ 372,675 24 |
| American lumber | 1,062,490 27 |
| Total | \$1,435,165 51 |
| 1886—Produce not American | \$ 461,728 79 |
| American lumber | 1,434,286 23 |
| Total | \$1,896,015 02 |
| 1887—Produce not American | \$ 705,976 00 |
| American lumber | 1,263,714 23 |
| Total | \$1,969,685 23 |
| Gain | \$737,203 00 |

The trade, so far as regards the American lumber, is not one that we can control, but the land is probably cut over year by year and the limit of production will probably soon be reached; but there is no limit whatever, I repeat, to the increased products of New Brunswick if opportunity is given. Reference has been made to the old tariff. I desire to call attention to the fact that during the eleven years preceding reciprocity the value of exports from New Brunswick to the United States was \$2,300,000. During the eleven years of the operation of reciprocity the balance was \$11,500,000. In 1854, the year before the treaty, it was \$480,000; in 1865, the last year of the treaty, the value was \$1,700,000. The fact is quite plain that the people of New Brunswick, remembering the advantages accruing from reciprocity, desire to again obtain a reciprocity treaty. But there was one peculiarity with regard to the treaty which has been referred to in our debate here. Our exports from the Province of New Brunswick increased to a large extent. In 1854 we sent out \$485,000 worth; in 1886,

\$880,000 worth; in 1859 \$1,115,000; and in 1865, the last year of the treaty, \$1,800,000. But, Sir, the imports from the United States did not increase at all. In 1854 we brought in \$3,500,000 worth; next year the same; next year \$3,300,000 worth, and in 1865, the last year of the treaty, \$3,100,000, showing that there is ground and good ground for the complaint made by the American people that while the treaty opened to us the markets of the United States it did not give them a corresponding advantage in our market. I can expect, Sir, that some gentleman replying to me will confront me with the savings bank returns. The savings bank returns always do a great service to the Government. I would like somebody who understands this question better perhaps than I do to look into those returns and see what they mean. One gentleman spoke about this money being laid up by the people and put in the banks. It is not in the banks. The people in their individual capacity have saved the money and the people in their collective capacity owe the money and have spent it. If the Government wants to pay that money to the country they have to borrow it at its own expense. I took the trouble to look over the returns for last year and I find that the operation of those savings banks is like the gold in King Solomon's Mines of which that imaginative writer Rider Haggard tells us. The interest account last year was increased by \$1,322,000. But do we earn that interest? Is it like money invested in any savings bank or institution where there is a direct return? We are simply increasing this by writing it on papers, and the moment we add to the principal we commence to add to the interest again, and so it goes on increasing. Fully one-third of this amount is an amount which has no existence whatever but is added by a stroke of the pen of a clerk in the Finance Department. Sir, the hon. gentleman who spoke last referred to the State of Maine, and it is quite a common thing to compare New Brunswick with the State of Maine. What are the facts in regard to that State. In the first place a man who leaves the State of Maine goes to another part of the United States and he is still bearing his share of the national burden, and does not escape. With regard to the movement from that State any person who looks at history will remember that during the war of the rebellion the population of that country was disturbed and a large number of men went out from some States and have not come back again. Some left their bones on the field of battle, some took situations in various other places, and such was the disturbance among the male population of the country that it has not yet recovered. But the State of Maine notwithstanding the fact that it has only about double the population of New Brunswick has \$35,100,000 in its saving bank while Canada has only \$4,000,000. The State of Massachusetts which has not as large a population as Ontario, has could buy up the whole debt of Canada and have thirty or forty millions dollars left. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the savings banks and they seem to think it a great thing that the Government has left a small amount of money which they have not taken from the people by taxation. The sooner that saving bank business is looked fully in the face and the sooner the Government ceases to brag about it the better for the country. The State of Vermont in 1870 had \$2,300,000 in the savings bank; in 1886 it had \$11,700,000. You must understand that this money is invested in productive investments and it earns its own interest. It may not be as safe as in the hands of the Government of Canada, but I will not pronounce an opinion upon that. The State of New Hampshire, not a very remarkable State, had \$21,500,000 in the saving bank in 1870, and in 1886 in had \$47,000,000, or had more than doubled itself in that period. Now, as to the State of Rhode Island. I do not wish to refer particularly to this State because it is one of the richest States of the

Union, and I can recollect the time when there was more gold and silver in Providence than there was in any other place. Rhode Island, in 1870, had \$30,700,000 in the saving bank, and in 1886 \$51,800,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And what is the population?

Mr ELLIS. The population is 276,000, not as many as the population of New Brunswick, but it has ten or twelve times as much money in the banks as all the people of the Dominion of Canada put together. I presume it is sufficient to call attention to those facts to show that all this talk about the greatness of the saving bank deposits in Canada is just sheer nonsense, when we compare the results with the industrial and prosperous condition of the country alongside of us. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other night referred to our gross trade, and when that gentleman undertakes to launch forth into a current of words nobody in this House can equal him. He made a long speech; perhaps I am making a long speech too, but I am endeavoring to discharge the duty I have before me as best I can. In the long current of words delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the hon. gentleman undertook to controvert the statement made by the hon. the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution into the House and he spoke about the geographical difficulties in the way of trade. The hon. gentleman built up quite a pyramid of words and when I came to examine his speech I found that he had reached about the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He says that somebody has tunneled the Alps. That is quite true. They made a straight line through the Alps, but I cannot myself see much sense in making an enormous hole in the Alps, if they put up a paper wall which is more effective against trade than when the mountain stood there in its natural state. We boast in this country that we have made the shortest and quickest route for the carriage of trade, and if there is anything in that argument how can you hold to the principle that it is best to carry trade over a long distance to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman referred to the trade of the east. Why, Sir, what greater achievement was ever undertaken by a single man than the man who carried the first overland mail so that there might be quickness of carriage, the man who devoted his life to that object of carrying the overland mail from India to England. And, Sir, England and Europe has followed his example and they have cut canals. You do not go against nature, but you use nature entirely for your own purposes. The best you can do is occasionally to wrest from her by patient and diligent work or by some accident some of her attributes which you can turn to your own account. All those things have been done to facilitate trade and they have been done not by going against nature, but by utilising nature as far as possible. Now, Sir, you have built a railway in this country over the longest possible route you could build it. Is that common sense? I think you will say no, because if it were you have certainly shown you did not believe in your own action, because you have put up a large amount of the public money of Canada to take the trade across the United States in order to bring it to the ports of St. John. You have corrected the mistake you made. The hon. gentleman was perfectly right in his statement, notwithstanding the apparent objections the hon. Minister of Marine raised. You are doing for New Brunswick what you refused to do for Manitoba, but what I presume you will have eventually to do. The hon. Minister of Marine referred to the trade with the West Indies. He said that Halifax was the proper place from where to carry on that trade, and I have no doubt it is. But let us see the condition of that trade. In 1873 the total exports from Canada to the West Indies were \$3,984,000; in 1880 they

Mr. ELLIS.

had fallen to \$3,588,000; and in 1887 they had fallen to \$2,075,000 or nearly one-half. Well, Sir, not selling to that country, we cannot buy so easily from it. In 1882 there was entered for consumption in Canada from the West Indies \$4,000,000 worth; in 1883 \$4,369,000 worth; and in 1887 \$1,942,000 worth, showing a falling off of one-half. The total imports from the West Indies, including British Guiana, were, in 1831 \$4,000,000, in 1882, \$4,400,000 and in 1887, \$2,421,000. That trade is completely gone, and I think there are perhaps several reasons for it. I think the real reason is that there is no trade in the West Indies. Any one who takes up the work of the great Conservative historian on the West Indies will see that the whole country is in a state of chaos. I turn to New Brunswick and I find that in 1881 we sent from that Province to the West Indies \$141,385 worth of goods. There was a time when we used to bring 100 pounds of sugar and a puncheon of rum from the West Indies, but with the spread of temperance we do not import this article to the same extent. The trade has fallen from \$141,000 in 1881 to \$46,000 in 1887. There is practically no trade that we in New Brunswick can carry on with that country. The Province of Nova Scotia can, I presume, send some fish there, but even in fish the trade is not so good as it was. Now, the facts which I have presented have not been set down in malice; they have not been exaggerated; they are statements found in the blue-books of the country, and they stare us in the face day after day. I live in a community where I have lived thirty years—a community in which the people are not to be excelled in enterprise, energy and spirit, and we are face to face with this question. I will not say that the farms of New Brunswick do not produce as well as they ever did. I presume that those that are cultivated do. But the great trade we had we are losing, and we want the trade of the United States; we want to pass into that country with our trade as freely as we can pass from one part of Canada to the other. How that is to be done I leave to the sense of the House; but, speaking with the responsibility I hold, I say it will have to be done or you will not retain New Brunswick in the Confederation. An hon. gentleman laughs. He has no responsibility to that Province; he does not live in it; and the fact that he laughs shows how little he cares about it. I will not conceal the fact that we have started some manufactories in that Province. I am, myself, in a small way a shareholder in a cotton factory, having become possessed of a share because the company could not pay me a debt it owed to me, and gave me the share. Mr. Gibson, a man of great enterprise and ability, has started a cotton factory, and the result is that he finds himself confronted by the fact that he has no market, except such as he can get by the most energetic pushing and driving in a market already well filled. The hon. Minister of Marine, the other night, asked what is going to become of the coal miner of New Brunswick if you allow American coal in. Well, Sir, we do admit American coal of a particular kind, and Nova Scotia produces coal that the Americans want, and if that market were opened there would be tens and hundreds of thousands of tons additional produced, and if you would displace a small quantity in one direction you would make it up in another. So with regard to cotton. Mr. Gibson believes that he can go in the American market and hold his own there, and I am told that the proprietors of a cotton mill on the St. Croix River, which is on the border, are quite anxious to get the American market opened to them; and why should they not? A man in the State of Maine may put up a cotton factory, and he trusts to his energy and enterprise to make his way. In that country one factory is nothing here or there, and if the manufacturer on the St. Croix river cannot make his way with the United States markets opened to him better than he can now in the over-

crowded market of Canada, he had better take his mill down. The employment of the people of the Maritime Provinces in paying industries would have the effect of increasing the population, and we should have people going on the soil, not only farmers, but miners and persons engaged in various industrial occupations which first spring from the soil; and those people being there, manufactures would vastly grow up around them. In the city of St. John to-day there are quite a number of various kinds of small manufactories, there were quite a number of manufacturers in various lines, who, beginning with very little, have grown by degrees, and some of them were started 30 or 40 years ago. But the great difficulty now is that the present system compels the erection of immense factories for which there is not sufficient market. I notice with some interest that the Labor Commission are just now visiting the city of St. John, I notice that Mr. Alexander Crosby, who has his whole life been Conservative and an energetic Conservative, told the Commissioners that he had been in the business of wood turning for 20 years, and he had not increased it a great deal. It was as small now as it had ever been, and a few years ago there was better employment for the workmen than there is now. He says he knows now of no mechanics who build houses for themselves, and he holds that is due to the lack of profitable employment. That is the testimony of a prominent Conservative, well known among the clubs in St. John. Another hon. gentleman said he could employ more hands if the Upper Province competition was put at an end to. I notice that another gentleman, Mr. Pender, who is a man of whom any country ought to be proud—a man who, beginning in a small way, made an article of horse-shoe nails, which, for excellence of workmanship, surpasses all other articles in the same line. If he had access to the markets of the United States, I have no doubt that the excellence of his work would command these markets—complained that the difficulty in his work was the duty on nail rods. This he said should come in free, as no iron suitable for his purpose could be found in Canada. It appears he is allowed a certain drawback on the iron he uses, but it is not sufficient. He practically has not the raw material free, because he only gets back two-thirds of the duty he paid on it. I will deal with one point more with reference to the question whether it is possible, assuming that this treaty is made, to carry on the Government of the country, because, of course, this is a matter of considerable importance. Well, I think that in the first place the effect of opening up a large number of new manufactories in the country would be to increase our population. We have tried to do so under existing circumstances, and have failed. You cannot retain your population, and a great and growing factor in the political and social history of Canada to-day is that the people are leaving it. Can you do anything to retain them? I believe that by the creation of industries based upon the natural wants of the country you could. Other manufactories to suit our needs would follow, and thus by degrees would grow up requirements which demand almost every kind of undertaking. No doubt the country is expensively governed. I take it that we could do with seven members of the Cabinet. France has only seven or eight, and if a country like France can do with so small a number, I think Canada ought to follow her example. I do not see at present what further retrenchments could be made, but, no doubt, there is room for a great many. The establishment of reciprocity in fish with the United States would enable us to sweep away at once \$150,000. You could go through the civil service, and with a firm hand make such a number of reductions as to bring down the expenditure of the country to a fair basis compared with its revenue. That might be hard work, because the country, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite has suffered so much from depression, that you cannot get a railroad started in any

locality except by means of Government aid. There is a particular insect tribe in which the mother generates the young in her body, and they feed upon her until they reach maturity, and that is the way the Provinces to-day are feeding on the Dominion. One by one they are feeding upon it, and how it is possible for the country to carry the burdens which bear upon it, it is impossible for any man who takes a reasonable view of the case to say. What is the position of our coasting trade? We had in the city of St. John 600 schooners of various sizes and classes. Our seamen thoroughly knew the coast with all the indentations and sinuosities from the harbor of Quebec to the cape of Florida. But the people of St. John, at any rate, are compelled to-day to put their money in American vessels, as it does not pay to put it in Canadian vessels, and the hardy mariners of our coast are passing under the American flag. That may make no difference to hon. gentlemen opposite, but these are facts of great importance to us, and there was a time when they were infinitely important; there was a time the mother country would spend thousands of dollars in promoting the growth of a good class of seamen in the Dominion. Having pointed out these things, I do not know that I have much more to say, but I would like to refer to just one matter, and that is the political aspect of the question as regards the mother country, I see the hon. member for Montreal in his seat, and I may say, with reference to his remarks, that the articles he read to-night against the proposition before the House, seemed to me to suit admirably the case of the Maritime Provinces. Had he made the application of his remarks to these Provinces they would have been far more pertinent than they were in the way he did apply them. There is one fact in the history of the mother country which is plain as any fact can be. The hon. member for South Oxford referred to it in his speech. He did not, perhaps, cover the whole ground, but it is an absolute fact that England is putting forth every possible effort to cement friendship with the people of the United States. That is one fact that stands out above all others in the literature of the times, so far as the current of English literature is concerned. I do not think that any small pecuniary disadvantage which might happen to England from the loss of a small trade, could be at all put in comparison with the advantage which would come to England by any arrangement that would have for its object the promotion of peace and prosperity between the two people. I read the other day in an English magazine a paper written by an English Liberal, once an English politician, Lord Coleridge, to the memory of the brilliant English Conservative, Sir Stafford Northcote—an article that is replete with as much tender sentiment, perhaps, as Englishmen like to express, an article that in some respects rises to the perfection of Wordsworth's poetry, as the perfection of art so carried out that it seems like nature. What was the one fact which he put forward above all others why the people of England should keep enshrined in their memory this amiable and able Conservative? It was that during the war of the rebellion, during the differences which arose out of the *Alabama* question, this man stood by the side of the North, and he emphasised that fact above all others in order to impress upon the American people, as well as upon his own people, the duty of a relationship which should exist between the two; and, taking up the other day a book written by a historian who probably stands as high in English literature as anyone we have, I refer to Mr. Freeman, the historian of the Norman Conquest, I came across an extract which I think suits the position better than anything I could say myself, and I will read it to the House. I have nearly finished.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ELLIS. An hon. member says "hear, hear." I am very much obliged to the House for the patient hearing

they have given me. Mr. Freeman says, speaking in the United States:

"If we do not belong to the same nation, I do hold that we belong to the same people, or rather, to use a word of our own tongue, to the same *folk*. By that, I mean that we come of the same stock, that we speak the same tongue, that we have a long common history and a crowd of common memories. I mean, in short, that we are one folk in all things except that local and political separation which the hand of nature and the facts of nature have wrought. And these ties of blood and speech and memory surely rise above the lesser facts of local and political separation to make us feel ourselves in the highest sense one people. We dwell in different quarters of the globe, but we are surely more to one another than dwellers in the same quarter of the globe who do not come of the common stock, who do not speak the common tongue. Let me say that the words 'foreign' and 'foreigner' are words which should never be spoken between men of the English folk in Britain and men of the English folk in America. It grated more on my ears when I heard myself, in a speech otherwise highly honorable to me, spoken of as one of a 'foreign nationality.' But I was relieved and comforted by the hearty zeal with which the rest of the company accepted my strong disclaimers of anything foreign about me, and welcomed me as one of their own kin. 'Foreign,' 'foreigner,' and 'foreign nationality;' away with such forms of words! You are not foreigners; we do not look on you as foreigners, when you come to visit the older England in Britain. And I am not a foreigner, I will not deem myself a foreigner, I will not bear that you should look on me as a foreigner, when I come to visit this newer England in America. Here on your soil I am not indeed in mine own home, but I am none the less among mine own folk. I am among men of mine own blood and mine own tongue, sharers in all that a man of either England deems it his pride and happiness to share in. How can we be strangers and foreigners to one another, how can we be other than kinsfolk and brethren of the same hearth, when we think that your forefathers and mine may have sailed together from the oldest England of all in the keels of Hengest or of Cerdic—that they may have lurked together with Ælfred in the marshes of Athelney—that they may have stood side by side in the thick shield-wall on the hill of Seulac—that they may have marched together as brethren to live and die for English freedom alike on the field of overthrow at Evesham, and on the field of victory at Naseby. I surely need not remind you that the whole heritage of the past, the history, the memories, the illustrious names, which belong to the earlier days of the English folk in Britain, are yours as well as ours. They are in the stricter sense your own. The men who piled up the mighty fabric of English law and English freedom, were your fathers, your brethren, no less than ours. In the long line of hero—Kings who built up the Kingdom of England you have as full a share as we have. In building up the Kingdom of England they were building up the commonwealth of America. If yours is the King who lurked in Athelney, yours too is the King who won the fight at Brunanburh. Yours are the King who waged the year of battle with the Dane and the King who waged the day of battle with the Norman. And if the Kings are yours as well as ours, so are the men who curbed the power of Kings. Yours are the men who wrung the great charter from the kingly rebel; yours are the men who dictated the provisions of Oxford and the men who gathered round the victor of Poitiers on the nobler field of

the Good Parliament. Your share is alike with ours in every blow struck on behalf of freedom from the day of Lewes to the day of Marston. And if we boast that we won to ourselves the men of other lands, if we changed the Dane and the Norman into Englishmen as true as if their forefathers had first seen the shores of Britain from the keels of Hengest, the work was yours as well as ours. The strangers whom we made specially our own, they whose names we rank alongside of the noblest of our native worthies, the men who came from the beech-clad iles of Denmark, from the deep Alpine valley of Aosta, from the strong mount that guarded the land of France against the Norman, to become Englishmen on English soil—Canut the King, Anslem the bishop, Simon the earl—they are yours by the same law of adoption that makes them ours. And when the course of our history parts asunder, when the English people become two nations instead of one, if the history which you have wrought in America is no longer ours, if the history which we have wrought in Britain is no longer yours, in the same sense as in the common history which we wrought together in earlier times, still, we have a common interest, a common fellow-feeling, the feeling which follows the deeds of friends and kinsfolk with a different eye from that with which it follows the deeds of strangers, in all that men of English blood have done on American soil since the older and newer England parted asunder. And you too, I trust, have not ceased to look with the like feeling on all that men of English blood have done on British soil since the day when the newer England bade farewell to its political connection with the elder, but did not, I trust, bid farewell to the far higher tie of a common blood, a common speech, the long glories of a common history.

And so I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that whatever we can do to strengthen the ties between England and the people of the United States in the way of trade relations it is our duty to do, it is in the interests of England as well as in the interests of Canada, it is not against the interests of England, and it is not worth while to raise that question here to-day because the interests of Canada, as they stand to-day, are certainly the interests of England.

Mr. BAIRD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:45 a.m. (Thursday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, March 22, 1888.

No. 21.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 22nd March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper, Picton.)

Bill (No. 60) to amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

EASTER HOLIDAYS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked the Minister of Public Works yesterday if he could give the House any information as to the intention of the Government with respect to the Easter holidays. The hon. gentleman was to have mentioned the matter, I think, to the Prime Minister, and, as I see that the right hon. gentleman is now in his place, I ask him if he can give us the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are very anxious, if it is possible, to finish this important debate before the adjournment, but that is for the House to say, not for us. We propose, if it be the will of the House, that when we adjourn on Wednesday night, we shall stand adjourned until the following Tuesday, at eight o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—THE UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY DEBATE.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). I rise to make an explanation. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter), in his speech the other night, denied the accuracy of my statement previously made that the value of farm land in the County of Huron was not increasing, and he said that between 1880 and 1886 it had increased in value 15 per cent. I sent and got the minutes of the County Council of Huron for this year, to prove the statement I had made, that land was not rising in value, and, Sir, I am borne out by those minutes. I find that in 1880—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is quite in order. The statement made by him was contradicted on the floor of this House, and he is now simply proving

that he made an accurate statement. I have never known an hon. gentleman refused permission, when contradicted, to prove that he was right. I do not suppose the First Minister wishes to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he confines himself to that point.

Mr. McMILLAN. As I understand the rules of the House, I have a right to speak to the amendment after I have spoken on the main motion, and therefore I take the opportunity of making an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has not the floor. If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak on the amendment he cannot do so now, because the hon. gentleman who has moved the adjournment of the debate, has precedence.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understand the position, the hon. gentleman rises to a question of privilege for the purpose of explaining a statement in which he was contradicted, and in that case he has a right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. But he claims to speak to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member for West Huron contradicting my statement. In the first place I stated—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a speech now.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let him make an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman made his explanation and is now proceeding to give his proofs. If that is not making a speech, I do not know what is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity. My hon. friend who moved the adjournment of the debate has the floor. When he sits down, the hon. gentleman can get up and make his speech, and make his explanation at the same time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are we to understand it is ruled that an explanation cannot be had, although the Order has not yet been called? My hon. friend has a right, before the Orders of the Day are called, to make his correction.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already ruled that when the statements of an hon. member have been misrepresented, he is always allowed to say that what had been attributed to him was not what he said, or was not what he intended to say, and nothing more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, do I understand that you rule that an hon. gentleman who has been flatly contradicted on a point of fact, is not allowed to produce the evidence which he wishes, that he was right?—because that has hardly been our practice, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole of this debate is a contradiction of statements made on either side, and if I allow every hon. gentleman to get up a second time and prove that his statements were correct, and to make a new speech to show that what he said ought not to be contradicted, I

should have to allow every hon. member to speak, perhaps, a dozen times.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright :

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And on the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment :

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And on the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment :

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I promise not to detain the House long with the remarks that I have to make. The subject has been well and ably discussed on both sides, and I must admit that there is no great necessity for any speech at all from me. But coming as I do from the chief commercial city of the Province of New Brunswick, representing a constituency near that city where the people are, I may say, intensely interested in the subject of this debate, I feel it a duty and a privilege to lay before you the reasons for the vote that I intend to record; and I trust that you will excuse me if my remarks are somewhat broken and fragmentary. I do not come here armed with an array of figures. Statistics have been so ably filled in here that I think it unnecessary for me to produce any more, and I shall rely on a few general statements in placing my views before you. I want to be very careful in what I say. Since Monday night I have conceived a great horror of scrap books. I would rather meet almost any thing else in the world than to have one of these hon. gentlemen after me with a scrap book. Up to that time I had gained the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite had always entertained only one view of this question, but I have learned that very many of the leading lights on the other side of the House, at some stage or another in their political career, have been coquetting with protection, and many of these sages and profound statesmen have been thinking and believing both sides of the question. It was a revelation to me, because I knew nothing or recollected nothing of it in the past. Now, Sir, it appears that both sides claim to be actuated by motives of patriotism, and I hope and trust they are. But I think everyone must admit there are two kinds of patriotism in this House. There is the despondent patriot and the hopeful patriot; there appears to be the patriot who sees nothing before us but political and financial ruin, who thinks only of neglected farms and deserted homes, the result of emigration, who speaks of deserted villages and ruined cities, and an impoverished people, the result of corruption and misrule. Then, on the other hand, we have the hopeful patriot, who likes to look at Canada as she is, who likes to look at her as she appears on the map of the world,

Mr. SPEAKER.

greater in extent than the whole continent of Europe, greater than the great United States of America, stretching away from ocean to ocean, nearly 4,000 miles, with the Atlantic bathing her eastern and the Pacific bathing her western shores, with an area of fertile land greater, I may say, than any other country under the sun, with broad plains, and magnificent forests, and an intelligent and industrious people able to subdue these forests and to convert our vast prairies into fields of waving corn. He likes also to speak of many other of her great qualities, of the surroundings of the ocean, of her bays and her harbors and her rivers filled with the tribes of the sea, making up one of the most magnificent fisheries in the world. Then he speaks of her great highway being finished from ocean to ocean, and with pride he speaks of the fact that the banner of the Canadian Pacific now floats from the top of the Rockies, and draws your attention to one of the greatest monuments of engineering skill ever known to the world. Well, Sir, the hopeful patriot does not stop there. He looks beyond. Away to the westward he sees the broad Pacific capable of bearing commerce ten-fold greater than has ever yet furrowed the waves of the Atlantic. He looks across that ocean, and sees that we are trading neighbors to seven hundred millions or eight hundred millions of people, and with hope he believes that we have an interest in the trade of the Orient, and he looks to that as one of the future prizes to the Dominion of Canada. Then he looks to the eastward and he sees we are trading neighbors to two hundred and fifty millions of the busy populations of Europe, and each year our large trade is growing and will continue to grow with those busy nations. Then, again, he looks to the southward, and finds the great United States, a people whom we are proud and anxious to call our American brothers, and we can boast of a great trade with that people, a trade on which our friends opposite enlarge. We think as much of the American people, I trust, as do hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, and we know them to be a shrewd and clever people, a people who have in the past shown their ability to enforce the law of political science, and we have to look to our dealings with them with a careful and jealous eye. He does not stop there. He looks further to the south, even crossing the equator, and beholds the countries of South America. Many of them have grown with a rapidity that even outrivals the United States, cities growing up in the Argentine Republic and in the Brazils outrivalling the growth even of Chicago. And I say in looking at the south we have a warm interest in her trade, which may be called a foreign trade, to be built up with that continent. I hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak with great emphasis in regard to an exchange of natural products or a natural market. If the word "natural market" has any meaning as between Canada and the United States, that meaning is ten-fold increased and ten fold intensified when used as between Canada and South America. In Canada we grow all that will grow in the northern temperate climate, in South America they grow all that will grow in a tropical climate, all that will grow under the blaze of the meridian sun. We are the two extremes. They are known to be a people of great wealth, a people who are surprising all beholders at the prodigious strides they are making. The great thing to be considered is this, that in South America they have little or no manufactures. That country is low and level chiefly, and affords no water power. Then, again, coal is one of the motive powers of the day, and that they are absolutely without. Their supply of coal at present comes from Great Britain, chiefly from Cardiff in Wales. That coal when it leaves Cardiff costs 11s. sterling a ton and is carried at freight rates varying from 20s to 27s. 6d. per ton, and that coal when delivered realises too high a price to be used in arts and manufactures. Canada has a right to look in that direction for a trade with that people. Again, they have none of the products

grown in Canadian forests. They have neither pine nor spruce, and, if I am correctly informed, those cities, even the cities of the Argentine Republic, consume perhaps one hundred millions of lumber of the northern temperate climate, and, strange to say, those one hundred millions of lumber are supplied from our two neighboring States, Maine and Massachusetts, and when their supply is short they come into Canada and obtain here what they require to carry on that trade. It is strange that we must sit idly by while this trade goes into the hands, and is kept under the control, of our American neighbors. I say there is a real meaning when you speak of exchanging natural products, or obtaining a national market in regard to South America. Here are the two extremes. There is a land of perpetual summer, where the tall palmetto waves; here we are the land of the pine and the maple; and, if there is any meaning to be given to the words, "exchange of natural products," I think hon. gentlemen opposite will see that the meaning has great force as regards trade between these two countries. While I am dwelling on this matter I will speak of a movement on foot in the city of St. John with a view to secure and encourage trade as between Canada and the countries of South America; I should not say St. John alone, because I find the other Provinces of the Dominion are identified with it, and with commendable zeal they have undertaken to drive the enquiry to the very bottom. The Government have been approached on this matter, and I am gratified to say that they too have taken the matter under consideration, and have appointed a Commissioner to visit those countries and make a report. I trust that report will be a favorable one. I trust that on a future day we shall see the products of Canadian forests being carried to the countries of South America. I trust we shall see the products of the mines of Nova Scotia taking the place of the products of the mines of Great Britain, and it will be a gratifying thing to see trade, which is untold in its volume, carried on in this way. When we take a further view of it we find that hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with this matter appear to take great satisfaction in speaking in a doubtful way respecting Canada generally. The subject is one that enables them to reach the highest altitude of liberal statesmanship in running down and belittling Canada. They appear to reach their greatest height in dealing with this subject, and they appear to enjoy the privilege of making unfair comparisons between Canada and the great United States of America. They are not content to compare Canada with Australia, New Zealand, or New South Wales, or some other colony that is doing just what Canada is doing, that is, trying to open up and develop its resources, making great expenditures in view of the large territory it has to deal with in order to develop the country and make it attractive, and drawing the population of Europe by immigration here to fill up the country. This is what we have been doing, this is what the colonies have been doing; and if you make a comparison with those colonies you will find that Canada outrivals them all, that Canada to-day is the most favored of all British colonial possessions. But they are not satisfied with that—United States alone is the subject of comparison. It is unfair, it is unjust and ungenerous that you should compare Canada with the great United States. They have had privileges that no other country under the sun ever enjoyed. They have had the wealth of forest and field in an abundance that is most marvellous. They have had in addition to this a wealth of mine and mineral that surpasses all records of the world. They have had the wealth of hills and mountains that were fairly blasted with silver and gold, and they have had the wealth of river and stream whose yellow sands when sifted enabled them to build up cities by magic, and furnish them with all the grand em-

bellishments of art and science. In addition to that, they have been drawing from their western prairies the strength of the virgin soil and transporting it as rapidly as possible in order to convert it into cash. Some time, if reports be true, they might as well have taken the acres and shipped them away, as they were drawing the very strength from them by tilling large areas with all modern means and appliances and gathering great crops of grain year after year, until the land is no longer productive, and if reports be true, the very best areas of the United States have been turned into ready cash; and in this way the country is rolling full of money, which fact no one denies, but all readily admit. It is unfair to compare the savings banks and monetary institutions of the United States with similar institutions in Canada. We have had none of those advantages. On the other hand, we have the natural advantages of which I have spoken. We have our fertile soil and good climate, we have an industrious people who are willing and are determined to make of Canada all that can be expected or can be asked for. I say that a person coming with such an argument, in that way acts unfairly against Canada. I consider it a damaging statement to go abroad to the people, who hear and must every day read the remarks that are being made. Take the effect of this when it is placed before the uninitiated mind. Take it and place it before the farmer's son. He may be content with his surroundings, he may be content with the farm and the homestead life, but you preach to him and tell him that the land is fit to starve him to death; tell him that it is in fact no life for him to lead, give him to understand that there are more prospects to the westward, tell him that there are colossal fortunes to be made there and do not tell him the real truth, do not tell him that the laborer in the United States is not better off than he is in Canada, but paint such a picture, and he becomes discouraged under those strange arguments. It is a disposition in all the human family to be somewhat dissatisfied with their lots, and most minds are susceptible to it. You can even convince a man that he is sick, for if a number of persons tell him he is sick he may yield to their persuasion. So the human family is constituted. So they receive the damaging propositions, and so the mind becomes imbued with a false idea. Those damaging assertions are made against Canada only for the purpose of bringing certain people prominently to the front and of creating discontent in the minds of the Canadian people. In order that they may gain something, those damaging assertions are made by certain gentlemen, to get the public mind interested in the matter. They think they may gain something if they can make a disturbance in the minds of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, to come right down to the matter before us and to deal with the question that is now before the House in its closer sense, I would like to take hold of the remarks which I first heard made by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). That hon. gentleman made the charge against the present Administration, that when protection was first introduced, or, as he said, when it was "first preached" to the people of the Maritime Provinces it was not introduced or it was not preached to them as a remedy for their troubles, for it was introduced to them as a remedy which would bring about a return of the old Reciprocity Treaty or some treaty of commerce between ourselves and the people of the United States. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) dwelt most heavily upon this point, and his worthy colleague there appeared to endorse very strongly what he said. The substance of what he said was that the people of the Maritime Provinces were cheated by this delusion, and carried away by the hope that it was going to bring back to them reciprocity with the United States. Now, Sir, the hon. member spoke for Prince Edward Island, and I will undertake to speak on behalf of New Brunswick.

When the policy of protection was first introduced in the Maritime Provinces, Sir Leonard Tilley, a statesman who occupies the highest respect from friend and foe alike, was about the first I heard speak on the subject. He and several worthy members of our party opened the subject in the city of St. John, and what I understood from them was substantially that they laid before the people the fact that, located as we were alongside the people of the great United States of America, who, in consequence of some ill-feeling towards Great Britain arising out of the late rebellion, had abrogated the treaty of commerce and had put up a wall against us and our trade relations, by which they should take charge of us and our markets, and by which they were taking away our raw material and sending back manufactured goods. Those gentlemen pointed out that it was absolutely necessary that something should be done to turn the tide of affairs, and I am pleased to say, Sir, that the people of St. John and the people of New Brunswick readily understood their meaning at the time and become deeply interested in the question. They knew that something was wrong and they could see that the country was being wasted in its youth, and that the people were being impoverished in the midst of great natural abundance which only awaited development. The policy was laid before us in that way. Shortly after that I recollect that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) visited the city of St. John, and I looked very anxiously for his coming. I was deeply interested and anxious to see and hear him, for up to that time I had never seen a live English knight. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke to us in the St. John's skating rink, I think, and he dwelt the greater part of his time on the Pacific Scandal, and then for an hour or two he told us what he had done for the country—and what he would do for the country. The people gave him a patient hearing and I think they made up their minds that he had done enough for his country and they ought to give him a rest. At all events, they acted upon that principle. Among other things Sir Leonard Tilley taught us to believe was that by the adoption of this policy of commercial independence, or even of retaliation if you like to call it so, that we would be able to show our American neighbors that we could take care of ourselves, that we could live in defiance of the wall which they put up against us, that Canada had rights which she knew and was ready to protect, that the effect of the National Policy would be to bring the American people to a clear understanding of what our rights were, and that if they would no longer deal with us in that way, we could live independent of them. I am proud to say, Sir, and to see that the prophecies and promises made respecting that policy were truly made, and that they never had the appearance of being more literally verified than they are to-day. Surely the signs of the present times show it. Why are the American people interested in us to-day more than they were at that date? If you recollect aright, at that time they laughed at our inability. They laughed at the idea of our independence and they prophesied that they would drive us into annexation. That was the kind of talk which prevailed at that time. Why is it now that the Butterworths, the Morriss', the Hitts, the Wimans and other political economists are trying to draw us from our attitude to-day? Why is the attitude of the United States Congress liberal towards us? Do you think it is because they wish to help us or benefit Canada? No, Sir, they see we are able to maintain the attitude that we have taken, that we are able to take care of ourselves under the protective system, and that we could really live independent of them. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the American people are now ready to make overtures to us. There must be some reason for that; and I say that we are driven to the conclusion that it is in consequence of the adoption of the National Policy, which had far more efficacy in bringing

Mr. BAIRD.

that state of things about than any servile prayer for admission to their trade would have had. When you look at the matter fairly, I think you will agree with me that no set of men could have had deeper forethought or greater wisdom in handling the affairs of a nation than the hon. leader of this House and his worthy colleagues, when they prepared that policy of commercial independence for the Dominion of Canada, and applied it to the country in the firm manner they did. Hon. gentlemen may assert that they acted from a different motive than the welfare of the country, and I have heard it asserted, on the platform, that they did it in order to draw from the people a large revenue which they might squander in all sorts of spendthrift profusion and extravagance. But I have confidence that they had higher aims and nobler ambitions than that—that they were working for the true interests of their country; and I think the results to-day prove it. If to-day there is an approach by the people of the United States, it is in consequence of the firm attitude that has been taken and maintained down to the present day. The people of the Dominion of Canada may well congratulate themselves on having sustained the National Policy three times, and they may well be proud of the statesmen who inaugurated that policy and showed to the world that they were able to take care of Canada in every exigency. Now, I wish to reply for a few moments to the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) who made the last address on this subject. That hon. gentleman undertook to set forth the deplorable state of affairs in the Province of New Brunswick, and with an array of figures that lasted nearly two hours he applied himself to the task of showing that there had been a decline in our trade and prosperity. I do not intend to occupy your time with a like array of figures; life is too short for that kind of business. I think we are here to deal simply with the causes of the decline, and to supply a remedy if we can, and having done that, we shall have done our duty. Now, my business career is short, but by experience and observation I claim to have acquired some knowledge of the causes of the decline, and I shall show you that the National Policy is not to blame for a single dollar of the loss which he has shown to have occurred in the Province of New Brunswick. He has stated that lumber and shipping are our chief industries, and I agree with him. The manufacture and export of spruce deals to the English market and to the Mediterranean ports in the early days yielded great profits. My recollection runs back ten or twelve years, during which time I have been about the city of St. John. When I first went there, I saw and handled deals for which \$11 per 1,000 superficial feet was paid. Time went on, and prices began to decline; the English market failed; the Baltic trade sprang up, and from that the English were able to obtain deals at a lower price than they were paying us. Therefore prices gradually declined to \$9, \$8, and I believe as low as \$7 and \$7.50. Since the National Policy came into effect it is very rarely that we have seen spruce deals sold above \$8 or \$9 per 1,000—the average, I think, would be \$8. Before the National Policy was introduced, our forests were largely depleted, and the lumberman to-day has not only a reduced price to contend with, but he cannot get his lumber with the same facilities as he could when the primeval forests were there in their original grandeur. The forests have been cut away, and he has to go farther and get inferior lumber to what he did ten or twelve years ago; he has to contend with a reduction of 25 per cent. in the price, he has to pay increased stampage; and all these things have had a tendency to dry up the lumber trade, and hence the volume of the trade of the province, and to dry up the statistics my hon. friend handled. Is the National Policy to blame for that? Were you told that the National Policy was intended to keep up the English market? Could the

National Policy affect a market in the ports of the Mediterranean? It is with regret that we have seen the lumber industry become a waning industry; we had some years ago a large trade in pine and birch timber, which brought remunerative prices on the other side of the Atlantic. This timber was required to be cut square, and to be sound and good timber. But the forests have been cut away, and there has been a large decline in the supply, and along with that the prices have declined. Then, again, up to the time of the National Policy, we did a considerable trade in box pine for the West India Islands, to be used for boxes required in the sugar trade. That trade lasted up to perhaps nine or ten years ago and then it suddenly dropped. The means of transportation were entirely changed, the timber was gone, and there was no demand. Ten or twelve years ago, all the mills surrounding the harbor of St. John, as soon as they shut down on the production of spruce lumber, would begin to be occupied in sawing lumber for sugar boxes. A fleet of vessels carried the boxes to the West India Islands, where they would load with sugar and carry it in other directions. Had the National Policy anything to do with the loss of that trade? If you had had unrestricted reciprocity, could it have prolonged that trade any longer? He states that the shipping industry is an industry of the past, but no blame can be attached to the National Policy for the decline in that respect. When I first went to the city of St. John, every place where a ship-yard could be established was a hive of industry. A large number of wooden ships were being built, and an immense number of men employed every day in the year; but since then the iron vessels have ousted the wooden ones from the trade, and the shipbuilding industry has received a blow from which it will probably never recover. I remember when at times two ships would be on the stocks at once, and when in one year, as in 1873, from 120,000 to 150,000 tons of shipping would be added to the shipping list of Canada. Again, the ships were largely owned at the port of St. John, which was, at that time, ranked as the fourth port in the empire for the ownership of ships; and go where you would throughout the world, you would see "St. Johns, N.B.," written on the bows of numerous ships. It was almost impossible to visit any shipping ports in the world without seeing in its waters a number of St. John's vessels, but that trade has been destroyed almost entirely by the increase in the number of iron ships, which, having taken the place of the wooden vessels, have dealt the finishing blow to the shipbuilding industry. But surely it will not be contended that the National Policy can be blamed for this state of affairs. The hon. gentleman takes great delight in dwelling on the reduced condition of the city of St. John. Instead of sympathising with her in her misfortunes, he seems to gloat over them. But when we consider the great losses that St. John has sustained, when we consider the great industry that has been swept away from her, when we consider the immense revenues which flowed from the large fleet of ships that formerly frequented her harbor into the hands of her ship owners, but which now have become a thing of the past; when we consider the destruction that took place on June 20, 1877, when the entire city was swept away by a terrible conflagration which left hardly anything standing but a few desolate walls to mark the resting-place of that once fine city, it should be, not a matter for condolence, but rather a matter for congratulation that she should have sprung up as she has, like the phoenix from its ashes, and should occupy the position she does to-day despite all her reverses. Instead of showing that, despite her great losses, St. John is able to hold her own to-day, the hon. gentleman endeavors to depict her condition to make out the worst he can out of her condition. He is obliged to confess, however, that

despite all his wailings, St. John is still able to hold her own, and in admitting that, he admits a great deal. Again, the city of St. John, I may say, had another stroke of disaster on the 22nd February, 1887, a political stroke as blighting almost as the flames of the great conflagration. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to tell me that St. John would have recovered, as she has to-day, in a great degree from her reverses, had it not been for the National Policy? Can he in any way point out a single fault that can be found with the National Policy? Could the shipping trade have been in any way affected by the abolition of the National Policy? If it could, the hon. gentleman would not have failed to tell us how and in what manner the National Policy has worked to our detriment, but he confined himself to pointing out that St. John is in a deplorable condition; he contented himself with merely pointing out her difficulties and misfortunes. He took delight in taunting her people with their poverty, and was careful not to furnish a single shadow of an excuse for that state of affairs, a state of affairs which, instead of discussing fairly, he largely exaggerated. The hon. gentleman ought not to complain, for he has been well provided for in that city. He has been sent here as its representative, and I think he has dealt unjustly towards the city of his birth, or adoption—I do not know which,—and that it deserved better treatment at his hands. Did the hon. gentleman assign any cause for the state of affairs he depicted? No, he was entirely silent on that point. He merely recited all these calamities, and did not even go so far as to say they were the result of the National Policy. He did not say that if the National Policy had never been adopted there would have been a different state of things. He did not say that the National Policy is responsible for the people of the United States abrogating the Reciprocity Treaty. He would not go to that extent. Now, what remedy does he propose? Or does he propose any? I find him silent on that point, too. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Foster), and, I think, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), congratulated the hon. gentleman upon his boldness and courage; they congratulated him on showing that he had the courage of his convictions, and was prepared to give his remedy boldly and openly in preference to the hon. gentleman who, they said, really contemplated annexation in disguise. I thought, when I heard those hon. gentlemen speaking, that they really did not know their man, and that they would find they were mistaken in him. I was confident we would not have from that hon. gentleman a bold and outspoken statement of what he considered the true remedy. Nor have we had such a statement. The hon. gentleman does not like honorable warfare; he likes warfare of a more quiet and concealed nature and he would not put himself on record by going the full length of his views, as the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. member for Westmoreland supposed he would. It may be, however, that the hon. gentleman has relented, and is not prepared to go so far as he led us to believe he would. I hope he has relented; I hope he has receded from the position he once took; I hope he is not now disguising his real sentiments under a species of mock loyalty; I hope and trust the hon. gentleman has changed his tactics. Surely the hon. gentleman would not like to see all that is Canadian handed over to foreign hands; surely his mind has undergone a change; surely patriotism and love of home and country are not still to him words without meaning; surely the memory of England's care and England's love for her patriot sons in all parts of the world has awakened in his mind the slumbering recollections of his earlier manhood, and brought him to a nearer and clearer sense of duty; surely the thought of an alien flag floating over loyalists' graves has formed a barrier between him and the

darling scheme he held a few months ago. I hope and trust that a change has come over the spirit of his dreams; I hope and trust the hon. gentleman is in a position to say that he has relented and cast his annexationist ideas to the wind; I hope and trust that the hon. member is hand to hand in sentiment with true patriots. The hon. gentleman, through the medium of his press, has always taught us to look to this part of Canada as our natural enemy; he has taught us to look upon inter-provincial trade as a humbug and to cast our eyes towards the United States as our great and only friend, as our only real friend, as the only source from which we have anything to hope. The hon. gentleman might have explained, for he is up here among Ontario gentlemen who are on the same side of politics with him, and no doubt hold high hopes, and high anticipations, and high aspirations as to Ontario. But the hon. member has always told us something different through the medium of a mischievous press. He has given us to understand, you are a weight and a burden, and and you are dragging us down to ruin. He might have explained this, but he did not see fit to do so. The hon. gentleman and several others on that side of the House, I have heard make mention of the industries that were in existence. But they do not take the trouble to mention such as were to be found in the city of St. John, such as were sustained by the protecting care of the National Policy; they do not mention that the population of St. John, large as it is now, is maintained and sustained by manufactures which have taken the place of shipbuilding. This was not very suddenly the result, but it was of slow growth. Many other parts of the Dominion have grown up more rapidly, but we have not stood still. While I was on my way up here, I asked a gentleman to give me some statistics of the industries which were going on in St. John, and he did so, but, unfortunately, I have dropped the statement. At all events, he showed, I think, that there were nearly or quite 2,000 men employed in factories there, in the cotton factories and the iron works, and the car establishments, in all those industries which are well known to men who come from St. John. Those industries have grown up and are maintained under the fostering care of the National Policy. Still the hon. gentlemen did not speak of them, but they all did speak of the factory of Mr. Alexander Gibson, and many of them quoted the remarks made by Mr. Gibson. I am not aware, and I scarcely believe, that Mr. Gibson ever made the remarks attributed to him. However, I would not be afraid to deal with the question, or to hear Mr. Gibson express himself. Those hon. gentlemen speak as if he wanted an extended market. I only visited his factory once in my life, and then it appeared to me to be the pride of Mr. Gibson to point out a lot of orders and to say, I cannot begin to fill the orders, that is my trouble; I do not have to send out a runner, because I cannot fill the orders I have, and I believe, if I had another factory like this, I could run it. To take the reverse view of it and say that he wanted the market of the United States, appears extraordinary to me. What reason or what argument is there why Mr. Gibson, or any other man, should contend against the great establishments of the United States? We know that cotton is a little lower in the United States than in Canada; we know that they have an over-supply of factories, that they have an over-supply of cotton which they could throw on to this market, and make a profit. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the 60,000,000 of people he spoke of as his market are well supplied, and there is a surplus in the United States which would come into Canada if the Customs line were taken away. He knows that he would not point with pride to unfilled orders hanging upon the wall if they had full swing in our market. I have understood that Mr. Gibson has repudiated the statement and declared that he never made it, but,

MR. BAIRD.

if he did make it, it has been the subject of his reconsideration. Now, we do not stand alone in this matter. When these gentlemen introduced and inaugurated this policy of protection for the industries of Canada, they could not have been working on their imagination alone. They had the experience and they had the precedents of other nations. In fact, all the powerful and sagacious nations of the earth, at some time in their political history, have been forced to do in self-defence just what Canada did when she adopted the National Policy. This is no assertion of mine, it is a matter of history. Each of the powerful nations of the earth at some time have tried this policy. We know that France, Germany, Austria, Prussia, Belgium, all these great countries have seen fit to adopt a protective system. For instance, we may take Germany. At the time she commenced with her protective system, if statistics are to be believed, she imported \$240,000,000 of manufactured goods from Great Britain more than she sent back. Ten years afterwards she had entirely turned the tables, and was sending to England upwards of \$240,000,000 more than she brought back. That was the effect of the adoption of that policy. In all these other countries, there has been unparalleled prosperity from the time they adopted their protective policy. They had wise and sagacious men at the head of affairs, each considering what would be best for his country, each taking up this system in turn, and each going in that direction as far as the system could be enforced. England alone, at the present time, of all these great nations stands out as a free-trade people, but at the time she commenced her system of free trade, at the time she admitted grain into her ports free, although all the world hailed it with delight as a step in the direction of free trade, it was in reality a master-stroke in the direction of protection. At that time England was the manufacturing centre of the world, it was the workshop of the world. Sir Robert Peel saw that, by encouraging her industries, he could, as he desired, really make her manufacturing supremacy complete. All he had to do was to give cheap breadstuffs to her people, and, while he was willing to sacrifice her farmers, he knew he could draw a generous supply of breadstuffs from the different parts of the world, from the prairies of the United States, from the banks of the Nile, from the shores of the Baltic, from the fields of Russia and of India; that he could obtain a more generous supply from those regions than he could by trying to protect the farmers of Great Britain, and he saw that it was really a master-stroke in the way of maintaining the manufacturing supremacy of Great Britain at that time to adopt the policy he did. That state of things continued for a time. England really was the workshop of the world, and to a great extent she has preserved that position, but at the same time she had a full and complete supply of coal in unlimited quantity and iron to an unlimited quantity, and she had workmen and she had everything but cheap bread, and it was Sir Robert Peel's design to give her cheap bread and thus to maintain her manufacturing supremacy. Now, in dealing with the subject of iron, I have heard one of the gentlemen opposite, from East Huron, I think, deal with the question of iron, and I have heard many members on the Opposition side find fault with the price of iron, and the additional duties which have been placed on iron, and they always point to the great United States, and to the flourishing condition of the iron industry in the United States; but they do not take the record of the iron industry in the United States in the past, but speak of it as it is to-day, just as it suits their argument. Why do they do not go back a little over twenty years? If they do, they will find that that industry in the United States was then in a flatter condition than it is now in this country. At that time steel rails were held at \$150 a ton in Great Britain. The Bessemer Steel Works had full con-

trol of that market. Then protection comes in in the United States, and, after that, the iron industries are started there. The English manufacturer sees that it is to be an encroachment on his work, and he visits the American market, and then down goes the price of steel rails from \$150 to \$130 a ton. But they had taken the grip of this matter in the United States. They saw that to be compelled to pay from \$350 to \$400 a ton for the rails when landed in New York was going too far. They found, as the hon. gentleman explained it, that they had an abundance of coal, they had an abundance of iron, almost an unlimited quantity, and there was no reason why it could not be manufactured if their industries were fostered and encouraged, no reason why they could not manufacture as cheaply as Great Britain. Well, the prices came tumbling down until they reached the historical figures of 54. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen remember when steel rails got down to 54, then there was a great purchase made for Canada. Hon. gentlemen did not believe in protection at that time, they did not consider that protection was at work upon the industries of the United States, and that the price of steel rails would come tumbling down through the range of prices, leaving them dangling in the air at 54. They ought to recollect those figures. When hon. gentlemen opposite deal with the iron industry, they ought to deal with its history for a few years back, and not deal with it as it is today. It seems to me that they must know that iron is the very sinews of our modern civilisation, that no country which cannot supply its own iron can be independent. It is needed in commerce, it is needed in war, it is needed everywhere. If I recollect aright, we import \$11,000,000 worth every year to carry on the great public works of Canada. In face of this fact, the hon. member for Huron told us that we had unlimited coal fields in Canada, that we had boundless fields of iron ore, and all the materials in the earth, only waiting the magic touch of capital and enterprise to drag them forth for the benefit of the people. Still, they are unwilling that the industry should be encouraged; they would rather see this country purchase from a foreign country, and from this standpoint they argue. I look at it from an entirely different standpoint. If you are going to adopt a protective system, you must adopt it in its entirety, and you must apply it to all the industries that need encouragement and protection. The true principle of protection is to encourage every industry that needs protection until it can stand alone and can compete with like industries in other countries, or in other words, until it is able to take care of itself. It appears to me to be right and consistent that the iron industry of Canada should be protected and fostered, and that it will have the effect of forcing into action the very powers that are capable of making Canada an iron manufacturing country. Now, Sir, the question is also one that appeals to our patriotism, somewhat, as well as to our material interests. We have a pride in talking of our British connection, notwithstanding that the hon. member for South Oxford tells that it is a flimsy hope. He gives us to understand that the day is rapidly approaching when some power more potent than the arm of Britain will be needed to protect us from invading foes, and indeed, he warns us in a quiet way that we had better seek shelter under the wing of the great American Eagle. Well, Sir, that has not much effect upon our minds in the Province of New Brunswick. I do not think it has much effect upon the minds up here in this part of the Dominion. We have long had implicit faith and confidence in the power of Great Britain, and we are proud to say that she has always protected her dominions, and always protected her subjects. We do not expect to live to see the day when we shall have to learn the bitter lesson that Britannia no longer rules the wave. I can tell the hon. member for South Oxford that his pre-

diction does not affect our minds in the least. He tells us that all the great powers of Europe, France, Germany and Austria, are in league against Great Britain; still we are willing to take our lot and share with her, and if she is not able to protect her broad domains, then, Sir, we are willing to go down with her expiring glories. This is our view of it down in the Province, and I think it is really the view of the hon. member himself, only he wants to make an argument to suit his own purpose. Now, I want to deal with another industry, one which is somewhat difficult for me to speak about, an industry referred to in the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones)—I refer to the shipping industries of Canada. That amendment is somewhat artful, somewhat ingenious, and it would be folly for an individual like me who claims to be acquainted with the mariners interests of the country, to contend for one moment that the privileges mentioned in that amendment would not be a great boon to the Maritime Provinces. I admit that they would be a great boon; I must also admit that, comparatively speaking, perhaps no member in this House would be more benefitted by such a privilege than myself; no one would hail with greater delight such a privilege if it could be obtained upon fair and equitable terms to the Dominion. The reasons are obvious to any man who is acquainted with the shipping industry. We know that to give Canadian coasters the privilege of coasting along the American seaboard from Maine to Mexico, would be to enhance the value of Canadian coasters 50 per cent., yes, perhaps 100 per cent., at a single stroke. It would open a field to Canadian mariners where they could outdo our American neighbors. Let it be remembered that the carrying of the ocean trade of the world is now a subject of keen competition. It is a matter where combines and monopolies do not reach, it is really a survival of the fittest and it is only by energy, industry and a close application of the rules of economy, that we can obtain success in prosecuting the marine industry. Now, Sir, Canadian ships can under-work and outdo the American ships—lower cost of construction, lower wages, more economy exercised, and the sterling qualities of courage, energy and hardihood so prominent in the English sailor, and which have enabled England to become the mistress of the sea, are still to be found in her Canadian sons, which would win in any race upon the ocean. But, Sir, we have got to look at this matter in the face. Can this privilege be obtained? I am of opinion that it cannot be obtained, but even if it could be obtained upon the terms the hon. gentlemen propose, I would say, No, the price is too high. The matter comes home very close to me in that respect. Many of you are aware that every dollar I possess in the world is the result of following that industry, and every dollar I possess is involved in that business. But, Sir, if I must declare between my country and my property, I shall let the property go. I say it would be better that our coasting interests should perish, it would be better that our commerce in that direction should be driven from the seas, it would be better that our ships should rot, than we should engage in an increased trade in that direction at the fearful price to Canada that hon. gentlemen opposite propose to pay. It is coming right down to that with us. I expect to meet these statements. I expect to again face my constituents, and to hear it heralded on every platform that I stood in their light and in the way of obtaining a reciprocity treaty or unrestricted reciprocity. It will, no doubt, be heralded just as though hon. gentlemen opposite held reciprocity in their hands, and that voting for them and sustaining them would give us reciprocity. Such is not the fact at all; that is the way they desire it should go to the country, and, no doubt, they will avail themselves of it; but I will give them credit if they are able to persuade the people of my county that such is the case. I think I can show fairly and honestly what is the

true state of affairs. I can show them that the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite would mean the destruction of Canada. Experience has proved beyond a doubt that new industries can not combat with establishments that are cemented by time and raised by generous capital, backed by credit, the result of long and continued success, and operated by a large number of skilled and experienced workmen. It is impossible to expect it. They ask us at a single stroke to do away with protection, they ask us at a single stroke to open our markets to all foreign fabrics, to all the merchandise of the world, the result of which would be that our stores and warehouses would be filled with foreign fabrics at the price extinguishing our own manufactures. This is the extent and true state of affairs, and the carrying out of such a proposition would shake to its very foundation every industry and every establishment now in operation in this Dominion, and we would soon have a repetition of the scenes enacted in 1878 when the flies were on the wheel. It would not be long before we would get back to that position. It is unnecessary for me to follow that line of argument further. I think hon. gentlemen understand my views. I believe, I firmly believe, that the time is coming when we shall have freer trade relations with the people of the United States; but I take to ourselves the credit of bringing about that reciprocity of trade through the operation of the National Policy. That alone can bring it. I can fully understand and appreciate any remarks made by hon. gentlemen from different localities, particularly from Prince Edward Island, whose constituents suffer great loss on many products that go to the United States by the high duty and tariff against them. One of the hon. members for Prince Edwards Island spoke more particularly of potatoes. That is a low-priced article, and when a duty is placed on it, I sympathise with the farmers who have to meet it; but I say there is no advantage in the course the hon. gentlemen opposite are taking with regard to our natural products. I say it is only by holding firmly, by adhering strictly to the principles of our present policy, that we shall get reciprocity on fair and equitable terms to Canada; then I would claim it should be had, and I would fail to support any Administration that would not give us any reciprocity on those equitable terms. Hon. gentlemen opposite perhaps take that view to a certain extent, perhaps they do not. Perhaps they are of the opinion that all that is necessary for us to do is to say to the people of the United States that we are ready for unrestricted reciprocity or for any other kind of reciprocity, and they would accept our offer. But there is nothing to lead us to suppose that or to hope for that, and going to them in that way, as has been done repeatedly, will not bring about the desired result. Then I would ask each hon. member who can deal with the question from this standpoint to remember with me that the best interests of our country demands that we should maintain ourselves in our present condition until we know we can get fair and reasonable terms from the people of the United States. Remember that the best interests of our country, the power and glory of our country, depend entirely upon the prosperity, the intelligence and the inspiring hopes of the people we are here to represent and to govern. Then, so far as we can see, our duty lies in the direction of taking care of our different industries, and if we love our country we will stand by her industries and by the statesmen who have made them great.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The question now before the House is perhaps one of the greatest interest that has been discussed since 1878. It would appear as if as many members would discuss this on the floor of Parliament as have discussed any other question since the date I have mentioned. I have the honor of representing a constituency which forms a portion of the county of Lambton. The

Mr. BAIRD.

hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and myself represent, I think I may say without being egotistical, one of the finest counties in Canada, an opinion which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) I feel satisfied will endorse, as he will anything I may say in regard to the prosperity and industry of the people of that county. In addition to the farming community and its farming interests, in addition to its fertile land, in addition to the intelligence of the people and the growing prosperity of its farmers, it has in its centre one of the largest industrial interests in this Dominion. That industry came into existence twenty years ago. Enniskillen, now Petrolia, was, at that time I may say, almost a solid bush. Now, so rapidly has that industry advanced, that to-day it has a population of about 5,000 people. To-day, Sir, let us look at the prosperity which is taking place in the country, and we will see that instead of the frame houses built temporarily some 20 years ago we have now some of the finest buildings and residences in that place that you will find in any other prosperous town in the Dominion. We have now before the House a choice of two resolutions. The one is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, irrespective of the injury or the damage it may do to any of our prosperous manufactories or other prosperous industries in our country. The amendment to that motion embraces as well the desire to have reciprocity with the United States, but it is clothed with a protective clause which I think will meet with the approval of this House by perhaps the largest majority that this Government will obtain on any vote that will be taken during this Session. It will not only receive the very large support of the respective members of the House, but I think that if the questions were to be referred to the people of Canada, a still greater proportion would endorse the principles enunciated in the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Marine. While, Sir, adopting and approving of reciprocal trade with the United States to a large extent this motion protects our position in this country. Allow me to read it:

"That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and which has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of the people."

This, Mr. Speaker, would appear to be the question before the House. The arguments adduced in favor of the original motion, if I mistake not, are these: First, that the deplorable condition of this country requires this radical change; and that, Sir, is perhaps the strongest ground that gentlemen on the other side submit to this House as to their argument that we should have unrestricted reciprocal trade with the United States. It is also contended, as a second argument, that free trade with the American market would add to our wealth, would increase the industries that we have in the country, and would increase the manufactures and manufacturers of the country; that it would increase the mining interests of this country, and would more thoroughly develop and increase the population. It is stated further, that it would also bring back to this country thousands of Canadians who are to be found in the United States, and who have left our Dominion; and it is also contended by those gentlemen opposite that all this could be obtained without any increased expense to us, without even resorting to direct taxation, and without tending to annexation. I wish to take issue flatly with those gentlemen on the other side on the arguments they have brought before the House, and on which, so far, they have maintained their position. I wish, Sir, and I hope to be able to prove to this House in my humble way before I sit down, that every argument they have used is untenable. I hope to be able to prove to this House that the position taken by the Con-

servatives of this country is the true position, and the only one that can be supported by facts. Now, Sir, as to the argument that they make that this country is in a deplorable condition, that it requires this radical change. I shall say a few words. It might be almost like cracking chestnuts if I attempted to repeat the testimony given by members on this side of the House, and which testimony points clearly to the improvement and steady progress of this country. But, Sir, you will remember that very distinct language has been used by gentlemen on the other side. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in the early part of his remarks to this House, treated the question on the ground that it would remove the agricultural depression which exists. This was the position that he took. In addition to this the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in referring to the same matter says "that it was a cruel insult to the farmers of Ontario to say that they were in a prosperous and contented condition." Now, Sir, you have had the views of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and the testimony of the highest authorities in the Province of Ontario on this question. You have had quoted to you the remarks made by Mr. Mowat, and also the remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Education for that Province. It may be that the experience of those gentlemen who administer public affairs in the Province of Ontario, has shown them the position of that Province better than it has to the gentlemen who are opposed to us in this House. In addition, Sir, to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Education, and which this House surely is bound to accept, in addition to the remarks he made that this country had advantages and was surrounded by influences tending to make us a peaceful and contented people—using the very language in the positive that the hon. leader of the Opposition used in the negative, and using the very language in the positive that the hon. the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) used in the negative—I will quote, Sir, another expression of this gentleman (the Hon. Mr. Ross) which I do not think was quoted on a previous occasion. He says, Sir:

"Our prosperity must have impressed him——"

This was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain.

"and I hope he will speak of it when he returns to our friends in the mother country."

The gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will have to accept one of two positions. They must either have to apologise to the hon. the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario for their ignorance in speaking of the farmers of Ontario, or else they will have to put up their hands to him and say: "Never mind, I was only talking 'buncombe' in the House of Parliament." I think, Sir, that I shall leave the hon. gentlemen on the other side to fight out this matter with the Hon. Mr. Mowat and the Hon. the Minister of Education, and not take up our time any further on this ground. Now, Sir, I shall refer to the position often referred to before in this debate which Canada occupies at the present time. Her progress to-day and the growth of her industries, as hon. gentlemen in this House know, whether they are willing to acknowledge it or not, are dependent on the resolutions of 1878. These resolutions having been carried into effect, have had the results of what protection in any young country will do, to foster the industries of the country, to increase its manufactures and to furnish a home market for the farmers of the country and thus improve their condition. I regret to say that the hon. the leader of the Opposition is absent from the House, but I will quote to you what the hon. gentleman said during the elections previous to the last election:

"I freely acknowledge that the situation had been changed even by 1882, and I have as freely acknowledged that it has been changed more since 1882, and that many things then possible are now absolutely impossible."

Now, Sir, he was then speaking against any interference with the tariff or in any way returning to the position that the country had been in prior to 1878.

"And that a more permanent structure has been raised some may think it for good, some may think it evil, but so it is. What an absurdity it would be not to recognise existing facts, not to avail ourselves fully and freely with frank and unprejudiced minds of all the knowledge and all the experience which has been accumulated, not to direct our course by the light so to be gained."

There, Sir, was the acknowledgment of that gentleman that having had the experience of this country since 1878, he said, as his own language tells us, that it would be wrong now not to direct our course by the light that we had gained. What was the result of that? The result of the adoption of the policy set forth in that speech is that many a Reformer to-day sits in this House who would otherwise never have been here. The hon. gentleman said:

"I have always recognised the great importance of stability in tariffs. It is one of the most material things."

It is only a few months since that language was used by that hon. gentleman, and it is only a few months since the Reformers who now occupy seats on the other side of the House were elected on the strength of the hon. gentleman's words. But to-day we find them, in the absence of the hon. gentleman, who I believe is in Italy, springing upon this House a motion for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union with the United States, or whatever you like to call it. Surely that cannot be done with the sanction of that hon. gentleman. I hope, Sir, his absence is not dependent on this resolution being passed or refused by this House. I hope his absence will not be delayed a moment on account of this discussion. To me, a very young politician indeed, it seems that when a radical change of this kind is proposed, this House should remember that the principle of protection which was submitted fairly and honestly to the people of Canada, in three elections, was approved by the people only some thirteen months ago; and on that principle the majority of the members of this House now hold their seats. Therefore it appears to me that it would be monstrous for any member of this House to vote for this resolution of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States without at least having had the sanction of his constituents. Before any gentleman votes for it, I think his duty would first be to resign his seat, go to his constituents and tell them: There is the issue, I want you to send me to Parliament upon it. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to take that course, I shall regret, after the election, the absence of a number of familiar faces that I see opposite me now. Now, Sir, on account of the very large vote of the farming population of this country, hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to awaken the prejudices of the farmers as much as possible. What is the best policy for the farmers? Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that I do not know anything about them; but I think I have had as much communication with farmers as many hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that any policy having the effect of increasing the demand for farm products must be of benefit to the farmers; and, not to waste more time on that subject, because it has already been fully discussed, I would just like to read three lines written by Robert Ellis Thompson, the great political economist of the United States, a gentleman who stands so high that he has been invited to lecture on political economy in the Harvard University. Upon that question he says:

"The policy which increases the number of those who are not engaged in farming, but must live on its products and pay for them, is that which secures for the farmer the best and steadiest remuneration."

Now, Sir, that policy was adopted by the hon. leader of this House, and has it resulted in benefit to the farmer? Let me refer to a few statistics showing the quantities of breadstuffs imported into this country under the policy which existed from 1874 to 1878, and under the National

Policy from 1882 to 1886, and we shall see at a glance whether that policy has been of benefit to the farmers of this country or not. From 1874 to 1878 we imported breadstuffs to the enormous value of \$67,692,000; from 1882 to 1886, with the protective tariff stemming back the flood of produce from the American market, the whole amount that has been permitted to come to this country to compete with the produce of the Canadian farmer, has been only \$18,536,000 worth. \$50,000,000 worth of breadstuffs have been excluded under the National Policy during those five years, which would have otherwise have come in to displace the produce of the Canadian farmer. Sir, that is not an evidence of ruin or desolation in Canada, but the very reverse. But while hon. gentlemen are wailing over the discontent of the farmers have they any idea of the condition of the farmers in other countries? Have they any idea that while we in Canada are enjoying prosperity, other countries are in the condition which they have improperly attributed to Canada. I find a report in a Scotch newspaper, of the Teviotdale Farmers' Club, stating that agriculture in Scotland is in a deplorable condition, that they have looked from year to year for an improvement in that interest, but without avail, and that now there appears to be no brighter prospect for the future, and there was no word of encouragement that could be offered to the farmers of Scotland at the present time. So that you find that your language is more applicable to other countries than to our own. Now, the result of our protection, as I have said, and I believe the statement cannot be contradicted, is, that it fosters the industries of the country, by increasing the demand for labor and creating among ourselves a variety of industrial functions. This same writer, to whom I have referred, Mr. Thomson, on page 363, says in reference to protection:

"It creates a variety of industrial functions within the nation, and fosters the most rapid and continual interchange of services between persons thus differentiated. It promotes associations between members of a same nation by producing variety in their employments; while free trade between more or less advanced nations always has resulted in the destruction of association among the people of the less advanced, and in a reduction to a monotony of occupation."

The United States have seen the folly of free trade, and Mr. Thomson, at page 358, refers to the development of the industries of the States, under its protective tariff, in these words:

"It is admitted on all hands that the effect of our present protective tariff has been an extraordinary development of our manufacturing industries, and a rapid advance towards a period when we shall be altogether independent of the rest of the world, as regards all the great staples which are capable of economical production on American soil."

Now, that is just the goal towards which we are steering in Canada to-day. And in time, economic writers will be able to use, with regard to Canada, the same language as Mr. Thomson has used in reference to the States. Now, it is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that all they propose to do by their policy may be done without ever having to resort to direct taxation, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), speaking of the amount of money we would require to economise, said that we would not be in a worse position than that in which we are to-day. He said:

"It is possible to reduce our expenses by the entire loss that we would sustain from the American duties. We could reduce our expenses \$7,000,000 with advantage."

Now, I understand, it is conceded in this House that the loss to the revenue of this country would be about \$7,000,000 upon American imports, based upon the returns of last year. I maintain, however, that if we had free trade or reciprocity with the United States, the amount that would be cut off from our revenue would far exceed \$7,000,000. I do not think I would be far astray in saying that it would be nearer \$17,000,000 than \$7,000,000, and my reasons are these: Hon. gentlemen opposite start off by saying that

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

our loss would be \$7,000,000, because that is the amount of duties we collected on imports from the United States last year; but the gentlemen who have been arguing in favor of unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union on the other side, have told the Americans there—and I believe their argument was a good one—as an inducement to carry out this policy, that it would double, if not quadruple, the trade between the United States and Canada. They contend that the Americans would furnish the Canadians with more cotton and machinery and with an additional quantity of every item upon which our tariff to-day imposes a tax of \$7,000,000. What would the result be, we cannot use any more goods in the country than we make now; we have quite enough for our wants. It is therefore undeniable that, with a tariff ruling against all other countries but the United States, the result must be that the American goods will crowd out goods from Great Britain and Germany and other countries in the world, and thus deprive us of one-half, if not three-quarters, of the revenue at present obtained from our Customs tariff on imports from those countries. Let me tell you, Sir, what is the amount of dutiable goods received by us: the total imports of dutiable goods into this country last year were \$105,639,000, of which we got from the United States, \$45,107,000; from Great Britain, \$44,962,000, and from other places the balance, about \$15,500,000. From the United States, as I have said, we imported of dutiable goods \$45,107,000 worth, and from other places, including Great Britain, \$60,535,000 worth. Well, if the Americans were to bring into this country double what they bring now, we would only have about \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 worth of goods coming into this country from all the rest of the world, upon which the Minister of Customs could lay his tax. What would the result of that be? The result would be inevitably just what those hon. gentlemen say will not take place: it would be direct taxation. Are the people prepared to have direct taxation? I am sure the House would show by an overwhelming majority that we are not, and I am sure, if the hon. gentlemen opposite would go to the country on a policy of direct taxation, they would be met with the most ignominious defeat that they have yet received. I have here the language in reference to direct taxation, which the hon. gentleman who formerly led the Opposition and who is now in Italy, used here in January last. He said: "The great bulk of our taxes come, and must come, from taxation." Again he said: "What are our sources of taxation? Direct taxation is at this time out of the question." That hon. gentleman was, therefore, as fully impressed as we are to-day with the conviction that direct taxation is entirely out of the question. The reasons, he said, I need not discuss; the advantages and disadvantages I need not review. We are dealing with practical conditions, and no one suggests direct taxation as practicable. I think I have established that under the most economical system that could be devised, under a system that I would almost be willing the leader of the Opposition should adopt on this side of the House, it would be impossible to so control the finances of the country that we would not fall short \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000, which would have to be raised by direct taxation. So much for direct taxation. A number of hon. gentlemen have talked about the sentimental view. So far, I have only dealt with the question in a business light, but I have sentiments just as other gentlemen in this House, and I should not like to enter into any trade arrangements that would have the effect of severing, at any time, our connection with the mother country, and I think that statement meets the hearty approval of every member of this House. If there is any hon. gentleman who does not approve of it, he had better retire and ask his constituents whether his views and theirs are in harmony. Now, dealing with this ques-

tion of annexation with the United States, or with the fact that a resolution of this kind would have the effect of tending towards annexation with the United States, I feel I am correct in stating that it would. My naked statement certainly will not convince hon. gentlemen on the other side, but I think I shall prove to them, out of their own mouth, out of the mouths of their own newspapers and out of the mouths of their own supporters, that the result of this unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union will unquestionably tend, sooner or later, towards a political union of the two countries. I now read from the *Globe* of August 1st, 1887, the organ, I suppose, of hon. gentlemen opposite—at least, I do not think they will repudiate it as being their organ. The *Globe* says:

"Unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union is the unattainable best."

That is, that they consider that unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union is the best for this country.

"With a customs union, it would be very good, and that we can probably obtain. To refuse unrestricted reciprocity because it happens to involve commercial union would be like refusing a business worth a million a year because to take it would necessitate the abandonment of a trade worth ten thousand."

Now, what does this mean? It simply means, to begin with, that unrestricted reciprocity means commercial union, and, having defined that so far, I think I shall be able to prove to you more clearly that commercial union means annexation. Now, gentlemen on the other side, though they do not have their friend Mr. Goldwin Smith on the floor of the House to advocate their views, still advocate views very much like his, and they seem to be taking their cues from him and from the Wiman combination. On the 27th August last, speaking in Detroit, Mr. Goldwin Smith said:

"I believe that annexation would be best for both countries. I believe it is bound to come. It was not possible in this era of civilisation to keep apart two peoples so much alike as these. Their manifest destiny was to come together, and commercial union was but a step, though a large step to that end."

Do I prove it out of his mouth? Let me also refer to some gentlemen who are members of this House, and see whether their views are the same as those of this gentleman. This gentleman expresses almost a desire for annexation, but I believe the member in this House to whom I refer will not for a moment endorse the sentiments of Professor Goldwin Smith in this regard. I believe he is too loyal to do that, and I feel sure that there is not a taint of annexation about him. I refer to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). Still, I want to quote his words in reply to an interviewer who had an interview with him in the town of Sarnia, last summer. The interviewer says:

"Will not union develop the annexation sentiment?"

What is his answer, as far as the newspaper gives it? I was not there, but I have never heard it contradicted, and it is published in his own newspaper, the *Sarnia Observer*. He says:

"Annexation is the natural outgrowth of union, and, if we had that, annexation would probably follow ultimately."

I think I have convinced you of two things, that unrestricted reciprocity is only an underhand name for commercial union, and that commercial union in this country means only annexation ultimately, as the hon. member for Lambton West says. There is another thing to be considered. Having answered, I think, in some way, perhaps not to the satisfaction of all hon. gentlemen in this House, but according to my own opinions, these questions, I think we may fairly sum up by considering what would be the result of this union as it is to be brought out now. What would be the result to this country if we had this unrestricted reciprocity, by any name you choose to give it? I listened with great pleasure indeed to the remarks of the

hon. gentleman from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). He seemed to grasp the key of the situation. He dealt with it in a masterly manner, showing the effect that commercial union or unrestricted free trade had in foreign countries where it had been adopted before, the effect it has had upon nations in the past, and that is the only way in which we would be able to judge as to the result of this proposed commercial union. My own impression would be that the United States would be constantly underselling us Canadians, that our manufacturers in this country would suffer from day to day, that the large surplus manufactured on the other side, which used to be brought in here as to a slaughter market under the 17½ per cent. tariff, would continue to be brought into this country in larger quantities than ever, that it would oust our manufacturers from the trade they have now accumulated here. That would have the inevitable result of destroying the growth of capital in the country. The one certainly follows the other. If you destroy the manufacturing interest in this country, you destroy one of the great means of increasing capital and making wealth. If you adopt the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), you will destroy many an industry in this country, and the variety of industries in Canada will be lessened. That will be the inevitable result. Some industries are of a weaker class than others which have grown to be strong under this policy, and those would be wiped out, and in a short time the industries of this country would be probably counted on your fingers. I think also that the result of this resolution would be to cause the productive powers of Canada to steadily decline, the capital having been drawn out and the means of accumulating wealth having been taken away, and before very long we would find this country in the condition in which the hon. gentleman from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) described the industrial manufactures of his own country. Now, Sir, this political economist, Mr. Thomson, has also very decided views upon that question. The House will pardon me if I read what he says upon the effect of free trade union between two nations, not between two nations of equal weight, of equal capital, of equal resources, but free trade union between a wealthy nation and a nation that is not in as good circumstances. Here is what he says:

"But this is by no means the actual state, even of the nations called civilised."

That is, they are not on an equal footing.

"No two nations have reached the same point in industrial development, some are far ahead, because of an earlier use of natural advantages, others lag far behind, though they are striving with all energy to come up. Suppose now, that two nations that differ thus should establish full and free commercial intercourse between each other, what will be the necessary effect? At first sight it might seem that the rich nation would be conferring benefits upon the poorer one, which the other could but feebly return; that the difference between them would gradually and steadily diminish through the poorer nation coming forward in industrial development, and taking an even higher place and that more rapidly than before."

Now, Sir, this author says that at first sight all that might be the result—at first sight only. He says that the picture drawn by the hon. gentlemen opposite may be a correct picture; but hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps, had better study political economy a little more carefully and see if that is the inevitable result or not. Mr. Thomson goes on to say:

"But experience shows that just the reverse of this is the case: The rich nation becomes, for a time, at least, richer by the exchange, the poor nation permanently poorer. The former, through its command of cheap capital, and, by consequence, its greater division and deficiency of labor, can continually undersell the latter in whatever it chooses to export to it, for it can send it manufactured goods at prices with which the manufacturers of the other cannot compete. The process of accumulating capital in the poorer country is decidedly checked; its people are reduced from what variety of industry and the mutual exchange of services they had possessed, to a uniformity of employment in which no man needs or helps his neighbor. Their power of association is destroyed;

money, the instrument of association, is drained out of the country. Nothing is left them but the production of such raw materials as the richer nation chooses to buy, and how unprofitable a commerce of that sort is, we have already seen. The country steadily declines in all the elements of productive power, even in the character of the single home industry that is left it. 'From him that hath not, is taken away that which he seemeth to have.'"

Now, Sir, that is the true doctrine, and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, before they cast their votes, will consider well the doctrine that is laid down by this political economist. Let me ask those hon. gentlemen now, if they were upon this side of the House, and charged with the administration of the country, is there a single man of them who would dare to pronounce in favor of unrestricted reciprocity? I will guarantee that it never would be mentioned by any one of those hon. gentlemen, if they were conducting the finance and the fiscal policy of this country, as they were elected to do, and as that policy is now being conducted by the leader of this Government. In conclusion let me say that the vast majority of the Canadian people are in favor of cultivating trade with the United States, but, in the language of the amendment, only in so far as it does not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries of this country; nor will the Conservative party support any policy that will disturb the trade and industry which have been established here. I can honestly say that I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would not take such a gloomy view of this country and of its future. I believe if they could rid themselves of that tendency they would be much better able to discuss this question. I wish they would lay aside their partisan views in discussing a national question like this. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I ask them whether they would not take the same view if they were intrusted with the administration of this country. We ought to approach the consideration of this question as true and loyal Canadians and British subjects. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have no faith in the future of this country. It may be well said of them, "O, ye of little faith." In closing, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote just four lines from an American poet, which I venture to believe, echo the feelings and echo the hopes of all true Canadians:

"Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee;
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our fears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee."

Mr. SKINNER. In rising to address the House upon this important question I feel some embarrassment, because I doubt if the opinions I hold are entirely in accordance with those held on either side of the House. Still, whatever opinions I have I feel it my duty to express them under the circumstances, because, from the liberty of debate that is granted here, it seems to be generally conceded that every gentleman should have the privilege of saying pretty nearly what he likes upon this question. The reason that I feel a degree of embarrassment in addressing the House on this question is that I ran my election under a pledge to my constituents that I would make no war upon the National Policy. I do not know but that, to a certain extent, at least in my own mind, I thought that was a wiser way in which to run the election, because I believed that, outside of the merits or demerits of the National Policy, inasmuch as the country had approved of it in subsequent elections, it was better, in the interest of the whole country, that it should be maintained, for a time, at least, in order that the manufacturers and capitalists of the country should know what to depend upon, and that the business of the country should be, as far as possible, upon a stable foundation. But holding that opinion and making these statements, representing as I do and running as I did in connection with a maritime constituency, I always understood that those who framed the National Policy framed it in this way, that as soon as the United States were willing to relax their

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

tariff we would be willing to meet them and relax ours. And therefore I stand upon that foundation in this House to-day, and while I have been a supporter in my own constituency of the National Policy, and while I am to a certain extent at least a supporter of it here, I say that I support it upon the understanding that it is not to be forever, so to speak, established among us, that it is not to be considered as one of the permanent institutions of the country, but as the strong hand of the people for the time to guard the manufacturers of the country until they shall by the strength of the tariff have sufficient power of themselves to compete with other nations. If they are not then willing to accept the National Policy, then my opinion would be that it would be better that we had never had it. Passing from that branch of the subject as to permanency of the tariff I say this, that if we can get free trade with the United States I am in favor of having it. If we are to have free trade with the United States I want us to acquire it in such a way that we can conduct the institutions of the country and preserve our national existence all the way through. It has been said here that if the tariff of the United States was going to be disagreeable to England, then so much the worse for England. I do not accede to that proposition at all.

An hon. MEMBER. A Tory.

Mr. SKINNER. Never mind what I am, Tory or anything else. We could not get free trade with the United States as a matter of legislation; that is to say, that if the United States would give us free trade now, within five or ten years they might change that legislation and so upset the whole trade relations of the two countries; that would not do. If we are to have free trade with them it must be a matter of treaty, and if so, the treaty must be made as matters now stand through the British Government, we speaking through and with them, as was the case in regard to the Fisheries Treaty. That being the way these matters would have to be proceeded with we should move hand in hand with the mother country, or I would rather say shoulder to shoulder with the mother country. I do not, therefore, like either here or at the hustings or in the country or anywhere these sentiments thrown out—that if the mother country did not like it we would do so and so. Let us as loyal men and as the representatives of loyal people first ascertain what the mother country is willing to do, and if after that had been done it was not satisfactory, it would then be time enough for us to express sentiments of that character. There are two points to be kept in view with respect to the National Policy; the first is the building up of our domestic trade, and the second is the creation and building up of a foreign trade as well. We all know that the National Policy or protection is practically directed towards the building up of internal trade, and in proportion very largely as it builds up internal trade it does so at the expense of the foreign trade, and that country cannot be called to any very great extent a successful country which, while it may strengthen its right hand, so to speak, its domestic trade, paralyses its left hand, its foreign trade. The real truth of this matter is, therefore, not on either side of the House, or at all events is not as much on either side as hon. gentlemen on the Opposition seem to think. Now, with respect to our foreign trade. I do not agree exactly with what my co-representative (Mr. Ellis) said last night in regard to the West India trade. He seemed to think we would reach the very sum of happiness so far as trade was concerned if we obtained free trade with the United States. I do not think so. I think free trade with the United States would be very desirable, I do not think it would be everything. I hold that growing as young Canada is we are capable, even if the United States would never give us free trade, of building up a foreign as well as a domestic trade. My

hon. friend said that it was not worth while troubling about the West India trade for it would not amount to much. I looked into the statistics with respect to the West India trade the other day and I differ from him, and with the very best of feeling I put this difference before the House. Since last session of Parliament I have done what I could in my own constituency with a view to turning the attention of the merchants and traders of the Province to the development of a foreign trade—not exactly a foreign trade, but a trade with South America and the West Indies. What is the West India trade, that is trade with the British West Indies in particular? Last year the United States exported of their products to the West Indies an amount to the value of \$6,462,030; Canada sent products to the value of \$1,166,268. When you remember that the West Indies are a part of our country and that if we had facilities for trading with them and if our people directed their attention to the same extent in that direction as they have done in other directions the United States would not so far outstrip us in that trade. If hon. members would turn their attention, moreover, to the details of the articles that make up the merchandise sent by the United States to the British West Indies last year, they will see that Canada could have supplied every article the United States sent there. I think, therefore, it is worth our while to turn our attention to this trade and to control it if we can, and the merchants and manufacturers of Canada in view of the perseverance, capital and capacity they have shown in regard to the internal trade, could no doubt substantially control that foreign business if they make up their minds to do it. Take now the great country of Brazil, a country as large as the United States, and one possessing vast resources. The United States sent there last year goods to the value of \$7,071,753, Canada sent goods to the value of \$439,382. Is there not a fine field there for the cultivation of Canadian trade? How was it with respect to the Argentine Republic? The United States sent that republic last year \$5,671,729 worth of merchandise. How much did Canada send them? Only \$385,984 worth. See what a field there is there. That country is rising into mercantile greatness, not into manufacturing greatness, and it is rising with astonishingly rapid strides, and, so to speak, inviting the merchants and manufacturing world to bid for its trade. Let us in Canada not turn so much to internal business but direct our attention to the foreign trade, and when we want some field of operation let us not altogether turn our attention to the United States but let us take other countries as well. Then there is the French West Indies. The United States last year sent them \$4,344,344 worth, and Canada sent them next to nothing, if not almost nothing. I put those statistics before the House because I recognise that all peoples as well as all individuals are inclined to run too much into grooves. We are running one time into the groove of the National Policy and we get it, so to speak, on the brain. We relieve our minds from that, and then we turn our attention to the United States as the great panacea for what are called the evils of this country. I think this question is larger than that, and I ask that the attention of the country shall be turned towards South America, in order that a trade may be built up in that direction. I wish also to say, when I am upon this subject, that, as a Canadian and as a British subject, I hope to see the day when every foot of British soil in America shall be under the confederation of which we have the honor to be associated. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, I make this expression of my opinion, and I do not wish to be misunderstood in the slightest. I am not seeking to go between parties, or anything of that kind. I have just as much interest as the rest of you in falling right into line, and I merely wish to express what my own honest conviction is. I do not wish to be considered as attacking party

lines. The expression is purely of my own opinions, whether they be worth anything or not. I am in favor of reciprocal trade with the United States. I am in favor of meeting the United States, as it were step by step, as they may hold out their hands towards us, but I am not in favor of cringing to them; I am not in favor of degrading my own country, and asking them to give us free trade because we are poor. Gentlemen, poverty is no more honorable in a nation than it is in an individual. The individual who is poor is powerless as still water. So it is with a nation and so it would be with a Dominion like this. In my opinion, if we want the respect of the United States, and if we want the respect of the world, it is our duty to stand upon the greatness of our country, and whilst we say to the United States: "We want to trade with you," we should also say: "We do not want to trade with you because we are poor, but we want to trade with you because we are rich, because we are capable of giving you as much as you can give us, and we can make our relations reciprocal and to the interest of both of us." Now, gentlemen, as to the coasting trade in the Maritime Provinces. Some hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces scarcely grasp—at least, I think they scarcely grasp—the importance of the coasting trade and of all that it implies. I would have you remember that in the Maritime Provinces we have something over 800,000 of a population, and taking them man for man they are as prosperous as any people in the Dominion. They may not be as wealthy, because we have not had the opportunity of heaping up wealth of individuals as you have had in the western country, but yet, take our population man for man they are on the average as independent, as contented and as prosperous a people as in any other part of the Dominion. We have heard a good deal of the greatness, of wheat products of Ontario. Why, gentlemen, the fishing privileges and properties of the Maritime Provinces are equal in value to the wheat crop of Ontario. Therefore it is that with those maritime interests on our hands we are not as deeply interested in the National Policy as you are in the other Provinces. Protection of course is a sort of congestion, protection benefits the centres more than it does the extremes of a country. In those ports and places situated upon the coast of the country there, merchants stretch their eyes as it were out over the seas and their business grows up upon the water, and merchants and manufacturers in those centres are more deeply interested in protection than others. In my opinion therefore the policy of Canada should be so moderated, or, so to speak, it should be so modulated, that it should not be all for Ontario, if you like that, but it should prosper the Maritime Provinces as well, and the Government of the country casting their eyes over the whole country should see what the whole demands and make an average policy for the benefit of the entire Dominion. That being the case you will see that our policy could be modified in a great many things, so that it will give to the merchants of the sea an opportunity to build up a foreign commerce, as well as to give the manufacturers of Hamilton, Montreal and Toronto an opportunity to have protection against "slaughter markets" and against all foreign trade unfairly carried on against them. I wish to say a word with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Everything seems to have been drawn into this debate and I have heard it charged here against the Government of Canada that the Intercolonial Railway does not pay. Gentlemen, the River St. Lawrence does not pay, but if you would close it up it would paralyse the free flow of trade and commerce of this great Dominion to such an extent that you could not get any person to vote in favor of closing it up. The Intercolonial Railway is as I understand it in the same position with reference to Canada as the Canadian Pacific Railway is, that is to say, the two together make up the great artery of trade through this Dominion.

In this connection, I am sorry to see that one of my maritime friends should have reflected upon the Government because they gave money enough to build the Short Line Railway. A remark of this kind, of course, does not please a gentleman who comes from another part of the country. As you know, in the city of which I am one of the representatives in this House, this project has been looked forward to since Confederation. They have looked forward to having the shortest line to Montreal and the west for the purpose, of our trade. We say that this work is in the spirit of Confederation, we also say that it tends to develop the commerce of the whole country, and the city of St. John is, therefore, heartily in favor of the Short Line Railway. We hope, when it shall be built and when we have facilities to carry on business with Western Canada, we shall be in a position then to extend our trade with Montreal and Toronto under greatly more advantageous circumstances than we have had before. Gentlemen, we, in the Maritime Provinces, have made sacrifices in connection with the Union, and as my hon. friend said last night, our foreign trade has been depressed. It has decreased to some extent but the decrease of our foreign trade has been made up by the development of a certain amount of internal trade, otherwise we would have been in a very bad position in St. John and New Brunswick. Mr. Speaker, in reference to this question of how New Brunswick has suffered from the trade relations of this country let me say this, that when we entered into the Union our Province, according to its population, was one of the largest shipowning countries in the world. The money of our merchants was invested in wooden ships, and that business has been entirely wiped out—when I say entirely, I mean substantially; and after that business was wiped out by the iron ships, one would think we would fall beneath the loss. But we did not; and more than that, we stood up under the great calamity of the fire of ten years ago, which was as great a loss to us as would be the loss to the people of Montreal if a fire should occur there to-morrow and sweep away \$75,000,000 worth of property. We could not have done that unless our business houses were on good foundations, and unless manufacturing to some extent had been developed. We are holding our own to-day, and I do not believe that in the Maritime Provinces anything like a substantial vote would be cast in favor of taking New Brunswick out of this Union. I come here representing the sentiments of a class of people who believe they should have some remedies given them, and who believe they can get those remedies by loyalty to the Union, by joining hands with those with whom they are associated, and persevering in the course we have undertaken to follow.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. SKINNER. I do not intend to continue my remarks at any great length. I have expressed the views I hold on this question and in doing so have attempted to condense rather than expand. If I had my own way in the matter, I should propose a resolution different from any of those now before the House; but before saying what that resolution would be, I wish to call the attention of the House to a fact in illustration of the object at which I think we should aim, namely, to reduce our tariff whenever the business of the country will allow of it, and whenever the course taken by the United States would be in the same direction. For example, the members for the city and county of St. John have recently heard from their constituents, and we have seen it is stated in the public press, that a petition has been sent to the United States Congress by persons interested in the lime business in the United States paying for an increase in the duty on lime. We have near the city of St. John one of the finest lime

Mr. SKINNER.

deposits in America, and recently there has been an extensive development of that business, and the lime has been exported in large quantities to the United States, thus, of course, coming into direct competition with the lime produced in that country. Our tariff on lime is 20 per cent, whereas the tariff of the United States is 10 per cent, and the petition presented to Congress asks that the duty on lime coming from Canada should be made equal to the Canadian duty. Now, that strikes me to be a case to which the attention of the Government should be drawn, and if our tariff is higher than that of the United States, let it be reduced. Therefore, I would have no cast-iron rule regulating this matter; but I would say, let us modify our tariff as the interests of the country should require. The resolution I would like to move would be something like this: Resolved, that the Government of Canada be requested to communicate with the Government of the United States, and ascertain whether they are willing to enter into an arrangement of reciprocity in all articles the produce of the two countries, and if they are, on what terms it can be had, and that the result of the enquiry be laid before the House. Then we could ascertain whether we could get such an arrangement and on what terms, and the House and the country would be able to come to a conclusion as to whether they could get it or not. But, as I say, situated as I am, it is not for me to say what resolution should be submitted to the House, because it would be useless for me to move a resolution unless I were certain of getting some considerable support for it. Therefore my views of the question just bring me to this conclusion, that I am in favor of reciprocity when it can be had, even if it impinges to a certain extent on the National Policy. The amendment moved to the resolution by the hon. Minister of Marine is to the effect that we can never have reciprocity if it is going to impinge on the National Policy. That far I cannot go, and, therefore, I shall not be able to support that amendment. I would rather something such as I suggest should be offered, so that inquiry could be made, because I wish it distinctly understood that I am in favor of reciprocity between the two countries when we can get it in harmony with the interest of the country, and in accordance with the dignity of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) in his speech last night, based a large part of his argument, to justify him in voting against the proposition for unrestricted reciprocity, upon certain reports of agricultural societies from which he read very extensive extracts to this House, the principal one being that of an agricultural society in my county. It is possible that I should not have troubled the House with any remarks on this subject at this stage had not the hon. gentleman paid so much attention to the county which I have the honor to represent. Now, I will say at once that I have no objection to that report. That report in the main, so far as it referred to the subject to which it had a right to refer, as the report of an agricultural society, was true. It is a report written by a clever man, but not by an agriculturist. It will be clear to any one who reads it, that the report was a very peculiar one to emanate from an agricultural society. The fact is it was the work of a doctor of medicine. Like many other doctors, whom we know in this House, this doctor had a mind above and beyond the ordinary practice of his profession, and if this report be fully read, it will be found that he is inclined to cut a very wide swathe, because, in the course of the report, he treats of the physical position of the country, its political position, its trade and commerce, and winds up with a short dissertation on morals. He concludes his report in this way:

"The only ruin threatening is rum ruin. Let us see to it that our Council makes every provision in its power for the enforcement of the Scott Act."

So you will observe the author of this report is a cosmopolitan gentleman, who does not confine himself to matters of agriculture. It is only fair for me to explain in this connection that the gentleman who wrote it took a very active part in politics in the county of King's, and took the stump throughout the elections just preceding the issuing of this report, the local elections of 1886. Having taken a very prominent part in these elections, and having got the worst of it, he took advantage of his opportunity to abuse his position by interjecting political matters into a report which should have been entirely free from anything of the kind. But, as I have said, so far as the report treats of matters which legitimately belong to it, I endorse it entirely. When he says that the valley of Cornwallis and Annapolis, the country represented by the hon. member for Annapolis and myself, has superior advantages for the growing of fruit and apples, I agree with him. When he says it is one of the finest spots on the face of the earth for that industry, I approve of what he says. His statement cannot be gainsaid. But the hon. member for Annapolis has no right to make use of statements improperly put in his report, as for instance, the following with regard to potatoes :

"For years the crop which overshadowed all others in this valley, since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty, and the imposition of a duty, in 1886, have gradually taken the second place, apples now leading. In the political agitation which recently visited us, there is no doubt that potatoes and reciprocity were greatly mixed up in the minds of our farmers. The old days of a dollar a bushel held a fond place in their memories. Reciprocity for King's means simply a free market in the United States for potatoes. This, it is believed, would be a panacea for all our ills."

Now, by that very statement, he admits that the question of reciprocity is an important one in the county of King's. That very statement shows that the people think reciprocity would be the panacea for all their ills, yet the hon. member for Annapolis argues from this report that the people of that country are entirely satisfied with their present condition, and do not desire reciprocity at all. Now, with regard to the growth of fruit, and with regard to the apple crop, we have, as I said before, superior advantages. We have, it may be said, a monopoly, which is a natural monopoly, a monopoly which the Great Giver of all goods has bestowed upon us, and which hurts nobody but does good to everybody. It is not a monopoly which we have had to seek at the hands of Parliament; it is not a monopoly which taxes the rest of the country to support us. Quite the contrary, it is a monopoly which does everybody good, both those to whom we sell and those who have the fruit to sell. The hon. member for Annapolis has told us that we go abroad into the world to sell our products. So we do, we go into the English market. A year ago, we sold in that market 100 barrels of apples, for which we obtained good prices; but we have not to thank the National Policy for that. We have not to thank any particular legislation for that. On the contrary we were interfered with. Our enjoyment of the very benefits which Providence has conferred on us is interfered with by the fact that we are not allowed to buy where we sell; and when we go across the Atlantic with our fruit, we cannot bring back English goods, but have to bring back the money and spend it somewhere in the Dominion, in purchasing, at enhanced prices, the articles we consume. To judge by the tone of the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis, the people of King's and Annapolis live exclusively upon apples. They clothe themselves with apples or apple leaves, possibly, as in the old story with regard to the Garden of Eden. Why, the people of those counties are large consumers. They want something to eat; they want clothing; they want agricultural implements and the tariff we have in this country interferes with their buying in the markets where they want to buy, and obliges them to come back with their money and buy it home at enhanced prices. However, I do not intend to enlarge on that subject.

I wish to show further that the hon. member for Annapolis is not correct in endeavoring to convey to the House the impression, although he was correct in what he said with regard to the fruit industry, that we do nothing in those counties but grow fruit. One of the most important features of that magnificent valley is the diversity of the crops we are able to grow. We not only grow apples but we produce an enormous quantity of potatoes, and there is no crop from which our farmers are as sure of getting a return as from the potato crop. The hon. member for Annapolis did not see fit to read extracts from some of the reports of the agricultural societies, which would have thrown light upon this industry, and have shown that we are dependent upon other markets besides the English market for a return for our crops. In King's country, the Central Agricultural Society has this report :

"A new market has been opened to us through the Hathaway Line of steamers which ply between Annapolis and Boston."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is defunct years ago.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, there is a line in its place. Is there not regular steam communication between Annapolis and Boston every week or twice a week.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Then it does not matter whether it is a Hathaway Line or another line. But the report goes on to say :

"A new market has been opened to us through the Hathaway Line of steamers with Boston, which has already been of great importance to this section of the Province. A large amount of mutton, fruit, vegetables, poultry and dairy produce have been shipped, and favorable returns realised."

The King's County Agricultural Society in its report says :

"A new departure was made in this county by the shipment to New York of several cargoes of turnips at 35 and 40 cents per bushel. Should a market for turnips continue, even at 30 cents, this will make a profitable crop, as they can be made to yield 1,000 bushels to the acre—900 having been grown on one acre in Cornwallis last season."

That report was written by the very gentleman whose other report was so largely quoted by the hon. member for Annapolis. Then the Central Agricultural Society of King's County, says :

"Potatoes, our staple crop, have given a very abundant yield * * * Lamb, poultry, eggs and dairy produce (owing mainly to the Boston market *via* the Hathaway line from Annapolis) have been in good demand and bring good returns. A large amount of potatoes are also sent by this line, which is a great accommodation to many farmers along the line of railway."

The Union Agricultural Society reports :

"With an average crop of fruit they (the farmers) are obtaining very large prices, and in the sale of an extraordinary large yield of potatoes and hay of superior quality, the returns have seldom been equalled and never exceeded. In viewing the prospects of the industrious agriculturists, we are more and more convinced that, with free and favorable markets for the sale of our products, our lines have fallen in pleasant places and that we have a goodly heritage."

The Farmers Agricultural Society Directors' report of 1884 says :

"In reference to the crops we beg to report that as a whole we have been blessed with a liberal harvest, for which we feel grateful to the Giver of all good. Potatoes, our staple crop, were about an average; prices however, ruled low, and owing to the exorbitant duty, but few will be likely to find their way to the United States; probably a large portion of them will be driven to market. * * * Apples probably not more than half an average crop, but quality good; a large quantity have already found their way to the United States markets."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). What year is that?

Mr. BORDEN. 1884.

M. MILLS (Annapolis). That is four years ago.

Mr. BORDEN. Three years ago. It is not very long ago. The West Cornwallis Agricultural Society Officers report says :

"Potatoes an abundant crop, especially in moist land, but as yet prices ranging very low."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will quote to the hon. gentleman some of the reports from the Annapolis Society which he seems to have overlooked, and first the Nictaux Agricultural Society Directors' report, says:

"Potatoes a large crop, and turnips about an average, but owing to the low price and small demand they will mostly be fed to stock."

Bridgetown Agricultural Society Directors' report:

"Potatoes a fair yield, but the market value both 'home and abroad' is very discouraging for paying prices."

Paradise Agricultural Society Directors' report:

"In presenting their annual report the directors of this society would note that while our farmers are not untouched by the 'hard times,' which more or less affect all branches of trade, their condition will yet, we believe, compare favorably with that of their fellows enjoyed in other industries."

"2. Crop Report.—Hay far below the average, but well made. Potatoes above average and of fine quality. Grain, average yield; turnips and other roots, owing to want of timely rain, small. Fruit far below average, but prices for hand picked, rule high; from \$3 to \$4 at the orchard."

The Eastern Annapolis Agricultural Society Director's report states:

"The past year has been in many respects disadvantageous to the farmers in this place in common with other localities, as regards general cultivated crops. Hay very short and gathered in bad condition; wheat small quantities sown with fair yield; corn below average; peas and beans medium; potatoes, small crop and rather inferior in quality, selling value nothing; apples, abundant crop, of average quality, but the selling prices are low, so in the end our net cash receipts on our year's operations in crops will be much less than was wished for and expected in the early season."

Now, I think that those extracts which I have read show very fairly that the impression which the hon. gentleman attempted to convey to this House last night was not exactly in accordance with the facts, first as to our dependence entirely upon the fruit crop, and secondly, as to the people of that locality not wishing or caring for a reciprocity treaty. The potato crop, as I have shown, is one of our most important crops, and, as pointed out in one of the reports I have read, we know that our farmers are met with a duty of 15 cents a bushel on these potatoes when they send them to the United States. Last year the farmers of my county exported more than 200,000 bushels of potatoes, which at 15 cents a bushel, means \$30,000 which the farmers of the county would have received but for the duty. I do not know the extent of the exportation from Annapolis county, but I have no doubt, judging from the reports which are here, that it was very large. Then there is the article of hay, and I am sure the hon. gentleman is deeply interested in that. I believe that Annapolis county exports a very large quantity of hay to the United States market, where it meets a duty of \$2 a ton. The hon. gentleman told us that the values of real estate had greatly increased in that valley. He said that the statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the assessed value of property in this country had not materially increased in the last twenty years, were entirely a mistake so far as our section of the country was concerned. I agree with him so far as the orchard lands of that valley are concerned. There is no question that there has been in the last five years a great increase in the value of those lands, but, I am sorry to say, they are all not orchard lands; orchard lands bear a very small proportion to the total number of acres in that valley. We have large farms which are not growing fruit at all, but are depending entirely on the growth of potatoes and other vegetables, and I say, and I challenge contradiction, that any farm which has not an orchard on it is not worth half what it was in 1866, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty. I think the hon. gentleman will find that, in the county of Annapolis, as well as in the county of King's, along the area of the mountain range along the southern side of the Bay of Fundy, there are thousands of acres of land which are now not occupied at all and which twenty years ago were supporting

Mr. BORDEN,

hundreds of thrifty and industrious people. I challenge contradiction on that point. Three years ago, the total assessment of the county of King's did not exceed by many thousand dollars the total assessment twenty years previous to that date.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The same may be said of Annapolis as regards the assessment.

Mr. BORDEN. The assessment is conducted on the same principle now as it was then.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The assessment is no criterion whatever.

Mr. BORDEN. It may not be a criterion, but I say that the assessment is made on precisely the same principle as it was twenty years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I would like to make an explanation, if the hon. gentlemen will allow me. The assessment is no criterion. In the county of Annapolis—and I know what I am talking about, for I have had some experience in regard to it—they assess the wards, each ward has an assessor, and the county is rated according to that assessment. In some wards, they think the ward nearest to them is assessed too low, and, notwithstanding their oath, they will assess the property in their ward lower still, and so on until they get the whole thing down to a very low rate of assessment. That is the way in Annapolis, and I think it is in King's also.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not see that that is very much of an explanation. The principle upon which the assessment is made is precisely the same now as it was twenty years ago, and I say that the assessment has not increased *pro rata* with the population in the last twenty years, and the reason is that, although there has been an enormous increase in the value of orchard lands, there has been a corresponding decrease in the value of those lands which are used for ordinary farming purposes only, and I say further that, if we had the old Reciprocity Treaty—and I appeal to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) to contradict me if he can—if we had a restoration of the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the property in the county of Annapolis and in the county of King's, the moment it was known, would be worth 25 per cent. more than it is to-day. The hon. gentleman cannot contradict that statement. Now, I will call attention still further concerning the value of property. There is another kind of property, the property in the villages and towns along the coasts of our western shores. During the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty we had a continuous progress. Towns and villages grew up and became thrifty, and did a profitable trade with our neighbors in the United States. Those towns have become almost depopulated. Along the whole coast of King's county and the Bay of Fundy, and, I will venture to say, the county of Annapolis, you will find scores of houses untenanted, shops unused, and wharves unused. If the resolution of the hon. gentleman for Halifax could become law, if that arrangement for coasting trade between the two countries could be made, I venture to say that in only three years these towns and villages would be restored to the old prosperity which they enjoyed during the period between 1854 and 1866. Now, since the report of the gentleman to whom I referred in opening my speech, has been read so extensively, and commented upon so extensively, by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), I may be pardoned for illustrating this part of my subject by referring to an incident of the campaign during the elections of 1866. The gentleman who made this report was on the stump, supporting the candidate who was opposed to me. I happened to meet him in a public meeting. He pointed to me and said: "Dr. Borden is the last man to complain of our not being entirely prosperous."

"Why," he said, "he is prosperous, look at the fine place he lives in, the nice grounds and beautiful buildings that he has around him. I am glad of it, but he is the last man to complain of hard times." I said in reply that I did not care to have my private affairs dragged into a public meeting, but as he had seen fit to take me as an example I explained to this meeting how I happened to become possessed of that property. That property was purchased in 1866 by the man who sold it to me the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, and one year before Confederation, for the sum of \$4,000. That man spent \$1,000 in adding lands and buildings to that property, making it cost him \$5,000, 15 years after that date, that man was glad to sell it to me for \$2,100, and that is the way I became possessor of that valuable property. That argument seemed to satisfy even the gentleman himself, and I may state further that if any person would come to me to-day and give me \$2,100 and the additional money which I have spent in building since, I will gladly sell him that property. I think that is a fair illustration of how property has diminished in value in towns. I do not speak of farming and orchard lands, they are exceptions, but of the towns in the western part of Nova Scotia. So much, then, for the assessed value of property. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been a somewhat attentive student of public questions in this country since I had the honor of a seat in this House. Since 1874, I have usually been in my place, and I have had the pleasure of listening to most of the discussions that have taken place in this House during the time I have been a member of it, and I have always understood, up to this time, that reciprocity was a part of the political faith of both parties in this country. I think I can show the House the very best reasons for believing that. Take the history of the different treaties. Both parties assisted in the negotiations of the treaty of 1854; both parties agreed that it was a good thing. In 1866 both parties agreed that that treaty should be renewed if possible. The liberal party sent an agent to Washington, in 1874, to attempt to negotiate a treaty; unfortunately he failed. The next utterance we have upon the subject of reciprocity was made in 1876, in this House, and I had the pleasure of listening to it. I hold in my hand the speech of the present Finance Minister, which he made in this House on the 15th March, 1876, and here is what he said:

"Individual members might be opposed to reciprocity, but both political parties were favorable to such a treaty, which meant free trade to a certain extent with the United States; and it could only be attained by one means—a defensive policy. Why did we get it 20 years ago? Simply in order to remove the customs duties, which restricted the free interchange of certain products between the two countries. Why did they adopt that treaty? It was because there was a hostile tariff on both sides of the line, and the time has come when, if we would secure a renewal of reciprocal relations, we must have something to offer. Therefore every one who believed in reciprocal free trade with the United States was bound to support the resolution before the House."

The resolution mentioned was moved by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, in amendment, I think, to going into Committee of Supply. Then what do we find next? In 1878, on the eve of the general election, the right hon. gentleman moved the following resolution:

"This House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicial readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow country-men now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

And what did the right hon. gentleman say in supporting his resolution? Speaking of the Americans he said:

21—1888—3

"They will not have anything like reciprocity of trade with us unless we show them that it will be to their advantage. Why should they give us reciprocity when they have our markets open to them now? * * * It is only by closing our doors and by cutting them out of our markets, that they will open theirs to us. If they would take the same steps as England had done with France, and say: We will lower the duties on your wines, if you will lower the duties on our cotton goods, for instance, something might be done. All the Browns in Canada sent to Washington will be of no avail unless we have something to give in return. * * * If you say 'we will cripple your trade and shut you out, but at the same time we will give you every opportunity of fairly entering into a reciprocity of trade with us; if not we will keep our markets to ourselves,' it would have a great effect."

What was the object, then, in imposing this high taxation? It was in order to keep the Americans out and to force them to make reciprocal trade relations with us. We objected to the admission of their manufactured goods into Canada. We said: We will put up a high tariff and keep their manufactured goods out, and when the proper time came, according to the hon. gentleman's own reasoning, that we had something to give them, what was that something? It either meant that or nothing. As late as 28th March, 1884, during a discussion of a resolution in favor of reciprocity offered by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government said:

"Unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty, not only for our natural productions but for our manufactures as well as our natural products, we will never have a treaty."

Thus, I think, I have shown clearly that the *raison d'être* of establishing the policy of protection which was established in this country was, that we would be in a better position to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. That kind of language was used not only in this House but also in the country. We are all aware that the Finance Minister stated once and I think twice in public in Prince Edward Island, on the eve of elections, that we would have reciprocity within two years. I venture to say that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), notwithstanding his statement last night, declared during his campaign at the recent election, for he dare not do otherwise, that he was favorable to reciprocity if reciprocity could be got. I venture to say he did so. This policy of protection has been put forward as an alternative, as something not desirable but something that we could not help adopting, and something that we were to use as a means to an end. Now the policy seems to be the reverse, and this protective policy is to be the means of preventing the attainment of the desired end, because the resolution of the Minister of Marine, plainly tells us that if reciprocity is to interfere in the slightest degree with any industry fostered in this country then he will not have it, thus virtually substituting a policy of protection for a policy of reciprocity. Why, Mr. Speaker, coming down to a later date, almost up to this very day, we find that it was the policy of this Government, and the policy therefore of this country, to endeavor to obtain a reciprocity treaty. Let hon. members look at the correspondence between Mr. Bayard and the Finance Minister; let them look at the protocols and at the offers made. Are we to suppose that that offer to negotiate on the basis of freer trade relations was not made sincerely? I should be very sorry to suppose anything of the kind, I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe it was the policy until a very late date, until almost within an hour of the time this resolution was put before the House by the Minister of Marine. I cannot say why this change of base has been made; but certainly after the statements I have made and the proofs I have given, it is not fitting that hon. gentlemen opposite should charge members on this side of the House with inconsistency. We have been consistent advocates of reciprocity from first to last; hon. gentlemen opposite have been advocates of reciprocity up to the time when, I venture to think, there is more chance of obtaining it than there has been at any time during the last

twenty years. Are they abandoning it because there is a prospect of our getting it? Is that the reason? I do not know what the reason is. This extraordinary change of base requires explanation. I cannot understand it. Does it mean that the manufacturers are getting too much power? Certainly there must be some explanation to afford. I await with interest their explanation. It is scarcely necessary to ask, after I have shown that both sides have agreed as to the advisability of reciprocity, and it has been an axiom in the political faith of both parties, to show whether it is a desirable thing or not. I might ask the question: Is commerce desirable at all, is it advantageous? Surely if commerce is desirable, if foreign trade is desirable, it is certainly desirable that we should have the freest possible trade with our neighbors to the south. They are our nearest neighbors. They want what we have to sell, and we want what they have to sell. Our geographical position is such that it is convenient for us to trade with them; and as to the advantage there cannot be any question, we have had experience of it. What did the experience of 1854 to 1866 show? Why, trade went up by leaps and bounds during those twenty years, advancing from six million dollars to ten times that amount. We have heard a good deal during this debate of the loyalty cry. I have here an extract from a report of the Committee of the Executive Council approved by the Governor General of Canada, 19th February, 1865, upon the subject of the old Reciprocity Treaty. I believe the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House was a member of the Government at that time; I do not know whether he was leader but he was a member of it. After a reference to loyalty to their sovereign the committee concluded with these words:

"They cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen of the Great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians to form a part, to the connection between material prosperity and political contentment, feeling that they appealed to the highest motives of patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

My hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) has spoken of this aspect of the question. It was quite pathetic to hear him. He said that there was no doubt at all that the adoption of the policy shadowed in the resolution of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to give us free coasting trade along the whole coast of North America would be a wonderful advantage to his constituency and to himself. He spoke as if he had a personal interest in the matter, but he would rather sacrifice his property, he said, his own personal interests, than do anything at all that might savor of disloyalty. It was truly pathetic. It reminded one of what another distinguished patriot, Artemus Ward, said during the Southern rebellion. He said rather than the secession of the Southern States of the Union should have taken place he would have sacrificed his wife's relations. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., would sacrifice his property rather than be suspected of disloyalty. I tell that hon. gentleman that there are some things in the world quite as important as loyalty. And if he would turn his attention as carefully to all the other virtues as he does to this, possibly it would not do him any harm. I will not remind him, possibly it would not be parliamentary to do so, of what the celebrated Dr. Johnson said of people who were inclined to talk so much about their own loyalty. But, Sir, we are told that we are disloyal because we are in favor of freer trade relations with the United States. I hold in my hand, Sir, an article in the *Westminster Review* on the subject of Imperial Federation and I think it will be generally conceded that this review—a British review—might be supposed to be quite as loyal in its utterances, particularly when it is advocating a cause such as that of Imperial Federation, as the hon. gentleman who takes an opposite view to myself on this question.

Mr. BORDEN.

"We are long past the day when the interests of classes can long prevail over those of nations, or diplomatic artifices or expedients over facts; and it is only when those who are in the right descend to artifices and expedients that the opponents of truth and nature have a chance. The Canadian people know what they are about and what they want, and will vote as benefits their own commercial interests and national and imperial instincts. Those who think otherwise should consider how and why the Reciprocity Treaty fell through, the vast and almost magical changes already resulting from the development of the Great North-West, how the transcontinental and inter-oceanic railway at once empowers, embodies, and stimulates the spirit of patriotism and empire, as well as the energies of commerce, and whether it is likely that citizens of the freest country in the world will much longer continue to raise a superabundant income by taxing themselves for the benefit of a few manufacturers?"

And again:

"Every passing year now strengthens the Canadian nationality beyond all ordinary computation of the effect of time, but if commercial union with the States should come and prosper, popular content with things as they are would strengthen with it."

And again:

"We hear a good deal now of Canadian railways which are political and ought to be commercial, and of the Canadian farmer, with profits mulcted by excessive freight on the one hand and a protective tariff on the other, who is kept out of the States' markets close by, whilst beckoned on through vast spaces to Dominion markets that hardly yet exist. We rely, however on general causes operating naturally, and we think irresistibly in a given uniform direction; and we say that Canadian nationality has grown with everything that has favored it, and in spite of everything that seemed to hinder it; that it has increased and not decreased with the feeling of loyalty to England, and of pride in belonging to a great empire, and that facts now favor an immense development of that feeling. Canada has nationality and wants empire. She can have a freer hand as a member of the British Empire than as one of the United States railways beset railways and traffic traffic. Unity consolidates nationality, and nationality leads to empire. Dominion markets must constantly extend and increase. Railways will create along their route and especially at either end, vast emporia of commerce. Esquimalt Harbor, land-docked easily protected, of sufficient depth, of four or five hundred acres area, and covered by Vancouver's Island, the only coal producing spot in that region, will be a place of concourse for the fleets of that hemisphere, and eyrie of imperial outlook and a stronghold for defence and communication."

How does he conclude the article?

"All tends to show that Canadian nationality and loyalty bid fair to be intensified and extended, and that if Canadian and States commercial unity comes, it will not mean severance from England."

That is the opinion of the reviewer in the *Westminster Review*. Now, Sir, what is the truest kind of loyalty? It is loyalty to the best interests of the country. The time has come in our system of government when the best understood wishes of the people are the wishes of the sovereign, and when there is no difference between the feelings and desires and wishes of the majority and the wishes of the sovereign under whose beneficent sway we are proud to live. That is the fact, and if we, by a large majority in this country, show to Her Majesty the Queen that we are in favor of freer trade relations with the United States she will not only consider it disloyal, but she will be proud to assist us in carrying out that which is going to be for our own material advantage. Now we are told that the adoption of this resolution and this policy will injure the manufacturers. I dissent entirely from that view. I do believe that so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned that the manufacturers of Toronto, Hamilton, London and perhaps of Montreal will not have the markets in the Maritime Provinces. I quite admit that the Maritime Provinces would have the right to trade where they want to trade, where they have a right to trade, and where they would trade, were it not for the very high tariff, with the United States their nearest neighbor. Those centres to which I have referred would become centres of a larger area of country. They would have their share of the trade with the 60,000,000 people to the south of us, and they could send their goods down in competition with the manufacturers of the United States. Is it possible that after a lengthened period of protection to our manufacturers in this country that we are not able to compete with the manufacturers of the United States? I would be ashamed to acknowledge anything of that kind. I do not believe it. I believe that

the adoption of the policy would be as advantageous to the manufacturers of this country as to any other of the people of the country. If not, then what does it mean? Is it not a contention that the people of this country are being taxed heavily in order to support those manufacturers and that we are annually paying heavy taxes into the revenue and putting the taxes into the pockets of the manufacturers? This is what it means. What do we find in the United States? We find that twenty-five years, aye, fifteen years ago, manufacturers were unknown in the southern States of the Union; we find to-day that manufacturers are going ahead rapidly and that the southern States of the Union are doing their own manufacturing, notwithstanding that their neighbors in the New England States had from fifty to one hundred years the start of them. Are we, who are manufacturing almost as long as the manufacturers of the New England, to fall behind in the race, when the southern States have within a few years developed their large manufactures? I think not. I am entirely of a different view from that. I have in my own county a few manufacturers and I have talked with them on the subject. We have manufacturers of axes and I am assured by those men that they do not fear reciprocity and free trade with the United States. They say give us the raw materials free and we will compete with anybody. We are not afraid of competition. So it is with all the manufacturers. They say: "give us a chance to send our manufactures into the State of Maine and we are not afraid of competition. We are more afraid of Canadian competition under a high tariff than we would be of competition under free trade with the United States." We are further told that this is not a practical question, and that it does not come within the range of practical politics. I think, Sir, that this article which I have read on the subject of Imperial Federation, and in which incidentally this question of commercial free trade with the United States is considered, shows that it is within the range of practical politics, shows that it is being considered upon the other side of the water, and I think it is only necessary to read a letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper in order to see that the question is within the range of practical politics. We find now that there are two propositions on this subject in the United States, one before Congress and one before the Senate, directly pointing to the carrying out of something similar to that which is proposed in the resolution before the House. I refer to Congressman Hitt's resolution for commercial union, and I refer also to the resolution of Senator Frye for reciprocal commercial relations between the United States, Mexico, South America and Brazil. Why were we not included? Simply because we have not at present the power of negotiating our own treaties. It is clear from these propositions, which are now before both branches of the United States Legislature, that the Americans are turning their attention to greater freedom of trade; and in view of that disposition on the part of the United States to extend their trade relations with the whole of North America, I think it is not correct to say that this subject is not within the range of practical politics.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in occupying the time of the House at this late stage of the debate, the only excuse that I can offer is the importance of the subject under consideration. The hon. member who introduced the resolution told this House, and through this House the country, that this was one of the most important subjects that ever engaged the attention of the Canadian Parliament since Confederation. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will agree with him in that statement, for from whatever standpoint we consider the issue involved, we must acknowledge that it is a most important question. If we look at it from a commercial standpoint, it means a complete revolution in the trade of over 4,000,000 people.

If we examine it from a social standpoint, remembering that in social life as in everything else the greater invariably controls the less, it means a change in our social status. It means a change in every part of our country, so that we must ultimately grow more and more like the nation with whom we associate. If we examine it from the manufacturers' standpoint, I think there are few but would admit that it means virtually the extinction of the manufacturing industries of our country. If we examine it from a political standpoint, it means the annihilation of our system which we believe to be modelled on the best system in the world, or the grafting upon it whatever is new and peculiar in the political system of the great country lying to the south of us. If we examine it from a national standpoint, whether as an integral part of the British Empire or as an important nation growing up on the North American continent, it is equally important, because I believe it means our national extinction. If we examine it from the standpoint of the mother country, that power which has been our protection and shield in our embryonic life to the present, whose flag has shielded us through the helpless years of infancy and has continued to wave over us in our growth to maturity, whose influence and power have secured for us the rights of the high seas, and whose overshadowing influence has always afforded us protection in every part of the world, it means the detraction of this important and integral part of the British Empire from the mother country. We must admit that it is a great issue. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution told us that it was only owing to the condition of the country at the present time that he ventured to spring upon the Canadian Parliament such an important issue, and he went on to give us that doleful and lamentable picture which we have had presented to us year after year since 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were so signally defeated at the polls. He painted that picture in all its horrors and melancholy. One might almost suppose, if the picture was sketched by an artist, that after he had given it the last touch of the brush, he would sit down in solitude and melancholy and feel unhappy for the rest of his life. He gave us a picture of the condition of our country from many standpoints. It was a ruined and impoverished country. He told us our railways had cost millions of dollars, and had never paid for the money invested in them. He forgot to tell us of our highways, our concessions, our streets, for which we have paid large sums of money, but which do not pay any interest on the investment; but they are there to enable us to carry on our trade and intercourse with each other. He forgot to tell us of the great highways of nature, such as the St. Lawrence, which have been deepened in their channels, or the canals which have been dug in the earth, and which are paying no interest on the money expended. But will he tell us that any civilised country in the world could do without these conveniences of life? They do not give us any returns in dividends, but they enable us conveniently to carry on all the operations of trade and commerce like other civilised countries. He told you that the farmers, a great and important industrial class of the country, were growing poorer and poorer every year, that they are unable by their labors to supply themselves and their families with the necessities and comforts of life. He represented their farms as shrinking in value year after year, and debts growing up on their farms in the shape of mortgages which represented a large percentage of their actual value, and their wealth as decreasing owing to a reduction in their profits from the products of their farms. He declared that we were rapidly rolling up a national debt so burdensome to the people of Canada that they were unable to bear it. With regard to that, I have a return from which I find that the burden imposed upon the people in consequence of that national debt is comparatively very

light. The only burden they can feel is the interest they pay on it; and how much a head does it amount to to-day? When Mr. Mackenzie left power it amounted to \$1.58 a head, and if there was any truth in the assertion that the extravagance of this Government had run up the debt so rapidly that the people could not endure it, you would naturally expect the interest to be much greater, but it is only \$1.59 to-day. Did he tell the people that the magnificent railway system we possess, nearly 3,000 miles in length, in addition to the other railway lines subsidised all over the country, is no compensation for this one cent ahead? Did he tell them that the development which has gone on in this country from 1878 to the recent time is of no importance, and that they are paying too dearly for it at the rate of one cent a head more than they had in 1878? If the hon. gentleman were honest, he would give credit to the party which has successfully navigated the ship of State since 1878, for the greatest progress which any country has accomplished in the same time, and this, with the very least burden imposed on the people. But instead of this, the hon. gentleman asserts that everything in Canada has been falling into decay, that there has been a shrinkage in values in every line, that poverty is depicted on every countenance, and concluded by saying that there is no country in the world to-day in which the producing people receive less for what they sell and pay more for what they have to buy. He made this sweeping statement, and when we consider his position as a public man, we might be disposed to attribute to it some force, but what can be thought of that hon. gentleman's standing, what can be thought of his intelligence and of his integrity, when, on looking at the different markets of the world, we find that we are receiving for what we produce as high prices as the great people to the south of us receive for similar productions, and that we pay as little for what we buy as almost any people in the world. When we look over this country and find, in spite of the hon. gentleman's doleful picture, that the sun shines as brightly here as ever, that the day is as long, that the people have their three meals a day, that they are well clothed, healthy, happy and prosperous, when we look at them in their homes and at their gatherings and see them well dressed and buoyant in spirits, what opinion must we form of the patriotism or the intelligence of the hon. gentleman who draws these dismal pictures? We have heard from time to time, during the last ten years, the same oft-repeated story which has become stale and unpalatable, but which has been dished up to us this last few weeks in an entirely new form and dress; we have seen the picture drawn so often that we can almost imagine the people of the country addressing the hon. gentlemen opposite in the celebrated language which the poet Edgar Allen Poe addressed to his raven. These hon. gentlemen have often on previous occasions challenged us to appeal to the country. Speaking the other night, an hon. gentleman said: I challenge the Government to appeal to this country on this issue, and I can assure them that if they should accept the challenge they would not come back with the corporal's guard. This is not the first time we have heard of this corporal's guard. We heard of it in 1879, when the National Policy was adopted, and we heard of it again when the contract was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway; yet on every occasion that we have appealed to the people we have come back with a good many corporals guard. We may well imagine the people addressing the hon. gentleman opposite as I have said in the celebrated lines:

Prophet! said I, thing of evil. Prophet still, though bird or devil,
Whether tempter sent, or whether, tempest-tossed the here ashore—
Be olate yet all undaunted, on this desert land enchanted,
On this home by horror haunted, tell me truly I implore,
Is there—is there balm in Gilead, tell me—tell me, I implore.
Said the Raven: never more.

Mr. SPROULE.

Hon. gentlemen opposite said to the people of the country for ten years, "never more," but they have now come back with a remedy, and they say there is balm in Gilead. There is a remedy, and that remedy is unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. Let us see what that will lead to. We have these doleful pictures given to us by hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding the fact that when we entered Confederation we had only 2,000 miles of railway, while to-day we have 10,700 miles. Our canals have been extended, widened and deepened in every part of the country. The position of our people is a prosperous one, looked at from every standpoint. Whether looked at from the standpoint of the savings banks deposits, the deposits in the banks, the operation of loan companies, the number of farm mortgages, the comfort of the people in their homes—from whatever standpoint we look at it, you must conclude unmistakably that the condition of our people is prosperous. An hon. gentleman opposite said that the number of mortgages held by the loan society was no criterion, because a number of people in private life are taking mortgages on farms. I would ask, where the people get the money to lend, if not from the operations they have carried on during the time when the opposition said the country was going down and men were receiving no return for their labor? We find farmers to-day lending money to their brother farmers on mortgages; and we must conclude that if their agricultural operations had not been successful, they would not have been in a position to lend money. Take the deposits in the post-office savings banks, which I consider is one of the most correct barometers for ascertaining the condition of the working people. There is no reasonable man who will not come to the conclusion that the people are not in a very bad condition to-day. I have a return before me, by which I find that, in 1873, when Mr. Mackenzie came in power, the deposits in the post office savings bank amounted to \$3,000,000; in 1875 the amount was \$3,000,000; in 1876 \$2,000,000; in 1877, \$2,000,000; in 1878, \$2,000,000; but in 1879, the first year under the present Administration, the deposits reached \$3,105,000; in 1880, the amount deposited was \$3,945,000; in 1881, \$6,000,000; in 1882, \$9,000,000; in 1883, \$11,000,000; in 1884, \$13,000,000 and last year no less a sum than \$19,880,000. Now this represents the deposits from 109,383 peoples, showing that they covered a large class, and according to the post office regulations, the deposits must have come from the poorer classes because you can only deposit a small sum at a time. To-night we have a remedy proposed for this condition of the country by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have a remedy proposed for the condition of this down-trodden people. The hon. the leader of the Opposition gave us several remedies; but to finish up, he was pleased to propose what he called the climax, "unrestricted reciprocity." He said we want a distribution of the taxes equitably; we want to curtail expenditure on public works, we want a reduction on expenditure in building railways, we want a reconstruction of the civil service, and we want a revision of the constitution. I may say of the hon. gentleman that if the constitution needs revision, and if his motion should pass, the unfortunate provisional revision would not be in the direction mapped out by the provincial delegates last year or in the direction mapped out by the Hon. Mr. Mowat in Ontario, but it would be a reconstruction of the state so as to make it suit an alliance or connection with the United States, so as to cause the annexation of our country, so as to sink our national individuality, and to make us part and parcel of the United States, with such provisions as to make us work in harmony with their system of political government. He said, we are going to do away with railway monopoly, and we are going to do that by asking another country to open her arms to us and receive us—a country which has the Vanderbilt railway monopoly, and the Jay Gould railway monopoly, of which we have all

heard, and the celebrated Mr. Wiman, himself, the apostle of free trade and unrestricted reciprocity, is one of the greatest monopolists of telegraph lines on this continent to-day. This is the direction in which this resolution leads. He says it is to do away with the gigantic railway monopolies, and for that he says the true remedy is to have free trade with the United States, and that in that way the sting would be taken away from these tariff combines. It is for us to consider to-night how far that would be a panacea for our ills. I purpose to examine this question for a short time, because I think that hon. gentlemen are very unfair in their presentation of it. These hon. gentlemen have placed their policy before the country and the House. They have submitted that panacea, and they are to-day in the judgment of this House, and will be in the future in the judgment of the people of this country, because we are told that this is only a commencement, that they will fight it out at the polls, and will continue the agitation, and I tell them that, when an appeal is made to the country, they will come back with some experience, and with some such consolation and comfort as the old lady obtained from the parrot for which she paid a high price. There is a story of an old lady who lived alone and had no children and had very few comforts as far as society was concerned. She induced a little girl to come to her from the orphan's home and to live with her, and she promised her a great deal, but the discrepancy between age and youth was so great that the child did not find much comfort there, and, as an inducement, the old lady used to tell her: "Stay until I die, and I will give you all my money, and then you can buy what you want, you can be rich and pay for everything you desire, and be a great woman." She did not comfort her much in this way, and a gentleman came round selling parrots that he said were great talkers, and, though they were held at a high price, the old lady bought one of these parrots, thinking it would be a great comfort to her, and would be some company for the child. After she had bought it, she found that, like a good many parrots for which high prices had been paid, it did not talk at all; but the little girl was so lonesome when the old lady would go away that she used to say to herself: "I wish the old lady would die, it would be a good thing, and then I would get the money." She repeated this so often that the parrot got hold of it, and he would say: "I wish the old lady would die." So the old lady had not much comfort from the parrot. She was lonesome, and she appealed to her spiritual adviser, and told him: "The parrot that I have is the curse of my life; it only says two or three words, but it never says anything but bad words, and there is no comfort in that." He suggested a remedy: He said, "I have a parrot which has been with me for a long time; it does not talk very much, but, as I am a preacher, what it says are good words, and not bad words. You take this parrot and put it with your parrot, and it will teach it to talk in such a way that it will say nothing but good words." So she got the preacher's parrot. In due time the preacher came to visit her, and he said: "Well, sister, how is the parrot getting along?" "Oh," said she, "it is worse and worse. These parrots are the curse of my life. I do not know what to do with those parrots. When I come in, feeling so lonesome that I could sink into the ground, the first thing I hear is, 'I wish the old lady would die!' and then your parrot will draw a long face and say, 'Lord, answer prayer!'" I think hon. gentlemen will have about as much comfort out of the situation when they come back from the country as the old lady had from her parrot. But we may be asked, what does this unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union mean? We have had the versions of several hon. gentlemen. They have not been very definite. They have not given a very clear definition of what it is, but, if we can glean from those hon. gentlemen who have been advocating the subject so strongly what they mean by it, we will be able to find out

what is meant by unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. You will understand that I hold these to be synonymous terms, that they are convertible the one into the other, because in reality they mean the same thing. But it happens that these hon. gentlemen, finding of late that the words "commercial union" turned out to be not very palatable, have dressed them up and adopted a new name and presented the same idea in a different shape. If we ask what does it mean and take the gentlemen who have been discussing the question not only in Canada but in the United States, we may fairly be entitled to accept their views as to what it means. The Hon. Robert Hitt, who has introduced a Bill in the United States Congress, pointing in the direction at which these hon. gentlemen aim, says, speaking of the people of Canada:

"They would probably accept commercial union, with unrestricted trade, common fishing rights, coasting trade privileges, and an equalised tariff would abolish all these custom houses."

What does this include? Exactly what is included in the first motion made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the addition tacked on to it by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). What does Mr. Goldwin Smith say about this? He is another gentleman who has been enlightening the country on this subject, and he says:—

"Commercial union would, of course, involve assimilation of tariffs, which, however, since the raising of Canadian import duties, has brought the tariff more nearly to a level, would present no insurmountable difficulty."

The Hon. Mr. Longley, Attorney General of Nova Scotia, writes as follows:

"I have just had time to express a strong sense of the value and importance of a commercial union and to hie to the spirit in which the United States—from whom such a proposition must emanate—should approach it. The passing of Mr. Butterworth's proposed measure by the American Congress, will, in my judgment, be an enormous step in the accomplishment of this great object."

"Canadian Union"—that is what one of our Canadian statesmen calls it, and that is what he understands by this motion before the House. Then take Mr. Wharton-Barker, and he speaks of it as Commercial Union with Canada. He says:

"A commercial union with Canada, such as is here proposed as preferable to reciprocity, would be established on the footing of a common tariff for both countries, and the distribution of the receipts from customs on the basis of population, or on some other basis that might be thought more equitable. As the present Canadian tariff contains many duties 'for revenue only,' its assimilation to our own would be attended by some loss of revenue to Canada; and it would not be unfair to guarantee her a sum equal to her present receipts for a number of years."

Now, he speaks of it and he makes no difference between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. He is an American. We go further, and we take Vallancy E. Fuller, one of our own Canadians, who has been over Ontario in reference to this question. We find him addressing a circular to the Farmers' Institutes of Ontario, asking them to take up this question and pass resolutions in favor of it. The following is the heading of his circular:

THE CANADIAN FARMERS' DUTY,

By VALANCY E. FULLER,

President Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario.

Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the other night that 48 Farmers' Institutes has passed resolutions on the lines of the resolution that was introduced here. Then, if that be so, who will say that it does not mean commercial union? Why, the Farmers' Institutes recognise it, Mr. Fuller looked upon it, Goldwin Smith, and Mr. Shaw, of Hamilton, who is conducting a campaign in the west—all these look upon it as practically commercial union. Then, are we not entitled to consider it in the same light? I think we are. But Mr. Wiman himself speaks of it in the same light, and he called it com-

mercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. So we have it from different public men who have given utterance to sentiments on this question, that they mean the same thing and the agitation has been kept up since in our country on these lines. Take the utterances of every public man on this question, and you can come to no other conclusion than that they understand commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity to mean the same thing, and it is the same thing. Then I would like to ask one question here. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that 48 Farmers' Institutes decided in favor of this scheme. Why did they decide in favor of it? Because we had Mr. Shaw, of Hamilton, we had Vallancy E. Fuller, from Hamilton, we had the agent of these men going through the country calling the Farmers' Institutes together, and addressing them upon the subject, almost entirely on the one side, there was no discussion on the other side at all, and it was an easy matter, when these men were brought together, to get an opinion from these Institutes on the one side, when there was no discussion on the other side. It was an easy matter to get resolutions pointing in the direction which the hon. member for North Norfolk has spoken of. Now, let me ask what is unrestricted reciprocity, provided we get it? I hold that from our position as Canadians it is unreasonable to expect that we could get a fair commercial treaty with the United States to-day. Commercial Union, I believe the people of Canada do not want, but a fair commercial treaty, I believe they will be willing to make, and are prepared to accept freer trade relations with the United States any time that they can get them. But can we get them? We find that during the last 22 years every effort that has been made by Canada to extend these trade relations with the United States, has been rejected almost contemptuously. In 1869 it was rejected, and in 1874, when George Brown went to Washington, it was rejected. Our standing offer which has been on the Statute-book since 1879, has been disregarded and ignored, and every offer that has been made to induce the United States to grant an extension of these trade relations on lines which we believe would be in the interest of the people of Canada, has been systematically ignored. Now, would we be more likely to obtain it to-day? Let us see the answer which was made to the British plenipotentiaries by the representatives of the United States, and I think that is the very best argument we can produce to show that we are unlikely to get it at the present time. Here is what the United States Commissioners say:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries; the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the president authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd inst. as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action; which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing"

Now, then, it appears that this matter is to them one of perfect indifference. This is the conclusion that we must come to from reading their answer to Sir Charles Tupper's letter, and this is the conclusion they come to after careful consideration of the question, that if they proposed such a thing from their standpoint, it would be impracticable for the simple reason that it would require Congressional action, which they are inclined to think they could not get. Now, how far would England be likely to tolerate this, provided we got it? I understand there is a provision made between England and other countries, that when commercial relations with other countries are entered into she promises to give them the same advantages, the freest trade relations that they concede to the British Empire or her colonies. Now, if this is the case, and I be-

Mr. SPROULE,

lieve it is, how far would England tolerate a discrimination in tariff in favor of the United States, and against her, and against all other countries with which she was on amicable relations, and with which she had trade relations. Would it not be a distinct violation of her commercial treaties with other countries? Because if we do not let these countries trade with us upon the same terms that we let the United States trade with us, we do not give them the advantages of the most favored trade relations. Therefore, I say it would be a violation of her treaties, and if there were no other reasons, that alone would prevent her from entertaining the subject for a single moment. But what objections are there to the commercial relations provided we had them? Well, in the first place, it would destroy the revenue of our country. Now, I think that both parties are agreed that if we abolished the duty now paid by goods that we receive from the United States, the change would at one slap take away from us \$7,300,000, and if we can believe the sentiments uttered by the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, when they tell us that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our trade with the United States would increase nearly one hundred fold, I say it means nearly twice the amount. I believe that it means, at least, a falling off in our revenue of over \$15,000,000. Now, when you reduce the revenue of a country by \$15,000,000, you bring about a very serious condition of things in that country. We are yet a new country, and we must spend increasing amounts of money almost every years, because our country being new, it needs to be developed. We want railways, we want canals, we want harbors, we want public buildings, we want various things to enable our people to carry on their operations as successfully as other countries which are in the enjoyment of advanced civilised life, therefore we need an increasing amount of expenditure each year. But the United States are an old country, and their great difficulty is to know how to decrease the revenue at the present time. Then I say that if we were to rest the tariff on the principle suggested by the hon. gentleman, to say that we could throw our customs revenue into one pool, whereas we are 5,000,000 of people, and the United States are 60,000,000 we could draw out only one dollar for every twelve they drew out. They want to reduce their revenue, but we want to increase ours. Now, in order to reduce their revenue they must reduce their tariff, and we do not believe that it is the interests of the people of our country to reduce our tariff now. Therefore, provided we had this, what would be the result? We would be face to face with the very condition of things that we find in the United States to-day. We would be almost in a state of insolvency. We would be unable to raise enough money to carry on the operations in our extensive country. The Provinces are spending money as part of the Dominion of Canada to-day, and when they run short of money they can come back and say: We want an additional subsidy. We are obliged to do it because they are a part and parcel of our country. But could we go to the United States after we had entered into an arrangement for a certain time, but found in a few years that we were short of revenue, and ask them to readjust this arrangement? They would tell us, no, that it was entered into for a definite length of time, that they could not adjust it to suit our purposes, that we must take the consequence, that it suited our public men at the time, and that we must accept the result. What would be our condition then? Either we would have to get rid of the compact or would have to devise some other means of relief in the direction of raising money. Suppose we went out of the compact. Suppose we stepped out again and assumed our national independence as it exists to-day, it would bring about a financial crises in our country that would shake it from the centre to the circumference, that would be felt in every line of trade for ten years to come, and it would leave us in the condition we occupied in 1867 after

the abrogation of reciprocity, and we would have to build up our country again. Suppose we accepted the other alternative, and imposed direct taxation. We have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the burdens imposed upon the country and as to who pays the taxes, the poor men or rich men. They would require very little argument, provided that state of things was brought about that I have indicated, to satisfy poor people as to who paid the taxes. If we levied direct taxation, instead of the taxes being paid by the wealthy, in part by foreigners and only in a fractional degree by poor people, the poor people would have to bear the burdens of the country as they would find to their cost, and they would be called upon to pay the bulk of the taxation required to carry on the affairs of this great country. I say it would be most impracticable, most unreasonable to ask the people to enter into such a contract and into such relations, because we would be unable at any time to carry out the arrangement. We say further that you would have no chance to protect the interests of our people. Why? Because the tariff of the United States represents the interests of 60,000,000 of people, and they would necessarily make it suit their wants, even though it might crush our industries. Then it is suggested we might change our tariff. What right would we have to do so? It is proposed that those tariffs would be framed and agreed upon by some kind of a committee which would be composed of twelve representatives of the United States to everyone from Canada. What influence would one representative have among twelve? What chance would he have to protect the interests of this country? What could he do in regard to altering the tariff for our protection and to suit our requirements and wants, and to aid in the development of this country that is only partially developed, especially when as regards the United States the country does not need development, for it is developed to-day, but it needs reduced taxation so that less money need be raised. We would have little or no share of the work. There is another feature which must not be lost sight of. Canadian history from the earliest time to the present shows that the Reform party has sought to get Canada from under the control of the mother country. It has always been said that Downing Street has too much part in controlling this country, and even at the present time hon. gentlemen opposite are fighting for the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties. If Canada entered into a commercial treaty as is proposed, what would she be doing? She would be giving away the right, not to the mother country that is interested in our welfare and progress, but to a country whose interests are foreign to ours, whose interests are not on the same lines, but distinctly opposing lines, and that power which was taken from Downing Street and transferred to Canada would be taken away and given to the Congress of the United States. Would that be desirable as regards Canada's interests and would she be likely to prosper under it? This would be in harmony with the line marked out for constitutional government and our right to do our own business by the Reform Party from 1867 to the present time. But we may ask, provided the arrangements were carried out successfully, what interests would it affect? I have told this House that I believe it would be disastrous to our country, that it would give away our right to control our own affairs to foreigners, that it would prevent our being able either to raise or reduce the tariff, and it would injure the country and its various interests. I will go further. What would be those interests injured? I believe it would injure every class. It would injure the commercial class, because it would transfer our wholesale houses at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Hamilton and London to New York, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those would be the commercial centres built up at the expense of Toronto and our own cities. Then we would

have American commercial drummers passing over this country pressing upon the retail trade the superiority of their goods, and, no doubt, they would sell large quantities as they did before 1879. We find that our commerce was virtually taken away from us. Again, it would prove disastrous to our railways, because, as the mover of the resolution stated, our lines of trade would be directed into natural channels, and they would not be run east and west but north and south. In other words, our trade would pass right across the border. The hon. gentleman has complained that the railways were furnishing no revenue for the money invested in them. I would like to ask him if the present policy is not much more favorable to the railway companies than a policy would be which would carry the trade across the lines and not among them. It would prove one of the most destructive elements in regard to our Canadian railway system ever introduced into the Canadian Parliament. It would destroy our commercial life. I believe it would also destroy our shipping interest. It would certainly entirely destroy our manufacturers. But our manufacturers could compete against the United States with its advanced intelligence, with its attainments in all manufacturing departments, with the vast capital, with the improved machinery and the cheapness with which they can turn out products, that our manufactures, which are comparatively in an embryonic state, could withstand such competition, is something that no reasonable or rational man would believe. I am satisfied that if this policy were carried into effect it would prove most disastrous to the manufactures of our country, and would either cause the transfer of our capital and our labor across the lines or it would kill them out in a short time. Our manufactures and trade would pass from us, and the result would be that our money would follow, and if our money followed that must mean the impairment of the country. There is another phase of the question which leads me to believe that the policy proposed would be a very disastrous one to Canada. In whatever line you take it if you allow the people to assemble together and associate together in trade relations the money will follow, on the principle that the greater attracts the less, and sixty millions must absorb five millions. Our social institutions would be imbued with their manners and customs, and the result would be a complete absorption of or extinction of our national existence, and we would imperceptibly fall right into what many people on the other side desire, and I am sorry to say a great many desire here, annexation, and our country would be virtually destroyed. Let me go further, and ask what other interests would be injured by it? Perhaps the most important at the present time that would be injured by commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity would be the agricultural interests of this country. The tone of all the arguments which have been addressed from the Opposition side, I think, without exception, was that this would be a great panacea for the farmers of our country, and that it would be a great advantage to the farmers of the country. I would like to ask them why? I would like to ask them how is it that it happens to be so? If the American people were all manufacturers and not farmers, then I could understand that it would be a great value to the farmers of our country to get their market, but the American people have a variety of climates stretching from north to south, and a varied country from east to west, with all kinds of soil and with all kinds of climate so as to enable them to raise every line in which our farmers are interested or engaged in here, and indeed to raise very many that we do not raise at all. I see in their vast wheat growing areas of the Western States, with their southern climate, their northern climate and with the climate found in the middle of the country, that they raise very largely and very extensively every line of produce raised by the farmers of our country here. If we look at

their Trade and Navigation Returns we can see what shape in this principle would affect the farmers of our country. I see that the policy would expose them to competition in the various industries in which they are now engaged. The United States to-day are engaged in the same line of produce and they are exporting the same articles that our farmers export. The American farmers raises somewhere about \$2,500,000,000 in round numbers worth of agricultural products. He consumes out of that a portion at home and he exports \$550,000,000 in round numbers. In that respect he becomes a competitor with our farmers. Our position is about this: We raise about \$400,000,000 worth of agricultural products. There is about \$330,000,000 worth consumed in the country, and we must find markets for about \$42,000,000 worth in foreign countries. The American has to find a market for \$550,000,000 worth, and is it reasonable to say that the United States, if we had commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, would not send a large share of that stuff over here into Canada? In some parts of the country they have an early season and, consequently, their grain comes in earlier. Close to our borders they raise some lines cheaper than we do in Canada, and everyone of those lines would come into direct competition with the farmers of our country. The hon. gentleman for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in speaking on this question the other night said that we would open up a market of 60,000,000 people to the people of Canada. But he might as well have told us that we were not only opening up a market for 60,000,000 but we were entering into trade relations with a people and giving them the privilege of throwing into our country \$550,000,000 worth of agricultural products in the year if they can find a market for it here. To tell me or to tell any farmer in this country that that will not displace the market for a very large amount of agricultural products is something I do not think any farmer will believe. Before we had our protective tariff we found the oats coming in at Georgian Bay from the Western States and being sold there. In one day the price of oats was reduced 20 cents a bushel on account of western oats coming into the market from the States. We found that the lumbermen were bringing all their pork from Chicago because they got it cheaper; it was this corn fed pork raised cheaply and our farmers were unable to sell them pork. We found that corn was coming in and taking the place of grain and oats for the purpose of feeding cattle and horses. Every one of those lines came in direct competition with the farmers of this country. I hold that whatever trade relations we have with the United States, it would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmers to take off the duty which we have on those commodities I have referred to. So sure as it is taken off, so sure will we find the same condition of things cropping up very soon as we had before. I pointed out that while the American farmer has to find a market for that \$550,000,000 worth of products he would throw a large share of it into our country and when the people of the United States supplied our own people we would have to find a market four thousand miles away, and the cost of transportation over that four thousand miles would come out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in speaking on this question endeavored to build up an argument that seemed to me to have at least the advantage of originality. That hon. gentleman has had an experience in educating the people of this country as to his views upon tariffs. In 1876, I understand he was a protectionist, in 1878, he was a free trader and since that he has been a revenue tariff man or a free trader I do not know which. During the years of 1878 and 1879 when the present protective tariff was put on, and for the last ten years he has endeavored to educate the people of this country in the belief that the consumer always pays the duty. He has

Mr. SPROULE.

advanced various kinds of arguments for that purpose, and he turns around now and tries to prove to the Canadian farmer that not the consumer but the producer pays the duty. Because it happens to suit his purpose he turns around and preaches all over the country that the Canadian farmer loses an amount equal to the duty on all our stuff which goes to that country, and, therefore, that our farmers are at a disadvantage, and that it is a hardship to them because they pay 15 cents on every barrel that goes to that country. He says the amount sent from our country to the States is so small that it cannot affect the market of that country, and he was telling the poor people of this country that by virtue of the National Policy they were obliged to pay more for every line they used because they had to pay the tariff. He forgot that he was building up an argument against his own logic. He says in one case that the producer pays the duty, but on the other side, he says that the poor man in this country pays the duty also on what he consumes. Is there any force in his argument? I contend there is not. The hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) endeavored to give as his argument that the Canadian farmer was a very large exporter and whereas he raised the goods in this country and he was obliged to find a market for them he was obliged to pay the duty, and that therefore it was in the interest of the farmers that we should have this commercial union. He went on to show that we exported from Canada last year 18,225 horses and that those horses were valued at \$2,214,338. He was correct in this, so far as the Trade and Navigation Returns go, but when I asked that gentleman a fair question he very indignantly refused either to answer it or to give a reply at all. The taunt came back of ignorance. Although he intended as he said in the outset to debate this question upon high toned principles the retort came back of ignorance. Last year we exported as I said before to the United States 18,225 horses; of which the value was \$2,214,338. But did the farmer, he asks, get that amount of money? No, he said the farmer had to pay \$442,000 in duties. I asked him how he got at the amount of the duty which he told the Canadian farmer he had to pay; was it by taking the value of these horses as given by the Trade and Navigation Returns, and multiplying that by twenty, because the duty is 20 per cent? He did not deign to give me a reply. It did not serve his purpose to enlighten the farmers of this country on this question. Now, I will show the House and the country wherein his argument was unfair and misleading. I have here the trade returns of the United States, and I find that the Americans imported last year 38,000 horses, whereas we exported 18,000. They valued those 38,000 horses at \$2,450,000, while according to the hon. gentleman's estimate ours were valued at \$2,214,000, that is over twice the number of horses are valued at about the same amount. Therefore the value on which the duty should be computed should be less than half of what the hon. gentleman stated. The United States returns show that instead of \$442,000 being paid upon them there was just \$245,075 paid. This shows how unfair a presentation of the case to the Canadian farmer the hon. gentleman gave. It would lead him to believe that this \$442,000 was taken out of his pocket, when in reality, if there was any correctness in the argument advanced for the last nine years by the hon. member for North Norfolk and his friends, it was not the seller of the horses who paid the duty, but the party who got them in the United States. Upon what value was that duty imposed? We only value the horses when they are going over the lines, so as to ascertain the amount of our exports. The Americans who collect the duty put their own value on them. A large number of horses are taken into the United States for the improvement of their stock, and there is no duty on them. But instead of valuing those horses at \$2,214,000, he should

value them at a little over \$1,000,000. Did the Canadian farmer get that money? the hon. member asks: and he answers, No, the duty was taken off the \$2,214,000, and he got the balance. Now, one of two things the hon. gentleman must admit, either his deliberate intention to mislead the farmers of Canada or his ignorance. If he intended to mislead the Canadian farmer, he ought to be ashamed of himself. If he was honest in his calculation, then I say he ought to be ashamed of it. That is his dilemma, and he can take whichever horn he chooses. It is not much to the credit of the hon. gentleman, who was so very imperative in forcing his views on the people of this country. I say that this measure would injure the Canadian farmers very much. I need not discuss its effect on the cattle, sheep or other products of the country which we export, because I find that he made the same mistake with regard to them that he did with regard to horses. Therefore, that argument was most fallacious and unfair, and should not have been used. The Canadian farmer received the market value of his horses in this country, where they were bought by buyers. Hon. members will remember that a short time ago England sent men to this country to buy horses. They only picked up a few, because they said the market price was so high here that it would not pay to buy them. But those they did buy they bought at the Canadian price, and when they took them to the United States, they got them in as best they could, whether at a reduced value or free of duty, it made no difference to the Canadian farmer. If the Americans have to pay more for the horses which are taken into the United States from Canada, because of the duty, it makes no difference to the Canadian farmer. If the American comes into Canada and buys an article he pays the market price here. In the same way, if we go to the United States to buy anything we have to buy at their price, and when we come to the border line we must pay the duty, which may enhance the value of that article here. This measure would also bring the Canadian farmer into direct competition with the American farmer in his oats, his peas, his barley, his wheat, his Indian corn, his hay, his roots, and almost everything else he raises. It would do more than this; it would bring him into direct competition with the American farmer in one of the most important lines in the country, namely, the dairy interest. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns last year we exported to England no less than 73,604,000 lbs. of cheese, which represented a value of \$7,108,000. How would commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity affect the Canadian farmer in that line? I will show you how. I have here a clipping from a newspaper in reference to an enquiry made on this subject in London:—

“LONDON, March 20.—It was announced in the House of Commons to-night that the Colonial Office is about to enquire of Canada whether the alleged adulteration of imported American cheese also relates to the Canadian product, especially as regard the practice of using animal fat in making cheese.”

The adulteration of American cheese has so lowered its price in the market that it would be unfortunate if our cheese were sent to England through the same channel and should be known as American cheese; and if we have unrestricted reciprocity, that must be the result. While we exported that large quantity last year, we find that the American cheese producer, with his far-sightedness shipped his cheese to Brockville, Gananoque, Kingston and Montreal in order to have it sent to the English market as Canadian cheese. That is being done every day at the present time. Over 5,000,000 lbs. of this cheese was brought into Canada during the last year, and shipped to Europe from here, so as to create the impression in England that it was Canadian cheese. This cheese is adulterated with lard, cotton seed oil and various ingredients that depreciate its value. I say it will be incumbent on our Gov-

ernment to do, as they have shown they are always anxious to do, whenever the interests of any great class of the people is concerned, to devise some means, by which the English purchaser may discriminate between Canadian and American cheese. I would suggest that the Canadian Government should label every box of cheese that comes from the United States as United States cheese, and our own as Canadian cheese, so that there would be no possibility of mistake. Had we unrestricted reciprocity, the depreciation in the value of American cheese would be a great drawback, as it would destroy the standing of Canadian cheese in the home market. The same principle would apply to American butter, which would be shipped to foreign countries as Canadian butter, and thus destroy the reputation of our article in the market. People do not know often how to discriminate between the oleomargarine, butterine and other various compounds and our own butter, and often put the two on the same level. Seeing the importance of this subject, I may refer to a discussion that we had only two years ago in this House on the question of oleomargarine, and I may be pardoned if I read a short statement made by Mr. Reall at a meeting of the National Dairy and Agricultural Convention held in New York on the 16th February, 1886, relative to this butter question;

“For ten years the manufacture of artificial butter has been growing until dairymen everywhere find their vocations almost ruined. The 18,000,000 milch cows in the country have depreciated \$10 per head, and the land on which they are kept, something over 75,000,000 acres, worth nominally \$50 an acre, has declined 25 per cent. These reductions represent a loss of \$1,000,000,000. This is not brought about through honest and fair competition, but in consequence of the most outrageous and glaring fraud that can be practiced, for the substitute is not sold to the consumer for what it is, but as butter. The people of New York city alone are paying not less than \$10,000,000 for the stuff they suppose to be butter, and which brings to the manufacturer one-half profit. Some 700 grocers of the city have refused to deal in the article.”

If the manufacture of this spurious article means that large reduction to the American farmers, it must mean a proportionately large reduction to the Canadian farmers. He says further:

“Boston, New York, New Haven, Cleveland, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Louisville and St. Louis have large bogus butter factories, while Chicago manufactures more bogus butter than all the other cities together.”

Speaking in Prince Edward county a short time ago, the candidate supporting the hon. gentleman who represents the Opposition said the Opposition were entitled to credit because the hon. member for Brant introduced a resolution for prohibiting the importation of these spurious articles into the country. But if the policy advocated by the Opposition, of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, should be adopted, what advantage could we derive from this prohibitory resolution? What benefit would the Canadian farmers derive from the prohibitive duty of 10 cents a lb. and the inland revenue duty of 8 cents a lb. imposed on these articles to-day, if we had commercial union? All restriction would be broken down entirely, and the country would be flooded with all this stuff which the Americans chose to send us. The Americans manufacture 260,000,000 lbs. a year, a very large amount of which would come in here to take the place of Canadian butter and thus reduce the reputation of the latter in the foreign markets. What will the farmer think of these same men who took so much credit for having that policy of restriction imposed on these spurious compounds, but who now want that restriction removed. They remind me of the cow, which, after giving a pail of milk, kicked the pail over and spilled it all. I believe the Canadian farmers are sufficiently intelligent to see what would be the result to him were this restriction abolished. Were we to do away with it, what would there be to prevent the American farmer from sending to this country this very large amount of spurious butter? In what other line would this policy bring

about competition with our Canadian farmer. Hon. gentlemen will remember the interest created by the announcement, a few years ago, that Sir Charles Tupper had succeeded in having Canadian cattle taken off the schedule when imported into Great Britain. Our Canadian farmers had been building up a very large and important export trade to Great Britain. It was our best and largest market. The Americans were also competing with us, and, unfortunately for them, a contagious disease, known as pleuro pneumonia, had sprung up among their cattle and destroyed their trade in England, because the English Government refused to allow American cattle to be imported alive and transported through the country for fear of transmission of the disease. The result was the cattle were scheduled, and through the influence of the English farmers, Canadian cattle were also scheduled and excluded from the English market. Had that policy been persisted in, it would have meant destruction to the cattle business of this country, but to the credit of Sir Charles Tupper, be it said, he succeeded by his indefatigable energy and great ability in getting that order rescinded, and the Canadian cattle were taken off the schedule. Supposing we had reciprocity unrestricted, how long would we occupy, as regards our cattle, the superior position we hold as compared with the Americans? In a short time we would stand in the same position as the American farmer. Our cattle would be scheduled and our cattle raisers ruined. These are a few of the important lines in which the Canadian farmer is largely interested. In every one of these lines we are brought into direct competition with the American farmers, and they are brought into direct competition with us. Before sitting down I would like to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for King. The hon. member for Annapolis last night, in what I think the House recognised as a fair explanation of the condition of the farmers in the fertile valley of Annapolis, read the reports of agricultural committees. At the time he gave these reports, he reminded the House that the gentlemen who composed those agricultural societies represented both sides of politics, that there were a large number of Reformers as well as Conservatives in those societies. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), in endeavoring to minimise the force of this argument said that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) had read long reports from those agricultural societies, but that it was nothing but apples, that it seemed to be composed of apples from first to last. Surely the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that the member for Annapolis spoke not only of apples but of cattle, potatoes, oats, hay, and almost every line representing the agricultural interests of that productive valley, and that he read not only the report of one agricultural society but of a large number of them, and that he had in his hand and spoke of no less than ninety-two of them from the Province of Nova Scotia. Was not that likely to be an index to the condition of the agriculturists of that Province? He read those reports fairly, he gave very valuable information to the House, information which would prove to the members of this House and to the country that, notwithstanding all that has been said of her unfortunate condition, the Province of Nova Scotia is in a healthy condition and her people are peaceful and prosperous. The hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Borden) said that some one in his part of the country had purchased a farm in 1866, the year after the abolition of the old Reciprocity Treaty, for \$15,000, and had sold it to the hon. member for only \$2,000 a short time ago. If that hon. gentleman had been fair, and had drawn the proper deduction from this, he would have told the House, and through the House would have told the country, that the value of farms at that time was largely enhanced, owing to the important market we had at that time in the United States. Some hon. gentleman will say that was by virtue of the Reciprocity Treaty.

Mr. SPROULE.

No, it was just after the Reciprocity Treaty had expired, but it was just at a time when everything we had to spare was bought up by the United States, it was at a time when 3,000,000 of the people of that country were taken away from their ordinary pursuits, from agriculture and from manufactures, and from other lines of business, and everything that we could sell brought a high figure in that market. I was living in the United States at that time, and I know that we have had to pay for pork 20 cents a pound, for beef 15 cents a pound, for a suit of clothes \$85, for a pair of pants \$25, for a pair of boots \$15. That was in 1865, the last year of the American war, and all over the Province of Ontario we had not only Americans, but Canadians, buying up our sheep in thousands, to put on the prairies in the west in order to re-establish their agricultural industries after the disastrous effects of their very long and disastrous war. We had the sheep, and the pork, and the grain, and the coal of our country bought up at fabulous prices and taken over there, not as the result of the Reciprocity Treaty or of the negotiations of 1854, but as the result of the destruction of the agricultural pursuits of the people of the United States on account of that great civil war which lasted from 1862 to 1865. Everyone of those hon. gentlemen has called attention to the very glorious times which existed in this country from 1854 to 1866, during the time that the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation, but they never tell the people that we had the Russian war in 1855, the very year after the treaty was accomplished, and that, on account of that, the Canadian farmers' wheat sold for \$2 50 a bushel. I remember selling 200 bushels of wheat in 1855 for \$2 50 a bushel. That brought nearly three times the amount it would to-day, and yet hon. gentlemen compare those times with times of to-day, when the American is only able to sell his wheat for 75 cents a bushel. I remember when a pair of cattle were sold for \$175, and beef was proportionately high, and everything that went to foreign countries that would bear long transport was sold for equally high prices. After the Russian war had passed over, we had the building of the Intercolonial Railway, the Northern Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway. These great works were going on and large amounts of money were brought to the country; and afterwards, when times got harder, we had the great disastrous civil war which commenced in 1862, and we felt the beneficial effects in this country, as far as the enhanced value of farm products were concerned, up to 1869 and 1870, and therefore we had good times, the farmers enjoyed good times; but, while those were partially, but only to a small degree, attributable to the Reciprocity Treaty, they were largely due to the fact that so many of the agriculturists of the United States were taken away from their peaceful pursuits in order to defend their country, and our Canadian farmers had to fill the place. Therefore it is unfair to say that, if you give commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, you would bring back the glorious times we enjoyed during those years. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, I believe it would be a disastrous blow to the farmers of this country. I believe it would kill out the manufactures of this country, I believe it would destroy the commerce of this country. We have in this Dominion a territory of more than 3,500,000 square miles. We are expecting to go on and develop that country, we have the resources which nature has given us to supply the wants of our people. We have not only the resources on the top of the ground in the shape of timber, but we have the resources below the ground in the shape of minerals. We have the fish in the ocean and in the lakes. We have the minerals in the ground, and we have manufactures springing up and giving employment to the people of our country. We have those vast and fertile fields of the west raising vast quantities of wheat every year. As they grow older, they will supply us with the wheat which we require, and we will supply them with the

manufactured goods which they need. We will keep our people at home and we will keep our money at home, and the people here and in the eastern Provinces, when they cannot buy a farm in this portion of the country for the amount of money which they can command, will go out to that western country and get their farms for nothing. I heard a gentleman say that the farms have depreciated in value, and he gave the reason, that we had not unrestricted reciprocity. Those gentlemen forget to tell you that we have added that vast area to this country within a few years Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia, and that our farmers have been going in large numbers into that western country. Are we any worse off in that respect than the American farmers, if you take the return which they get for their labor? The apostle of commercial union, himself, Mr. Erastus Wiman, states that the price of a barrel of flour in New York is from \$2.65 to \$3.50. In what part of Canada do you find any such price? If the American can only get from \$2.65 to \$3.50 for his flour, and it is selling in my part of the country, where they raise flour, for \$4.10, and has been all the winter, is it likely that the American will not throw that into Canada and get the enhanced price paid for it here? But is the Canadian farmer in the east any worse off than the American farmer in the east? We hear hon. gentlemen in this House talking about the population growing less in Ontario, less in New Brunswick, less in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, less in Quebec, and they say it is because the people are driven out of this country owing to the high tariff. Now, I have here a clipping from the Boston *Provincialist*, which tells us that the very same condition of things is going in the Eastern States of the Union. It says:

"What advantages are there in the New England States—over Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island? We see the statement made, that the young people leave their provincial homes by the score to seek employment in 'the States.' But to these young people 'the States' mean a very few centres of business, and outside of these centres there are as many deserted farms and tenantless houses, and as great a dearth of young people, in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and other New England States as can be found in the Maritime Provinces, in proportion to the population. Take Massachusetts even—the Mecca for most provincials—and two evils are met by all—intensely close competition, in the cities, and 'no business' in the country. The exceptions to this are about the same in the two countries under comparison. Let any who doubt this take a trip to Cape Cod, or down New Bedford way, or through the central and western counties of the State. Who has not read of Fairhaven and Nantucket, the once greatest whaling ports in the world? but now almost unknown. And wise people say that Gloucester and Provincetown and other such places are going the same way. There are thousands of deserted farms in New England to-day—the owners having moved to Boston or other large cities."

Now, I say, that proves that the very same condition of things that is to be found in our country to-day, is found in the Eastern States. The people are going westward. It is said, that "westward the course of Empire takes its way." A great many young people take Horace Greely's advice and go west, where they can make homes for themselves, and start anew in the operations of life, with all the energies of young people, with all the prospects of a long future before them that their fathers enjoyed when they were young. Then, I say that Canada is in no worse position than the United States. We find that the same operations are going in both countries, and a fair comparison of the condition of the farmers in both lands will unmistakably show that our Canadian farmers, man for man, are better off to-day than the American farmers. Remembering this, I come to the conclusion that this resolution would result in great disaster to the people of Canada, to the great agricultural class of this country, and remembering this, I can only tell the hon. gentleman opposite, that I am not only disposed to vote against his resolution, but I am disposed to fight it inch by inch, in every part of the country, wherever I may be brought face to face with the people. I can tell him that when both sides of this question are

before the farmers of this country, it will not take long to show on which side the great majority rests, and these hon. gentlemen will be as unfortunate when they appeal to the people again on the strength of this resolution as they were in 1878, as they were in 1882, and as they were again in 1887. They will not only find themselves, as they are to-day, leaderless in this House, with scarcely more than a corporal's guard to support them, but they will find their party entirely snuffed out of existence, and we will have but one party in this country, the Liberal Conservative party, the party which has always shown a commendable desire to work for the good of the people. That party has always been ready to come to the defence of the farmer. When combines are alleged to exist, a committee is appointed to ascertain whether the allegations respecting them are true, and if so, that party provides legislation to choke them off. And as long as we keep up that barrier line, we keep those combines at bay, and when they come within our territory we can control them by law. We do not want any great monopolies here, we want no Vanderbilt monopoly, we want no Jay Gould monopoly, in our country; but when a monopoly does come here, we can legislate to take away its injurious effects. I do not care what class of the country requires attention, whether it is the farmer, or the miner, or the shipowner, or the fisherman; as soon as there is a want apparent, the Liberal Conservative party are ever ready to come to the defence of the people of the country and provide legislation that will do them good. Remembering this, I am prepared to oppose this resolution, and to support the National Policy, that has done so much for every class in the country but more especially for the agricultural class, who are in truth the backbone of this country.

Gen. LAURIE. I feel that it would not be right for me to give a vote on this question without laying my views before the House. During the first 15 years that I lived in this country I was a free trader, but I found reason to change my views. After having seen what was going on in our own country, and especially after visiting the great Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, I came to the conclusion that it was to protection that the United States owed the progress they had made, and that if we were to make similar progress, under the conditions that surrounded us, we must copy their example and introduce a National Policy. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has pointed out that the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, in 1877 and 1878, was ready to go any length for reciprocity. I think he stated that the right hon. gentleman was ready to go any length for a reciprocity of trade or a reciprocity of tariff. But we have also been told by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that the utterances of our public men in the discussions of the National Policy in this House, and afterwards in the country, caused much irritation in the United States, and did more than even the National Policy itself to embitter public sentiment in the United States, and the minds of leading statesmen in Congress, against the people of this country. If that is the case, and if the statement of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) is true, then it is clear that it was not the utterances of the right hon. gentleman and his party that embittered our friends across the border against us, but the utterances of hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, such as I read for the information of the House. We thereby learn what the utterances must have been if the view of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) be correct, that the utterances embittered our neighbors across the border. But what do we find in the discussion on the National Policy? I read this:

"No person will assert it is proper to project industries that are not naturally adapted to the country, but when they are suited to the land it is the duty of the Government to foster them. Arts and manufactures do not spring up on a virgin soil. In the first place, trade has a tendency

to remain in beaten tracks. Then the advantage is on the side of a nation in which manufactures are established, because money is more easily obtained there than in a new country. I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer being brought to the door of the farmer would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops."

That came from the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); it did not come from any hon. member supporting the Government. If that is not enough what have we here?

"The American Government, always alive to the interests of their people and all that relates to the prosperity of their country, have recently passed a Treasury order, increasing very considerably the drawback on white refined sugar, the result of which, I learn, has been that the great bulk of that quality now used in Canada comes from that quarter, and their manufacture is entirely abandoned at Montreal, where formerly large quantities were made; hence it follows that if our trade with the West Indies is to be encouraged or sustained, such exceptional legislation as I have referred to must be met by corresponding legislation on our part."

He goes on to say—and this has a bearing on the present case:

"Such a system could not continue very long, for in a short time, when the Americans found that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and that it would be seen how disastrous the present (Grit) policy was."

By whom were these sentiments uttered? They were uttered by the very hon. gentleman who from his place in this House a few nights ago assured this House that the discussion of the National Policy embittered the Americans against us and did more to interfere with our obtaining reciprocity than even the National Policy itself. If that be the case, then I say it was hardly fair for that hon. gentleman to throw that as a charge against us and assume that the supporters of the Government were to blame, that it was the National Policy party who were to blame, when the very sentiments he himself enunciated were the sentiments that did the most to embitter our friends across the border against us. But our friends on the Opposition benches in the course of their arguments have dwelt at length on the great prosperity of the United States. They have shown that the United States, not so favorably situated agriculturally, commercially or minerally with ourselves, is very prosperous and we in Canada are suffering from depression; although it is evident from the evidence that they have adduced that they have not shown that we have superior natural advantages to what the United States enjoy. Have not those hon. gentlemen proved a little too much? Have they not proved that in this case, if our neighbors across the border, with natural advantages, have prospered more than we have, there must be a cause for it. What is that cause? We, who have supported the National Policy, have maintained that it is protection to manufacturers, that that was the cause of the great prosperity in the United States, and that we are proceeding to follow that example. Let the hon. gentlemen say what they like. I have heard it stated this evening from the Opposition benches that if the National Policy has not already developed our manufactures into such a complete state as to enable them to compete with the manufacturers of the United States, then it was a failure. It was hardly fair to assume that our manufacturers can be developed in ten years and placed in as perfect a condition as the manufactures of a country that have been fostered during seventy or eighty years. I say that our friends on the Opposition benches have proved too much. Then, what is the object of the resolution placed before the House? There must be a definite object in it. Is it to increase our exports or our importations? If it is to increase our imports, that is a question we will consider presently. If it is to increase our exports, on what description is the increase proposed to be made? I hold in my hand the tariff

Gen. LAURIE.

submitted by the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the Fiftieth Congress, and what do I find? Let me here say that while it must be acknowledged that raw materials are the main product we can export profitably, I find in the new tariff submitted to Congress and which may very possibly be passed this session, or if not this session it will be ready to be brought forward immediately after the Presidential election that nearly every material in which the vast mass of our people are interested as exporters is to be removed from the list of articles subject to duty and is to be placed on the free list. Surely, then, if the United States Congress are prepared to meet us in that way, if the Government of the United States, represented by that legislative body, are prepared to deal with us in this way, is it wise for us at present to go into these details, and describe how this country is suffering? What did the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) say the other evening? Did he not say that it was unwise for us to discuss the matters relating to the fishery negotiations, and I take it that what applies to the Fisheries Treaty would apply equally to the subject now before the House. The hon. gentleman said that our neighbors at Washington would watch the discussion, and he was unwilling that any language should be spoken that might be used against us in regard to that question. Practical negotiations must follow any proposition made by us for reciprocity. Certainly hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have used much language that may be fairly used against us in any negotiation on which we might enter. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have assured the country that the Dominion cannot go on any longer in its present position.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Gen. LAURIE. While the hon. gentleman takes that view, the large body of the House take the opposite view, and we are prepared to justify that view. We do not merely state it, but we hold to it and we give our reasons. We are told it would be proper for us not to seek to promote inter-provincial trade for the interchange of the products of each part of the country, but that we should look to the natural market to the south of us, and that that was the object of the reciprocal arrangement. In regard to the natural market I do not hesitate to say that the natural market is thoroughly fallacious. I am not prepared to recognise that those markets are in any sense natural markets to us for those markets were artificially created. We have heard from the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Borden) of the great value and the large amount of produce that could under favorable circumstances be exported to New England. We have heard of the large market there and the very large amount of goods that the people of the United States were ready to purchase. But why are they ready to purchase that and what has put them in a position to do so? Is not that country able to raise products for its own ordinary consumption? Undoubtedly I claim it is. But protection has artificially created large cities and large centres of population. Those in no sense are natural markets; they are artificial markets created under a system that we desire to adopt and which we desire in our own way to promote our own market. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) stated that the British market being far away from us was of little value and that the West India market had practically become valueless. On this question, other members from the Maritime Provinces and myself, I am happy to say, are prepared to join issue, and at the same time he assumes that the only market left to us is the market to the south because the United States are nearest at hand. I claim, Sir, if a market near at hand is the only market desirable for us that it will be better still to carry out the view of the promoters of the National Policy, and, under the same system as our American neighbors, increase our own home market.

It the argument of the hon. the member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) is good for anything that the nearer a market is to us the better for us, then I say to him the home market that we have at hand is better still and therefore out of his own mouth and by his own argument I desire to prove my case. I will deal with the remarks he made and I will dispose of them. Another point that he raised was when he said: "It was hardly fair to consider that sugar sent from the Maritime Provinces to other Provinces was a product of the country." In one sense, Sir, it is not a product. He disputed the fact whether that raw material being imported, the manufactured article produced from that raw material is a product of the country. There again, Sir, I join issue with him. The article that we have by labor changed from an article of small value to an article of much higher value, to my mind, is a product of the country, as our mechanics and laborers have reaped advantage thereby and as money has gone into the hands of the people of the country. It is a product which we have handled and passed out to other markets, and in that sense it is a product of the country. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, in their desire for unrestricted reciprocity, speak as free traders, but as a matter of fact the apostle of this commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, whichever it may be called, or whether it be both, distinctly tells us that he supports it because it is protection in a marked and more extreme form and likely to make protection more permanent than ever, even as it is at present. At present, Sir, we have a committee investigating combines and if this be the case, is not this the most gigantic combine that has been proposed? We are asked that the two nations should combine to hold all the consumers of those two nations in the hands of the manufacturers, and for this purpose I assume that Canada is a nation. Comparing the prospects of countries which are following out the free trade policy, we find that the exports from Great Britain have diminished largely the world over. I find that in ten years the export from England to Germany have decreased £10,000,000 sterling; the exports from England to Holland have diminished from £16,000,000 to £9,000,000; the exports from England to the United States from £33,000,000 to £27,000,000, and the exports to Belgium from £7,000,000 to £6,000,000, and yet, Sir, we are told that a free trade country is better for the manufacturer than a protected one. That hardly appears to be the case, and those figures are from Mr. Giffen, who is, above all things, an apostle of free trade. The English manufacturers lately raised their hands in astonishment when a large contract for locomotives, by one of the large railway companies of England, was given to a firm in Belgium, where strict protection and a very high tariff is granted to the manufacturers, and highly protected Belgium was able to compete with free trade England in free trade England itself. This shows, Sir, that protection there has developed manufactures and enabled manufacturers to manufacture cheaply when they once got fairly started and under way. Again the great argument which has been used is that the farmers are suffering, and that the farmers will suffer under the protective system. I hold in my hand, Sir, a paper elaborated by Sir James Hare who is a strong apostle of free trade in England. He has considered this question, and has examined the reports in the United States and he has come to the conclusion that value in agriculture is enhanced by increase of a non agricultural population. As shown by a table prepared in the agricultural department it appears that the States in the Union were divided into four classes. The first had a population of only 18 per cent. engaged in agriculture, the second with 42 per cent., the third with 58 per cent., and the fourth with 77 per cent. In those States that had 18 per cent. only employed in agriculture the value of the land was £7 14s. an acre, and the wages of the agricultural laborer was £5 a month. In the second

class, where 42 per cent. were employed in agriculture, we find that the value of the land diminishes by £1 10s. an acre, and that the monthly wages have also diminished. In the third class we find that 58 per cent. of the population are employed in agriculture, the land is only £2 14s. an acre and the wages of the agricultural laborer £3 10s. a month. In the fourth class, where 77 per cent. are employed in agriculture, we find the land but worth £1 sterling an acre and wages of the agricultural laborer £2 10s. a month, just half what it is in the district where only 18 per cent. of the population are employed in agriculture. This shows, Sir, if proof goes for anything, and by the evidence of the United States returns, that the less of the population employed in agriculture the greater the value of the agricultural land and the greater the returns to the agricultural laborer. But, Sir, we are told that if we adopt commercial reciprocity with the United States, we shall prosper. Now, Sir, what are the views of the statesmen of the United States? I will read an extract from a letter addressed by Mr. Frelinghuysen, the secretary of the late Republican Government, to Senator Miller, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in which he says:

"Any increase of our trade with foreign countries commensurate with our industrial development and requirements can only come through our commercial relations with countries inferior to us in wealth and population."

Now, Sir, that is the position of the republican statesmen of the United States, and I think it will be found that the Democratic party take the same view. They say that reciprocity with nations equally developed with themselves would be no reciprocity whatever. They want to establish reciprocity, if they establish it at all, with such nations as will sell them their raw material, and in return take their manufactures. He sums up his argument by saying:

"It follows that the superior nation which aids in such development can monopolise the greater portion of the import trade of each and all."

That is the position the United States would take if we adopted such an arrangement as that proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford. I had a little personal experience of this very thing two years ago. Duty took me to the south of Europe. I there found a young and struggling nation with vast natural resources—Serbia. Serbia is held in subjection to Austria-Hungary, and is bound under treaty to send her raw material to that country; but she is not permitted to send her manufactures there. Theoretically she is permitted, but practically the superior advantages held by the more advanced country ensure that Serbia with its great natural resources shall only send its raw material into Austria-Hungary, and any attempt on its part to send manufactures is at once crushed out. I saw the discontent and hopelessness in which the people of Serbia lived, and I must say that if any argument were necessary to prove to me that the proposition held out to us should not be adopted by this House, it would be the case of Serbia, which has tried the same system and failed. I should be very sorry to see Canada placed in the condition of that country, and therefore I shall do my utmost to oppose the proposition made by the hon. gentleman. Our attention has been called to the great exodus that has gone from this country. I heard the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., say that Prince Edward Island was almost depopulated. I can almost say that there is also a great exodus from the Province from which I come—a very great exodus.

Mr. KIRK. Hear, hear.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." If that hon. gentleman were an employer of labor, I do not think he would say "hear hear." I am an employer of labor, and it is almost impossible for us to get the labor we require. Therefore the people do not leave because they cannot get work. There was a time when work was not plenty in this country, and when men had to go to the

United States to get work. They then established relations in that country, and now having relations there and wishing not unnaturally to see the world, they go, and the result is that it is almost impossible to obtain the necessary supply of labor in Nova Scotia. Last winter it was most difficult to obtain the labor we required, and now when spring has opened it is still more difficult. Therefore while our industries are promising, we have not sufficient labor to cultivate them. The hon. member for Queen's stated that many of those who left Prince Edward Island sent remittances home to pay for the farms they purchased. Fortunately that shows that they have some desire to go back, and intended to do so. But I am sorry to say that is not my experience. I have known a large number to go away in the spring and come back in the autumn; when they come back they have a good suit of clothes, but instead of bringing any money in their pockets, they come to live on the old people during the winter. It is not the case with us that they bring back large sums of money. The hon. member for Halifax was astonished the other evening at my saying "hear, hear," when he pointed out that it was impossible last summer for owners of vessels fitting out for the fisheries to obtain crews, because the young men had gone to the States. Why, that was an argument against himself, because it showed that while there was work, the people were not there to do it. Therefore it is not anything connected with our industrial system that has caused this exodus. I am not prepared to say what they go for, but I say they do not go because they cannot get work. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution expressed his belief that this country will suffer terribly if the present system of government is continued, and he told us that unrestricted reciprocity is the only thing that will put Canada on her feet again. He told us also that England is friendless, and he dwelt on the isolated condition the mother country occupied. But he assured us that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted immediately by Canada, England would make friends again, and Ireland would be conciliated. I have seen posted on the walls everywhere Radway's Ready Relief and Johnson's Liniment, as cures from all diseases, and it appears to me the hon. gentleman's prescription is not merely to help Canada but it is a panacea for all evils, and all ailments are cured by this wonderful remedy. The only salvation if unrestricted reciprocity should be introduced—and God forbid such a thing should ever happen—the only salvation from direct taxation would be the placing of a duty on the patent medicine which the hon. gentleman is trying to palm off on us, and in so doing we might raise revenue enough to enable us to manage without direct taxation. I will not go into all the arguments brought forward by hon. gentlemen on this side to show how our trade will be reduced under unrestricted reciprocity and how the imports of the United States coming in here to the exclusion of the imports from other countries, we will be compelled to resort to direct taxation. I do not think I should reiterate the arguments advanced in support of the contention, for there can be no doubt that the position thus set forth will be one from which we cannot escape. The hon. gentleman went on to say that the present system would become a great strain on his loyalty. Of course, Sir, loyalty is a sentiment. Each man is his own lord in the matter of sentiment, and no one can prescribe what sentiment another should hold. The hon. gentleman holds his sentiments, I hold mine, and each of us is entitled to hold his own; but I have never yet been able to understand the peculiar position he gives his loyalty. He says that whilst his forefathers were loyal and made great sacrifices, he now considers the debt of loyalty is paid. His forefathers were right in doing what they did, but his duty is to strike out for himself. The debt is paid and squared. His loyalty was a limited liability affair, and

Gen. LAURIE.

he is now free to act independently of it. As an illustration of another species of loyalty which is not a limited liability concern, I will read a few words of a letter that I received from one of my electors "I have the honor to represent. He says:

"I hope the Fishery Treaty will hasten a free market for our fish, which without a doubt, we need, but not at a sacrifice of Canada's rights and honor."

The writer of that letter is only a poor fisherman, but I am prepared to put his view of loyalty alongside of that expressed by the hon. gentleman opposite who introduced this resolution, and I am confident the hon. gentleman will admit that the writer of this letter gave a better idea of loyalty in the few words he expressed than did the hon. gentleman in his speech and resolution. I have heard the phrase as used, in connection with the proposal of the hon. gentleman, describing this proposal as "a heroic remedy." I demur to that statement. I conceive that true heroism consists in making a sacrifice of your own interests for the benefit of others. But as I understood the proposal of the hon. gentleman, his idea of a heroic remedy is to sacrifice other people's interests to his. That is not the interpretation that I should be inclined to give to the term "heroic remedy." I heard the hon. gentleman state that if it was a question whether he lost his nationality or his property, he would rather lose his property. The hon. member for Queen's stated that, and the reply was flung across the floor that that was a foolish speech to make, that it would be far better to lose one's nationality than one's property. But is it not possible, if this unrestricted reciprocity were brought into force, that we might lose both nationality and property? That is certainly a danger that I dread. I am sorry to see the hon. member for Halifax is not in his place, because I would like to comment on a few points with which he dealt. He remarked among other things on the difficulties our fishermen had to meet when they carried their fish to American markets, in not being able to bring back their supplies. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no difficulty in this regard. If our fishermen go to the port of Boston to sell their fish, they can bring back Canadian produce in bond and at as cheap prices as they could American produce. All of us who have visited the eastern portion of the States, know that wheat does not grow in any quantity around Boston. New England is not celebrated for her growth of cereals. These products come from the far west, and the distance is just as far from the wheat producing districts of the United States as from those of Canada, and the products are as easily taken from the one place as from the other. Our people have found that out. At first there was a great deal of nonsense talked about Canadian flour being no good to make bread with, and our people would only use American flour, but after a while they discovered that this theory was absurd, and the consumption of Canadian flour has steadily increased. In 1886 we imported 213,000 barrels from the United States, in 1887 we imported 172,000 barrels, while in Nova Scotia we find we have reduced our importation from 15,000 in 1886 to 10,000 in 1887. Therefore it is evident we can use Canadian flour and do as well by buying it, though of course, it entails the purchase by earloads and not by single barrels; but if a fishing vessel can bring home 120 barrels of flour, it is not likely to come home with one barrel. One of the grievances of the National Policy is the sugar grievance. We are told that we are playing into the hands of the manufacturers in the case of sugar, and that sugar is worth 16s. 6d. per cwt., whilst in Canada the consumer had to pay three and a half cents per pound higher than in England. The hon. gentleman who made this statement, forgot to mention the price of sugar in New York. That would be a fairer comparison than to compare Canada with free trade England. Had the hon. gentleman for South Oxford given

the comparison with the country south of us, it would have been sufficient for all practical purposes to arrive at an opinion on his resolution. Supposing we took the duty off sugar, what do we come back to? We come back to direct taxation. If the duty is taken off articles that we consume, we must admit the fact that to raise a revenue, we must have recourse to direct taxation. He tells us that the refineries of Montreal are making \$7,000 a day profit. The shareholders will be glad to hear that, but I doubt if it is really the case. He also undertook to tell us something in regard to the catch of mackerel. He says our fishermen must take their mackerel to the United States. Well, it is very true that, to a certain extent, the United States is the market for our mackerel, but is that an unmixed hardship, that our fishermen should take their mackerel to the United States? I think, when we consider the large protection we have afforded to our fisheries, while, as he says, that is, on the one hand, our market, on the other hand he forgot to tell the House that our fisheries are the source of supply to the United States, that they have to get their fish from us, and therefore the price of the fish going to the United States is largely fixed by the quantity we send them. It is true that a duty of \$2 a barrel is charged, but, if our mackerel were admitted free, the price would come down. As long as the duty is kept up, the fisherman in the United States gets that benefit, but our fishermen do not suffer. I will show the great change which has taken place in the mackerel trade owing to the protection of the fisheries. In 1880, at Gloucester, the principal entrepôt for mackerel, the total catch was 190,000 barrels; in 1881, the catch was 163,000 barrels; in 1882, 170,000 barrels; in 1883, 108,000 barrels; in 1884, 223,000 barrels; and then we come to a different state of things. We come to a comparison between the catch of mackerel which the United States fishermen made when they were allowed to go where they liked to fish, and when they were restricted. In 1885 the catch was 157,000 barrels, but in 1886, when they were kept out of our fishing grounds, the catch was only 58,000 barrels, and there was consequently a market for our fishermen; and in 1887 their catch was again reduced to 44,000 barrels, showing that practically we hold the supply of the fish in our own hands, and, if we hold the supply, the consumer is dependent upon us, and we fix the price and not the Americans, and consequently the duty is paid on these fish by the man who wants to buy them. An illustration was given of the hardships our people suffer in connection with fishing, by the description which was given of the work of a fishing vessel in one summer. As I understood it, the statement was that, in 1885, a fishing vessel was on her fishing cruise from the 1st June to the 30th September, and the catch that was sold amounted to 800 barrels of mackerel, and all the fishermen realised for the season's work was \$30 apiece. This may be so. The hon. gentleman has stated it, and that ought to be sufficient, but it is a very curious fact in connection with this that the whole catch, less duty, must in that case have been sold for \$1,200, or \$1.50 a barrel, and that is a low price. Even with the duty added, it would be only \$3.50 a barrel. I hold in my hand the report of the Boston Official Bureau of Statistics for 1885, and the statement made by the secretary of that Bureau is that Nova Scotia mackerel at that time sold for from \$6 to \$8 a barrel. It is odd that our people, who, as I said before, are fairly hard-headed, should, when the price ranged from \$6 to \$8, have accepted only \$3.50. But there are ups and downs even in the mackerel fishing. I met a young man this year, during my canvass, who had been in the mackerel fishing in the United States. He had been urged to go there by those who said there was no chance of getting a living here, and so he had gone to the United States. I asked him what success he had had, and he told me he had

made \$1 for his work during this year from the Gloucester fishing. I do not think he had been paid better than if he had remained in this country, even if, as the hon. gentleman says, he had got only \$3 instead of \$1 for his season's work. I do not think that those who told him it was better for him to go to the United States advised him well, and I think there are people who lead others astray sometimes, as they did in this case. I think the hon. gentleman stated that those of us who believed in the National Policy had been dangling it before the eyes of a deceived people for political purposes. Might not that be considered a fair description of the resolution which the hon. gentleman himself has submitted for the consideration of this House, that he is holding it before the people and dangling it before the eyes of a deceived people for political purposes? A complaint was made that, while we professed under the National Policy to discriminate in favor of English trade, the average duty on the imports from Great Britain was 21 per cent., and on those from the United States only 16 per cent., so that we were discriminating against the mother country and in favor of the United States. But surely the hon. gentleman knows that the large proportion of our raw material comes from the United States, and that comes in free of duty in order to stimulate and encourage manufacture in this country, and, by encouraging these industries and helping our products of the soil, the fishery, the mine and other industries, we employ more people, and the more people we employ, the more money we have, and the better market we have for everything we have to sell. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) showed that England had a large trade with India, and he said that was natural because that was a dependency. The Indian Government some years ago found it necessary to protect their manufactures, and they increased the wealth of India to such an extent that now that country is able to consume a large amount of those manufactures, which, not being indigenous to India, would never have been established but for that policy. The people, in working up the material which they have, have so increased in wealth that they are able to utilise a much larger portion than before of the manufactures of England. He told us how much the progress of Michigan was greater than the progress of Ontario. Why, Sir, possibly because Michigan has been longer living in a state of protection, possibly because Michigan has been in a position to make a market of her products to a non-agricultural and non-lumbering population. Her goods have sold more readily. He made out, if I understood him, that the crops of 1887 were much reduced compared with those of 1882. I cannot conceive that this is a charge against the National Policy. I do not know that unrestricted reciprocity would give us larger crops, it depends very much on the season. Now, I have pointed out that in the Tariff Bill submitted to Congress by the Ways and Means Committee, is found a large proportion of these articles that we are so anxious to send into the States, on which we now have a duty, and for the remission of which duty we are so anxious that we are prepared, almost, to sacrifice anything and anybody but our own selves, and to throw our manufacturers to the wolves. Whilst we are doing this we find that at Washington they are prepared to take the duty off most of these articles. It is true the duties remain on some others, but it will be found that of the articles on which duties remain we export already more than \$13,000,000. The hon. gentleman gave us at length a statement showing how 97, 98 and 99 per cent. of various products went to the States. They do, Sir. How will unrestricted reciprocity make more than 100 per cent. of those articles go to the States? Therefore, what benefit are we going to gain, commensurate with the sacrifices we are asked to make, in simply sending one or two per cent. more of those articles to the States?

Mr. DAVIES. It doubles the quantity of consumption.

Gen. LAURIE. But if the quantity is not available. If we have no more barley, for instance, to sell, it will not double the consumption. Then the hon. member for Halifax mentioned that Nova Scotia exported fruit. He said that had nothing to do with the National Policy, and that was the view taken by the hon. member for King's county (Mr. Borden). Now, I am inclined to think that is a little wide of the mark. I think the duty imposed on potatoes going into the United States has improved the farms of King's county very materially. As a matter of fact those properties were being considerably run down by the export of potatoes, without any fertilisers being used to supply the exhaustion of the soil. I am aware that Prince Edward Island also sends a great many potatoes to the States. But in the case of King's county the advantage has been that when that particular article was low, the farmers fed their potatoes to their cattle and made beef, and in making beef they furnished fertilisers to their land, consequently they have been able to increase the product; and I believe the product of fruit has also largely increased, owing to the fact that the farmers were not at all times able to export their potatoes and deprive their farms of fertilisers. But the potato market is not closed in the United States. There is a duty, but last autumn a very large amount of the potato product was sent to the United States. Whenever the article is wanted it goes there, when it is not, it is used at home, and the farmer benefits. I believe that in the matter of fruit export the retention of the duties in the United States has really not injured that district to the extent that is assumed. Now, the hon. member for Halifax was rather jocular—at least I assumed that was the line he took in the description he gave of my visiting Shelburne county during my last canvass. I will read what he says:

"I would like the hon. the Minister of Marine to go along our coast when he visits Halifax next year, instead of allowing his gunboat to go down the shore electioneering in the county of Shelburne, instead of sending her down there to sound along every little harbor in the county of Shelburne, but of course not to make promises. Oh, no; we have the word of the gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that he made no promises. I do not say he did, but I say that, when he went down on board that Dominion gunboat, with the Dominion flag flying over his head, and the so-called engineer going into every port along that coast and sounding, and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf, and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a lighthouse here—I do not say he made any promises, but the inference would be natural."

Now, am I to understand that is a correct statement of what occurred?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Gen. LAURIE. Well, I say distinctly it is not.

Mr. JONES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask whether that lightship did not carry him down to his election in the county of Shelburne.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is not the point.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman asks me what did occur, and I will tell him. I think it would have been better if the hon. member for Halifax, in this statement, had not, by innuendo, implied that I had stated what was not the case. The hon. member for York asked me a question in this House the other day, and he told us something about the promises made in the election. I answered that question, I thanked him for asking the question and giving me an opportunity to make the explanation.

Mr. JONES. You did not answer the question.

Gen. LAURIE. The gunboat did not go into every harbor along the coast, did not go electioneering, did not go into every port, there was no engineer going sounding along that coast and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf and that would be a nice place for a breakwater.

Mr. JONES. Did she carry you down?

Gen. LAURIE.

Gen. LAURIE. Yes, and I will tell you how she carried me down. Domestic affairs took me home during the elections. Shelburne is deprived of the privileges of a railway. We have 66 miles to travel by stage and it only travels in the night. It does not suit me to travel in a coach at night if I can help it. It would take me two days to arrive at Shelburne, and I had appointments there. I found that this vessel was going down with some stores to supply a lighthouse, and I telegraphed to the Minister of Marine asking if I might get a passage in her. I obtained passage in her, and according to the usual rule on board those vessels, I paid for the three meals that I had on board. I left Halifax in the middle of the day and arrived at Shelburne at 8 o'clock the next morning, and left the vessel there. Now, is that going into every port along the coast? But there is something more. I met the President of the Yarmouth Steamship Company who complained to me that the passage at Barrington, entering into the channel, was very bad, and he wanted a wharf there. I said: Yes, I knew they wanted a wharf. But I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the president of this Yarmouth Company does not reside in my county, and he has no vote there. A petition was sent in last spring signed by both political parties urging that a wharf should be built at Barrington. When it was found impossible that a lightship could be built at Shelburne—hon. gentlemen will try to make something out of that—it happened that the *Newfield* was around there. I telegraphed the Minister of Marine, asking if, as the vessel was engaged in the lightship service and being on the spot, she could not be employed in ascertaining where the best place would be for the wharf.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We are getting at it now.

Gen. LAURIE. You are going to get the whole of it. I went to Barrington and saw the Collector of Customs, and asked him to select two gentlemen, one on each side of politics, so that there should be no politics in it, to go and see the captain of the vessel and show him where, in their view, would be the best place for him to examine.

An hon. MEMBER. Before the election?

Gen. LAURIE. Certainly before the election.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many days?

Gen. LAURIE. I would ask whether the description given by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) of the gunboat going into every port along that coast and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a lightship there, is a fair description of what I have stated. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether when the vessel was on the spot and it was known that it was desirable to ascertain where the right place for this wharf would be—which is to accommodate steamers which cannot at present get up there, but have to lie up—I say it was a desirable thing that this should be done, and I particularly explained that I was most anxious there should be nothing connected with politics in regard to it. I wish further to say this: I do not know why the hon. gentleman should be surprised that when I went on board of the Dominion gunboat there should be a Dominion flag floating over her head. What flag would he like to see floating?

An hon. MEMBER. Pull down the flag.

Gen. LAURIE. So long as I live in Canada I hope the flag of Old England will float over us; so long as Canada remains as she is I trust the flag of Canada will remain what it now is. I wish to have this matter explained, because it is most desirable that this story that this vessel was round there canvassing with me, that she visited every harbor, should be contradicted. The hon. member for

Halifax (Mr. Jones) has himself stated it, so that I am able to contradict it; before this time I had no opportunity.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You corroborate it.

Gen. LAURIE. I beg your pardon. I distinctly stated the vessel being there I asked that she might sound one harbor, and that she did. If that is not a different thing from the colored statement of the hon. member for Halifax, then I am not able to understand English; but I am glad I have noticed it because hon. gentlemen will now understand how everything is colored for political purposes. In reply to an enquiry as to how it is proposed to obtain unrestricted reciprocity the hon. gentleman says we should make overtures to a friendly nation—they have shown themselves so friendly in the past. I have no better friends in the world than the friends I have in the United States, but to speak of them as a friendly nation, to speak of their Government as acting on high principles, especially in regard to their treaties, is to give them a character I do not think we are warranted in giving them. What happened in regard to the Treaty of Washington in 1873? It was provided that the products of our fisheries should enter the United States duty free. On a quibble they made the products of the British Columbia fisheries pay duty during the whole term of that treaty, on the plea that a proclamation had not been issued bringing British Columbia into the Union. Under the same treaty a similar question was raised in regard to certain kinds of fish entering from the Maritime Provinces, and they imposed a duty of one and a-half cents on each can containing canned fish entering the United States. That is another illustration that it is not wise for us to put ourselves too much into their hands. What has the Minister of Finance been doing lately? Has he not been at Washington negotiating a fresh treaty in place of a treaty made by our Government, the Government of England with the United States, to which they acknowledged they were bound by law but in regard to which they said it was not applicable to the new system of morality among nations. If they are able to shift their ground and change their views in regard to treaties, in what position would we find ourselves as a nation of five millions against sixty millions, or in that proportion if, in the event of any arrangement being made, they declared after it had been in operation for some time that it was not in harmony with modern ideas and, therefore, they declined to be bound to it any longer. It seems to me that in view of our experience we had better be careful in dealing with them in the future. The hon. member for Halifax pointed out that it was a ridiculous argument to use that it was unfair to discriminate in regard to goods against England and in favor of the United States when we had already discriminated against England in favor of Canada, and he thought the cases were similar. I hardly think that is the case. We were legislating for our own people, and within our own boundaries. We have a right to decide how to raise our revenue, because we have undertaken the burdens that our revenue is intended to meet, and consequently we have a right to impose taxation. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), expresses a most desirable proposition, that it is desirable that we should obtain the coasting trade of the United States if possible. Undoubtedly it is desirable, and if the hon. gentleman had moved it as a separate resolution, I would have been one of the first to support it. Of course it is desirable, in fact there is a great deal that is desirable that we should obtain. It is desirable that we should obtain reciprocity in natural products. Tacking it on to the resolution which is hostile to our country, which is opposed to the policy under which we believe we are thriving, has neutralised its effect, and has prevented it from being acceptable to many members. Speaking for myself, I am satisfied that I cannot vote for it. I believe that a

great many who approve of the principle of the motion, are, like myself, compelled to oppose it, because they believe it is tacked on to a proposition that we cannot support. As it is late to-night, I will touch upon another question very briefly. I asked just now what the object of this proposal was? Was it to increase our imports or to increase our exports? I assume, Sir, and I hope that it is intended to increase our exports, to benefit our products, and in benefiting our products to afford more employment within our borders. It seems to me the right chord was struck by hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces when they said that we should not look only to the United States as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright, proposes, but that we can look to other countries as well; we can look to the West Indies, to the Brazils and to South America for a large trade, and I think we may reasonably look, in an especial degree, to those islands under our own flag, and under our own Queen. If we want to enter into commercial relations to a larger extent, as is proposed by the hon. gentleman, I think it would be better for us to initiate proposals for commercial relations with the islands of the West Indies rather than with our friends to the south of us. Much as we love them, much as we respect them, I can see that we will be in a false position if we are placed in competition alongside of them. We are not sufficiently advanced to hold our own against them yet, and many of our industries would go to the wall. In the West Indies we have a population—in Jamaica—of 600,000. They are consuming mainly the products which we produce, and they produce what we desire to consume. It is true we would lose three and a half millions of our revenue on the imports from the West Indies, for we should lose the whole duty on raw sugar, although we might reasonably expect a balance against that, which our increased trade would give us. If the hon. gentleman's argument is worth anything, when he says that we can afford to abandon seven millions of dollars duty to improve our trade with the United States, I think we might more reasonably propose to abandon three and a half millions of duty to improve our trade with the West Indies, especially when in studying the statistics we find the West Indies consume what we produce and that they produce what we consume. The United States are competitors with us, they are customers and we can find markets in other directions for what we want to sell. We need not alone look to what has been described as a market of 60,000,000 people in the United States, for have we not New Mexico, California, Arizona and the Carolines to trade with? It is true, of course, there is a market in the border country, there is a market in New England, there is a market in the lake cities and there is a market in Minnesota for our wheat, but this market for our wheat is simply that it may be manufactured and sold in its manufactured state to those who otherwise would be customers of ours. Why, instead of sending over millions of bushels of our wheat to Minnesota to be manufactured, should we not manufacture it ourselves. And now as regards the cattle of our own North-West. Is there any need of sending herds of cattle to Chicago to be put into cans and sent back to the North-West for consumption; would it not be a wiser way to stimulate our industries there, if we could prepare our meat at home for consumption by the people of our country and for exports to all parts of our own Dominion. Go where you will you see canned meats, always with the Chicago brand. You will hardly see in the Eastern Provinces and certainly not in the North-West any prepared meat without the Chicago brand. Let us not destroy the National Policy which we have been at some pains to build up, but so far from destroying it let us try to add to it and improve it. I think this is within our power to do. I feel satisfied that the members of this House will not be recreant to the duty imposed upon them to build up this country and faithfully

continue in the good work which they have begun. I am satisfied that in the period of years of an ordinary man's life they will see the good results of such a course and that we shall be able to carry, not the scalps of hon. gentleman who now vote against us, but as a result of our policy that these hon. gentlemen will be the first to approve of the course which we have taken. Let us vindicate this principle which we laid down in 1878, which we endorsed again in 1882, and let us confirm it by our votes in this House in 1883.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I will only detain the House a few minutes, as it is no doubt weary of this discussion and of the very long speeches we have had on this question. The hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), who has just resumed his seat, took a long time in describing the fact that it was not our fishermen that paid the \$2 duty on the mackerel that went to the United States. If that be the case, I would like to ask what is the reason that this very Government granted a large sum of money to indemnify the fishermen in Prince Edward Island for duties which they paid to the United States on the mackerel? If our fishermen did not pay this duty, then this Government did wrong in refunding it. That is the only answer I will give to that argument of the hon. gentleman. He also says that our people who go from the Dominion to the United States do not emigrate at all, but that they go there to visit their friends. There must be some emigrants there, because they had friends there before them, whom they went to see, and those friends must have emigrated from Canada some time. I will speak of the Maritime Provinces principally, because I know nothing about Ontario and the west. I would like to hear hon. gentlemen come down to the Maritime Provinces and make such a declaration as he has made in any settlement or section of the country down there. Why, Sir, he would be laughed at. I have travelled among the farming community down there and I know what I am speaking of. There is scarcely a house that you go into, in which you will not find that one, or two, or three members of the family are in the United States. Why is this the case? Because they have left the country and they have gone to the States in order to earn a little money and they send considerable sums back to assist the people they have left behind them to maintain an existence in this country. I shall make my arguments as short and endeavor to limit them as such as possible without making any repetition. But repetitions must be inevitable in such a discussion as this which has taken such a wide range and upon which so many speeches have been made. When my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) addressed this House and pointed to the exodus from the country, showing that the lands had depreciated in value in our Island at all events, and in the Maritime Provinces generally, that our trade had disappeared from the country, that our shipping had disappeared and that prices had been lowered for produce, he was replied to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with the argument that this was utterly impossible, because he said: "Look at the state of the country, look at the savings bank returns, and in the year 1874 you will find that the savings bank deposits were \$336,000, while in 1887 they were \$2,200,000. He says this is the most conclusive evidence of the prosperity of the people. That argument has been used here before; but he was answered, that in place of being an evidence of prosperity it is an evidence of depreciation of trade in the country, because the money has been withdrawn from industry or from other banks and placed in the savings bank for safety. Since the adoption of the National Policy one of our oldest and most substantial banks has gone to the wall, and a large number of people

Gen. LAURIE.

who put their money in other banks withdrew it and placed it in the savings bank in order that it might be safe. Before the National Policy was adopted, and when we had reciprocity with the United States, our farmers, instead of depositing their money in the savings bank used to buy farms with it for their sons and establish those farms, thus building up the country, increasing its population and making it prosperous. But the same sons, who in better times used to get farms of their own, are now leaving the country and going to the United States. Then, we have heard about inter-provincial trade. I reply to the statement that there has been no trade established between the Maritime Provinces and Upper Provinces of the Dominion, the Minister of Marine said that there has been. He said that he found a statement that \$12,000,000 had been sent by the Province of Nova Scotia to the Upper Provinces to buy manufactured goods. If \$12,000,000 went from Nova Scotia, there would be \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 from New Brunswick and \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 from Prince Edward Island, and that is the very thing we complain of, that the large manufacturing provinces do not take any of the products we have to dispose of in return for what we buy from them. We are forced by the National Policy to purchase our supplies from the Upper Provinces, and we have to send them the cash. They do not take anything from Prince Edward Island at any rate, unless it be a few barrels of oysters. The result of fostering these manufactures is that the manufacturers are encouraged to produce materials of inferior quality, and can force us to buy them. Now, when the National Policy was adopted, we were told that everything was going to be lovely; tall chimneys were going to rise in every village, and everybody was going to become rich at everybody else's expense, and the people in Prince Edward Island were induced to vote for that policy in the expectation that these things would come. But they did not come, and in place of times becoming better and farmers getting better prices for their produce and becoming wealthier, everything has been growing worse; and to-day, I say it without fear of contradiction, the depreciation of real estate in the Province overbalances five times the deposits in the savings banks. I know this to be the case. I do not come here to say what I do not know and do not see. I am in the habit of talking to the farmers, and I see and hear of these things every day, and I do not come here to mislead the House. But this depreciation exists, and we believe it is going to get worse. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite: "Why you must not say anything about it; the man who does so is disloyal to his country." Although the depreciation is going on, they say we must let it go on and say nothing about it. I would like to ask this question before the free trade policy was established in England, when Cobden and Bright and their confrères saw their country becoming poorer, their poor-houses filling up and times getting bad, did they hide the facts? Did they not get commissions sent to investigate the state of affairs and supply the remedy, which was free trade. Now, it is free trade we want in the Maritime Provinces. When we had free trade there before, we prospered. Our farmers were able to purchase more lands and they got better prices for their produce, and they believe that if they get free trade again, they will prosper again. I would like to ask, are we more disloyal on this side of the House than the hon. members on the other side? All we ask for is friendly trade relations with our neighbors, not a political union at all. Now, I know that the House is tired of figures, but you will permit me to read a few relating to our own Province, in order to show how its condition improved while we had reciprocity with the United States. Our Island is not as old as the other Provinces, its settlement dates back only between eighty and a hundred years. I take the decade before we had reciprocity, and I find that our imports and exports were as follows:—

| Year. | Value of Imports from United States. | Value of Exports to United States. |
|-----------|--|--|
| 1844..... | \$ 7,160 | \$ 6,285 |
| 1845..... | 14,105 | 15,325 |
| 1846..... | 20,320 | 6,635 |
| 1847..... | 35,325 | 4,105 |
| 1848..... | 81,905 | 6,420 |
| 1849..... | 82,580 | 32,410 |
| 1850..... | 41,600 | 55,385 |
| 1851..... | 87,430 | 109,340 |
| 1852..... | 171,290 | 141,850 |
| 1853..... | 187,915 | 120,500 |
| 1854..... | 195,836 | 81,880 |
| 1855..... | 216,202 | 161,305 |
| 1856..... | 174,580 | 90,075 |
| 1857..... | 251,480 | 212,260 |
| 1858..... | 210,020 | 319,100 |
| 1859..... | 310,280 | 439,990 |
| 1860..... | 282,145 | 392,025 |
| 1861..... | 216,050 | 233,875 |
| 1862..... | 234,660 | 217,235 |
| 1863..... | 423,880 | 528,670 |
| 1864..... | 418,300 | 387,210 |
| 1865..... | 464,000 | 604,640 |

That finishes the period of Reciprocity Treaty. You will notice that in the previous decade our imports exceeded our exports, but under the reciprocity our exports increased very largely, and every year exceeded our imports, showing we had the advantage, and the balance we received in cash;

| Year. | Value of Imports from United States. | Value of Exports to United States. |
|-----------|--|--|
| 1866..... | \$370,930 | \$108,315 |
| 1867..... | 242,600 | 185,955 |
| 1868..... | 350,038 | 239,392 |
| 1869..... | 279,131 | 236,815 |
| 1870..... | 227,942 | 403,548 |
| 1871..... | 230,000 | 410,000 |
| 1872..... | 250,000 | 450,000 |
| 1873..... | 275,000 | 470,000 |
| 1874..... | 394,803 | 198,571 |
| 1875..... | 345,603 | 362,900 |
| 1876..... | 337,967 | 217,710 |
| 1885..... | 230,019 | 479,340 |
| 1886..... | 179,775 | 679,886 |

Ten years after the Reciprocity Treaty had been abrogated, we did only about one-third the business we did during the last year of reciprocity. Take 1886, our exports only exceed by a few dollars the exports of the last year of reciprocity. This shows how important it is for us to have reciprocity with the United States, if it can be arranged, as we believe it can be, should the Government only take the proper steps. I hope to see reciprocity brought about in a short time, and that the Government will take the proper steps in the matter. In the Maritime Provinces we were under the impression that the upper Provinces were in love with the National Policy and would not help us to get reciprocity even if the United States were disposed to grant it, but I am glad to see, since this discussion began, that in the other Provinces the same feeling exists as exists in the Maritime Provinces, and that we all look with hope to reciprocity. Were it established in the Maritime Provinces we could treble our exports to the United States. Take the article of potatoes. In Prince Edward Island, if the duty of 15 cents per bushel were removed, in place of a 1,000,000 bushels we would send 2,000,000 or 3,000,000, which it would be just as easy to raise as 1,000,000. What were the serious objections raised against the adoption of a free trade policy by hon. gentlemen opposite? The first is that since we have adopted the National Policy the Government has appealed several times to the country and have always been sustained, and the Government are not slow in boasting of their success. But there is a little lesson to be learnt even by the Government from the elections. In 1878, you will remember, Sir, the Government appealed to the people on the National Policy, but in our Province we were told the National Policy was

only a means to an end, and that end was reciprocity with the United States. We returned the Government to power with a majority of 70 to 80. Four years later they came back again, and neither on this occasion did they preach the National Policy purely and simply. They said we have not reciprocity, but give us a little time. The people renewed their confidence in the Government and returned them with a majority of 60 or 70. Then they came back last year, but the people had learned a little in the meantime. Yet with the assistance of the Gerrymandering Act, the Franchise Act, and other Acts, they came back with a reduced majority of 15 or 20. Even that should be a caution to the Government, because there will be another election in four years, and if their numbers are reduced in the same proportion, they will be back here in the minority. The next objection is the charge of disloyalty. Do hon. gentlemen opposite seriously mean to say that we are less loyal than they? Do they mean to say that the Liberal party are more disloyal or less loyal than the Conservatives? I may refer to an incident which took place in the little village from which I came. When the North-West Rebellion started, the Minister of Militia called upon the volunteers throughout the country, and the section of the country from which I come is composed almost entirely of Liberals. We have there a volunteer corps which is made up five-sixths of Liberals. The Minister of Militia had ordered them to be ready to start for the North-West, and every man, without exception, volunteered his services. Even men who did not belong to the company asked that they might be allowed to go in the place of any who were missing. He telegraphed to the Minister of Militia that he had his quota of volunteers all ready, and they were nearly to a man all Liberals. I know of another company not far away, composed of men who are nearly all Tories, and, when the captain of that company sent for them to come in, he only got three men to come in. I do not know where they were, but the captain could not find them. The charge of disloyalty which has been thrown across to this side I hurl back. It is no disloyalty for any Government or any people to ask that the trade of their country shall be made by the adoption of any particular policy. The next serious objection they bring up is in regard to the revenue of the country. They say, if we adopt a free trade policy, or reciprocity with the United States, we shall lose \$7,000,000 a year. I was not in the House at the time, but I am in the habit of reading a little, and if I remember aright, the present Finance Minister declared, when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, when he was explaining why there was required a revenue of \$23,000,000, that it was a million too much, and that the Government expenditure should be covered by \$22,000,000. Well, now that expenditure is \$36,000,000. Taking the story which they told us then, that the country could be governed for \$22,000,000, we have a large margin, we have a margin equal to nearly double the amount they say we are to lose by this union with the United States, and, if the country is economically governed, the saving could be made in the Government of this country, and there would be no necessity for any change in the taxation or for any resort to direct taxation, which they hold up as a bugbear to the people, but which is not necessary at all. I think it was Mr. Gladstone who was talking about the temperance question in England, when certain gentlemen said to him: You will lose so much revenue that you cannot afford to adopt temperance principles in this country," and Mr. Gladstone replied: "Give me a sober people and I will find the revenue." Well, Mr. Speaker, give us a prosperous people, and there will be no trouble about the revenue. The fourth objection is, that this discriminates against Great Britain. Perhaps it may, but what does this Government do, and what does the National Policy do? Has it not been discriminating against Great Britain ever since it has been estab-

lished, and, if you carry out the National Policy to its legitimate end, you will stop all importations from Great Britain and from every other country, and then where is the discrimination? It is too absurd to talk about it. The fifth objection, and the real objection they bring is that this will injure the manufacturers. That it will injure some manufactures is undoubtedly true, but, if we as a people or if this Government or this House are going to maintain a handful of manufacturers, and to make them millionaires in this country, at the expense of the trade and at the expense of the good of the whole country, then I believe our Government is getting back to the old feudal times, and, if we are to be governed by a few manufacturers, we will be in a short time in the same position as the people of Ireland are in regard to their landlords. It is very peculiar in regard to hon. gentlemen opposite that, while arguing against free trade with might and main, they almost all wind up by saying they are ready for greater commercial relations with the United States. The only conclusion to be drawn from that is that they are afraid to go to their constituencies on this point. They are the servants of the manufacturers, but they are afraid of their constituents. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. the Minister of Interior told us that we should have nothing to do with the Yankees at all, that the Yankee farmers are poorer than our farmers. If that is so, that is an argument against hon. gentlemen opposite, because, if the Yankee farmer is becoming poorer in the same way that our farmers are, the sooner they come together the better. If it means anything, it is an argument against any protective policy at all. I think I could show, if I were not afraid of detaining the House too long, that the United States was proceeding faster under a revenue tariff than she has been under a protective policy. If the Minister of the Interior had taken up the subject and made a speech on the results of protection in the United States, I think it would have been much more effective

than the speech he delivered the other night. Now, I have only this to say. As far as we are concerned in the Maritime Provinces—and I am sorry to say it—if the state of affairs which has existed for the past eight years is to continue for another eight years, the first thing the Government will find there will be such an agitation for repeal that the Province will be severed, because, unless they do something for us in this regard, and in regard to our winter communication, we will have to sue for repeal, and to see if we cannot work our own affairs better, as we did in the old times and as we can do in the present time. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government pictured the condition of the country well, when he compared it to the monkey in the tree, shaking the fruit to the hogs. It was an ugly picture, but it was a true one. It reminded me of a man who had a picture in which Old Nick was represented urging him on. All the boys took a pick at him, and he got no sympathy, so he took the picture to an old elder of the church, and showed it to him and the elder said: "It is a very ugly picture, but it is a true one." The picture the Prime Minister drew was very ugly but it was very true, and, if we are to be governed by combines like this, if we are going to be feeding these hogs, the yeomanry of this country, as well as those of the North-West, will rise and tell the right hon. gentleman to get out of this country, both himself and his hogs.

Mr. KENNY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:40 a.m. (Friday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Friday, March 23, 1888.

No. 22.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 23rd March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL RETURN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the certificate of the Returning Officer at the last election for the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward, that John Milton Platt, Esquire, was duly elected for said Electoral District.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that it be resolved that in admitting John Milton Platt, Esquire, to represent the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward upon the production of the certificate of the Returning Officer, this House still recommends a strict adherence to the principle of requiring the production of the usual return.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask what the meaning of that is? Have the strict rules of the House not been complied with?

Mr. SPEAKER. For some reason the certificate has not been before the House.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

The following Members, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took their seats in the House:—

JOHN MILTON PLATT, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Prince Edward, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Charlton.

WILLIAM F. ROOME, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of West Middlesex, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Foster.

REPRESENTATION OF KENT.

Mr. WELDON (Albert), moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting the West Kent election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there are portions of this report in which we cannot concur, but I have no desire whatever to delay the issue of the writ, and therefore the report may be adopted, I suppose, on a division.

Motion agreed to on a division.

22—1888—1

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill No. 66) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

TREATY BETWEEN HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the absence of Sir Charles Tupper I beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States. The Bill was ready for introduction when the notice was placed on the paper. That was done with the expectation that the Minister of Finance would be able to introduce it at an early day. It is desirable that it should be before the House at as early a date as possible, and at his request, I make a motion for its introduction. It is thought more proper that its introduction should have been expedited, in consequence of the publication of the Bill in the papers of the country. I may state, by way of explanation to the House, that its publication was evidently through a breach of confidence in some of the persons connected, in all probability, with the printing of the Bill, and not in any way owing to the fault of those who had it in charge for the Government. It is unnecessary that I should explain the Bill at any length, because it simply gives the effect of the treaty before this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WRIT FOR KENT ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you call the Orders of the Day, I would like to enquire, Mr. Speaker, what is the position now with regard to the issue of a writ for the election in the County of Kent. I understand, Sir, that you issued your warrant some time ago, and we were informed to-day in the Committee of Privileges and Elections, at the time that report was up for consideration, that the reason why no writ had issued was that the Government had declined as yet to appoint a returning officer, or had failed, at all events, to appoint a returning officer, and that there was no one to whom that writ could be addressed. Now that this permission has been obtained, I suppose it is unnecessary you should issue a second warrant, but that the Government can appoint a returning officer to whom the writ for holding the election might be addressed. I would like to know exactly what the position is, as I think, the House having determined that the election ought to take place immediately, it would be well to know precisely the position of the matter at the present time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the position stands thus: Mr. Speaker having received the report, should issue his warrant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He has issued it. I understand that Mr. Speaker did issue his warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I said. He did issue his warrant, but, looking at the report, I took the liberty of thinking that I should report that it should remain with the House to order the writ. On communication with Mr. Speaker, the question seemed to be of so much doubt that I understand Mr. Speaker had withdrawn his warrant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not so understand it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I understand it. If it had not been withdrawn the practice would be to move for a writ of *supersedeas* as to the previous warrant. Now, as I understand it, a warrant must issue—a new warrant must issue unless it is considered that the old warrant was effete. I think so beyond a doubt. At all events, I think a new warrant should be issued, and a writ of *supersedeas* could be moved for unless it is held that Mr. Speaker has withdrawn his warrant; if he has, of course a new warrant is necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With the permission of the House I would say that I understand the warrant of the Speaker was issued, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery took no action upon that because there was no returning officer appointed to whom the writ could be addressed. The issue of the warrant and the proceedings upon that warrant have not been stayed by any action of the House. The House simply referred it to the Committee of Privileges and Elections to enquire into the matter as to the propriety of the issue of the warrant under the existing circumstances. But the regularity or the validity of the warrant was not, it seems to me, questioned by any action that has taken place in this House. That warrant has been issued and is in force. It is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to obey it and act upon it as soon as the Government appoint a party to whom the writ can be addressed. That is precisely as I understand the matter to stand at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The writ has not been withdrawn, that is it has not been formally withdrawn, although it is understood that the Clerk in Chancery would not act upon it until the House had decided. I suppose a warrant for a writ of *supersedeas* would do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would move for a writ of *supersedeas* to that warrant. It was issued at a time it ought not to have been issued. I think if the hon. gentleman will look into the practice he will find that this is the practice. There may be a question of the legality of the issue, and the seat of the elected member, whoever he may be, might be challenged on the ground that the writ was issued on a warrant which was illegal, because it was issued before the House had declared its will in the matter. I now move:

That the warrant of the Speaker issued for the election in Kent be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the writ for a new election in the riding of Kent be issued.

Mr. LAURIER. There was another point suggested by my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Even if the warrant of Mr. Speaker had issued legally, there was no returning officer. When the warrant does issue it is the duty of the Government to appoint a returning officer, and I suppose they will attend to that promptly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes. The facts were simply these: the Clerk of the Crown Chancery, when he received the Speaker's warrant, informed the Government of it and asked for the name of a returning officer. When that came to the Government I was acting as Minister of Justice, in the absence of my hon. friend behind me, and, looking at the Judge's report, I was of opinion that the House only could take action in the matter. I communicated that to Mr. Speaker, and it was understood the whole thing should stand over till the House met.

Mr. LAURIER. But there were some instances where there was no reason of this kind and the Government did not act promptly, as in the case of Dorchester.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, we gave it every consideration.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And on the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, in desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And on the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to deal with the resolution which is now under consideration in this House, I deem it my duty; as one of the representatives of the Province of Nova Scotia in the Commons of Canada, to refer to what I consider a very remarkable and very improper statement which was made in this House on Thursday of last week. On that day, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) stated in the course of his address that the Government majority in the Province of Nova Scotia had been secured by promises to railroad companies. I am not disposed, Sir, to cavil at anything my hon. friend from Queen's may say. During my brief parliamentary career, I have noticed that that hon. gentleman seems privileged to indulge in the wildest flights of fancy. In that role he is quite unrivalled and quite inimitable. But, Sir, when a gentleman occupying a prominent position in this House and in this country, leads in a debate like this, one of the parties in this country, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does, I think the observations of that gentleman claim attention. On the occasion to which I refer, the hon. member for South Oxford, referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's which I have quoted, stated that "they (the electors of Nova Scotia) offered themselves to us, but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them." Now, Sir, as a representative from Nova Scotia, I confess that I felt

humiliated when I heard that remark, and infinitely more so when I saw it recorded in *Hansard*. That statement, Sir, is now historical; these words are indelibly inscribed on the parliamentary records of Canada; and coming from a trained parliamentarian, from a gentleman who weighs his words, I regret to have to say that in my opinion they are insulting to the people of Nova Scotia. I know, Sir, that my opinion on such a matter is of slight importance to the hon. member for South Oxford; I recognise fully, Sir, the great disparity which exists between our positions in this House; but, Sir, as a representative of the people of Nova Scotia, sent here by the metropolitan constituency of Halifax, I tell that hon. gentleman that while the people of Nova Scotia may not be so gifted in the wealth of this world as their fellow-countrymen in some of the other Provinces in Canada, yet, man for man, in manliness of character, in uprightness of conduct, in a high sense of honor, I claim that we are second to none in this Dominion or out of it; and I tell that hon. gentleman—and I am glad to be able to do it here in vindication of the good name of the Province of Nova Scotia—that the gold has never been found that can buy the people of Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am as anxious as any man in Canada can be to see a fair and honorable measure of reciprocal trade established between the people of Canada and the kindred nation to the south of us with whom we have so much in common. I am in favor of a very extended measure of reciprocal trade with the people of the United States, as great a measure as would be compatible with the interests and self-respect of the people of Canada. I have the greatest admiration for the people of the United States, and I have given as tangible proof of that as any man can give. I would consider it my duty here or elsewhere to do anything that a man fairly can do to unite the great English-speaking races all the world over in the closest bonds of comity and friendship. I fear, Sir, that the course we are now pursuing may actually thwart the object which I believe the people of Canada and their representatives here so much desire to attain—some reciprocal trade between the United States and this Dominion. The hon. member for South Oxford has introduced a resolution in favor of what he is pleased to term unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I can understand reciprocity, or I remember what we understood it to mean a few years ago. I have some idea of what commercial union may mean; but, Sir, I must proclaim that, in my opinion at least, unrestricted reciprocity is not within the domain of practical politics. The suddenness of the apparition of unrestricted reciprocity is most startling, and induces one to enquire whence it comes. I find, Sir, that it emanates from a party which only a short year ago in the general elections held in this Dominion, raised every cry, made every appeal, advanced every argument that human ingenuity could devise; and yet, Sir, we never heard of unrestricted reciprocity until it suddenly bounced on this Table. Are we to attribute it to the emphatic expression of the opinions of the people of Canada as given at that election? Are we to attribute it to what the proposer of the resolution, in a moment of exuberant candor, was pleased to call “our friends of the Quebec conference?” Are we to attribute it to what some gentlemen call “our friends on the other side of the border?” Are we to attribute it to the amiable American gentlemen who, so charitable in thought any intent, have been visiting Canada during the past few months and interesting themselves in all that concerns the affairs of Canada? That apparition, Sir, is so sudden that instinctively one is reminded of the well-known lines:

“Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn’d,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,
Be thy intents wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape
That I will speak to thee!”

I find, Sir, that the result of the late election is the primary cause of the apparition. I believe, Sir, that the utter helplessness and hopelessness hon. gentlemen opposite had of ever obtaining power in this country, and the taunts of their followers that they had no policy, have made them reckless, and out of sheer desperation they have resorted to this expedient. They know, Sir, that Canada looks favorably upon a fair and honorable arrangement with our neighbour to the south of us; but in order that political capital may be made, a great commercial question has now been prostituted for party purposes. The condition of the Opposition is so desperate that they have come to the conclusion that they must have some cry, so they shout “unrestricted reciprocity.” I do not believe hon. gentlemen are sincere in the course they are now taking. They know that their present course is more likely to retard than to advance our chances of trade relations with the people of the United States. I hold that I can prove that from their own utterances. Have these hon. gentlemen forgotten that Mr. Mackenzie, when he led the Government of Canada, told us it would be unworthy of ourselves to go cringing to the people of the United States. Has the hon. member for South Oxford forgotten his own utterances, when in a position of responsibility in this country, he said:

“They say we must have reciprocity and we cannot live without it. For the Dominion of Canada I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships and will carry the war into Africa. We will find new markets for ourselves and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe they had the power to drive us to their own terms.”

Have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten the utterances of their own press, which I have in my hand, but will not delay the House with reading. I find that my hon. friend whose absence I regret to-day, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), is reported in the *Morning Chronicle* of July 18th, 1884, to have stated in a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce that “he thought it would not be well to appear too anxious about the matter, and there was no doubt the Dominion Government (the same Government that we have to-day) were willing to have reciprocity, but nothing was to be gained by seeming over-anxious.” The correspondence between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper shows that the Canadian plenipotentiary expressed his readiness to confer with a representative of the United States at any time. Our Government is prepared at any day to discuss the question of our commercial relations with the representative of the United States. I have amply proved from the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite and from the writings in their press, that the line of conduct they are now pursuing is not calculated, even in their own opinions, to promote the cause of reciprocity. It is one which they themselves have pronounced unwise and undignified. I can say, therefore, that having gone back on their record, having contradicted themselves and having proved their insincerity, I cannot attach the slightest consequence to their utterances, nor do I believe, will the country. This important question of our commercial relations with the United States is to be made by them a foot ball for disappointed politicians. What is contemplated by this policy which hon. gentlemen opposite call unrestricted reciprocity? Mr. Longley, of Nova Scotia, who is an authority, does not attempt to conceal the full force of the meaning of commercial union. “It implies,” he admits, “the establishment of a common tariff against the rest of the world;” and with the greatest frankness he adds: “Let no person be deceived. This will mean that we will have to adopt the American tariff against Great Britain.” Further on he says, “I cannot ignore the fact that commercial union involves to a close degree the relationship be-

tween Canada and Great Britain herself." But we have an authority across the line from which to quote, Mr. Butterworth, who has stated that he is opposed to any measure which does not contemplate a Customs union. We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion that what hon. gentlemen opposite contemplate is a Customs union. Now, what are we to get in exchange for such an arrangement. In order to arrive at an estimate of the position we occupy in regard to the United States, we have to consider our trade relations with that country. I find our importations are \$45,000,000, and our exports \$37,000,000; thus the balance of trade is against us. Of the \$37,000,000 exports, \$11,000,000 is on the free list, and it is proposed, in the contemplated changes of the tariff in the United States, that \$9,000,000 shall be added to the free list. That would leave \$16,000,000 to be accounted for. Now, I have examined what these \$16,000,000 are composed of. \$13,000,000 are composed of articles of which the total importation into the United States is only \$14,743,000, so that if we acquire the whole additional trade it would only amount to \$1,600,000. These \$16,000,000 of dutiable articles are chiefly made up of the following:—

| | Imported from Canada. | Total U. States Imports. |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Horses | \$ 2,300,000 | 2,464,000 |
| Sheep | 1,100,000 | 1,183,000 |
| Barley | 6,171,000 | 6,173,000 |
| Hay | 789,000 | 790,000 |
| Malt | 150,000 | 153,000 |
| Cattle | 883,000 | 979,000 |
| Coal, Bituminous | 1,422,000 | 2,715,000 |
| Wheat | 218,000 | 218,867 |
| Oats | 27,600 | 29,500 |
| Butter | 38,000 | 38,100 |
| | \$13,100,000 | \$14,743,000 |

So that out of a total import of \$14,743,000 by the United States, Canada furnishes the whole amount with the exception of \$1,600,000 worth. Take out the article of coal and you will find Canada does within half a million dollars of all the business the United States desire to do in these articles with countries outside of themselves. There is still three million dollars to be considered, and this consists of different articles which may possibly be put on the free list, but in any case the amount is insignificant. It is admitted on both sides that, as the result of unrestricted reciprocity, the loss to the revenue of Canada on our present importations from the United States would amount to \$7,300,000. But under commercial union, another serious loss stares us in the face, and that is the duties on importations from Great Britain which amount to \$9,300,000, or \$8 per head. We pay \$8 per head, on importations from Great Britain, and the people from the United States pay \$2 per head. Under any new arrangement, therefore, the result of the commercial relations between the two countries, under a common tariff, would be that Canada would lose not only \$7,000,000 but \$14,000,000. Therefore, under this arrangement or even under unrestricted reciprocity, if it is practicable, we would have to resort to direct taxation, and the Provincial subsidies must cease to exist. As authority for that statement, I shall quote an article which appeared in a leading Liberal paper in the Province of Ontario. It says:

"The inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces are probably men of common sense. They understand that a fellow 'cannot eat his cake and have it.' They are supposed to favor reciprocity with the United States. A good many of them are believed to be free traders. The abolition of the Provincial subsidy would help them get what they want. Why, then, should they not consent to it?"

Then, I will quote the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, which says, as recently as December 2nd, 1887, that commercial union is a Customs union; and on December 3rd the same paper makes this announcement:

"It is gratifying to learn definitely and authoritatively, from his own lips, that Mr. Jones is not only favorable to commercial union, but sees no difficulty in working out a practical scheme on that basis."

Mr. KENNY.

Therefore it is evident that hitherto all these hon. gentlemen have contemplated commercial union. Now, I wish to place on record some more figures as regard the trade of the United States. On examination it will be found that of the whole importations from the United States, 66 per cent. come from the port of New York, and 8 per cent. through the port of Boston. I refer to that because, undoubtedly, under a commercial union these two cities would become the distributing points to Canada. Great stress has been laid, by hon. gentlemen opposite, upon the great exodus that is going on from Canada, and they never seem to be as happy as when they are referring to the fact that a number of Canadians are leaving their own country; they seem positively to gloat over it. The westward flow of emigration has been going on for many years. It went on just as much under the Grit régime as during the subsequent period of our history. The same thing is noticed in the Eastern States, and even in the agricultural portions of the State of New York, and considering the manner in which a great party in this Dominion have been constantly belittling and traducing their own country, the only surprise is that more people do not go away. When it was suggested the other day that an additional number of *Hansards* should be issued containing this debate, I could not help thinking that some of the numbers would doubtless find their way to our friends across the border, and I could not help wondering what the American statesmen and politicians would think of us as they read some of the speeches. If there is one trait more than another in the American character which is estimable and admirable, it is love of country. They all unite in praising their own land, and the riches of the English language are exhausted in finding words of eulogy. We know that, in the United States, the political differences are great and the political knife makes incisions which are deep and broad, but there is one point on which they will always rally and in regard to which you will always find them together, and that is in lauding their own country. Nothing has contributed more to their great importance and their great success than their love of country. It is much to be regretted that this feeling does not exist with us to the extent it ought. Its existence I acknowledge, but it does not exist to the extent it ought in the Dominion of Canada. However, in order to show that the exodus which has been going on for so many years, from the western flow of emigration, is no greater from our own territory than from certain of the Eastern States of America, I will read a statement of which a portion, I think, was read the other day, and which I may say, for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, was prepared by one of their own political supporters. That document reads:

"The growth of the population during a decennial period may be influenced by transient causes, but if we take a period of fifty years and compare the growth of one country with another, during that period, we shall be able to determine pretty accurately which country has within it the greatest elements of progress. The New England States afford a fair field for comparison with the old Provinces of Canada. This is what the census reveal:

| | 1830-1. | 1881. | Increase in 50 years. |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Maine | 1,953,717 | 4,010,026 | 2,056,309 |
| New Hampshire | | | |
| Vermont | | | |
| Massachusetts | | | |
| Connecticut | | | |
| Rhode Island | 1,065,215 | 4,141,424 | 3,076,200 |
| Ontario | | | |
| Quebec | | | |
| New Brunswick | | | |
| Nova Scotia | | | |
| Prince Edward Island | | | |

While the New England States have merely doubled their population in fifty years, the older Provinces of Canada have nearly quadrupled theirs in the same period."

I do not think that is very discouraging. It may not be very gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite, it is true,

but there are the figures, and, if they are not true, they can be contradicted. It is not fair to ourselves, it is not doing justice to our own land, or to those people who are to come after us, that unfair and misleading statements should go abroad.

"Dropping Ontario from the comparison, let us see how Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont—the States that lie immediately on our borders, whose soil and climate are similar to ours—have grown in population during the past fifty years compared with Quebec and the Maritime Provinces:—

| | 1830-1. | 1880-1. | Increase in 50 years. |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Three New England States..... | 949,435 | 1,327,713 | 378,278 |
| Four Canadian Provinces..... | 828,513 | 2,227,961 | 1,399,451 |

"In other words, while the increase of population in the New England States on our borders in fifty years has been only 38 per cent., the increase in the four Provinces has been 169 per cent. Figures like these require no comment.

"If we drop Quebec out of the statement and compare the growth of the Maritime Provinces with that of Maine, which lies immediately on our borders, the result will be found hardly less remarkable:

| | 1830-1. | 1880-1. | Increase in 50 years. |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|
| Maine..... | 399,455 | 648,436 | 248,981 |
| Maritime Provinces..... | 275,379 | 869,495 | 594,116 |

"In other words, while the increase of Maine in population in fifty years has been only 62 per cent., the increase of the Maritime Provinces in the same period has been 212 per cent.

"Let us limit the comparison between Maine and the Maritime Provinces to a period of twenty years, and exclude Prince Edward Island, and we shall have a still better opportunity of judging of the comparative growth of two pieces of territory differing but little in soil or climate and where the natural advantages are nearly equal. The following table speaks for itself:

| | 1860-1. | 1880-1. | Increase in 20 years. |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------|
| Maine..... | 628,279 | 648,436 | 20,157 |
| New Brunswick and Nova Scotia..... | 582,940 | 761,714 | 178,774 |

"Maine which twenty years ago had 45,000 more people than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, now has 113,000 less; and while Maine in that period has only added to her population by 3 per cent., New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have increased in population more than 30 per cent."

I know that these statistics are very tedious and tiresome, and I shall be as brief in reading them as possible. But they are important, and I consider it a matter of duty on the part of every true Canadian, of every man who loves his country, to put the true condition of the people before them, and before the world. Now, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, let me read what this Grit editor says:

"Some people are never tired of telling us that if Canada had been annexed to the United States its progress would have been greater than it has been; others when they cross the line from even the least progressive of the New England States into Canada, profess to be struck with our want of progress and lament that the influence of monarchical institutions should so depress a people. The true test of the value of this kind of talk is in the census returns, and we propose to use them for the purpose of showing that people who employ such language do not know what they are talking about, and are only repeating the ignorant chatter which they have heard used by others who are as ill-informed as themselves."

These extracts are taken from the *St. John Telegram*, of November, 1881. Now, as regards this exodus, which seems to delight hon. gentlemen opposite, and which they are so fond of attributing to the National Policy,—why, Sir, what took our people away years ago? It was because they could not find employment in their own country, it was because we had no manufactures. Now that factories have been established all over the land, people find employment in their own country and are able to live happily here, and their labors add to the national wealth. I hope hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that, after all, we have held our own as regards population, when we compare our position with that of the neighboring States. I find that the population of Nova Scotia in 1860, was 330,000; in 1870, 387,000; in 1880, 440,572. Now, as regards the position of our working classes, I regret exceedingly that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is not in the House when I speak of this matter, because I cannot do so in the same manner that I should have done if he were here. But I find that we have had the usual professional wail over the condition of the poor man. The condition of the laboring classes in a country like ours is one that concerns the public, and is of public interest. The Government have

exerted themselves in every way to improve the condition of our working classes. Now, I would like to see what my hon. colleague says about the working classes and the workmen in Nova Scotia. I find on page 271 of the *Hansard*, that he makes a reference to Canadian girls, and this is what he says:

"Why, one of our Nova Scotian or Canadian girls who goes to the United States as a domestic servant, is able to earn from \$14 to \$20 a month with her board, while a poor girl in the Province of Quebec who, perhaps, cannot leave her home, is laboring there for \$3.50 a month and paying her board.

Now, I do not know what may be the conditions of labor in the Province of Quebec, but I do know that in Nova Scotia one of the great difficulties we have in housekeeping is to get domestic servants. For that I am disposed to blame the National Policy. Formerly, for labor of that class, there was little employment in Nova Scotia, and they either had to take positions as domestic servants, or more frequently they left Nova Scotia altogether, alienated themselves from their home associations, from home ties, and sought that work in the United States, in the mills at Lowell, which they could not obtain in their own country. But since factories have been established in the Maritime Provinces and all over Canada, that class of labor finds employment in these factories. I am quite satisfied that when the Labor Commission examines into the condition of the operatives in the city of Halifax, the results will be most satisfactory to those who take an interest in the welfare of their fellow-citizens, I speak from my own knowledge when I say that whilst that factory has not been remunerative to its own shareholders, it has been a great boon to the poor people and to the working people of that community. It is true that as a result we have greater difficulty in getting domestic servants, but I never heard of a domestic servant in Nova Scotia earning only \$3.50 and paying her board. I do not know, as I said before, how it is in the Province of Quebec, but I must do my hon. colleague the justice to say that while his accuracy is most commendable, he has been careful not to describe this lowering of wages in respect to the girls of Nova Scotia, and for that much in their behalf I thank him. As regards the condition of the laboring classes, I find that while my hon. colleague has not given us the benefit of his knowledge, and as no man in Nova Scotia is better informed on that point, whilst he has indulged in the usual doleful wail over the condition of the poor man, I will do him the justice to give you the views of a leading gentleman as to the condition of the laboring classes in Nova Scotia, and I ask the attention of the House seriously to what I am about to read; I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides to treasure in their minds what that hon. gentleman said a few years ago as regards the condition of the laboring classes in Nova Scotia. I find in the *Morning Chronicle* of 18th May, 1834, the following report of his speech:—

"He was of opinion that Halifax laborers had no good reason to be dissatisfied" * * * He believed that a laboring man who is sober and industrious can get along, in Halifax as well as in any part of the world. * * * He was glad to know that laborers were living much more comfortably now than they did in the past. * * * He could recollect when wages were 75 cents a day, and flour was from \$12 to \$14 a barrel; now it was \$6.25 per barrel, with tea, potatoes, cotton and almost all the other necessities of life as cheap as ever they were, with wages at \$1.25 a day."

It is not fair to give a quotation without giving the author. The gentleman who made that statement, which is recorded in the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* of May, 8th, 1834, is now the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). Now, I have done that hon. gentleman the justice which he refused to do himself. I have given you, Sir, his calm deliberate opinion upon the condition of his fellow-countrymen, when he was far removed from his recent surroundings, when he was not entangled by the exigencies of party, when he could give to you such an utterance as I am sure will have

infinitely more weight than the excited speech he has made in this House. I am quite sure it would be difficult, it would be impossible to find in the annals of our parliamentary records or in the outside political utterances of our public men, a greater tribute to the National Policy than has been paid in these words by the senior member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman in the course of his speech—and I very much regret his absence, because I shall have to curtail my remarks very much in this connection in consequence—wished we had the happy days gone by. The happy days of Grit politicians, when flour was from \$14 to \$16 a barrel, and wages were 75 cents a day—those were the happy days! The laboring man is now to be appealed to, he is to be called into line, we are going for the farmer and for the fishermen and for the laboring man. But the laboring men of this country are not likely to forget that when the hon. gentlemen who now profess to be their friends were in positions where they could have helped them, when the laboring men of Canada asked them to frame a tariff which would enable those laboring men to live at home with their families and keep them about them in their own country, what did they give them in answer to that application? They gave them soup kitchens, and now they offer them direct taxation. As regards the condition of the laborer I think in Nova Scotia, at least, I have given you as high an authority as hon. gentlemen opposite could possibly expect me to give them. But to arrive at the true position I will, in order to be explicit,—and I must ask the House to give me a little time in this matter—place before hon. members a record of the deposits in the savings banks in Nova Scotia, extending over some years. It has been attempted to belittle the importance of these savings banks returns, and it has been said they are not indicative of the prosperity of a country. Hon. gentlemen, in fact, have gone so far as to say that these savings banks returns are no indications of individual or national prosperity. This is a very startling proposition, but it is quite in keeping with the whole line of argument we have heard from the other side. The fact is these hon. gentlemen have so bad a case that in their efforts to defame their own country every principle of morals and ethics has to be subverted to suit the case. I am disposed to attach very great importance to the savings banks returns as indicative of a very happy state of things. The deposits in the savings banks in 1867 were \$614,687, in 1881 they amounted to \$1,530,981, in 1878 they had reached \$2,210,000, in 1883, \$5,790,733. During the Grit régime the increase was \$679,034, but the increase from 1883 to 1887 was \$3,274,096, the deposit in 1887 amounting to \$9,064,829. That has been the increase during the last four years under this terrible National Policy which is ruining the country. My hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Jones) desires that the people should have money in their pockets, it is his most happy condition of things; but the people have not only the money in their pockets to gratify their ordinary requirements, they are not only by his own word, proved from his own mouth, more comfortable and more happy than they ever were before, but they have been actually able to pile up this enormous surplus of savings. The people are better housed, they are better fed, they are better clothed and better educated than ever before, and they have been able to put away this large sum. Those people who are able to do that must have had money in their pockets. We have heard something about the flour trade, and we have heard that the people of Nova Scotia were paying 50 cents a barrel more than they should pay on flour. Now, Sir, I remember very well in the discussion that took place in this House last year, in which I took a very subordinate part, it became my duty to say that flour was passing over the Intercolonial Railway through Halifax for Newfoundland, and was competing with American flour

Mr. KENNY.

started on its Atlantic journey from Boston or New York; in other words, by the arrangement made over the Intercolonial Railway the Newfoundland market was secured for Canadian millers. Now, we all know that the duty in Newfoundland is precisely the same on American flour as on Canadian flour, and therefore if Canadian flour was not cheaper it would not secure the market. I will quote a still better authority than the senior member for Halifax in defence of Canadian flour and in contradiction of his statement that Nova Scotian people are paying this 50 cents on their flour. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is reported to have made a speech at Halifax in 1878, when he made the following remarks:—

“Now, when your leaders come down here they declare, as Dr. Tupper did the other day, that the tax on flour would not raise the price one cent, and Dr. Tupper quotes me as an authority for that statement. Well, I do believe in it. I do believe that no tax would affect the price of a commodity of which we produce a surplus.”

Now, Sir, that is an answer, I think, to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) as regards flour, but in order to give him a reply nearer home I will quote him, with the permission of the House, what was said by one of the gentlemen who occupies a position in our Local Legislature, and who, in politics, is a political associate of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I will quote what Dr. Haley, member of the Local Legislature for the County of Hants, said:

“The duty has not increased the price of Canadian flour one fraction of a cent. We import it in bond, and can do so *via* Boston by packet cheaper than we can by railway.” “But do you not find a great deal more inconvenience in getting Canadian flour than American?” “Not the slightest. It comes to Boston by the railroad, in bond. It is just exactly as easy to get as the American. It is just as cheap, and, I think, just as good. The duty has not increased the price, but, flour being our chief import, and Boston being the city from which we can import at the lowest rates of freight, the duty has enabled us to obtain, *via* that city, the flour that we formerly bought in New York and Boston, when we had to pay higher rates of freight for bringing it here.”

Here, then, is a complete refutation of the statement of the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that our people were paying 50 cents a barrel more for flour. Now, Sir, we have been treated, also, to a dissertation about the coal trade, and hon. gentlemen have tried to show the very great disadvantages that important industry is laboring under in the Province of Nova Scotia. The hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) favors us with a letter from Mr. Lithgow, and Mr. Lithgow is a recognised authority on all matters connected with the coal trade. But, Sir, thanks to the member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper), who has been very diligent, we have ascertained that this letter was written in 1879. I think, Sir, that if the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) had been sincerely desirous of enlightening us as to his knowledge of the conditions of that trade, and as to the wishes and views of those who are engaged in it, he would have given us an extract from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, of December 1st, 1887, when that gentleman, in reply to a reporter, states the following in reference to the coal trade. He says:

“Our coal owners, to my surprise, are, I understand, not anxious to have their coal admitted free to the United States to be followed, as a matter of course, by the abolition of duty on our side, apprehending, I believe, that the Americans are strong competitors in our western markets, notably Montreal and Quebec. They do not think that the northern markets of the States would take our coal to the extent they did under the old treaty.”

Well, now, Sir, if that hon. gentleman had been anxious to convey to the Parliament of Canada the very latest information which he had upon that important industry, I think it would be better for him to have given us the views which he knows are entertained by coal owners in 1887, rather than to travel back to an old letter of 1879. But, Sir, the statistics of the coal trade in the Province of Nova Scotia are most instructive. We find, Sir, that of the coal raised in 1886, Nova Scotia consumed 460,000 tons, Quebec consumed 539,000 tons, New Brunswick consumed 176,000

tons, Prince Edward Island consumed 49,000 tons, Newfoundland consumed 72,000 tons, the United States consumed 61,000 tons, and the West Indies consumed 17,000 tons. In other words, the Province of Quebec took from the Province of Nova Scotia, last year, more coal than Nova Scotia had ever shipped to the United States under the Reciprocity Treaty. More than that, Sir, hon. gentlemen who come from the coal districts of Nova Scotia, who represent those constituencies and who are in touch with their constituents, have never said one word in favor of reciprocity in coal. Now, Sir, if they were so exceedingly anxious for it, if their districts were suffering for want of it, I am quite sure we should have had some expression of opinion from those gentlemen in favor of it. On the contrary, Sir, as far as I can gather from conversations with those gentlemen, they are not at all desirous that the present fiscal relations as regards coal should be changed. Now, Sir, we have heard a good deal about the fishermen. The fisherman is evidently growing rapidly in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), who favored us with the address which charmed us so much last evening, reminded us in eloquent terms of the very great value of the fisheries that surround the Maritime Provinces. I understood that hon. gentleman to say that they are as valuable as the wheat fields of Ontario. That fact was never brought so vividly before my mind as it was when I heard the statement from that hon. gentleman, and Sir, I listened to it with a great deal of pleasure and I think every true Canadian must have been glad to hear it. It is a good thing Sir, to direct attention to Canada's diversity of wealth. Nothing could be more unfortunate for the country than that it should have only one industry. If we were simply to become agriculturists and our crops fail, why, what would become of us? As you all know, Sir, that is simply Ireland's trouble to-day, that she has only one industry. And Sir, that is the condition of things which we are bound as statesmen, as politicians, and as representatives of the people to do all that we possibly can to avoid. No portion of our population are more useful to Canada than her fishermen. There a sturdy, honest, industrious, thrifty lot of fellows who from the depth of the ocean gather at great risk and with great labor that wealth which Providence has placed at our doors. I believe, Sir, that their condition is steadily improving and now that like the laborers they can in the words of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

"Buy flour that used to cost \$12 for \$6.25 and buy tea and cottons and all the necessities of life as cheap as ever they could."

To quote my hon. friend's language:

"They, too,"—

To quote him still:

"will be living more comfortably"—

And to continue the panegyric on the National Policy:

"they will have no good reason to be dissatisfied,"

But the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Skinner) made a suggestion which I thought was a considerate one and a thoughtful one in the interests of the fishermen. That was that we should push our commerce to the West Indies and Brazil. Now, Sir, to do that we must have steamers, and it will be recollected by hon. gentlemen that last year when I urged a subsidy to a line of steamers to the West Indies, I did so at the instance of the citizens of Halifax and also I believe, and I still believe, largely in the interests of our fishermen. When I did urge this I was strongly opposed and almost violently personally attacked, by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That is in the knowledge of gentlemen of this House, but, Sir, that does not discourage me. And I hope to see steamers carry our mails, passengers and fish to the West Indies and Brazil, and I believe it will benefit our fishermen, our millers, and our manufacturers.

Now, Sir, for the information of the hon. member for St. John, who evidently has taken very great interest in this question, I beg to say that the exports of the Province of Nova Scotia last year to the United States, which the hon. senior member for Halifax says is our only market, amounted to \$2,782,000, while our exports to the West Indies and South America amounted to \$2,228,000, a very trifling difference. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen who have suddenly become so zealous about the fishermen, I think, find in angling for them that they have not taken the bait. The fishermen know that the party opposite are no friends of theirs. Many of them remember, and remember affectionately and kindly, the late representative in this House, Mr. Power. Mr. Power was a Grit in politics, but he was a man who could rise above party in the interests of his country and his countrymen, and to help our fishermen he voted for the Washington Treaty, which was the great boon then, as it gave them free access to the American market. But while Mr. Power was voting for the Washington Treaty, his colleague, the present senior member for Halifax, was voting against it and against the interests of the fishermen in doing so, as in his efforts to thwart reciprocity, he is arraying himself against their best interests. Well, Sir, the fishermen, who have been so desperately appealed to in this House, knew Mr. Power and trusted him, and they bear his memory in grateful recollection; and they have still ringing in their ears the words of caution and advice which that hon. gentleman gave them, and which he was in a position to give them from his knowledge of the party opposite. Referring to the Grit party in this country, he said that it was the party that step by step and inch by inch had opposed every concession to Nova Scotia. But, Sir, I find that the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* also opposed the Washington Treaty, which was of such great advantage to the fisherman. That paper, on July 8th, 1881, said:

"Sir John has 'peculiar claims upon England's gratitude. He has helped the Home Government to complete the national degradation by the Washington Treaty.'"

Now, Sir, we have heard something of the general trade of Nova Scotia. We were by the hon. senior member for Halifax:

"The farmer has his wheat that he cultivates, his grains, his horses and sheep, and the various articles that he cultivates and raises; the fisherman from his hard toil has his fish, and the lumberman has his lumber; but where does it all go? It goes to the United States."

Now, Sir, that is a statement that is to go down to influence the fishermen in Nova Scotia to vote to restore hon. gentlemen opposite to the Treasury benches. But what are the facts of the case? The fishery products of Nova Scotia last year amounted to \$3,899,677. Of that amount \$1,353,000 went to the United States, while \$1,693,000 worth went to the West Indies and South America; and of the exports to the United States, Consul General Phelan's report shows that a large percentage was transported to the United States in bond and transhipped to other markets. Now, Sir, from the fact of our not having steamers to carry our fish from Halifax to the West Indies, large quantities are shipped in bond to New York and then re-shipped to the West Indies. Consul General Phelan, in his report issued in August, 1887, estimates the total exports from the port of Halifax to the United States at \$1,492,115. Of that amount \$863,977 was entered for consumption, and \$628,138, or 44 per cent., was transhipped. I have not the means at my command of ascertaining exactly what this transshipment in bond consisted of, and although I would not at all be supposed to say that it was exclusively fish, I am satisfied that a very large amount of it was fish. Now, we are told that of the products of the forests all we raise goes to the United States; but what is the fact? Here is a comparison of some of our exports to the United States with those to Great Britain:

| Products of | To Gt. Britain | To the U. States |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|
| The Forest | \$786,000 | \$ 345,000 |
| Animals, &c..... | 138,000 | 95,000 |
| Agriculture | 627,000 | 210,000 |
| The Fisheries | 718,000 | 1,358,000 |
| The Mine..... | 78,000 | 628,000 |

Now, Sir, as I may not again have the opportunity of dealing with the question of the fisheries, I wish to refer to one statement of the senior member for Halifax. That hon. gentleman said :

"What is the position of these fishermen? \$500,000 per year is what the fishermen of this country, under the present policy of restriction, pay to the revenue of the United States, that is, when they have the cash."

My hon. friend does not say the year. I did not know when the hon. gentleman was speaking, whether he was speaking solely of the farmers of the Lower Provinces, or whether, in the expansion of his heart, he had taken in all Canada, and was speaking for all the farmers of Canada. But I do know this, and I have taken some trouble to inform myself on the point, that the total importations into the United States of dutiable fish last year amounted to \$2,817,351, and the whole duty collected was \$611,937. Now, of that fish, there went from Canada into the United States the total value of \$1,330,832. It is a little difficult to arrive with mathematical precision at the exact amount that each different district in Canada may have sent, but I find that the total exports of the United States of fish, including anchovy, haddock, herring, dried salmon, mackerel, pickled salmon and the others, amounted to \$1,331,832, and that amount would include fish that was afterwards re-exported in bond, the duty on which could not have exceeded \$335,000. I give my figures, and I do not pretend to be infallible. I have taken some pains to make them up, and I shall be very glad to know if I am not correct. I desire to be correct, because, in discussing a great question like this, it is our interest, at all events, if it is not our object, to arrive at the strictest possible accuracy. Well, we have dealt with the laborers and the fishermen, let us now deal with the farmers. I was very glad to learn, for I had not the pleasure of hearing my hon. colleague the other night, that he stated the farmers were doing well, that the farmers of Nova Scotia are not in a bad condition, and he correctly attributed that to the diversity of employment in that Province. He said :

"We have not only our farming industry, but we have our fish, our coal, our lumber, our shipping industry, and our farmers are all to a certain extent more or less interested in one or more of these industries."

Again he said :

"We have in a part of Nova Scotia a very large fruit industry which has grown up lately with the old country, and which has brought \$100,000 into our Province."

I quite agree with my hon. colleague that the variety of our resources adds very much to the prosperity of our people. Then he added that the National Policy had nothing to do with our prosperity, because the National Policy did not make the crops. It has never been claimed for the National Policy that it did, but we claim that the National Policy gave life and vigor to our coal trade and expanded any manufactures which previously existed. My hon. colleague forgot to mention that the National Policy had enabled us to start cotton mills, woolen mills, glass and iron works, sugar refineries, and although these have not been all profitable to the investors, they have given remunerative employment to many of our people and thus created a home market for our farmers. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), in his very brilliant speech the other evening, and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) gave much and valuable information as to the prosperous condition of our farmers, which our fellow-countrymen will read with pleasure. Our ambition should be to try and increase the hum of the manufactories in order to benefit our farmers, and that is what Mr. Parnell is trying.

Mr. KENNY.

ing to do for Ireland. He simply wants to get in Ireland what we have in Nova Scotia, and that is varied employment for the people. He wants for Ireland what we have in Canada, a National Policy. As regards the Ontario farmers, which is a question I feel almost like apologising to the House for referring to, because it lies more with the residents of that Province to deal with it, my hon. colleague whom I am always happy to follow in any good example, took a very great interest in that question. He seemed to have become very much devoted to the interests of the Ontario farmers. Now, I hold in my hand a copy of a record sent to Congress from a delegation, held in Washington in January, 1887, of people interested in the shipping business of the United States. There were some 329 delegates present, and nearly every state and territory were represented. The memorial states the following:—

"The fact that the people of the United States are now producing so much more of the raw material from farm and mine, and such a superabundance of manufactured goods, that our own markets are glutted and stagnation thereby produced. Stagnation, experience has shown, is the parent of financial crisis, which brings ruin to the producing class of every community."

It is evident from these words that there is a superabundance of manufactured and agricultural products in the United States, and among these 329 delegates, not one conceived the bright idea of importing the superabundant products of Canada, but they said :

"Our best markets should be those of Central and South America, the West Indies and Australasia, from which we are practically excluded by the want of shipping."

Now, Sir, the Ontario farmers know they have to meet the competition of the American farmers in the English market, and they know that it is a very sharp, keen competition. What the Ontario farmers want, it seems to me—and I make the suggestion with all due respect—are more consumers, more customers for the produce, not more competitors at their own doors. Now, let us look at the condition of the farmers in the great State of New York. I am quite aware that it would not be fair to Ontario to institute a comparison between that Province and New England States. We all recognise that Ontario's wheat fields are of infinitely more value than agricultural districts in the New England States. What do we find as to the condition of the agriculturists in the State of New York? I will read from the report of the National Bureau of Agriculture, Washington, 1885, in regard to the condition of farmers in the State of New York. I do not know whether what I am about to read has come under the notice of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but to those who represent rural constituencies, and to the farmers of Ontario, I think this is a very important statement. This official document says :

"On the whole, farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago, and there are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged, which now would not sell for more than the face of the mortgage, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which, on the average, is fully 30 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of the buildings and other improvements."

Now, I do not know, of my own knowledge, whether such a condition of things prevails in the Province of Ontario, but that is the condition of things in the State of New York, and for the information of hon. gentlemen on both sides I have given them the authority from which I have quoted that. Now, as regards the agricultural districts of the New England States, their population has only increased 9 per cent. in 30 years, as compared with an increase of 62 per cent. in the Maritime Provinces. I was exceedingly sorry that my hon. colleague could not make out a case without referring disparagingly to the city of Halifax. When indulging in his usual dreary, doleful, dismal secession wail, he told the Dominion, from his place in Parliament, that Halifax was fast going to decay, that property was depreciating in value and that large amounts

of it were sold for taxes. I say that his attempt to disparage and belittle Halifax in the eyes of the country was unkind, ungenerous and unjust. I think Halifax deserved better treatment at his hands. The hon. gentleman has lived and prospered there for many years—it is my native place—we have both spent the happiest days of our lives there. All the dearest associations of our lives cluster round that old city. Surely we can say a kindly word of it in an assembly like this, in the presence especially of numbers of gentlemen who have never visited it. Those who have will bear it in kindly remembrance. I have noticed that the most lugubrious of the hon. gentlemen opposite generally had a cheery word for his own constituency, for his own home. What hope can there be for a city, when her own sons speak so gloomily of her as the hon. gentleman has spoken of Halifax? Is the hon. gentleman's argument so weak that in this broad Canadian land, he could not find ample illustration of it, without dragging in dear old Halifax? I can not deny that property is depreciated, and very seriously depreciated in Halifax. Real estate in London and in New York is depreciated. There has been a great shrinkage in values, and it has been very great at Halifax. I find that the assessed value of property in 1876 was \$11,943,832, and in 1886 was \$14,578,930. To the latter figures could be added factories which escape assessment at present, which might make the total increase in the past ten years to be \$3,000,000. I do not say that that is anything to boast about, but I will say that the condition of things would be much worse in Halifax, if we had not, subsequent to the date named by the hon. gentleman, started some factories. These factories may not have been very profitable to the shareholders, but they gave remunerative employment to a number of our people. The wholesale trade of Canada has been disturbed. That that is a matter on which I can speak freely, and in that respect Confederation has been of no advantage to Halifax, because it disturbed the distributing trade of Halifax. Previous to that time, Halifax supplied the Province of Nova Scotia and portions of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick with the imported goods which the people of those districts required. These goods paid tribute when they passed through Halifax; but when we had Confederation we immediately let in upon us the keen competition of the cities of Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and the neighboring city of St. John; and in a small community and a small market, you will recognise that that had a very depressing effect, and consequently, our trade has been very much diminished in that respect. I do not hesitate to say that Confederation has had that effect upon the city of Halifax. The steamboats and railways have, of course, distributed trade. I listened attentively to the hon. member for South Oxford, in the very able speech which he made in introducing his resolution the other evening, and in referring to the distributing trade of Canada, and the probable effect of the change proposed, he said that no great political change of this kind would be wrought without some disturbing element. Now, Sir, I recognise the existence of these distributing elements in Halifax in consequence of Confederation, and I would advise Canadians to be very cautious and careful, that the disturbing influences do not prevail when you allow your markets to be inundated by the products of American warehouses and packages. I am not going to express an opinion as to whether that is in the true interest of the people of Canada, but I know from experience that such will be the result. As it was in Halifax at Confederation, so it will be in Canadian cities and distributing centres, places like Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, &c., as soon as you remove the Customs barriers. Now, Sir, my hon. colleague has gone into the condition of Nova Scotia; he has undertaken to give us, with all the authority of a member of Parliament speaking to his colleagues in this assembly, the general condition of affairs

in Nova Scotia, which was made in a letter written by a gentleman in Halifax some years ago, and the letter is given as to the condition of Nova Scotia. This is the best authority the hon. gentleman can give us. He quotes Mr. Thompson, a personal friend of mine, a gentleman for whom I have very great respect and esteem; he quotes him as saying that some counties in Nova Scotia are suffering from depression in trade, and that the value of property there is infinitely less than it was some time ago. Now, what caused this depression in the value of property in Nova Scotia? I think the hon. gentleman ought to have told us. It may be that he meant us to infer that this great depression to which Mr. Thompson makes reference, was caused by the policy of the present Government; evidently his object was to convey that impression. Now, the only authority we have had quoted here on this point, is Mr. Thompson. I will read again the last portion of his letter which the hon. gentleman quoted:

"Taking four leading counties, representing the four of our leading industries,—Cape Breton as representing the coal mining interest; Antigonish as representing the farming interest; Hants as representing the ship-building interest, and Queen's as representing the lumbering interest, and we will find that the assessment rolls amounted in 1868 to \$11,316,000, while in 1884—at the time he was writing—they had decreased to less than \$8,000,000."

Now, it was the tariff, and what tariff? and who says it was the tariff? Why, Sir, Mr. James Thompson says it is the tariff, the same Mr. James Thompson who has been quoted here to the Parliament of Canada as an authority on the present condition of Nova Scotia. If Mr. James Thompson is an authority as to the condition of Canada, he is equally an authority as to the cause of that condition. Mr. James Thompson tells us it is the tariff. I have his letter in my hands, and it bears date July 19, 1878. He said it was the tariff, and it was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; that policy was supported by the senior member for Halifax. It was the tariff of the Government of which he was a member, that caused that depression in these counties, and for that I give Mr. James Thompson as my authority. Now, Sir, as Mr. James Thompson has become historical in this matter, it is only fair to you that I should tell you the circumstances under which this letter was written. It is addressed to the electors of the county of Halifax. He said in that address:

"The time is now rapidly approaching when you will be required to elect members for the Dominion Legislature, and in order that you may be better prepared to perform that duty, let me place a few facts before you."

Remember this authority is recognised by the senior member for Halifax, who quotes him in this Legislature. Mr. Thompson goes on to say:

"I think, however, you will agree with me that we ought, in the first place, to look to our own interests."

The interests of Nova Scotia.

"We must not follow leaders, but measures. We must not support Mackenzie because he is a representative of the Grit party, nor Macdonald because he is the representative of the Liberal Conservative party; but support that party, whatever its name, which will best promote the interests of the Dominion, and which will give us that justice which has so long been denied."

That is the justice which the Grit Government had denied to the Province of Nova Scotia, and this is simply verifying the words of the late Mr. Power which in the previous portion of my argument I quoted to you.

"The question which most affects us is the tariff. Shall there be a revision of the tariff or not? That is the question to be determined at the polls. It is not a question of protection or no. Neither of the opposing parties are free traders. Macdonald preaches a protective policy, but Mackenzie puts it in practice."

Then the writer, referring to the condition of Nova Scotia, says:

"In other words, every laboring man is compelled to give one day's labor out of ten to support the Government."

Now, we were told the other day that the present tariff presses enormously upon the poor man and adds to the poor man's sufferings. Listen to what the best authority that can be quoted from Nova Scotia says as to the tariff which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) supported:

"The articles used by the poor man, by the present tariff pay as much and in many cases far more than those used by the wealthy. Silks and satins pay no more than woollens and cottons. The tea used by the wealthy manufacturer of Ontario pays about 10 per cent., while that used by our poor fishermen pays between 30 and 35 per cent. Out of every ten pounds of tea the former uses, the Government takes one, while out of every four pounds the latter purchases, the same Government extracts one pound. The cigars smoked by the millionaire at the bank ball pay only 30 per cent., while the tobacco smoked by the poor fisherman on the Banks of Newfoundland pays 200 per cent. The wine consumed by the rich merchant pays less than 20 per cent., while the rum drunk by the poor laborer of this Province pays more than 350 per cent. For every dollar's worth of wine imported for the wealthy, the Government gets 20 cents; while it makes the poor man pay \$3.50 for every dollar's worth of rum imported for him.

"Is it surprising that the more lightly taxed manufacturers of Ontario can send down their goods and under-sell the highly-taxed people of this Province?

"Is it astonishing that with a tariff constructed to enable the grocers of Toronto to import from New York, that our West India trade should languish, that our coopers should lack employment, our fishermen customers, and our ships return empty to this port after having deposited their cargoes at that great emporium of the United States?

"With these figures before you, taken from the public records, I call upon you to exercise your franchise in favor of the party which will so adjust the tariff as will make it fair and equitable in its operation. The present Government have not listened to our reasonable demand, but have refused to make any amendment. Let us try another, and let us be careful in the selection of our representatives to choose men who will not hesitate to abandon any Government that will not do us justice."

And we followed Mr. Thompson's advice, and we were exceedingly careful in the selection of the representatives, and refused to send the senior member for Halifax back to this House. As regards the city of Halifax I have a memorandum or statement of its population. The population of Halifax in 1860 was 25,000; in 1870, 29,000; in 1880, 36,000. I have already given the House a statement of the deposits in the savings banks in 1876, when we went into Confederation. The deposits in the chartered banks at that time were \$2,209,873; to-day the amount is \$3,818,763. The tonnage entered at Halifax has increased between 1866 and 1887 by 307,735 tons. I find we are dealing not only with Halifax but with the general condition of the Province of Nova Scotia, and therefore I may say that the exports of Nova Scotia in 1868 were of the value of \$4,563,369; in 1887 they were of the value of \$8,561,425 or very nearly double. The tonnage entered inward and outward in Nova Scotia has increased from 1867, when it was 440,382 tons, by 2,911,681 tons. I do not wish to exaggerate the condition of things in Nova Scotia, or in the city of Halifax. I admit that depreciation of real estate exists, and I admit that far more of our people are leaving than we like to see; but I say, as a public man, that it is not fair, it is not in the public interest, that these defamatory statements of the condition of our own country and our own cities should go abroad, and therefore it is that I have gone to some trouble to gather the statistics. I fear that in doing so I have trespassed very much on the time and attention of this House. We have also had a bid made for the shipbuilders and shipowners. I was told last year, when I attempted to talk about sugar, that I was talking about a business in which I was not personally engaged and in which I had no personal interest, and that I had better not say anything about it. That is a dangerous doctrine for hon. gentlemen to lay down, because it is the duty of a public man to discuss every phase of business and every branch of industry which in any way concerns the country, and to bring to Parliament the best information he can gather on the topic. I find in the heroic efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to obtain support for this heroic remedy that a bid has been made for the support of the shipbuilders

Mr. KENNY.

and shipowners of the Lower Provinces by telling the people that if they would only vote for hon. gentlemen opposite the coasting trade of the United States would certainly be opened to them. Every man who owns a ton of shipping would be very glad to see such a happy state of affairs; we in Nova Scotia would be very much delighted indeed to see it. We have had reciprocity treaties before, we have had hon. gentlemen advocating reciprocity before, but they never thought until now of the shipbuilders and shipowners. I do not consider it fair to put this question before the people of the Lower Provinces in such a manner as to lead them to suppose that the shipping interests of the United States were in a so much more prosperous condition than our own, but we, on that account, should risk any change which under any circumstances a customs' union must involve. I think, if I catch the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, that more than one hon. gentleman has told us that the condition of our shipping is infinitely worse than that of the United States. I may say as regards the shipping industry, that there is no industry in the Lower Provinces which of late years has suffered so much from depression as that of shipbuilding, and when I listen to the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), to which I have referred before, of the value of our fisheries, and when we reflect upon what had been the value of the shipping industry, I come to the conclusion that we should be about the most wealthy people in the world. Gentlemen who reside in the western portions of this Dominion can have no conception of the extent of our shipping industry of a few years ago. Nova Scotia *per capita* was the largest shipowning country in the world. We not only built our ships, Sir, but we manned them, and we sailed them and their earnings came home to enrich Canada. It was an export trade and all the world contributed to it. Our freight was carried from one part of the earth to the other, and the earnings, large in those days, came back to enrich our own country. The value of that industry, Sir, I am happy to say, was recognised by the present Government, and as a shipowner I thank them for that recognition of that important industry. When those hon. gentlemen who profess so much interest for the shipowners came down to Nova Scotia and talked to us as regards what they were going to do for us I advised my fellow countrymen to ask them what had they done for us when they were in a position to do anything for us—when they were in a position of power in this country. I would advise them to judge them by their acts and not by their words; and they have come to the same conclusion as I have, that they have done absolutely nothing for us, but that they have rather clogged the wheels of progress than helped us in every branch of industry. I regret to say that this great shipping industry of the lower Provinces has almost virtually ceased. That has been caused by the improvement in steam and the much cheaper steamships which are made and built on the Clyde, and also by the iron sailing ships. We, who wish to continue in the business, have discovered that the iron sailing ship is a more profitable investment than our wooden ships, and it is very unfortunate for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that stagnation prevails in this industry. I am sometimes astonished, Sir, that considering the great depression which exists in the shipbuilding trade, or rather the shipowning trade, for shipbuilding is nearly extinct, that more depression does not prevail in both the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of Nova Scotia. Those wooden ships, Sir, become, instead of a source of profit to their owners, an actual source of loss, and loss has been involved in sailing them. Now, Sir, let me look for a moment at the condition of the shipbuilding industry of the United States to which our attention has been invited. Those are the figures, and, gentlemen, they are remarkable figures:

SAILING VESSELS.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Atlantic coast sailing vessels, 1874 | 2,096,842 |
| do do 1887 | 1,685,070 |

Decrease 431,772

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Coasting tonnage vessels enrolled and licensed, 1874 | 3,293,439 |
| do do do 1887 | 3,010,735 |

Decrease 282,694

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Total sailing tonnage, 1874 | 3,615,042 |
| do do 1887 | 2,563,128 |

Decrease 1,051,914

Or, in other words, a decrease of \$ 5,000,000

The coasting tonnage of Nova Scotia taking the arrivals and departures has nearly doubled. For Maine, once foremost in shipbuilding:

| | |
|---|--------|
| In 1877 the new tonnages measured | 76,308 |
| In 1886 do do | 15,024 |

61,284

Or a difference of value of \$ 2,500,000

I can speak positively, Sir, and I believe that there are few vessels on the docks in Maine, but whilst that has been going on in Maine and the United States, there has also been a decrease in tonnage in the Maritime Provinces. The total tonnage of sailing and steam has decreased in the Maritime Provinces from 1878 to 1885 by 25,190 tons or about 33.7 per cent. Well, Sir, let us look at what the *Boston Herald* says about the Maine shipbuilding. The *Boston Herald* of 9th September, 1887, says:

"DECLINE IN AMERICAN SHIPPING.

"To-day a desolation of the sort which Charles Lamb noted at the South Sea House, and which he likened to the desolation at Balclutha reigns over the ship yards of Bath where 10,000 men once toiled without ceasing, and another 10,000 delved and toiled in turn for them, there is now but scant employment for a slim 1,000. Thirty years ago, along the front of Ancient Bath alone, the frames and forms of barques and brigs, and sloops and schooners and full-rigged ships and wooden steamers literally fringed the river bank for three miles. Now, only the memories of these stately hulls that sailed away are left to Bath. Where giant crafts were put together and yards were alive with industry, grass grows now; piles rot away, neglected wharves fall slowly to decay, or in some instances have become vegetable gardens, or well trimmed lawns. The old sheds and shops black and feeble and betraying, in their aged leanness, every rafter bone in their bodies drop gradually to pieces among the ghosts of shipping and the graves of stocks. Thirty years ago the ships of Bath sailed into every port in every clime. Wherever ships were gathered together, the masts of Bath carried the Stars and Stripes. Thirty years ago the yards of Bath launched half a hundred full-rigged ships in a twelve month. In the last two years they have not launched one, nor built one, nor planned one. Nor is there at the present time, within the wide borders of the United States, a single full-rigged ship in course of construction."

Now, Sir, I think that when hon. gentlemen compare the condition of our shipping, depressed as it is, depreciated in value as it is, they will recognise that we have not a great deal to find fault with as regards our inter-provincial trade. We are told, Sir, with great rejoicing by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we have no inter-provincial trade. We have not such an inter-provincial trade as I would like to see, but it is growing and will steadily increase. We often forget in discussing this question that we have only had 20 years of national life, and how short is 20 years in the life of a nation. I remember the early days of Confederation when gentlemen had to come to this Parliament and discharge their duties for the Lower Provinces, they had to take the steamer at Halifax and make the voyage to New York, then travel across the State of New York by the Suspension Bridge, or some other road, and then get around to Prescott Junction for Ottawa. That usually occupied six or seven days. At that same period of time, Sir, the railroads existing in Nova Scotia could only carry one 60 miles

from Halifax. As hon. gentlemen know we now come here from Halifax in two days, and I am informed that when the Short Line Railroad will be built next year we will be able to make the journey in one day. When the journey is shortened to one day, I hope, Sir, that we will have the pleasure of seeing some of our friends from Ontario down there. They will find that we have not such a bad country; that we are not such a bad people as would appear from the remarks of some hon. gentlemen; they will find that we are not "arrant fools," nor "sneaks," nor "cowards," nor "flunkies." Now, Sir, we cannot only travel from Ottawa with some comfort, and ease, and expedition, but, to-day, we can go from Halifax, on the Atlantic, to Vancouver on the Pacific, and all through Canada's territory. Is not this progress? I do hon. gentlemen opposite—some of them at least—the justice to say that I have had some conversation with them, that they agreed that the construction of that great Canadian enterprise, that magnificent railroad which has raised us so much in the estimation of our neighbors as well as of the whole British public, that that road should be to us all Canadians a source of national pride. And after all, there never was a great work so persecuted for party purposes as that very road has been. Now, I would say to hon. gentlemen who are ever grumbling about our inter-provincial trade: Remember our short national existence; give us a chance; we are still in our national youth; we still need some care and consideration; do not drive us from the paternal roof; do not turn us over to strangers; do not be guilty of the horrible crime of strangling your own progeny. Why, Mr. Wiman, the father of the fad, never abuses Canada; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to follow him, cannot they take that example from him, and occasionally say a kind word for their country? It was only 17 years ago that our currencies were assimilated. Have we no inter-provincial trade? The senior member for Halifax told us that the Maritime Provinces send to Ontario \$10,000,000 to pay for goods. Well, Sir, that may be true or it may not. Ask the Halifax and Moncton sugar refiners how long they could work without the markets of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba; ask the cotton manufacturers of St. John, Windsor, Moncton and Halifax where they sell the major part of their products, and they will tell you in the Upper Provinces. The products of our iron works and of our coal mines go largely to Ontario and Quebec. They say we have no interprovincial trade because Ontario and Quebec do not take our fish, and we do not take all their surplus produce. Would any American statesman who values his reputation say that because Pennsylvania supplies Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire with coal, and because Pennsylvania does not take because she does not require the surplus agricultural productions of those States, therefore there is no inter-state trade between them, and God and nature has decreed that it is impossible for them to live under the same policy and the same flag? No American legislator would make such a statement as that. Sir, it is surprising that we have accomplished so much. If the doctrine of natural trade, arises from contiguity of territory, were universally adopted, there would be no stability in the frontiers of the nations; every nation whose territory is coterminous with that of another would find a natural trade strangled by the national tariffs, and a rearrangement of the boundaries would be necessary. With regard to the mission of the Intercolonial Railway I expressed my views last year, and I have only to say that I cordially concur in what the hon. member for St. John has said on that subject. As regards the effects of the proposed policy, a gentleman who occupies a seat in the other end of this building tells us, in a Toronto newspaper of 20th May, 1887, that we have invested in manufactures \$104,000,000, and that a customs union would mean a depreciation to the

extent of 33 per cent. in the value of that property. Now, Sir, is that desirable in the interests of Canada? That is not my individual opinion, but it is that of a gentleman much better informed than I am. But I know that one of the largest boot and shoe manufacturers in the Lower Provinces has stated that if we had commercial union he would have to close his manufactory in 24 hours; and other large manufacturers have expressed themselves in similar terms. Is it wise to run the risk of destroying all these industries, which are giving employment to our people and adding so much to our wealth, and drive them to seek in a foreign state that protection which a change of policy might deprive them of in their own? Our sugar refineries would be imperilled. There is no industry in the country which so promotes our shipping, and, consequently, our trade with the West Indies. I have shown that 66 per cent. of the whole imports would go to New York under commercial union, which would drive the distributing centres of Canada into that city. I fear that commercial union would simply mean building up the cities of the United States at the cost of our own. I may be wrong. When the question comes before Parliament, I shall be prepared to discuss it on its merits. But this far I am satisfied, that under that system Canada would become the slaughter market of the American manufacturers. Of that I have had personal experience. I remember being in New York some years ago, and wanting to purchase some goods of a certain class, I called on a firm of bankers, one of whom was formerly in that business, Mr. George Bliss. He gave me the names of certain firms from whom I could make my purchases, saying: "You must tell them you want the goods for Canada." I replied, with natural diffidence, that I was a very small purchaser. He said: "If you will only tell them you want the goods for Canada, you will get them cheaper than A. T. Stewart or Claflin could buy them." He went on to tell me that while the manufacturers would not break their prices in their own territory, they would slaughter their productions in Canada. Now, any man who has any knowledge of the dry goods business knows that for continental goods, French, Swiss and German goods, New York is the great slaughter market, and that you can actually buy those goods there at auction for infinitely less money than you could import them for in any regular business channel. Under commercial union Canada would be made the slaughter market for those goods, and I am quite certain it would mean the depreciation and almost the destruction of the distribution trade of Montreal. It would be for the people of Canada to decide whether Montreal should be sacrificed to the country or not. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution told us that England had not a friend in the world, that she was torn by internal dissension and menaced by foreign aggression, and gave that as reason for our voting for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. This language recalled to my mind, the days when, as a boy at school, I committed to memory, that grand speech of Lord Chatham, when chiding his brother peers, for their outrageous conduct in arraying in arms against them their fellow countrymen at this side of the Atlantic—that most stupendous act of folly recorded on the pages of history—Lord Chatham told the House of Lords, that that unnatural war had so robbed England of her prestige, that none amongst the nations of the world were so poor as to do her reverence. I suppose the hon. gentleman who made this statement had some such words ringing in his memory. Sir, I recognise with the hon. gentlemen the domestic difficulties of Great Britain, I will go further and express my individual opinion, that Ireland has not been treated fairly or justly, but, now, that the great masses of the English people are aroused to a sense of the injustice that country has so long and so patiently labored under, I believe that the remedy will be swift and sure. I pray it may be so.

Mr. KENNY.

Ireland's wrongs, once righted, none will be more true to England than Ireland's sons, and we shall see in England, what we Canadians all wish for, a united, happy and prosperous people, and England will be in the future the beacon of justice and freedom for the world. I think, Sir, we need not give ourselves any anxiety for England's future. Since Lord Chatham spoke so many years ago, we know what her career has been, and now that the Canadian statesman who moved this resolution has spoken, I do not think we need be so much alarmed. I am sure, Sir, that her statesmen, wise in council and prudent in action, will be in the future, as they are to-day, ready, willing, anxious, to unite the great English-speaking peoples in the closest ties of friendship. The reference made by the hon. member for South Oxford reminds me, too, that no people in the world have ever suffered more for creed or for country than have Irishmen. Nowhere is all that Irishmen love most dearly, their religion and its clergy, more revered and respected than in this Canadian land, and the status of the Irish race is infinitely superior in Canada, to that of their fellow-countryman across the border, and any political change would mar that happy state of things. I cannot wish better for Ireland, than that her position may become like unto ours, and that when she acquires her own local self-government, she may also be enabled to inaugurate some system, by bounty or otherwise, whereby she too may have a National Policy as we have, which will enable her to employ some of her population in manufacturing, and not be solely dependent upon one industry, so that like us, with varied industries, the farmers' best market will be the home market. I repeat, Sir, that I am in favor of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, one that may be fair, and honorable, and mutually advantageous. I believe that the Government of this country is desirous of making such an arrangement, and that the matter should remain untrammelled in their hands. But I will say this, owing to the changed condition of the two countries, owing to the greater development in the larger country and its keen competition in the products of the soil, and still keener competition in manufacturing pursuits, great care and caution must be exercised in framing such a treaty, and I do not believe, if we had the old reciprocity in force to-day, it would be as great a financial advantage to Canada as it was formerly, because the condition of things has very much changed. Believing, from the oft-quoted utterances, that the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite is not calculated to benefit the cause of reciprocity, I shall not vote for the resolution nor for the amendment of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). And further, Sir, I say this from my place in Parliament, that if the negotiations so cordially opened between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper do not come to a successful issue, I shall hold this agitation responsible for the failure. I have considered this question from the standpoint of a Canadian, as I feel it my duty to consider all questions that come before me; and as regards sentiment, I must plead guilty to being subject to its influence and to having that share of it which I believe every Irishman possesses. It cannot be said that I have not been guilty of taking up your time, but I think you will admit that I have not been guilty of any sentimental gush. I will simply say that I was born under the British flag, that I have lived happily under it, that I believe the Canadian people are as happy to-day under it as any people in the world, and that I believe we enjoy as great a measure of civil and religious liberty and as full protection for life and property as any people in the world. I do hope that under any circumstances no political change will be brought about, and I will do hon. gentlemen opposite the justice to say that I believe a large number of them, in their hearts, do not desire a change. In conclusion I may say, again, I very much fear the agitation they have inaugurated will retard rather than advance the cause of reciprocity.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I stated yesterday that the report which I read of an interviewer's conversation with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), was taken from the *Sarina Observer*, the organ of that hon. gentleman. I find that I unintentionally made an error as to the newspaper in which the report appeared. I should have said it appeared in the *Sarnia Canadian*, of the 20th July last, not the organ of the hon. member, and an abstract from the *Detroit Evening News*.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) to incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, the amendment thereto by Mr. Foster, and the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Jones (Halifax):

M. BEAUSOLEIL: M. l'Orateur, rien que l'importance de la question qui est maintenant sous la considération de cette honorable Chambre peut m'induire à prendre la parole après avoir entendu la discussion savante et approfondie qui en a été faite.

Mais, M. l'Orateur, il s'agit, dans le moment, d'une mesure qui intéresse non-seulement la prospérité actuelle, mais encore la destinée future de toute la moitié d'un continent. Il s'agit, dans ce moment, de savoir si le Canada va rester stationnaire ou continuer les progrès peu rapides qu'il a faits jusqu'aujourd'hui, ou s'il va prendre son essor et rivaliser avec la république voisine.

Je désire dire de suite que je n'ai pas l'intention de faire, sur cette question, un discours de partisan, ni d'en faire une question de parti. La question est bien au-dessus des partis puisqu'elle intéresse le présent et l'avenir de tout un peuple.

Un fait, M. l'Orateur, qui doit frapper ceux qui s'occupent des affaires publiques, c'est que l'agriculture, qui est la première ressource d'un pays, n'est pas prospère, au moins dans la province de Québec. Je n'ai pas l'intention de parler de l'état de choses qui existe dans les autres provinces, mais je sais, et il est de mon devoir de dire ce qu'il en est pour ce qui concerne la province de Québec, dont j'ai l'honneur d'être un des représentants dans cette Chambre.

Si vous parcourez les comtés en dehors de Montréal, si vous parcourez nos paroisses, vous verrez dans tous les rangs des maisons vacantes parce que des familles entières sont parties pour les Etats-Unis, un par un d'abord et des familles entières ensuite. Dans le comté de Berthier que j'ai l'honneur de représenter, et qui est certainement l'un des plus riches de la province de Québec, il y a des paroisses où un quart des propriétaires sont absents aux Etats-Unis avec leurs familles et dont les noms sont encore portés sur les listes des élections, et qui n'y sont pas lorsque le moment du vote arrive. Et cela, M. l'Orateur, ne représente pas la moitié de l'émigration qui s'est faite dans nos campagnes, parce que en outre de ceux qui ont laissé leurs propriétés vacantes mais encore en leur nom il y a tous ceux qui en ont disposé avant

de partir, et qui sont occupées par d'autres. On m'a informé que le nombre de ceux qui ont vendu leurs propriétés avant de laisser le pays est au moins le double de ceux qui les ont gardées en leur nom pour aller gagner leur vie et la vie de leurs familles aux Etats-Unis.

Cependant, M. l'Orateur, ce serait une grande erreur de prétendre que la province de Québec n'offre pas à l'agriculture toutes les ressources désirables. Le sol est fertile, les terres sont susceptibles d'être labourées et de produire amplement. On compte par millions d'acres nos terres publiques qui sont arpentées et non encore occupées. Il y a place pour plusieurs millions de population additionnelle.

Je ne dirai pas que la province de Québec ne progresse pas, car elle progresse lentement si vous le voulez, mais elle progresse; mais il est incontestable que le progrès n'est pas en proportion de ce qu'il devrait être.

Quelle est la raison de cet état de choses? Il n'y en a qu'une seule. Si le sol est fertile et propre à la culture, si le climat est sain et la population vigoureuse, c'est donc que nous n'avons pas un marché convenable pour le surplus de nos produits.

En Canada, M. l'Orateur, nous savons qu'il n'existe pas de restriction à la disposition du surplus de nos produits. Nous savons également qu'il n'y a pas de restriction sur l'exportation en Angleterre de nos produits agricoles, mais il en existe aux Etats-Unis. Et si le marché anglais n'est pas plus favorable, c'est parce que les profits de l'agriculteur sont complètement absorbés par les frais de voyage, par le fret et l'assurance, et que lorsque nos grains sont rendus en Angleterre, ils entrent en concurrence avec ceux des Etats de l'ouest et ceux des Etats de l'Europe, de la Turquie, de la Russie, de l'Egypte et d'ailleurs.

A côté de nous, M. l'Orateur, nous avons un peuple de 60,000,000 d'âmes qui absorbe déjà une grande partie de notre surplus, mais les frais de transport y sont remplacés par des droits très élevés qui opèrent non moins désavantageusement à l'égard de l'agriculture.

Voici une liste de quelques-uns des produits agricoles que nous expédions aux Etats-Unis. Et si vous comparez le montant total de l'exportation de ces produits avec l'exportation aux Etats-Unis, vous vous apercevrez que ceux-ci en absorbent de 92 à 95 pour cent:

| Articles. | Montant exporté aux Etats-Unis. | Montant total de l'exportation. |
|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Orge..... | \$5,245,968 | \$5,277,889 |
| Chevreaux..... | 2,214,338 | 2,350,926 |
| Œufs..... | 1,821,364 | 1,825,559 |
| Moutons..... | 974,482 | 1,595,340 |
| Foin..... | 670,749 | 743,396 |
| Patates..... | 328,652 | 439,206 |
| Laine..... | 288,251 | 317,250 |
| Fèves..... | 206,617 | 207,402 |
| Malt..... | 146,012 | 146,012 |
| Volailles..... | 98,919 | 107,909 |
| Lin..... | 78,422 | 78,422 |
| Légumes..... | 75,517 | 83,639 |
| | \$12,149,291 | \$13,162,950 |

Ainsi, sur douze articles de productions agricoles, dont nous avons exporté pour \$13,162,950, les Etats-Unis en ont acheté pour \$12,149,291, ne laissant au reste de l'univers que \$1,013,659. C'est-à-dire que les Etats-Unis absorbent 92 pour 100 de notre surplus.

Faisons disparaître cette barrière douanière; abolissons ces droits qui absorbent de 20 à 40 pour 100 de la valeur des marchandises, et de suite nous augmenterons d'autant la valeur de ces produits dans ce pays, parce que le surplus que nous exportons aux Etats-Unis n'est qu'une goutte d'eau dans la mer comparée à la consommation des Etats-Unis et conséquemment ne peut en affecter les prix.

Si donc l'abolition des droits ne faisait pas baisser les prix aux Etats-Unis, ce serait nos cultivateurs qui en profiteraient et qui ajouteraient aux minces profits qu'ils réalisent aujourd'hui le montant des droits qu'ils sont obligés de

payer. Ces droits, dans le cas de certains articles équivalent à un tiers ou 40 pour 100 de leur valeur. Ainsi, dans le cours de l'été dernier nous pouvions acheter le foin dans le comté de Berthier, qui est l'un des comtés qui en produisent le plus et du meilleur, pour \$6 la tonne. Le droit sur le foin aux Etats-Unis est de \$2 par tonne. Voilà donc 33 pour 100 du produit des terres dans le comté de Berthier —et il y a beaucoup d'autres comtés dans la même position —absorbés par les droits américains. Sur l'orge il y a un droit de 10 cents par minot. Nous en exportons pour cinq millions et demi. Voilà encore \$550,000 pris sur la production du pays avant d'arriver sur le marché américain. Il en est de même de beaucoup d'autres articles; avant que nos cultivateurs puissent placer une seule parcelle du surplus de leurs productions, ils sont obligés de prendre un tiers ou un quart et de le déposer dans le trésor des Etats-Unis.

Encore une fois, M. l'Orateur, si ces droits de douane étaient abolis, nous verrions aujourd'hui ce que nous avons vu en 1854, lorsque l'ancien traité de réciprocité a été conclu. Durant l'année 1853, la province unie du Canada, c'est-à-dire le Haut et le Bas-Canada, avait exporté aux Etats-Unis :

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Animaux et leurs produits | 966,196 |
| Produits agricoles..... | 3,281,092 |
| En tout | 4,247,288 |

Douze ans après, c'est-à-dire durant l'année expirée le 30 juin 1866, les deux mêmes provinces avaient exporté aux Etats-Unis :

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Animaux et leurs produits | 11,184,741 |
| Produits agricoles..... | 13,298,008 |
| En tout | 24,482,749 |
| | 4,247,288 |
| Augmentation en 12 ans de..... | 20,025,461 |

soit près de 500 pour cent.

Les résultats désastreux pour l'agriculture de l'abrogation du traité de réciprocité ne tardèrent pas à se faire sentir. Dès l'année suivante, c'est-à-dire dès l'année fiscale expirée le 30 juin 1867, nos exportations aux Etats-Unis accusaient les réductions suivantes :

| | 1866. | 1867. | Réduction. |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Animaux et leurs produits.. | 11,184,741 | 3,686,191 | 7,498,550 |
| Produits agricoles..... | 13,298,008 | 11,185,227 | 2,112,781 |
| | 24,482,749 | 14,871,418 | 9,611,331 |
| | 14,871,418 | | |
| | 9,611,331 | | |

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, si l'on veut prétendre que ceci est une progression naturelle et qu'elle se serait produite sans la réciprocité, j'attirerais l'attention de la Chambre sur le fait qu'en 1867, l'année qui a suivi l'abrogation du traité de réciprocité, nos exportations des produits agricoles et de produits de la ferme accusent la différence suivante : Nous avons exporté comme je viens de la dire en 1866 pour \$11,184,741 d'animaux et pour \$13,293,008 de produits agricoles, en tout \$24,482,749. En 1867 nous avons exporté pour \$3,686,191 d'animaux et leurs produits, soit une réduction de \$7,498,550, et en produits agricoles \$11,185,227, soit une réduction nouvelle de \$2,112,781, ou une réduction totale de \$9,611,331 sur ces deux classes de produits seulement en une seule année.

En 1866, nos exportations totales aux Etats-Unis, abstraction faite du numéraire, s'étaient élevées à \$34,770,261, en 1867, elles tombaient à \$23,859,034, accusant une réduction de \$10,911,177.

Bien plus, après vingt ans du régime de l'exclusion, après avoir dépensé tant de millions pour faciliter les relations commerciales, nous trouvons que les exportations des provinces d'Ontario et Québec aux Etats-Unis sont moins considérables qu'elles ne l'étaient en 1866, ainsi que le démon-

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

trent les chiffres suivants extraits du tableau du commerce du Canada pour l'année expirée le 30 juin 1887.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Exportations aux Etats-Unis :—Ontario..... | \$30,803,434 |
| “ “ Québec..... | 4,710,270 |
| Total | \$35,513,704 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Exportations en 1866 | \$34,770,201 |
| Diminution après 21 ans | 9,256,547 |

Mais si nous prenons la Puissance entière; si nous ajoutons aux provinces d'Ontario et Québec, les cinq nouvelles provinces et les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, nous trouvons que nos exportations totales aux Etats-Unis sont encore inférieures à ce qu'étaient celles des deux provinces en 1866 :

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Exportations totales en 1866..... | \$34,770,201 |
| “ “ 1887..... | 34,658,275 |
| Réduction..... | \$111,926 |

Depuis vingt et un ans, notre agriculture, en supposant qu'elle n'aurait pas fait de progrès depuis 1866—a donc perdu chaque année un commerce de plus de \$9,000,000 avec les Etats-Unis, soit \$190,000,000 depuis que la réciprocité a été abolie. Mais il est clair que la perte a été bien plus considérable, puisque notre agriculture aurait continué de progresser comme elle le faisait depuis douze ans.

Il est donc établi que le marché américain est le marché naturel de l'agriculteur canadien; que notre agriculture se développe et prospère avec la réciprocité, tandis qu'elle dépérit et s'appauvrit avec le système d'exclusion adopté et maintenu par les deux pays depuis 1866.

Maintenant, je crois qu'il n'y a pas de divergence d'opinion, ni dans la Chambre, ni dans le pays, sur les avantages qui résulteraient d'un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis quant à ce qui concerne nos produits naturels ou agricoles.

Mais il y a deux matières d'envisager la chose. Il y a une manière effective et pratique d'être en faveur de la réciprocité et une qui ne l'est pas. Assurément nous ne pouvons pas nous présenter devant le Congrès américain et lui dire : Nous avons tout intérêt à ce que nos produits agricoles entrent chez vous, et nous vous demandons de nous accorder la réciprocité pour eux; mais nous n'avons rien à vous offrir en retour. Nous ne pouvons pas demander aux Américains de faire avec nous un marché de dupes. Si nous faisons une telle démarche, nous ne réussirions pas. Nous devons nous présenter à eux les mains pleines afin d'obtenir en retour les avantages dont nous avons besoin. En effet, les Etats-Unis nous disent : “ Nous avons déjà refusé de vous accorder un traité de réciprocité pour les produits naturels seulement; nous avions un traité semblable et nous n'avons pas voulu le renouveler lorsqu'il a pris fin. Nous sommes prêts à faire un nouveau traité avec vous, mais à la condition qu'il embrasse aussi la réciprocité dans les produits manufacturés.

Puis on essaie de faire croire à la Chambre et au pays qu'il y a un antagonisme réel entre la réciprocité et la politique nationale. Or, M. l'Orateur, cette prétention est absolument fautive; un tel antagonisme n'existe pas. Je suis un de ceux qui croient dans la protection. Je l'ai prêchée pendant qu'un certain nombre de ceux qui y croient aujourd'hui prêchaient le libre échange. Dès qu'il m'a été permis d'étudier la situation économique du Canada, je me suis exprimé, et j'ai dit,—comme je le répète ce soir—que nous avions besoin de la protection pour créer une industrie nationale; que nous avions besoin de la protection pour développer nos ressources; que la protection nous était nécessaire pour devenir un grand peuple et un grand pays. Cela, je l'ai prêché en 1871 et 1872, sous le gouvernement conservateur et en 1875 sous le gouvernement libéral. Mes opinions n'ont pas changé. Mais, M. l'Orateur, cela veut-il dire que si nous avons le libre échange avec les Etats-Unis, nous ne pourrions avoir un tarif protecteur avec les autres

pays qui, étant situés dans des conditions économiques différentes, pourraient détruire nos industries si nous leur ouvrons nos portes ? Assurément non.

Mais ne savons-nous pas que le Canada et les Etats-Unis sont dans les mêmes conditions économiques : que la main-d'œuvre est aussi chère aux Etats-Unis qu'ici ? Ne savons-nous pas encore, que la matière première est aussi abondante au Canada que chez nos voisins, et à meilleur marché ? N'avons-nous pas des pouvoirs d'eau innombrables et les plus puissants du monde ? Et nos mines, ne sont-elles pas d'une richesse extraordinaire ? Est-ce que nos forêts ne sont pas les plus belles de l'Amérique ? Enfin sous tous les rapports des ressources naturelles, ne sommes-nous pas les égaux sinon les supérieurs des Etats-Unis ? Si telle est notre situation, M. l'Orateur, je défie la contradiction de la part d'un cun membre de la droite. N'est-il pas évident que nous avons le moyen de faire face à la concurrence des Etats-Unis, que nous pouvons non-seulement maintenir notre terrain mais encore en gagner chez eux.

Il en serait autrement, M. l'Orateur, s'il s'agissait de l'Angleterre, de l'Allemagne ou de la France ou de la Belgique. Nous savons quels sont les salaires gagnés par les ouvriers en Europe. Nous savons ce qu'est le prolétariat européen. En Amérique les salaires sont élevés ; l'ouvrier peut gagner par son travail honorable la vie de lui-même et de sa famille. Nous ne pouvons donc pas mettre en concurrence le travail prolétaire de l'Europe avec le travail indépendant de l'Amérique. Voilà pourquoi nous pouvons avantageusement ouvrir nos portes aux Américains et pénétrer chez eux, tandis que nous ne pouvons pas les ouvrir à l'Europe. C'est pour cela que je prétends que nous devons maintenir le tarif protecteur en autant que l'Europe est concernée.

Il y a en outre une grande question qui demande une solution, et qui ne peut pas en trouver d'autre que la réciprocité complète avec les Etats-Unis.

L'adoption du tarif protecteur, en 1879, a eu pour résultat immédiat l'établissement de nombreuses et puissantes manufactures, dont la capacité productive dépasse de beaucoup les besoins de la consommation locale. Au bout de trois ou quatre ans seulement, la concurrence était devenue si active, la production si exagérée et les prix si réduits qu'il s'en est suivi une crise terrible qui a failli emporter la plupart des entreprises et des capitaux qui y avaient été placés.

Les compagnies se sont trouvées avec un marché surchargé, un surplus énorme de stock, sans aucune possibilité d'en disposer, même à sacrifice, sur aucun autre marché, et avec des engagements aux banques qu'elles ne pouvaient remplir.

Il leur fallut suspendre et supprimer les dividendes. La confiance publique fut tellement ébranlée, que des stocks qui avaient valu 125, 150 et 200 pour 100 tombèrent à 50, 40, 30 et même 10 pour cent, et à un moment donné, la ruine parut inévitable et certaine.

C'est de l'imminence du danger commun que sont nées les combinaisons entre fabricants pour diminuer la production et hausser les prix de manière à payer des dividendes sur un capital exagéré avec une production réduite. En sorte qu'aujourd'hui le public paie un prix excessif, hors de proportion avec le prix de revient pour les marchandises qu'il consomme.

C'est un état de choses anormal qui ne peut pas durer. Déjà l'opinion publique s'inquiète et s'agite ; déjà l'attention du Parlement a été attirée sur le sujet, et la motion de l'hon. député d'York-Ouest (M. Wallace), n'est que le premier murmure de la tempête.

Nous ne pouvons pas augmenter sensiblement la production industrielle du pays ; nous ne pouvons pas compter sur une consommation beaucoup plus considérable que celle que nous avons aujourd'hui. Nous sommes obligés déjà de réduire la production afin d'empêcher la ruine et l'extinction des manufactures. Conséquemment, il n'y a qu'un

remède, et ce remède ce n'est pas dans le pays qu'il se trouve, c'est en dehors.

Certains députés de cette Chambre disaient hier : allons aux Indes Occidentales ; allons au Brésil chercher un marché pour nos produits. Mais, M. l'Orateur, pourquoi aller si loin pour trouver ce marché lorsqu'il y en a un si proche ? Quel avantage aurions-nous à aller au Brésil ou aux Indes Occidentales, lorsqu'à cinquante milles de Montréal nous pouvons trouver un marché beaucoup plus avantageux ; une population de 60,000,000 d'âmes et qui peut absorber non-seulement ce que nous produisons déjà mais ce que nous pourrions produire à l'avenir.

Je désire que quelques-uns des membres de l'autre côté de la Chambre répondent à cette simple question, puisqu'ils admettent et l'existence du mal et la nécessité d'y remédier.

Mais il y a un fait sur lequel l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur a voulu attirer l'attention de la Chambre, mais sur lequel il n'a pas beaucoup insisté ; il a prétendu que si nous obtenions la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis nous détruirions le commerce de transport du Saint-Laurent. Cette prétention est quelque chose d'étrange ; d'absolument extraordinaire, qu'aucun homme d'affaires de Montréal ou de Québec ou aucun membre de cette Chambre ne voudrait endosser. Depuis vingt-cinq ans le gouvernement dépense pour le creusement des canaux entre le lac Supérieur et le Saint-Laurent, des sommes considérables qui s'élèvent aujourd'hui probablement à vingt-cinq ou trente millions. Or, quel est le but de ces travaux ? C'est de créer une ligne de navigation, une ligne de transport entre les Etats de l'Ouest et la mer en passant par le Saint-Laurent. On n'a jamais considéré que ces sacrifices étaient trop considérables, et on est prêt à les continuer afin d'offrir au commerce de l'Ouest une route plus large et plus avantageuse en permettant à nos canaux d'admettre les vaisseaux du plus gros tonnage. On sait que le Nord-Ouest est le grenier de l'Amérique et de l'Europe et que le Saint-Laurent offre incontestablement la route la plus avantageuse et la plus courte pour transporter les produits de l'une sur les marchés de l'autre.

Eh bien ! en quoi, M. l'Orateur, l'abolition des droits sur l'importation des marchandises américaines pourrait-elle nuire à ce commerce de transport ? N'est-il pas évident qu'au lieu de voir les marchands américains envoyer leurs grains *in bond* à travers le Canada pour prendre les vaisseaux à Montréal ou à Québec, les marchands canadiens iraient acheter les grains américains et feraient le commerce à leur propre bénéfice. Qu'est-ce qui empêchera ce commerce de transport lorsque nous aurons une ligne libre, sans *bonding system*, sans embarras commerciaux, qui s'étendra depuis les Etats de l'Ouest à travers la grande ligne du Saint-Laurent jusqu'à Liverpool ? N'est-il pas évident plutôt qu'en rendant libre la route du Saint-Laurent on la fera servir non seulement à transporter en Angleterre les grains de l'Ouest, mais encore à distribuer dans l'Ouest des objets manufacturés dont ces immenses Etats agricoles ont besoin, et qu'on ouvrira ainsi à notre industrie un débouché immense que'elle pourrait aisément accaparer. Le prix du transport des grains pourrait ainsi être abaissé au *minimum* et en peu d'années s'établirait un échange également avantageux aux deux pays dont nous pouvons à peine nous faire une idée, et Montréal deviendrait la digne rivale de New-York.

Mais j'ai été singulièrement surpris d'entendre l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur (M. White) émettre cette prétention en face du résultat que la politique du gouvernement a eu sur le commerce du Saint-Laurent. Il y a huit jours aujourd'hui, la Chambre de commerce de Montréal a tenu une assemblée, précisément afin de prendre en considération la question du commerce de transport entre le Canada, les Etats-Unis et l'Europe. Et qu'avons-nous vu ? Ce ne sont pas des *grits*, des libéraux ou des nationaux qui sont venus se plaindre de la politique du gouvernement ; ce sont ses

propres amis, comme M. G. A. Drummond, M. O'Gilvie, M. Edward Murphy, M. Hugh McLennan. Tous patriotes et amis dévoués du gouvernement. Et qu'ont-ils dit ? Ils ont dit ceci : que grâce à sa politique, le gouvernement achève de détruire le commerce de transport du Saint-Laurent ; et que pendant qu'en 1872 nous transportions 28 pour 100 des grains expédiés en Europe, aujourd'hui nous n'en transportons que 12 pour 100.

Voilà les faits qui ont été déclarés dans des résolutions adoptées à l'unanimité par la Chambre de commerce de Montréal et les citoyens réunis. Il n'y a pas de plus énergique condamnation de la politique du gouvernement, qui, loin de s'étudier à étendre la popularité de la route du Saint-Laurent, achève de la ruiner complètement. Et voici ces résolutions :

Proposé par M. G. A. Drummond, secondé par M. O'Gilvie et résolu : —

“ Que les charges imposées dans le port de Montréal sont tellement onéreuses qu'elles chassent le commerce du fleuve Saint-Laurent et des canaux et le forcent à chercher d'autres routes par les ports américains. En conséquence, le commerce du Saint-Laurent ne s'est pas développé en proportion des affaires, attendu qu'en 1872 nous avons exporté près de 28 pour 100 du grain et de la farine expédiés en Europe du continent américain, tandis que maintenant nous n'en exportons que 12 pour 100.

Et des conservateurs importants comme MM. Edward Murphy et Hugh McLennan se sont plaints de cette politique et sont allés jusqu'à dire qu'elle était de nature à ébranler leur loyauté, non seulement envers la mère-patrie, mais envers le Canada.

A propos du commerce du Saint-Laurent, M. l'Orateur, il me fait plaisir de pouvoir citer devant la Chambre certains documents que j'entraîne dans les rapports de la Chambre de Commerce de Montréal. Il y a quelques années, cette institution a fait préparer un plan indiquant quelle était la route la plus courte, ou le moyen de transport le plus facile et le plus économique entre les Etats-Unis et l'Europe. Elle avait chargé M. Thomas Keefer, un ingénieur bien connu, de préparer ces plans. Voici quel est le résultat auquel ce monsieur est arrivé :

“ That if a thread be stretched upon a globe, from any point in the British Channel to Toledo, on Lake Erie, and arranged so as to be upon the shortest line, it will be found that the River St. Lawrence does not deviate at any point more than 30 miles, connecting, in the shortest possible distance, with the most capacious, steady and economical mode of communication, the greatest food-consuming country in Europe with the greatest food-producing country in America—inhabited by the parent and offspring of the most favored race of men.”

M. Keefer ajoute :

“ The distance from Chicago to Montreal, *via* the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals is 1261 miles,—involving a lockage of 553 feet by 54 locks, there being 71 miles of canal, 185 miles of river and 1,005 miles of lake navigation. While the distance from Chicago to New York City *via* Buffalo and the Erie Canal is 1419 miles, involving a lockage of 655 feet by 72 locks,—there being 352 miles of canal, 202 miles of river and 865 miles of lake navigation.”

En conséquence, la route du Saint-Laurent est pour tous les points du Nord-Ouest, non seulement américain, mais encore du Nord-Ouest canadien, la route la plus directe entre l'Europe et l'Amérique. Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, la compagnie du Pacifique Canadien vient de terminer une seconde route entre les Etats de l'Ouest et le Saint-Laurent en été, et les ports de mer des Etats-Unis en hiver. Elle vient de compléter une voie ferrée qui se relie au Sault Sainte Marie au Northern Pacific. Déjà on annonce que l'été prochain, la compagnie aura à mouvoir au-delà de deux cents à deux cent cinquante chars de grain par jour dans le seul port de Montréal qui va devenir bientôt insuffisant. Nous avons donc deux routes qui sont les plus courtes en été et en hiver, pour transporter les produits de l'Ouest canadien et de l'Ouest américain sur le marché de l'Europe. La réciprocité leur donnera tout le trafic qu'elles pourront accommoder et même davantage puisque le commerce cherche toujours la route la plus directe et la plus économique.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL,

Il est inutile, M. l'Orateur, de rappeler que si la navigation profite de l'établissement de la réciprocité, les chemins de fer en profiteront également, car la navigation ne dure qu'à peu près six ou sept mois de l'année et le reste du transport doit se faire par chemin de fer. Or, le pays a construit le chemin de fer du Pacifique au prix de centaines de millions, et il est bien important pour l'avenir du pays que cette compagnie soit mise en mesure de pouvoir faire des profits suffisants pour l'empêcher de demander au pays de nouveaux sacrifices.

Quelques-uns des orateurs qui m'ont précédé de l'autre côté de la Chambre, prétendent que nous prenons une position humiliante à l'égard des Etats-Unis et que nous venons à leurs pieds comme de pauvres gens leur demander de nous faire la charité. M. l'Orateur, telle n'est pas la position. Comme j'ai eu l'honneur de l'expliquer, le Canada possède des ressources et des avantages qui sont très précieux aux Etats-Unis ; nous pouvons offrir autant aux Américains que les Américains peuvent nous offrir. La réciprocité serait également avantageuse aux deux pays, parce qu'elle stimulerait la production, qu'elle augmenterait le commerce dans des proportions telles que des millions d'âmes en bénéficieraient des deux côtés de la frontière.

Quelques-uns des députés de cette Chambre ont aussi prétendu que cette question était une affaire nouvelle, entièrement nouvelle, dont ils n'avaient jamais entendu parler ; ils ont été très surpris d'apprendre qu'il y avait des gens qui avaient rêvé de jeter les bases d'un commerce plus avantageux avec les Etats-Unis. Ils n'ont évidemment pas étudié l'histoire de l'établissement de la protection dans le pays. En 1871, la question a été carrément posée entre le tarif protecteur contre tout le monde ou le tarif protecteur contre l'Europe avec le commerce libre avec les Etats-Unis. La question a été posée de nouveau en 1872 et 1873. Dans chaque occasion les hommes politiques, des hommes de finance, des chefs de commerce dans les deux pays, ont déclaré que c'était la politique la plus avantageuse pour les deux peuples. En 1874, l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur — il n'était pas alors ministre — proposait à la Chambre de Commerce de la Puissance l'adoption de la réciprocité commerciale dans un discours éloquent comme il sait toujours les faire, et proposait la résolution suivante :

“ That this Board desires to express its gratification at the growing sentiment among our neighbors in the United States, in favor of more intimate reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as evidenced by the resolutions passed by the National Board of Trade :—

“ And that it be an instruction to the Executive Council to take whatever steps it may deem necessary in order to secure the adoption of a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States, upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis.”

Et le second de cette résolution n'était pas autre que M. Adam Brown, qui aujourd'hui a l'honneur de représenter la ville de Hamilton dans cette Chambre. La raison donnée par M. Brown pour appuyer cette résolution, c'est qu'il était absolument essentiel d'établir les relations les plus étroites possibles entre les deux pays. Voici ses paroles :

“ In seconding the resolution, I feel indisposed to make any lengthy remarks after the eloquent speech of Mr. White. He has established the fact that this Dominion can prosper without the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty ; and he has also established the fact that in the interest of the progress of both this country and the United States, we ought to have reciprocal trade between the two countries. This question should be regarded in the broad light of humanity. It is a matter of the greatest consequence to us in this country that we should live on the most amicable terms with our friends across the lines. We should cultivate peace in every possible way, and I believe there is no manner in which peace can be more thoroughly cultivated between two great nations, than by reciprocal trade relations between them. I have simply to say that I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution.”

Il me semble que l'honorable député aurait dû avoir un grand plaisir à seconder la motion de l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright)

Voici maintenant dans quels termes l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur s'exprimait sur les avantages que nous reti-

rerions du traité de réciprocité, non-seulement pour les produits naturels, mais encore pour les produits manufacturés :

"I think the figures I have given prove that this country has prospered and can prosper without that treaty. But I think no one can look to the position of both countries on this continent—coming to the discussion of this question on equal terms, each feeling that it can prosper without that treaty—without realising that it would be to the advantage of both to have the freest possible intercourse. Here we are with a common line of frontier extending some four thousand miles, with many interests in common, with the same language, religion and traditions, each proud of and loyal to his own form of government, but willing to respect the national sentiment of the other; and it does seem to me, that the closer we can bring our commercial relations the more prosperous will both countries become."

M. l'Orateur, je n'ai absolument rien à ajouter sous ce rapport aux paroles de l'honorable ministre, et je crois qu'elles seraient aussi vraies aujourd'hui qu'elles l'étaient en 1874.

Maintenant, on fait certaines objections à la proposition que nous avons mise devant cette Chambre. La première, c'est que nous allons perdre un revenu de sept millions et un quart si nous adoptons cette politique. C'est parfaitement vrai. Nous allons perdre certainement les revenus que nous prélevons aujourd'hui sur les produits américains qui entrent en Canada. Mais n'y a-t-il pas moyen, sur les \$35,000,000 que nous dépensons chaque année, de faire une petite économie de cinq à six millions ? Est-ce qu'il n'est pas possible de ramener le pays dans la condition où il était il y a dix ans et d'administrer les affaires avec vingt-cinq ou vingt-six millions par année, somme que l'on considérait extravagante en 1878 ? Est-ce qu'il n'est pas possible d'inaugurer un système d'économie et de faire cesser les extravagances, les dons que l'on fait au Pacifique et que l'on se prépare encore à renouveler, paraît-il ? Est-ce qu'il n'est pas possible d'introduire un système d'administration plus économique que celui que nous avons aujourd'hui ? Et s'il manque quelque chose, n'est-il pas possible d'imposer sur des objets de luxe qui entrent aujourd'hui en Canada à un tarif inférieur à celui des Etats-Unis des droits égaux à ceux qui sont imposés chez nos voisins ? Est-ce qu'il n'est pas possible de prévoir que les grands progrès qui vont être réalisés dans le pays vont nécessiter une importation beaucoup plus considérable et donner un revenu plus grand sur les marchandises européennes, sur les vins, les soieries, et tous les objets de luxe importés dans le pays ?

Il me semble, Monsieur l'Orateur, qu'il n'y a absolument, rien là qui puisse effrayer un ministre des finances prudent et sage et décidé à voir à ce que l'administration du pays soit faite dans les conditions les plus favorables possibles. Dans tous les cas, tout le monde sait que la chose est possible ; et on parle de taxe directe parce qu'on sait que la taxe directe est impopulaire, avec raison, parce qu'elle prélève brutalement sur le propriétaire, tandis que la taxe indirecte lui enlève autant, mais sans qu'il s'en aperçoive.

Pour ma part, je préfère le mode le plus facile de collection et d'administration, celui qui crée le moins de mécontentement et je serais certainement opposé à toute tentative d'imposition de taxe directe.

On fait une autre grande objection. On dit, si le Canada goûte au marché américain, il n'est pas certain qu'il restera loyal à l'Angleterre. Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, notre loyauté est au-dessus de tout soupçon ; je parle ici pour les Canadiens français. Quelques années seulement après la cession du pays à l'Angleterre, les Canadiens français ont eu occasion, en 1775, de faire preuve de loyauté. Des avantages assez considérables leur étaient offerts par les Américains révoltés pour les induire à abandonner l'Angleterre. Mais nous avons combattu pour le drapeau anglais en 1775. Nous avons combattu pour le drapeau anglais en 1812, et nous l'avons fait avec gloire. Ce sera toujours un des souvenirs les plus glorieux du peuple canadien français que de pouvoir dire qu'en 1812 nous avons été les premiers à soutenir la Couronne britannique.

22-1888-8

Aujourd'hui, les Canadiens français ne désirent pas l'annexion ; ils sont loyaux, et ils le sont de raison. Ils sont loyaux parce qu'ils veulent conserver la protection que leur offre le Trône britannique, parce qu'ils comptent que l'Angleterre saura respecter le traité de 1763 et que sous son égide "nos institutions, notre langue et nos lois" sont en sûreté. Nous savons que nous pouvons toujours arriver au pied du trône et faire entendre nos plaintes ; que nous sommes écoutés avec respect et avec l'intention de nous rendre justice, si justice nous était refusée. C'est pour cela, M. l'Orateur, que nous ne voulons pas changer la protection de la Couronne britannique pour entrer comme un des Etats de la République voisine, où, il est vrai, nos droits pourraient nous être garantis, mais où aussi on pourrait nous les arracher par l'adoption d'un amendement constitutionnel.

Voilà pourquoi nous sommes loyaux et pourquoi nous désirons le maintien de la connexion britannique et nous continuerons à l'être aussi longtemps du moins que nous jouirons des avantages et des garanties que nous possédons aujourd'hui.

Mais, M. l'Orateur, il faut se rappeler un peu l'histoire que ce n'est pas en affamant le peuple qu'on le rend loyal, content et tranquille. Il faut se rappeler l'état où était le pays en 1849 lorsque les Galt, les Holton, les McPherson, les Abbott signaient un manifeste déclarant qu'ils désespéraient de l'avenir du pays et que leur seul espoir était dans l'annexion aux Etats-Unis. Il faut se rappeler, M. l'Orateur, qu'à cette époque-là le pays était dans une excitation considérable, et que ce n'est qu'en établissant la réciprocité, c'est-à-dire, en donnant au Canada les avantages commerciaux de l'annexion, que l'on a évité une crise et une révolution, que l'on a évité l'annexion politique du Canada aux Etats-Unis.

Et qu'est-il arrivé aussitôt que la réciprocité a été établie ? La prospérité est revenue, la tranquillité s'est rétablie, des déloyaux sont devenus les chefs des loyaux, et aujourd'hui nous voyons ces messieurs porter les insignes de la faveur royale qu'ils ont sans doute bien mérités.

Eh bien ! les mêmes causes produisent les mêmes résultats. Si vous laissez dépérir l'agriculture, si vous laissez languir le commerce et les manufactures, les faits qui se sont produits en 1849 se renouvelleront. Vous aurez de nouveau de l'agitation, de l'inquiétude. Vous créerez un nouveau mouvement annexionniste que vous ne pourrez encore arrêter qu'en ayant recours au même remède, c'est-à-dire à la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. Voilà pourquoi de ce côté-ci nous voulons donner à notre commerce, à notre agriculture et à nos manufactures toute l'extension et le développement dont ils sont susceptibles, persuadés que c'est de cette manière, et de cette manière-là seulement, que nous éviterons les perturbations politiques et que nous pourrions continuer longtemps à nous appeler les loyaux sujets de Sa Majesté, tout en restant fidèles au Canada, notre patrie.

M. DUPONT: M. l'Orateur, "Le Canada pour les Canadiens" telle a été la devise inscrite en 1878 sur le drapeau conservateur laquelle lui a assuré une victoire signalée et sans précédent dans nos annales politiques. La fidélité à cette devise, la bonne foi et la loyauté avec lesquelles le parti conservateur est parvenu au pouvoir en 1878, lui a mérité le nouveau triomphe qu'il a obtenu en 1882.

Et, M. l'Orateur, le parti conservateur, dans l'intervalle qui s'est écoulé de 1882 à 1887, malgré les fautes qu'il a pu commettre pendant cet intervalle, a encore triomphé en 1887, grâce à cette devise "le Canada pour les Canadiens."

M. l'Orateur, il est inutile après ces trois épreuves consécutives, d'insister pour faire comprendre à la Chambre, ou à ceux qui s'occupent de la politique, que le système de protection est certainement accepté par le pays, quoi qu'en ait dit, l'autre jour, l'hon. député de Montmagny (M. Choquette), qui déclarait que cette politique n'avait pas été soumise loyalement aux voteurs. Nous devons affirmer, et

tout le monde devra le croire, et le croit,—à part l'hon. député de Montmagny,—que ces trois luttes consécutives ont établi la protection d'une manière définitive dans notre pays. Tout le monde est convaincu par la manière dont ces luttes ont été faites, que le peuple savait ce qu'il faisait quand il établissait la politique de protection.

En effet en 1878, en 1882 et en 1887, plusieurs des députés de la province de Québec qui sont ici dans cette Chambre, ont pris part à la lutte et se rappellent qu'elle s'est faite, d'une part sur la question du tarif protecteur, et d'autre part en opposition à ce tarif, lequel, disait-on, devait augmenter les impôts. Jamais lutte ne peut avoir été faite plus loyalement, et personne ne peut nier que la nation a accepté volontairement la protection, qui favorisait la fondation d'industries nationales. M. l'Orateur, la nation avait un motif pour en agir ainsi, et si l'on veut rechercher ce motif, on n'a qu'à jeter un coup d'œil sur l'état de choses dans lequel se trouvait le Dominion du Canada, de 1874 à 1878. M. l'Orateur, les Américains, après la guerre de sécession travaillaient à refaire leurs industries, à développer les ressources de leur pays, et en particulier leur agriculture. En 1874 l'agriculture américaine avait pris un tel développement, que les produits agricoles des Etats-Unis faisaient une compétition aux produits agricoles du Dominion sur son propre marché. Tout le monde se rappelle aussi qu'à cette époque les produits de l'industrie américaine nous faisaient une concurrence ruineuse malgré un tarif de revenu pour les industries canadiennes, c'est-à-dire malgré que nos industries fussent protégées par un tarif de 14 à 17½ pour cent.

Dans cette lutte que nos industries eurent à soutenir contre celles des Etats-Unis et des autres pays étrangers, elles faillirent succomber, et il était grand temps que la protection nous fût donnée, car nos industries ainsi que le commerce et l'agriculture étaient à l'agonie dans tout le Dominion.

Et je me demande sur quoi se base l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) pour déclarer maintenant que si nous avions le libre échange absolu, c'est-à-dire aucun tarif contre les marchandises venant des Etats-Unis, nos manufactures, qui n'ont pris développement qu'avec le tarif protecteur pourraient subir le choc de la concurrence sans être ébranlées. Il n'est pas possible de faire pareille assertion et de la soutenir par un raisonnement appuyé sur les faits.

De 1874 à 1878 l'industrie était donc tombée dans une prostration absolue. De même les hangars de nos agriculteurs étaient bondés de produits agricoles sans qu'il fut possible de trouver de débouchés. Nos fabriques étaient en grande majorité fermées. Nos négociants étaient pour la plupart en banqueroute, notre population, comme un flot, laissant les rivages de notre pays, franchissait la frontière et s'en allait demander du travail dans les manufactures de la république américaine. Je me rappelle fort bien qu'à cette époque néfaste,—de 1874 à 1878—près de la moitié des propriétés dans la paroisse où je réside, furent vendues par le shérif. Je me rappelle également que de grands négociants, amis politiques des honorables députés de la gauche, tombèrent en faillite, et que leur ruine entraîna d'autres avec eux.

C'était à peu près la même condition d'affaire dans les autres comtés de la province de Québec, et voilà l'état de torpeur dans lequel se trouvaient notre commerce, notre industrie, et notre agriculture. C'est à cela, c'est à ces maux considérables qu'est due la politique de protection, et qu'est due aussi la popularité qui c'est attachée depuis à cette politique-là. C'est le souvenir des misères que le peuple a endurées sous le tarif de revenu qui l'a attaché d'une manière presque inébranlable à la politique de protection, et qui l'a fait maintenir quand même au pouvoir le gouvernement actuel.

Il est étonnant, que tant d'hommes politiques intelligents et expérimentés qui se trouvent parmi les honorables mem-

Mr. DUPONT.

bres de ce côté-ci de la Chambre n'aient pas encore saisi le sentiment populaire exprimé d'une manière aussi tranchée qu'il l'a été en 1882 et en 1887.

Quelle a été, M. l'Orateur, depuis 1874, époque où le tarif protecteur a été établi dans la province de Québec, quelle a été la condition des affaires? Personne ne doit hésiter à admettre que depuis cette époque on a vu notre industrie se relever; on a vu notre agriculture se développer; on a vu notre classe mercantile se lancer dans les industries commerciales et remporter des succès si encourageants que le commerce ne s'est guère ralenti depuis, que l'industrie a toujours prospéré et que l'agriculteur,—je ne crains pas de le dire malgré ce qu'ont dit l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) et d'autres honorables députés de ce côté-ci de la Chambre,—est satisfait de sa position, quoiqu'il n'est guère possible de trouver dans le monde des hommes entièrement satisfaits de leur position.

Le changement opéré par la politique nationale a été tel que nous avons maintenant un marché local pour la consommation non seulement d'une grande partie des produits de notre agriculture, mais aussi pour la consommation des produits de nos manufactures. J'ai entendu l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) dire que notre industrie s'était tellement développée dans la province de Québec qu'il y avait un surplus de marchandises fabriquées qui restaient sur les bras des marchands de gros, et que c'était un inconvénient grave.

Que font les Américains, M. l'Orateur, quand ils ont des surplus de marchandises,—et personne n'hésite à croire qu'aux Etats-Unis il arrive souvent des pléthores dans les différentes lignes de fabrique. Ce que font les Américains, l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) ne doit pas l'ignorer. Ils font ce que l'honorable député appelle des coalitions, et ils s'en viennent en Canada sacrifier des lots énormes de marchandises à plus bas prix qu'ils les vendent sur leurs marchés. C'est pour conserver leur prix sur le marché américain qu'ils font du marché canadien et du marché des autres nations qui n'ont pas un tarif suffisant, un marché à sacrifice. Et c'est avec ces sacrifices qu'ils viennent à bout, comme ils sont venus à bout de le faire ici de 1874 à 1878, de faire périr l'industrie dans les pays où ils ont intérêt à écouler leurs marchandises. Pourquoi les Etats-Unis qui ont une industrie si solidement assise, une industrie qui date de cinquante années, pourquoi n'établissent-ils pas de libre échange avec la Grande-Bretagne? Pourquoi n'ouvrent-ils pas leur marché aux autres nations du globe? L'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) dit qu'en Europe le travail est trop bon marché. Mais, M. l'Orateur, si le travail est à bon marché en Europe, il y a aussi la distance à parcourir pour venir faire la compétition aux Américains sur leur marché, il y a le transport des marchandises qui équivaut à quelque chose; et comment se fait-il que les Américains qui réservent pour eux leur propre marché, pour leur industrie, pour leurs produits agricoles aient le moyen d'aller faire de la compétition sur le marché anglais? Ils devraient se trouver sur un pied d'égalité avec les manufacturiers de la Grande-Bretagne. Mais les Etats-Unis paraissent comprendre autrement leurs intérêts que ne les comprend mon honorable ami. Le député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) et quelques honorables députés de cette Chambre ont prétendu qu'en ayant la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis, les Américains viendraient ici nous bâtir des manufactures. Ah! M. l'Orateur, quelle illusion! Un peuple qui depuis cinquante ans s'impose des sacrifices pour faire progresser son industrie, pour développer ses ressources naturelles irait, après avoir fait tous ces sacrifices, jeter ses capitaux dans un pays étranger pour y développer des industries! Il irait faire cela, lorsque ce pays étranger aurait enlevé les barrières qui existaient entre eux, c'est-à-dire lorsqu'il serait libre de transporter ses marchandises dans ce pays et d'y ruiner les manufactures fondées aux dépens du crédit national! Je ne crois pas que les Américains tiennent une telle ligne de

conduite. Au reste, sous l'ancien traité de réciprocité, de 1854 à 1866, peut-on mentionner un seul cas dans lequel les Américains nous ont fourni des capitaux pour fonder des industries dans notre pays ?

Donc, je erois, et tout homme raisonnable devrait croire qu'il est peu convenable de compter sur le manque de patriotisme de la nation américaine pour avoir une industrie nationale dans la Puissance du Canada. Une nation doit compter sur elle-même avant tout pour développer l'industrie nationale. Si nous ne pouvons pas développer notre industrie, personne ne viendra la faire pour nous. Et si nous ne le faisons pas, ou si nous laissons périr celles qui existent il arrivera ce qui est arrivé de 1874 à 1878 : nos ouvriers prendront la route de l'étranger ; nos cultivateurs se trouveront sans marché local pour l'écoulement des produits de notre agriculture, et l'émigration augmentera dans une proportion effrayante.

Voilà quel sera le résultat de la banqueroute de notre industrie nationale. On a prétendu que nos manufactures étaient en état de faire de la compétition avec les manufactures des Etats-Unis. Cette prétention n'est pas raisonnable pour la raison que j'ai donnée tout-à-l'heure, et il y a encore d'autres raisons qui militent contre cette assertion.

M. l'Orateur, l'industrie américaine est autrement développée que la nôtre. Les capitaux engagés dans ces industries sont immenses. Ils représentent des centaines de millions pour chaque million que nous avons d'engagé dans les nôtres. Comme je le disais, il y a un instant—et j'aime à le répéter encore pour faire comprendre à la Chambre toute la force de cet argument,—il est très facile aux manufacturiers des Etats-Unis qui représentent des centaines de millions de capital de faire des sacrifices, et de faire la guerre aux industries canadiennes de même nature, dans lesquelles il n'y a que quelques millions de piastres d'engagés, et ensuite, ces industries étant disparues, messieurs les Américains auront le contrôle de notre marché comme du leur.

Tel serait le résultat du libre échange absolu entre les deux pays.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, un homme d'Etat très distingué, un penseur profond, s'écriait un jour en parlant des industries nationales de la France :

« Je comprends qu'une nation puisse hésiter pour s'imposer les sacrifices si lourds qu'il faut faire pour créer chez elle l'industrie nationale ; mais ce que je ne puis concevoir, ajoutait-il, c'est qu'une nation ayant fait ces sacrifices, laisse ensuite périr l'industrie nationale.... »

M. l'Orateur, que fait l'horticulteur qui veut orner sa résidence ou planter des arbres fruitiers ; que fait-il pour protéger ces jeunes arbres après la plantation ? Il les assure, en leur donnant, ce que les hommes de l'art appellent un tuteur. Quand ils ont grandi, qu'ils commencent à porter des fleurs, et que tout fait prévoir qu'ils pourront bientôt porter des fruits, l'homme de l'art élève ce qu'on appelle des brise-vents pour empêcher les vents impétueux qui soufflent à travers la campagne, de renverser les jeunes arbres ou d'en briser les rameaux qui devront bientôt donner des fruits ; ou pour empêcher que les fruits ne soient jetés sur le sol avant d'avoir atteint leur maturité. Ainsi, M. l'Orateur, fait l'homme prévoyant qui veut fonder l'industrie nationale.

Après l'avoir enracinée dans le sol de la patrie, il l'assure à un tuteur qui est la politique nationale.

Il fait aussi des brise-vents, c'est-à-dire, il établit le tarif protecteur afin d'empêcher la compétition étrangère de joncher le sol de la patrie des ruines de l'industrie nationale.

Voilà ce que doit faire l'homme qui a à cœur, les progrès de l'industrie nationale.

Une nation qui n'a pas d'industries nationales mérite-t-elle le nom de nation ? Non ; jamais. Une nation qui ne peut pas se suffire à elle-même et qui est toujours obligée de tout acheter à l'étranger, mérite-t-elle de porter le nom

de nation ? Dans mon opinion une telle nation ne sera jamais au premier rang. Elle occupera toujours parmi les nations du globe, un rang inférieur, et passera toujours, quel que soit son nombre, pour une nation de cinquième ou de sixième ordre. Est-ce que telle doit être notre ambition ? Non. Nous devons faire comme les Américains.

Les honorables membres de la gauche nous vantent continuellement la république américaine ; ils font briller devant nos yeux les progrès qu'elle a accomplis dans le cours de sa carrière. Comment se fait-il qu'il ne nous parlent pas des sacrifices qu'ont faits les Américains pour créer leur industrie nationale.

L'honorable député de Berthier n'a pas toujours été député. Et, bien qu'il soit parmi les hommes politiques de son parti, l'un des membres les plus remarquables, il fut aussi un publiciste distingué. Il a dit qu'il avait été protectionniste. Il n'a pas été seulement protectionniste, mais il a été aussi prohibitionniste. Écoutez ce que dit l'honorable député de Berthier, et les conseils qu'il donnait aux députés de la campagne quand il était publiciste distingué, en 1871, justement à l'époque où il nous a dit qu'il prônait la protection. Que dit-il à cette époque à ceux qui veulent à tout prix favoriser le commerce extérieur sans s'occuper de l'industrie nationale :—

Grâce au peu de connaissances économiques des représentants des comités de la campagne, ceux des villes sont promptement parvenus à leur persuader que le commerce est tout ; que l'imposition des droits élevés aurait pour effet de peser davantage sur l'agriculture et d'élever le prix des choses nécessaires à la vie. C'est ainsi qu'on est arrivé à inspirer aux cultivateurs l'horreur des taxes et à rendre impossible toute amélioration sensible de l'état économique du pays.

Puis au moyen de théories brillantes, on a persuadé sans peine que le commerce est la source de toutes les richesses.

L'exemple des grandes villes venait à point pour convaincre les récalcitrants.

Voici les conseils qu'il donnait aux députés de la campagne. L'honorable député nous donnait alors, et donnait aux députés de la campagne un conseil que je crois qu'il ferait bien de suivre.

Que dit-il, M. l'Orateur, en parlant des objections que font les libres-échangistes. Il ne fait pas d'exception pour les Etats-Unis, sa manière de traiter la question est contre toutes les nations ; contre la mère-patrie et contre toutes les autres nations du globe. Voici ce que disait alors l'honorable député de Berthier, et vous pouvez le comparer avec ses arguments d'aujourd'hui. Vous serez à même de juger, M. l'Orateur, ainsi que la Chambre, si c'est à cette époque qu'il avait raison, ou si c'est aujourd'hui. Quant à moi je n'hésite pas à croire que son raisonnement était plus fort alors qu'il ne l'est dans le moment.

Des tentatives étaient faites pour élever le tarif et le rendre protecteur, ainsi qu'il a été fait en 1878. Voici ce qu'il dit :

Deux obstacles s'opposaient au succès : l'intérêt des importateurs et des expéditeurs d'abord, et en second lieu, les préjugés et les sophismes qu'ils ont propagés parmi le peuple. Les partisans du régime actuel ont eu une foule d'objections à toute réforme économique. Mais la première et celle dont toutes les autres découlent, est généralement formulée dans les termes suivants.....

Vous allez voir, M. l'Orateur, que c'est la réfutation complète, à mon sens, des arguments présentés à la Chambre, ce soir, par l'honorable député de Berthier. Il continue :

Protéger l'industrie nationale, c'est taxer le plus grand nombre pour l'avantage de quelques individus....

Voilà bien ce que disent aujourd'hui ceux qui demandent le libre-échange.

C'est augmenter le prix de toutes les marchandises, et conséquemment, opprimer le consommateur et le forcer à payer plus cher des objets qu'il pourrait obtenir à meilleur marché. C'est en conséquence, peser sur l'agriculture, dont l'existence n'est pas déjà si brillante, et appauvrir généralement tout le pays.

Il n'y a pas de doute qu'à première vue ce raisonnement paraît concluant.

Nous espérons cependant prouver par les faits, par l'histoire et par le raisonnement, qu'il est fallacieux, et que c'est tout le contraire qu'il faudrait dire.

M. BEAUSOLEIL: L'honorable député me permettra-t-il une question? Prétend-il que j'ai parlé autrement aujourd'hui? Est-ce que je n'ai pas dit que j'étais pour la protection? Je pense que je suis protectionniste et que je continue de l'être.

M. DUPONT: M. l'Orateur, je ne comprends pas qu'un homme puisse être protectionniste et libre-échangiste en même temps. L'honorable député est pour le libre-échange avec les Etats-Unis et il se dit encore protectionniste. C'est là un phénomène de logique qui échappe à ma compétence; et je ne puis pas comprendre que l'honorable député soit pour son pays et soit en même temps pour le commerce libre avec les Américains.

M. l'Orateur, permettez-moi de faire encore une citation des admirables écrits de mon honorable ami lorsqu'il était non-seulement protectionniste, mais lorsqu'il était prohibitionniste. Que disait-il alors?

Nous posons d'abord les principes suivants, avec la réserve de les développer plus tard.

Le gouvernement doit prohiber l'importation de tous les objets de manufacture étrangère qui pourraient être fabriqués dans le pays.

Il doit aussi empêcher l'importation de la matière première, à moins qu'elle ne se trouve pas dans le pays. En ce cas l'importation devrait être libre.

Comme vous le voyez, l'honorable député était alors prohibitionniste.

A l'appui des merveilles opérées dans le pays par la politique de protection il est à peine utile d'en rappeler quelques-unes. Comme je l'ai dit en commençant, malgré les fautes qu'a pu commettre le gouvernement le peuple a cru devoir lui continuer l'administration des affaires publiques, —les honorables députés de ce côté-ci de la Chambre devront l'admettre,—justement parce que la nation avait confiance que le gouvernement qui avait établi la protection la maintiendrait. J'ai été étonné l'autre jour d'entendre l'honorable député de Montmagny (M. Choquette) nous dire que Cartier avait pu, dans sa jeunesse, exprimer des opinions libres-échangistes.

M. LANGELEIR (Québec-Centre): Ce n'est pas dans sa jeunesse; c'est dans sa vieillesse.

M. DUPONT: Qu'il aurait pu même dans son âge mûr exprimer des opinions libres-échangistes. J'ai été étonné, M. l'Orateur, d'entendre l'honorable député déclarer à la Chambre qu'il ne reconnaît plus les héritiers de Cartier dans cette Chambre. Je crois que si Cartier, le grand patriote canadien français eût été à la place de ses successeurs, il eût fait ce que ses successeurs ont fait. Cartier n'aurait pas vu son pays dans l'état de pauvreté; il n'aurait pas vu l'industrie de son pays dans l'agonie; il n'aurait pas vu le commerce de son pays dans un état de banqueroute; il n'aurait pas vu la misère générale dans tout le pays, sans s'émouvoir. Cartier était assez patriote pour sacrifier n'importe laquelle de ses théories les plus chères au bien de ses concitoyens. Et je ne crois pas qu'il se trouve en cette Chambre un seul homme pour nier cette qualité-là à Cartier. Si Cartier eût compris, comme il eût été forcé de le comprendre en 1878, qu'un tarif de revenu ne pouvait plus subsister sans causer la ruine du peuple canadien, Cartier n'eût pas hésité un instant à sacrifier ses théories et à établir un tarif protecteur.

M. l'Orateur, on donne à entendre que nous sommes de beaucoup en arrière de la nation américaine. On n'a qu'à se donner la peine de comparer notre commerce avec le commerce extérieur de la grande République voisine pour se rendre compte du commerce extérieur des deux nations, proportions gardées, chacune à son nombre. En regardant le Tableau du commerce et de la navigation des Etats-Unis pour la dernière année, on constate que les Etats-Unis avec une population de 60,000,000 d'âmes ont exporté pour \$1,408,000,000; la population canadienne de la Puissance du Canada, dans la même année, a exporté pour \$202,000,000.

Mr. DUPONT.

et en exportation et en importation elle a fait un commerce extérieur de \$208,000,000. Qu'est-ce que représente par tête de la population \$1,408,000,000 pour les Etats-Unis et \$208,000,000 pour la Puissance du Canada? Cela représente \$24 par tête de commerce extérieur aux Etats-Unis, et au-delà de \$40 par tête pour le Canada. Peut-on dire, M. l'Orateur, que notre commerce extérieur eu égard à notre nombre soit inférieur à celui de la République américaine? Pour le dire, il faudrait être en état de se baser sur des chiffres, sur des faits, et il n'en est aucun que les honorables députés puissent amener de l'avant pour convaincre la Chambre et le pays.

Un honorable député, celui de Norfolk-Nord (M. Charlton) je crois, a établi que le commerce intérieur de la République américaine était égal en tonnage au commerce intérieur de toutes les nations de la chrétienté réunies ensemble, à l'exception des Etats-Unis. Ces statistiques établissent justement que si une nation veut développer son commerce intérieur elle doit de toute nécessité établir un tarif de protection et pourvoir elle-même à ses besoins et au développement de l'industrie nationale. Cela vient donc à l'appui de mon assertion qu'une nation ne peut être une nation, et ne peut être véritablement maîtresse chez elle, qu'en étant capable de suffire à tous ses besoins.

La nation américaine n'a pas toujours eu un commerce intérieur aussi développé ni aussi florissant que celui qu'elle a aujourd'hui. Elle a été pendant un certain nombre d'années la proie des théoriciens. Il faut voir ce que disait en 1824, sur l'état des affaires, un illustre orateur et homme d'état, Henry Clay, dépeignant la désolation qui règne aux Etats-Unis, en proie au libre-échange:

Nous avons sous les yeux, disait-il, des exemples du terrible effet sur nos manufactures de la politique indécise et flottante du gouvernement à leur égard. Des villages et des parties de villages nés sous l'influence de la haute protection dont je parlais tout-à-l'heure, sont tombés en ruines et sont abandonnés.

En parcourant la Nouvelle Angleterre, on aperçoit de hauts et spacieux édifices, les vitres brisées, les contrevents abattus, mornes, sans bruit et sans activité. Si vous demandez la cause de ce triste état de choses, on vous informe que ces bâtisses étaient autrefois des manufactures de coton ou autres dont les propriétaires ont dû abandonner l'exploitation à cause de l'écrasante concurrence étrangère.

M. l'Orateur, cette peinture n'est-elle pas celle de notre pays avant l'établissement du tarif protecteur? Dans la petite ville qui nous avoisine, la ville de Saint-Hyacinthe, remplie aujourd'hui de manufactures prospères, là aussi sous l'ancien régime, on voyait de grandes bâtisses désolées et abandonnées, où autrefois régnait l'activité et la vie.

Depuis que la protection a été établie, non-seulement ces bâtisses ont été occupées, non-seulement des manufacturiers y exercent leur activité, mais une foule d'autres industries ont surgi sous le souffle de la politique nationale.

J'ai entendu l'honorable député de Berthier nous lire tout-à-l'heure une longue liste des produits agricoles que nous exportons aux Etats-Unis, et nous faire connaître que sur ces produits nous payons un droit, et qu'en ayant le libre-échange, nous n'en payerions pas. L'honorable député de Berthier a omis avec soin de mentionner cependant qu'en ayant le libre-échange, il y a une autre liste de produits qu'il aurait pu mettre à côté de celle-là, lesquels viendraient en compétition avec les produits de notre agriculture. Il a oublié de mentionner cet autre fait qu'en ayant le libre-échange, notre marché local serait perdu, notre industrie serait anéantie par l'industrie américaine plus forte que la nôtre.

Je me permettrai de lire à la Chambre un état des prix des différents produits agricoles aux Etats-Unis, pour démontrer qu'il n'y a pas qu'ici que les produits agricoles ont baissé en valeur, mais que cette baisse s'est produite sur tous les marchés de l'univers.

Prenons les Américains qui sont la nation du globe qui exporte le plus de produits agricoles, et si la République américaine est une de celles qui exportent le plus de pro-

duits agricoles, où serait l'avantage, je vous le demande, d'établir le libre-échange avec eux, puisque nous commerçons aussi dans la même ligne ? Ne vaut-il pas mieux ouvrir des marchés plus éloignés, avec des nations qui se livrent exclusivement à l'industrie, et qui ont absolument besoin de chercher en dehors de leur territoire les produits nécessaires pour nourrir leurs habitants, tel que la Grande-Bretagne par exemple ?

En 1881 le blé d'inde valait aux Etats-Unis cinquante-cinq cents du minot. En 1887 il ne valait plus que quarante-sept cents. Quel serait le résultat si les blés d'inde américains qui sont exportés en dehors des Etats-Unis, pour un chiffre d'environ \$20,000,000, entraient libres de tous droits dans les ports du Canada ? La même compétition aurait lieu pour nos pois, l'avoine et autres grains que nous produisons.

Quel serait le résultat ? On l'a connu le résultat de 1874 à 1878, et les cultivateurs de ce pays ont demandé à grands cris des impôts sur les denrées qui cependant nous venaient des Etats-Unis en moins grande quantité, alors, qu'elles ne pourraient être importées aujourd'hui si nous avions le libre échange.

La farine de blé d'inde a également baissé ; le lard fumé de 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ centins est tombé depuis à 8 $\frac{1}{10}$ centins par livre ; le lard salé de 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ centins à 6 $\frac{1}{10}$ centins ; le bœuf salé de 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ centins à 5 $\frac{1}{10}$ centins ; le beurre de 19 centins à 15 $\frac{1}{10}$ centins ; le fromage de 11 centins à 9 $\frac{1}{10}$ centins. La première liste des prix que je viens de donner est la liste de 1881 ; la seconde, qui est la plus basse, est la liste des prix en 1887. Donc il n'y a pas qu'ici que les produits agricoles sont en baisse. C'est qu'il y a eu pléthore dans le monde entier de produits agricoles. Cet encombrement a été causé surtout par l'immense développement de l'Ouest des Etats-Unis, lesquels pourraient exporter dans ce moment presque assez de blé et de viande pour nourrir l'Europe entière.

M. l'Orateur, l'exportation du foin aux Etats-Unis a été mentionnée comme l'un des produits que nous pourrions exporter le plus avantageusement.

On oublie cependant, comme l'a fait voir l'honorable député de Rouville, (M. Gigault) que l'exportation du foin aux Etats Unis diminue graduellement. Quelle est la cause de cette diminution ? c'est que les Etats-Unis ont d'immenses espaces de terres fatiguées par la culture du blé. Quand on a vu que dans la Nouvelle-Angleterre on pouvait vendre des fourrages, on a commencé à faire des prairies dans l'Ouest des Etats-Unis. D'immenses prairies se font chaque année ; le foin devient plus abondant, et même aujourd'hui, si les droits étaient enlevés sur cet article, nous serions obligés, comme nous le sommes maintenant, de souffrir la compétition des foin de l'Ouest. Et je nie complètement que nos cultivateurs auraient tout le bénéfice de la réduction des droits, car du moment qu'il y a compétition sur un marché étranger, les droits se paient partie par le consommateur, et partie par le producteur.

Notre marché le plus avantageux pour l'écoulement de nos produits agricoles sera toujours la Grande-Bretagne. Le jour n'est pas éloigné, je crois, où les Etats-Unis seront obligés de faire comme a fait, en 1842, l'Angleterre sous le ministère de sir Robert Peel, d'établir un libre-échange, du moins pour les produits naturels. Leur agriculture sera bientôt arrivée à un état de perfection et de développement tels quelle n'aura plus à craindre la compétition étrangère. Au reste, M. l'Orateur, vous connaissez l'état de chose qui se produit maintenant aujourd'hui aux Etats-Unis ; vous savez que le trésor américain est obéré par les fonds qui s'y accumulent. Le Président déclarait dernièrement au Congrès qu'il fallait absolument retrancher des droits, et du coup, on résolut d'en enlever pour \$80,000,000. Dans ces \$80,000,000 est compris le bois qui vient du Canada ; c'est un des articles qui devra entrer en franchise à l'avenir. On nous a mentionné que les Etats-Unis étaient un marché favorable pour l'exportation de la patate, et il paraît que ce

tubercule est placée sur la liste des effets qui doivent entrer en franchise aux Etats-Unis. Beaucoup d'autres articles, pour favoriser l'exportation de nos produits aux Etats-Unis, sont sur la liste des effets qui devront être admis en franchise.

Alors, pourquoi l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright) vient-il demander, dans de telles circonstances, d'établir le libre-échange avec les Etats-Unis ? Pourquoi tant se presser si les Américains, justement à cause de leur condition économique, à cause du développement de leurs industries, voient s'accumuler dans le trésor public un tel nombre de millions que le président lui-même en est effrayé ; qu'il déclare que ces impôts pèsent inutilement sur les consommateurs ? Puisque aucun besoin public ne le requiert, puisque la compétition n'est pas possible sur plusieurs produits de l'agriculture, pourquoi le président des Etats-Unis déclare-t-il ces impôts inutiles ? pourquoi demande-t-il qu'ils soient levés ? Et il est certain qu'avant de lever la barrière qui empêche les effets manufacturés d'entrer aux Etats-Unis, les Américains lèveront la barrière pour faire entrer chez eux les produits naturels des autres pays du monde.

Donc, M. l'Orateur, en demandant maintenant le libre-échange aux Etats-Unis, c'est fort possible que nous demandions une chose que les Américains désirent, car ils sont dans la nécessité peut-être de l'accorder. Mais si tel est le cas, la motion de l'honorable député d'Oxford Sud (sir Richard Cartwright) demande à la nation un sacrifice purement inutile.

Il y a plus, M. l'Orateur. Peut-on raisonnablement, comme l'a dit avec tant d'à-propos l'hon. député de Westmoreland (M. Wood), peut-on accorder le libre échange aux Etats Unis et le refuser à l'Angleterre. Qu'est-ce que nous accorderaient les Etats-Unis que l'Angleterre ne nous a pas accordé depuis longtemps ? Le libre échange, nous l'avons avec la mère-patrie. Alors, quelle serait la raison d'élever un tarif préférentiel contre l'Angleterre qui nous permet d'exporter chez elle nos produits agricoles et manufacturés. Et il est à remarquer que nous exportons plus en Angleterre de produits de notre agriculture que nous en exportons aux Etats Unis. Or, l'Angleterre ne faisant aucune compétition pour les produits agricoles, quelle serait la raison qui pourrait nous forcer convenablement de donner le libre-échange aux Etats-Unis, de leur ôter tous les droits qui les empêchent d'importer leurs marchandises et leurs produits agricoles qui viendraient faire concurrence aux nôtres pour certaines classes de produits ? Quelle serait la raison qui pourrait nous obliger de refuser à l'Angleterre ce que nous accorderions à une nation étrangère ? Ce serait une position tout à fait singulière que la mère-patrie ne permettrait pas, car il serait ridicule de compter sur l'Angleterre pour défendre et protéger la Puissance du Canada et d'accorder des faveurs commerciales à une nation étrangère à son détriment.

Au reste, M. l'Orateur, le libre-échange n'est pas possible quoiqu'aient fait pour en démontrer la praticabilité, l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil), et les autres honorables députés qui ont parlé sur cette question. Si nous voulons établir le libre-échange, il faudra ou adopter le tarif des Etats-Unis, ou que les Américains adoptent notre tarif. Si nous adoptons le tarif américain, quel est celui qui pourra prétendre que nous avons des capitaux suffisants, que nous avons une classe commerciale suffisante pour lutter contre les classes commerciales et contre les capitaux de la république américaine ? Les Américains feront les importations pour la Puissance du Canada ; toutes les marchandises seront importées pour nous dans les ports des Etats-Unis, et ce sera la ruine de notre commerce ; ce sera la ruine de nos villes maritimes et de nos ports de mer. Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, peut-on croire que les Américains devront adopter notre tarif. Je ne crois pas que nous

puissions raisonnablement avoir cette prétention; il faut mieux y renoncer de suite et ne pas en parler.

Un autre résultat du libre-échange sera la taxe directe. L'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) qui n'est pas un des hommes les moins habiles de son parti, il s'en faut, a pris le soin de faire comprendre à la Chambre et de dire ici, pour que ses électeurs le sachent, qu'il n'y a pas de danger du tout pour la taxe directe; qu'en faisant un peu d'économie nous arriverons à ce résultat surprenant de réduire les dépenses publiques aux chiffres où elles étaient quand ces messieurs ont laissé le pouvoir.

M. l'Orateur, on juge des hommes politiques par leur passé. Je vais me permettre d'examiner un instant avec l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) ce qu'ont fait ses amis quand ils étaient au pouvoir; s'ils ont ramené les dépenses à la plus basse année du régime conservateur.

D'abord, quant à l'augmentation de la dette publique, de 1874 à 1878, ils l'ont augmentée d'un peu au-delà de \$10,000,000. Quant à l'augmentation des dépenses, elle a eu lieu dans les proportions suivantes: prenons l'année 1873-74. Les dépenses pendant la dernière année du gouvernement Macdonald-Langevin étaient de \$19,174,000. Durant la première année du régime Mackerzie elles ont dépassé un peu \$23,000,000. L'année suivante, elles ont atteint \$24,000,000. L'année d'après, \$23,500,000, et l'année suivante encore \$23,500,000. Qu'est-ce que prouvent, M. l'Orateur, l'histoire des deux partis politiques dans cette Chambre et dans le pays? Elle prouve le contraire des assertions faites par l'honorable député de Berthier.

Les dépenses, bien loin de diminuer iroient en augmentant si le pays progresse. De 1874 à 1878, les dépenses ont augmenté quoique le pays ait peu progressé; quoique ce soit une des périodes où nous ayons le moins de progrès à constater dans l'histoire politique de notre pays, c'était une période de véritable décadence sous le tarif de revenu. Et cependant, la dette publique et les dépenses ont augmenté alors considérablement. Comment l'honorable député peut-il raisonnablement prétendre qu'un pays continue à se développer et à produire ce phénomène prodigieux qu'aucun gouvernement passé ni futur ne produira, de diminuer les dépenses en même temps que le pays progressera.

Donc, M. l'Orateur, malgré les promesses fallacieuses faites par les honorables députés de la gauche, nous n'avons aucun espoir si nous les jugeons par leur passé. Je ne veux pas leur faire un reproche de l'augmentation des dépenses de 1874 à 1878, vu que ce n'est pas le temps de discuter ce point-là. Je veux seulement constater le fait que sous leur administration la dette a augmenté considérablement. Je constate de plus, qu'un pays qui progresse doit en même temps augmenter ses dépenses, le service public l'exige.

L'hon. député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil) ayant tourné son télescope par le petit bout, voit qu'il n'est pas possible que le revenu de nos douanes diminue de plus de 7 millions de piastres. Il dit que c'est à-peu-près ce que nous prélevons sur les importations actuelles des États-Unis. Mais, M. l'Orateur, je vous le demande, et je le demande à la Chambre, est-il raisonnable de dire que nos revenus douaniers ne vont diminuer que du montant que nous percevons sur les importations des États-Unis? N'est-il pas plus raisonnable de dire que l'industrie américaine, développée comme elle l'est actuellement aux États-Unis, pourra exporter tout ce qu'il lui plaira au Canada, quand nous aurons, comme l'a dit l'honorable député de Berthier (M. Beausoleil), un tarif protecteur contre toutes les autres nations de l'univers? N'est-il pas raisonnable de dire que les États-Unis fourniront à la Puissance du Canada presque tous les articles, toutes les choses dont nous avons besoin pour la consommation. Qu'est-ce que les États-Unis ne nous peuvent fournir en fait de lainages, de cotonnades, de cuirs, de produits agricoles, de ferronneries? Or, M. l'Orateur, si les États-Unis peuvent nous fournir tous ces objets sous un traité de

Mr. DUPONT.

réciprocité, qu'aurons-nous à demander aux autres pays étrangers?

Je crois donc que nous devons raisonnablement présumer que non-seulement nos douanes diminueront de 7 millions mais que la diminution se chiffrera plutôt par 15 à 16 millions de piastres. De 22 millions que sont les revenus de nos douanes aujourd'hui, nous aurons à payer environ 15 millions de taxes directes, et nous aurons gagné, en exportant, sans droits, nos produits aux États-Unis, environ 3 millions de piastres. Ce sera probablement le montant de droits qui nous restera au pays sur nos exportations, lorsque le tarif américain, tel qu'il doit être modifié par le Congrès, l'aura été prochainement. Ainsi, nous perdrons 15 millions de droits pour éviter de payer 3 millions de taxes indirectes. Et ces trois millions, imposées surtout sur des marchandises de luxe et de fantaisie, ne sont pas supportées par les cultivateurs, comme mon honorable ami le prétend; mais par les classes riches des villes, qui peuvent se donner le luxe de porter de beaux habits. Voilà la classe de personnes qui se trouve obligée de supporter les taxes indirectes, car ces taxes ne pèsent pas sur le cultivateur qui confectionne généralement ses vêtements d'étoffes indigènes faites de produits domestiques.

Si les produits de la ferme ne se vendent pas, le cultivateur n'achète pas d'étoffes de manufacture étrangère. Il est ainsi en position de contrôler chaque année le montant qu'il paie au trésor public. Si les produits de la ferme ne trouvent pas d'écoulement sur le marché local ou sur le marché étranger et qu'il est obligé de les garder, il économise sur ces achats, et conséquemment, il paie moins de taxes. Mais quand nous aurons la taxe directe, bon an, mal an, le cultivateur aura toujours à payer le même montant. Sur 12 à 15 millions, de piastres que nous serons obligés de répartir sur une population de cinq millions d'habitants, il aura à payer, chaque année \$3.00 par tête pour chaque membre de sa famille, d'après l'évaluation si la taxe pèse sur sa propriété; ou sur son revenu si la taxe est imposée sur son revenu. Mais, bon an, mal an, il lui faudra payer cette taxe et il ne pourra pas contrôler le montant qu'il paie au trésor public.

Je dis donc que la taxe directe pèse plus sur le cultivateur que sur toute autre classe de citoyens.

M. l'Orateur, la taxe directe est-elle possible dans notre pays sous le contrôle surtout du gouvernement de la Puissance du Canada? En Angleterre, on a la taxe sur le revenu, mais il ne faut pas oublier que le gouvernement anglais a le contrôle sur les municipalités. Ce sont les officiers des municipalités dont il a le contrôle qui évaluent les revenus des citoyens ou les propriétés foncières, tandis qu'ici, le gouvernement fédéral n'a aucun contrôle sur les municipalités, ni pour l'évaluation des propriétés ni pour l'évaluation des revenus. Quel sera le résultat, si on impose la taxe directe? Il faudra une légion innombrable d'employés publics.

Il n'y a pas longtemps, je me joignais aux honorables membres de ce côté-ci de cette Chambre et je leur donnais la main pour opposer une mesure du gouvernement, et une des raisons pour lesquelles je me joignais à eux, c'est qu'il s'agissait, en empêchant l'adoption de cette loi, d'empêcher l'augmentation du nombre des employés publics. Les honorables membres n'hésitent pas en ce moment à préconiser un système qui devra lancer dans le pays et dans chacune des municipalités de la Puissance du Canada, un nombre innombrable de collecteurs. Quand on porte à un chiffre le nombre des taxes directes qu'il faudra prélever si nous avons le libre-échange je crois que l'on se trompe encore et que l'on fixe ce chiffre trop bas; car il faudra un montant énorme pour couvrir la perception de ces impôts et payer toutes les personnes qu'il faudra pour faire cette perception.

Les honorables députés se sont plaints de la loi électorale, se sont plaints aussi de la subdivision des comtés faite par

le gouvernement conservateur, car disaient-ils, par ce moyen, le gouvernement a exercé une pression sur l'électorat à notre détriment. Que serait-ce si une légion d'employés avaient entre les mains l'électorat, et pouvait le contrôler par le paiement des taxes directes ? Que serait-ce quand viendra le temps des élections, le temps d'en appeler au peuple pour faire changer le gouvernement quel que soit le parti au pouvoir ? Le résultat serait que les officiers du gouvernement pressureraient l'électorat pour obtenir son suffrage en faveur du parti au pouvoir, quel qu'il soit. Les honorables députés ne semblent pas craindre cet état de chose. Je considère qu'ils ont gagné beaucoup en hardiesse depuis quelque temps. Je crois que nous ne serions pas justifiables dans les circonstances d'adopter la résolution proposée par l'honorable député d'Oxford-Sud (sir Richard Cartwright), ce serait tenir une conduite étrange à l'égard de la nation si nous adoptions une telle politique.

Je crois que bien que nous en ayons le pouvoir, il n'est pas raisonnable d'adopter une telle proposition, lorsqu'il y a à peine un an la nation entière s'est déclarée pour la protection, puisque le gouvernement a remporté les élections pour la troisième fois sur cette question, malgré toutes les prévisions des honorables membres de ce côté-ci de la Chambre. La nation serait en droit de nous reprocher notre conduite à son égard. Notre conduite envers elle serait celle qu'on tient à l'égard de cette fille qu'on allait marier : le père la promet, la mère la donna, et la famille se réjouissait de l'union désirée. Quand vint le tour du prêtre de demander à la fiancée, selon l'usage, si elle acceptait l'alliance qu'on lui proposait. Homme de bien, dit-elle, vous êtes le premier qui avez songé à me faire cette question, et elle refusera.

M. l'Orateur, au jour des comices populaires, lorsque l'officier de la loi demandera à la nation si elle accepte l'alliance commerciale qu'on lui propose, je crois qu'elle répondra : Homme de bien, vous êtes le premier qui songez à me faire cette question-là, et elle refusera sa confiance au parti actuel, s'il est résolu de l'engager dans une alliance qui devra avoir pour elle des suites si funestes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, this important subject has been discussed at such great length and with so much ability, that there is very little left for me to say, and I do not know that I can add any interest to the debate. I can, perhaps, hope to do more than to answer an objection or two that have been raised, and can, perhaps, endeavor to impress upon the House a few of the points that have been touched upon. I am aware, Sir, that in discussing this question we were called upon by the Minister of Marine to give weighty and important reasons why we should introduce this resolution, because, he said, it was a question so far reaching in its importance, so vast in its magnitude, that he considered the responsibility very great for any one to introduce such a resolution into this Parliament. Well, Sir, our reasons have been given, given more ably than I can hope to do. Instead of reciting them, I would say that I consider they might, perhaps, be summed up in this, that the reason that we have introduced this motion is in order that we may materially benefit the people of Canada. Sir, it has been charged upon us that we picture the country in blacker colors than it should be pictured. It has been charged upon the Opposition that they decry their country, charges of lack of patriotism have been hurled at us because the mover of this resolution, and some of the gentlemen who succeeded him in debate on this side, have felt it necessary to point out that there has been, during many years past, a large exodus of the young men and the old men of this land into other lands, and they claim that is decrying the country, and say that we ought virtually to be ashamed of ourselves. Now, Sir, I do not think that we have decry the country, I do not think these gentlemen, in stating what they do, decry the country.

I hold, Sir, that we have a good country; I hold there is no country under the canopy of heaven that is a better country than Canada. If I were asked to prove it I think I might do so by asking hon. gentlemen present if they know of any other country under the sun that could manifest so great a degree of prosperity as Canada does to-day, whose affairs have been so mismanaged as those of Canada, Sir, it is the mismanagement of the country, it is the mismanagement of the Government, that these gentlemen complain of; and when they point to the fact that our population is leaving us, it is not that they glory in it, they regret the fact, they point out the causes, they seek for a remedy in order that this exodus may be stopped. But I do not wish to dwell upon this point, I am one of those who would be delighted if it were not necessary to allude to these things at all. But when we find that during the last decade, instead of 20 per cent. being added to our population, which would only be a small estimate of the natural increase of this country alone, to say nothing of immigrants coming to us of other lands, there has only been an increase of 16 per cent. to our population, in 10 years, when, from the natural increase alone, it should be 20 per cent.; when you find that you have lost every immigrant that came to the country and 4 per cent. of your natural increase besides, it is time to enquire whether we are managing affairs in such a way as will redound to the best interest of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look out to see where the hundreds of thousands of Canadians that have left us, have gone, where do we find them ? In England ? No. In France ? No. In Germany ? No. In Australia ? No. Where then ? Almost wholly within the borders of the nations to the south of us. Why did they go there ? Was it because they loved the flag that floats o'er that nation more than the flag that they left ? No, for they loved the old flag. Was it because they admired the political institutions of that country more than the political institutions of this country ? No, I am satisfied they would tell you that was not the reason. Was it because they had greater liberty there than in this country ? I am prepared to say that was not the reason. On being asked the reason, what would they say ? They would tell you that they went there because they thought they would obtain there a larger field and a better field for their energy and their enterprise. To the Minister of Marine who asked us to give an answer why we had brought such an important question as this before the House, I would say that one of the objects we hoped to attain by this resolution is to ascertain upon what terms we can acquire the right to work that field without leaving our own homesteads to do it. That, Sir, is one of our reasons. It has been said to us, it was said to us by the hon. member for Picton (Mr. Tupper) who spoke so fluently and pleasantly the other night, that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Macdonald) and others who instituted comparisons between this country and the United States did so in a very unfair manner. The hon. gentleman was forced, however, to admit that when a comparison was made it was not to the advantage of Canada, and he took refuge in a statement, which I think upon reflection he himself would not have cared to make. Possibly I am wrong, possibly the growth that is expected in this country by our Conservative friends may be measured by the standard he set up on that occasion, possibly their desires with respect to the development and extension of the country may be no higher than the standard he set up; but I must say for my part that I am not content to measure the standard of Canada, and Canadian progress by the standard set up by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. What did he say when he lectured those who had preceded him on this side of the House for instituting comparisons with the neighboring republic ? He said that it was not fair to compare Canada with four or five millions of people with the United States with sixty millions. Could anything, he asked, be more

unfair? If they had been honest and fair in their desire as regards making a comparison, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would have compared the progress made by Canada with the progress made by the United States when that country contained four or five millions. Sir, is that the standard set up by the Conservative party by which to measure our country and to rest content with it. No wonder we are depressed, no wonder that we are confined within narrow bounds, no wonder there is a lack of enterprise on the part of the men controlling our destinies if they are content with Canada progressing in the same ratio as the United States prospered when they had the same number of inhabitants as Canada has at the present time. In 1800 the United States had half a million more people than Canada has to-day. Seven years before the waters of the Hudson were disturbed by the steamboat that Fulton built upon its banks, thirty years or more before Stephenson built his first locomotive to run upon an English railway, thirty years before Faraday had experimented with electricity, forty-four years before Morse had flashed the first message across a telegraph wire, the United States possessed half a million more people than we are to-day. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) asks us in this nineteenth century, in this year 1888, with a cable lying in the depths of the Atlantic ocean across which we flash our commercial and other messages to the people of England, when the whole world is encircled with telegraph wires by which we can read in newspapers the news transpiring in every part of the world, when we have steamboats traversing the ocean and arriving in fleets at our ports, when our country and the countries all about us have lines of railways built, not hundreds, but thousands upon thousands of miles—with this state of things existing we are asked to be satisfied because we prosper as well as the United States did in 1800? What labor-saving appliances have we had since then? The hon. gentleman talked of the volume of trade, and said that even in 1840 the volume of trade in the United States was not as great as that of Canada to-day. Would he expect it? Has it not been by the great labor-saving appliances brought into use that the rapid advance has been made of recent years? Would you expect an increase of commerce in 1840 in proportion to the advance and development that might be expected in a young nation like Canada? No, the standard is too low. I regret that such a standard is set up by one of the principal speakers of the Government in this House as a standard by which we are to judge our progress, and if it comes up to that standard we should be content. We have been told that this is a bold and revolutionary measure we propose. That was one of the utterances, I think, of the Minister of Marine, that it was a bold and revolutionary measure. Yet the same hon. gentleman before he finished his speech declared that this Government had on the Statute-book of the land a standing offer to the Americans to reciprocate with us in trade. And the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) told us that the Finance Minister had in Washington made an offer for reciprocal trade with the neighboring nation in the broadest and freest possible manner, and yet we are denounced as guilty of treason because the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has seen fit to introduce a resolution to sanction just what Sir Charles Tupper, the British plenipotentiary, according to the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) offered to the American plenipotentiaries when in the city of Washington but a few weeks ago. The hon. gentleman for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) told us that this proposition involved national degradation and abject surrender, and that we are called upon to commit a deed of infamy. What does the hon. gentleman think of the Minister of Finance proposing the consummation of such a deed of unparalleled infamy? The Minister of the Interior told us in his speech, in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford, that he very

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

much doubted if people so high spirited as Canadians would be content to accept a measure of unrestricted reciprocity, even if Great Britain were willing to grant it. I was rather amused when the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) called our attention to the fact that if that were treason now, if that was a mean and despicable thing to propose, the members on this side of the House were not alone in venturing to propose such resolutions. The Minister of the Interior brought to the attention of the House the fact that leading business men in this country assembled in convention, sent to advise upon this question and to promote the welfare of this country as well as possible, meeting in the National Board of Trade have discussed this question in the year 1874, and in the year 1874 the representative business men in Canada had decided that it would be a wise, and a proper, and a just thing, and a prudent thing to do, to initiate measures looking towards the renewal of the reciprocal trade arrangements that existed between the United States and Canada for some years previous. Sir, it will not weary the House, I think—for, perhaps, some gentlemen present now were present then—if I read the propositions of those prominent gentlemen, so as to let you know what their views were, and to show you that this is not a question suddenly sprung upon the country, as those gentlemen would lead us to believe. It is a question which has exercised the business men of this country and those who have thought of the interests of this country ever since the day that the treaty was abrogated. It was in the year 1874 that this matter was brought up. At that meeting which I have referred to there were representatives of the National Board of Trade of the United States and Canada present and a prominent gentleman of our Board, always active, for he has always been an active man in business so long as I can remember, made some remarks upon the desirability of renewing the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States prior to submitting a motion for adoption by that body. He had been speaking of the abrogation of the treaty and stated that we had got along without it, and he says:

"Therefore I believe we have great reason to trust that before long we will realise what is the fond desire and hope of every true patriotic Canadian—that we should have more extended commercial intercourse with our neighbors."

And again:

"Now, Sir, although the figures which I propose to present indicate that we have prospered in spite of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, yet the progress of the country during reciprocity will show that it cannot but be for the advantage of Canada as it certainly will be for the advantage of the United States that closer commercial relations should exist between the two countries."

It would be well worth while, Sir, to read it all, but I am not very fond of reading extracts or of troubling the House with them, but to get the views of an eminent business man as this upon this question, I think we should hear something of what he says. He concluded with summing up the figures of how the country had prospered under the old Reciprocity Treaty and continues:

"I think the figures I have given prove that this country has prospered and can prosper without that treaty. But I think no one can look to the position of both countries on this continent—coming to the discussion of this question on equal terms, each feeling that it can prosper without the treaty—without realising that it would be to the advantage of both to have the freest possible intercourse."

I do not know any stronger words than those: "The freest possible intercourse." And again;

"Here we are with a common line of frontier extending some four thousand miles, with many interests in common, with the same language, religion, and traditions, each proud of and loyal to his own form of government but willing to respect the national sentiment of the other; and it does seem to me that the closer we can bring our commercial relations the more prosperous will both countries become."

Entertaining those views, Sir, and expressing them in such admirable language you will not be surprised to learn that

he closed his remarks by moving the following resolution:—

"That this board desires to express its gratification at the growing sentiment among our neighbors in the United States in favor of more intimate reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada as evidenced by the resolutions passed by the National Board of Trade;

"And that it be instruction to the Executive Council to take whatever steps it may deem necessary in order to secure the adoption of a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis."

Sir, the mover of that resolution upon which every patriotic Canadian should unite, is the name of a distinguished gentleman, a gentleman whose name has long been known to the Boards of Trade of Canada, a gentleman whose name is known in the history of this country—the name of the Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior. This is the gentleman who thinks that no Canadian ought to be too high spirited to accept a treaty even with the United States of America. Sir, this resolution was seconded by another prominent gentleman and in seconding the resolution he said:

"I feel indisposed to make any lengthy remarks after the eloquent speech of Mr. White. He has established the fact that this Dominion can prosper without the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty; and he has also established the fact that in the interest of the progress of both this country and the United States we ought to have reciprocal trade between the two countries."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I commend the next statement to the gentlemen who greeted me with "hear, hear."

"This question should be regarded in the broad light of humanity. It is a matter of the greatest consequence to us in this country that we should live on the most amicable terms with our friends across the lines. We should cultivate peace in every possible way, and I believe there is no manner in which peace can be more thoroughly cultivated between two great nations than by reciprocal trade relations between them."

Who was the seconder of that resolution? It was Adam Brown. Yet, Mr. Speaker, you saw how that patriot's breast heaved and how he throbbed with feeling as he contemplated the dire act of treason about to be consummated by my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); how he looked into different authors, if possible in order to find words that would faithfully describe the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), yet he was the gentleman who in 1874 seconded that resolution and seconded it in the "broad spirit of humanity."

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has got inside of the tiger since then.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, he has got inside of the tiger. Possibly it may be so. It is nothing much in the debate of course and it is nothing much to be considered because those gentlemen in time have altered and changed their views. But I would just say this, that when their views have changed and changed so radically, it would befit them in describing their opponent to use somewhat milder terms than they did, for as they have seen new light it is possible others may see new light too, and, therefore, they ought not despise men whom they consider to be in the darkness in which they themselves grovel. We are told, Sir, that this is "cringing" to the United States. I do not see any cringing to the United States in making this proposition. I do not consider it cringing to the United States when Mr. Bayard, a leading statesman of that country, invites a proposition like this on our part. When Mr. Bayard writing to Sir Charles Tupper, a couple of months ago, used such language as this:

"I am confident we seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement and there is but one way to promote it and that is by a straight forward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

When Mr. Bayard makes a proposition of that kind in writing to Sir Charles Tupper, I see no "cringing" to the

Americans if we say: "We are willing to accept the proposition you have made, we are willing in the great legislative halls of this country to pass a resolution stating that we also desire that which you have said." And, Sir, it seems to me it would have been a fit and proper thing, if the health of Sir Charles Tupper had permitted it—and we all regret his absence through illness—for him to be present and move the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, to give effect to the very views he expressed in reply to those entertained in common with him by Mr. Bayard; for what is the reply that he made to Mr. Bayard's letter proposing that we should take this means of dealing with the entire commercial affairs of these people:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straight forward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Can there be stronger language? We cringe not to the Americans. The proposition suggesting the solution was first made to us by Mr. Bayard in this letter to Sir Charles Tupper; Sir Charles Tupper concurs in the sentiment; and the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford simply asks this House to concur in the sentiment held both by Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard. But we are told by the hon. member for Pictou that Mr. Bayard receded from that position on the 7th of December in his reply to the offer of the British plenipotentiaries. I do not so read it. I understand Mr. Bayard in the correspondence—and I have read it carefully—to say, that we do not desire to mix up in the consideration of the question we are now met to consider, another question of great importance. I understand him to be ready and willing to enter upon negotiations in regard to that matter, and to endeavor to carry out what he himself had suggested; but he did not deem it wise to ask Congress to give the Administration power to do it in that connection; for he looked for a solution of the fisheries question, as he said, by agreeing to an interpretation or modification of the treaty, and in that way alone. But we have no right to say, because he took that position in reference to the method of dealing with the question, that he had receded from the position he had taken, that it was in the interest of both countries that the entire commercial relations of both countries should be reviewed with the view of effecting permanent reciprocity of trade between them. But, Sir, it has been charged upon us that in this proposition submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford, there is some covert treason; it has been hinted that there is a desire for an annexation, and that the adoption of this resolution would mean a change in the political relations of the country. Sir, I do not believe it; I trust it is not necessary for me to say in this House that I do not desire that. Where is the danger? What does Mr. Bayard say in reference to that matter? Does he stipulate that in adjusting our commercial relations, and in effecting reciprocal trade relations with the United States, either country shall alter its political status? No; he is very positive on that. After having used the words I have quoted, he adds:

"I say commercially, because I do not propose to include, however, indirectly, or for any intentment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that no words can more fitly describe the resolution offered by the hon. member for South Oxford. And now, we come to consider the question as to how it will affect us. Our opponents have argued on this matter, it seems to me, on different lines. Their arguments have been somewhat contradictory; the positions taken by them have been—I trust I may speak it without offense—somewhat mixed; I have endeavored to listen to them. I

have noticed, and I think, you, Sir, cannot have failed to observe that they would in many cases lead off with an argument that no reciprocity could benefit the agriculturist, the miner, or the fisherman, that instead of that, it would possibly do them harm, and yet before they would resume their seat, they would point with pride to that standing offer which we have on the Statute-book of the country as something they could boast of. Why, Sir, I can scarcely understand their position; yet it may, perhaps, not be as contradictory as it first appears. It may be that, they think they are safe in offering that, as the United States will never accept reciprocity on such terms. That may be the solution of their position. Now, Sir, we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States for twelve years, and what was its effect on the trade of the two countries. I do not intend to use more than one or two tables of figures. I do not think they have been given just in the way I propose to give them, or I would not submit them to the House; but in considering this question, I think it well to look at the extent of our trade with the United States under that old treaty, to see whether the Americans have been to blame in refusing to treat on the old lines; and if it should be found that that old treaty was working much more advantageously to Canada than to them, we could not find great fault with them if they manifested a reluctance to renew it on precisely the same basis, but that there would be much to be said for their contention that if there was to be a renewal of trade relations, the treaty must be somewhat broader, and they must participate somewhat more in the benefits intended to be secured by it than they did before. What are the facts in regard to our trade in the last year of the treaty? I have looked up in the Trade and Navigation Returns the trade in horned cattle, horses, sheep, wool, butter, and cheese under the head of animals and their produce, and I found that our imports from them and exports to them compared with our total imports and exports in these articles in that year were as follows:—

| Article. | Total Imports. | Imports from the U. States. | Total Exports. | Exports to the U. States. |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Horned cattle..... | 92,224 | 91,624 | 4,312,222 | 4,312,142 |
| Horses..... | 104,404 | 101,767 | 2,590,725 | 2,590,505 |
| Sheep..... | 20,403 | 16,222 | 570,202 | 570,191 |
| Wool..... | 481,079 | 435,698 | 766,259 | 753,113 |
| Butter..... | 11,193 | 9,344 | 2,094,270 | 1,251,436 |
| Cheese..... | 232,472 | 217,850 | 123,494 | 33,943 |
| Total..... | 943,775 | 872,505 | 10,447,152 | 9,514,333 |

The only item in which we took more from them than they took from us was that one item of cheese. I then took agricultural products—barley, rye, oats, corn, flour, beans and peas, and vegetables—and I found our imports from them and our exports to them compared with our total imports and exports in these articles in the same year to have been as follows:

| Article. | Total Imports. | Imports from the United States. | Total Exports. | Exports to the United States. |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Barley and rye..... | 49,655 | 49,093 | 4,623,341 | 4,618,808 |
| Oats..... | 11,301 | 10,366 | 1,615,185 | 903,158 |
| Corn..... | 1,062,012 | 1,062,012 | 46,587 | 19,142 |
| Wheat..... | 2,164,749 | 2,162,862 | 3,106,112 | 3,017,022 |
| Flour..... | 402,277 | 390,604 | 15,198,746 | 3,671,250 |
| Beans and peas..... | 2,104 | 1,559 | 1,282,801 | 376,938 |
| Vegetables..... | 20,805 | 17,407 | 24,696 | 18,405 |
| Total..... | 3,712,903 | 3,693,903 | 15,897,468 | 12,659,723 |
| Timber and lumber..... | 200,125 | 167,764 | 13,846,986 | 6,461,015 |
| The fisheries..... | 852,178 | 333,100 | 980,311 | 171,908 |

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Animals and their produce..... | 943,775 | 872,505 | 10,447,152 | 9,514,333 |
| Agriculture products..... | 3,712,903 | 3,693,903 | 15,897,468 | 12,659,723 |
| The forest..... | 200,125 | 167,764 | 13,846,986 | 6,461,015 |
| The fisheries..... | 852,178 | 333,100 | 980,311 | 171,908 |
| Total..... | 5,708,981 | 5,067,272 | 41,171,917 | 28,806,979 |

Total Exports to United States.....\$28,806,979
Total Imports from United States.....5,067,272

Balance in our favor.....\$23,739,707

*Price per barrel, \$4.90.

†Price per barrel, \$6.

Thus you will see that of these different articles which I have enumerated, the products of the farm, the fisheries and the forest, we imported from the United States to a total value of \$5,067,272, while we sold to them to the extent of \$23,806,979; or in that year we sold to them \$23,739,707 more than we bought. Looking at these figures, it will hardly be expected that the United States would be very anxious to renew the treaty upon the basis of the old Reciprocity Treaty; and you must remember that I have quoted only the figures from the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I have not had time to examine the returns of the Maritime Provinces, but no doubt they would very much swell the balance in favor of our exports. I was a little anxious to ascertain how the trade is running to-day; and on taking the returns of precisely the same articles, I find that although the treaty has been abrogated we send a very large quantity of the products of the farm, the forest, the sea and the mines to the United States, despite the imposition of heavy duties. The following is a list of our exports to as compared with our imports from the United States of animals and their products since the abrogation of the treaty, for the year ending 30th June, 1887, taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns:

| | Imports from the U. States. | Exports to the U. States. |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Horned cattle..... | \$50,497 | \$ 887,756 |
| Horses..... | 83,624 | 2,214,338 |
| Sheep..... | 73,447 | 974,482 |
| Wool..... | 2,098 | 288,251 |
| Butter..... | 51,733 | 17,207 |
| Cheese..... | 4,573 | 30,667 |
| Total..... | \$275,972 | \$1,412,701 |

Or, we imported from the United States of these articles to the value of \$275,972, while we sold to them to the value of \$1,412,701, so that you will see the balance is in our favor even to-day, notwithstanding the very high duties imposed against us. I will now give you, Sir, a statement of our imports from and exports to the United States of agricultural products:

| | Imports. | Exports. |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Barley..... | \$ 2,557 | \$5,245,969 |
| Oats..... | 9,611 | 12,216 |
| Corn..... | 884,125 | 105 |
| Wheat..... | 18,307 | 265,940 |
| Flour..... | 630,592 | 3,201 |
| Beans..... | 7,588 | 206,617 |
| Peas..... | 6,399 | 331,349 |
| Rye..... | 2,539 | 12,350 |
| Hay..... | 4,936 | 670,749 |
| Potatoes..... | 35,837 | 328,602 |
| Total..... | \$1,600,491 | \$7,077,094 |

Or, taking the total of the two statements, I find we imported from the United States goods to the value of \$2,433,087, while we exported to them to the value \$23,195,330. Hon. gentlemen will therefore see that the United States having access to Trade returns just as we have, will find the balance of trade too largely in our favor, and it seems to me that when we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that they are willing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty on the basis of natural products, which was the basis of the old treaty, they are simply declaring that they are prepared to accept

something it is not likely they themselves believe the United States will be prepared to concede.

Mr. BOWELL. Are you quoting from the Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, I am. Does it make any difference?

Mr. BOWELL. It would take too long for me to explain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think I know what the hon. gentleman means, judging by a question he asked the other night; and I contend that the duties paid on this \$23,000,000 worth of goods, which we send to the United States, and on which the United States levy a heavy duty, comes almost entirely out of the pockets of the farmers, the lumbermen and the fishermen of this country. The reason is clearly to be seen, and has been fully explained by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald). There is such an immense production of these articles in the United States, that the quantities sent in by Canadians do not swell the volume of supply to such an extent as to affect the prices; and there is this further fact to be borne in mind, that the amount I have mentioned here is already embraced in the volume of supply in the United States, because the goods have been sent there notwithstanding the duty. I contend, therefore, that if the duty were off, the supply would be no greater, the demand remaining the same, and the prices would remain stationary. Thus the whole of the duty would go into the pockets of the Canadian exporter, who has to find a market for those articles in the United States. The hon. the Minister of Customs asked, how do you know there is any duty paid on them at all; they might have gone there in bond? So they might. It is true our trade returns do not show that; but in order to be sure on that point, I also took the returns of the United States, and I found that the articles I have enumerated are on the dutiable list in the United States returns, equal in amount to the total amount of the returns sent from here. There need, therefore, be no doubt about that matter, and the American tables are here for reference if the hon. the Minister thinks I have made any mistake. The hon. the Minister of the Interior gave us tables to show that the products of Canada were selling in the United States at lower figures than in Canada. He solemnly read the figures here, and almost wound up his speech with a table of that kind. What was his object? If the hon. gentleman believed that that was the actual state of the American markets as compared with Canadian markets, then I ask him how he can justify himself in keeping an offer on our Statute-book to induce the farmers of the United States to send in their cheap products here and to put down the prices in all agricultural products? Then I ask how does he justify himself in keeping an offer on the Statute book of Canada to give the markets of Canada to our neighbors, to allow them to send in their cheap products here and to keep down the price of our products? He knows, and he admitted that the price of products was higher in the United States than it was in Canada, and, if we had a free market here, the duty which is paid into the American treasury would go into the pockets of the Canadian exporter, and we would be so many of millions of dollars richer than we are now. You will find that he admits that the farmer would get more for what he sells to the States if the American duty was removed. He said the whole of our exports to the United States upon which duty was charged amounted to about \$26,000,000, and the duty paid on that amount to about \$5,000,000, and that assuming that we paid that duty we would save by unrestricted reciprocity that \$5,000,000, but would sacrifice the duty on American goods coming into Canada, amounting to over \$7,250,000. That

is his position. He admits that we would save the \$5,000,000, though we would lose \$7,250,000. Is not that rather hard on the farmer? If that amount were saved, it would go into the pockets of the farmer and the lumberman and the fisherman. Is that to be taken out of the pockets of these classes in order to benefit one class alone? Certainly not. I notice that he uses another argument and that is this: Admitting, he said, that we paid the duty, as he did admit, the price could only be increased to the farmers of Canada in relation to one-tenth of their whole product. They produce \$400,000,000 and they only export \$40,000,000 of goods, and, therefore, he says, you would only benefit them by one-tenth of their whole yield, if you had reciprocity. What he said you wanted to do was this: Do not be so careful to enhance the price of the surplus export of one-tenth of what you produce. What you have to do is to improve the home market where you sell the great bulk of your produce. Let us examine that statement a little. He admits that the 10 per cent. which we export would be advanced in price by the amount of the duty. Let us illustrate that. We will take Buffalo and Toronto or Montreal, and Boston and Halifax, or Charlottetown and Boston. We have a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. The duty of 20 per cent. is taken off horses. The horse that was selling in Canada at \$80, the buyer from Buffalo offers \$100 for, because the duty is taken off. He buys that horse, he gets, according to Mr. White's own admission, \$20 more for that horse than he would have got when the duty was on; but he says, what does it matter if you do; there are nine horses that you have to sell in Canada; that is what you want to look at. We will suppose that the buyer from Buffalo is there and has paid \$100 for the horse. A buyer from Toronto wants the other nine horses for \$80 a piece. No, says he, I want \$100 for those horses. I got \$100 for the horse I sent to Buffalo, and, if you do not give me \$100 for the others, the man in Buffalo will get them instead of getting one; and therefore, if you increase the export price of your horses, which he says amounts to one-tenth, you increase the price of the horses for sale at home as well as in the foreign market. I think that is patent and apparent to every one. The hon. gentleman asked how the home market was to be improved. He says it is by building up an urban population, that the market is to be improved. How is that going to be done? Look at the city of Toronto, I am glad to agree with the Minister of the Interior in this matter. I hold that it is a benefit to the farmers of this country to have towns, and cities, and villages built up in this country. I have always maintained that the justification for the incidental protection that was given to the manufacturers of this country by reason of the imposition of duties was to give a market to the farmers; I thought it tended to build up towns and cities so that the farmers would find a market for their produce. I thought it was a great thing to see cities like Toronto, Hamilton, Halifax, Charlottetown and other cities spring up, because, as you increase the number of the dwellers in towns and cities, you are creating a larger demand for the products of the farm and the field. But, while that is true, it is also true that we are growing more produce in this country than will supply the market, and a portion has to be sent abroad. Nevertheless, it is a benefit to the farmer to have a home market, to have cities and towns built up in his own country, and I desire to see them built up, and to see these cities and towns that will provide a home market for the Canadian farmer, giving more demand for what he grows, and I propose to accomplish that by voting for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford and by seeing it carried into effect. The growth of Toronto has been great, the growth of Montreal has been great, but, if you carry out the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, what do you have as a home market for the Canadian manufacturer, and

the Canadian farmer? You have the city of New York, you have Brooklyn, you have Jersey City for a home market, with their three millions of people, and if you pass the reciprocity treaty, you have Buffalo with its 200,000 people for a home market, you have Boston with its 400,000 inhabitants for a home market, you have Chicago with half a million people for a home market, you have the great and growing city of Detroit with its 200,000 people for a home market, the moment you carry this treaty into effect. If the hon. Minister of the Interior wants to see towns, and cities, and villages built up to give a market for the Canadian farmer, I point to a more excellent way by which the Canadian farmer can get a home market with millions of people in cities which have not to be built up but which are built up, and are waiting to buy the produce of the Canadian farmer, and will become his home market. One of the very serious charges made against the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and more particularly against our honored leader, is that we have broken faith with the people of the country and have broken faith with our late leader, Mr. Blake—who, we are glad to learn, is getting benefited in health by his residence abroad—by the introduction of this resolution, and they say that we, as a party, are pledged by Mr. Blake in his speech which they refer to as the Malvern speech, fully pledged to the National Policy, and not to disturb existing arrangements. This has been dwelt upon by every speaker, I think. It has been one of their strongest points. The Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Marine, the member of Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and, I believe, all the other gentlemen who have spoken on that side, have urged this point very strongly. A breach of faith, a something that should not be done—and the Minister of the Interior gave to us a portion of that speech as delivered by our leader at Malvern, and, Sir, I may just repeat again what was said, and which he quoted as being said:

"We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of. We have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet, and it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any re-adjustment should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, 'all concerned,' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any re-adjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes; to the lightening of taxation upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of production in cases where, by combination or otherwise the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbors to the south."

And, Sir, here is the speech which the late leader, the hon. Mr. Blake, delivered at Malvern. Now, I would like to know what breach of faith there is with reference to this matter. Do not the hon. gentlemen opposite know what the National Policy is? Do they know what it was they propounded to the country? Do they believe that they themselves are standing by the National Policy as they said they would? Let me recall to them what their National Policy is. Let me read to them the resolution that was offered by the present Prime Minister of Canada when he was leader of the Opposition, in 1878, the resolution upon which, he said, they took their stand, upon which they would fight their contest, and which, if they were victorious, they would carry into effect when they came into power, and which they claim, having come into power, they have carried into effect. Here is the resolution:

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious re-adjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; and such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada will demand, will greatly tend to produce for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

What does that mean?

Mr. HESSON. It does not mean unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh! Well, I would like the hon. gentleman, as he has been kind enough to give an explanation—I would ask him, in all good faith, what reciprocity of trade it referred to?

Mr. HESSON. The natural products of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The natural products only? Yes, I see. Very well. Then here is the position gentlemen are in now. They represented—for I have the right hon. gentleman's words and could read them—how agriculture was depressed as well as the manufacturing industry, and mining, and all others, and the only remedy proposed for the agricultural depression, as well as for the manufacturing depression, was this, that they would put the duties upon Yankee grains coming into this country, so that the farmers might have release, by the imposition of these duties, just as the manufacturers were to have. And now we are told that since they did that, they are willing to take these duties off Yankee grains and let that come in here, but you cannot take it off your manufactured goods, for it will do them harm. Is that the position the hon. gentleman takes? Sir, there is no distinction in the industries there, and hon. gentlemen are as much bound by that resolution to promote reciprocal trade with the United States in manufactures as they are in agricultural products, every bit, and in mining, and in all other interests. Why, Sir, I can read you where the First Minister, in making this speech, pointed out the condition of the farmer; I can read you how he alluded to the fact that his interests were being greatly damaged by the introduction of these articles. Why, he gave us the case? He said:

"I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going in the United States, whereas the produce of the American farmer was allowed to be brought into this country free."

And his voice trembled, I can remember, almost, as he pictured the state of the farmer. I put a simple case—which I have done frequently and I can get no answer—I put the case of a man in the Eastern Townships, dwelling near the imaginary line between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side and 100 acres on the American side of the line. He grows 100 bushels of barley on the American side and takes it to the American market and gets \$1 a bushel for it; he takes his 100 bushels of barley grown on the Canadian side to the same market and gets but 85 cents a bushel for it, because he has to pay 15 cents for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it be said in this case that the consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmer. And so he goes on to show why the agricultural interest was depressed as well as the manufacturing, mining, and all other interests, and there was only one remedy that would give us relief and that was reciprocity with the United States, and failing getting reciprocity with the United States in all these industries, duties were to be imposed upon all the products of the farms as well as upon manufactures in order that Canadian farmers might get relief. And these are the gentlemen who say that faith is broken with the country; these are the gentlemen who, themselves, stand pledged by their own policy to secure reciprocal trade arrangements in all the industries of the country, as soon as it can be effected. They have to do that or they have to take the line already adopted by the hon. member for North Perth, that when the First Minister moved that

resolution, he was moving it as a direct rod on the farmers of this country, to treat them differently from other classes. They can adopt which form of the dilemma they choose.

Mr. HESSON. The farmers are not fools.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The farmers are not fools, but all men are not farmers. Now, then, what did Mr. Blake say? Mr. Blake was the leader of the Liberal party. It was not a strange thing for Mr. Blake to think that it was possible that he might be successful in the contest, that the Liberal party might be called upon to assume the reins of Government and to manage the affairs of the country. Sir, I say it was not an impossible thought for him to harbor, if he did harbor it, of which I am not able to speak positively, because I think the people of Canada, if they had understood their own interests, nay more, if the battle had been fought out in a fair, honorable and manly manner, would have put the Liberal party in power; and he had a right to expect it. Canada should never, in my judgment, have sent back to power a party with such a record as gentlemen opposite left behind them, a record foul with injustice, a record of which they themselves ought to be ashamed. I say it was not an improbable thing, then, that he should have thought that it was probable that the country would, when it had the opportunity, say to hon. gentlemen opposite: You have misgoverned us, you have mismanaged our affairs, you have heaped up the debt of the country, you have demoralised our public sentiment, you have done things unmanly and unfair, you have used your power to place your opponents at a disadvantage and you have not dared to meet them on a fair and open field. He had a right to expect that the Liberal party would be entrusted with the reins of Government. What did he do? He did what it was his duty to do. Expecting he would be called upon to take office, knowing he had protested against the burdens placed upon the country, knowing that he had set his face as a flint against imposing burthens, he perhaps thought within himself; the people will expect that when I am in power that I will be able to greatly reduce the burdens of taxation upon them, but this Government has so increased the expenditure of the country that no man, however desirous he may be to reduce the burdens, can accomplish it except by doing it gradually. He, therefore, gave the country to understand just in what position the people had been placed by the extravagance of the Government, and just what they might expect him to be able to do when he attained office. In stating that he said he was not able to promise such reductions in taxation as he would desire should be made, and therefore there was no danger that the taxation would not be enough to afford all protection to the manufacturing interests of the country, and his policy would be in the future, as it had been in the past, that in raising revenue he would levy duties upon the articles such as could be produced in this country, and at the same time allow the manufacturers to have that degree of protection that was afforded through the operation of a revenue tariff. That was the position Mr. Blake took at that time. But, as the Minister of the Interior read himself, while that was to be the position of affairs so long as the then condition of trade between the two countries existed, he stated in the very same speech, as the Minister of the Interior was fair enough to read, that a most important point to which he would devote himself was the procuring of reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States; and therefore if he had been with us this year, he would have been found, I have not the least doubt, moving on the same lines on which we are now moving and seeking to attain the same object we seek to attain by endeavoring to carry the resolution offered. He did not propose to take off the duties that we had imposed on manufactured goods coming in from the United States, unless the United States removed the duties they charged upon manufactured goods

going into that country. The manufacturers were therefore safe, but he told the manufacturers, as he told others: If the United States will consent to have reciprocity trade relations, and will take the duties off goods going into that country, we will remove the duties from their goods coming into this country. That is the position he took at that time, that was his faith, and that was the faith he was obliged to keep with the manufacturers, and that was the faith he did keep, that if the Americans did not consent to remove their duties, then our duties would remain as at the present time. That brings me to consider the point as to how this resolution will bear upon the manufactures of the country. No one attempts to prove seriously—they cannot prove it—they cannot refute the arguments given by a dozen speakers during this debate, that it is impossible for our lumbering and mining interests not to be benefited by reciprocal trade relations with the United States. But they say they will be benefited, but you will drive out one important industry and that is the manufacturing industry. Therefore, the manufacturing industry must be saved at all hazards, even though at a great loss to other interests. Would that be just; would it be carrying out the principles of good government, the greatest good for the greatest number? Is that the principle that governs the hon. gentleman's administration of the affairs of the country. It certainly ought to be so. No one will believe I am anxious or desirous to kill off our manufacturing interests. I certainly would not desire to see the manufacturing interests of the country destroyed, but I am satisfied that our manufacturers will not be destroyed by a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) gave us some instances of gentlemen who telegraphed him and whose telegrams he read to the House, and to them I desire the attention of hon. members. The hon. gentleman has made them part of the history of this country. He has assumed that responsibility, I have not done so. I desire to injure no man in his business, and many of them are gentlemen whom I do not know. I suppose they were conscious of what they were doing, and that the hon. member for Hamilton had permission to read those telegrams to the House. At all events they have become the property of the country, and no one will wonder if they are canvassed over; and all I say in regard to them is to express my surprise that there were in an enterprising city like Hamilton gentlemen who would be willing to say over their own signature that in a fair field they were not able to hold their own. That is the position in which the hon. member for Hamilton has placed certain manufacturers of that city. The amusing part of this is the evidence of the peculiar patriotism that affect some of our friends on the other side. Listen to this:

"Commercial Union would close our forge and preside at the funeral of our rolling mills."

I would not have found such fault if the writer had stopped there, for his declaration would then have been simply a statement that they were unable to hold their own with other people. But the writer adds:

"As loyal Canadians we protest against the possibility of our tariff being arranged for us in Washington."

They protest against the tariff being made at Washington because commercial union will put out our forge and preside at our funeral—there is the prophecy, there is the argument. I can respect one or two of those gentlemen who simply say—I do not find many of them say what I thought, but all speak in about the same strain—I think there was some one here who had stated that commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the interests of the country, and abstained from saying it would have a disastrous effect upon themselves. It seems to me that most all of them seem to think that the prosperity of the country is depending on those gentlemen from Hamilton in their own estimation:

"If commercial union should be adopted it would utterly destroy the pipe industry and certainly lead to annexation. Don't let Washington dictate our tariff."

Which are the most particular about—"destructive of their industries or annexation."

"Under commercial union we would have to shut down our works entirely."

ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS."

I much more admire that statement than the other. They say we cannot stand under that, they do not put in any of your loyalty and try to raise up a patriotic cry. This is one of the telegrams I was looking for, I admire that:

"Commercial union would destroy our business in carriage and saddlery hardware, and scales, and would seriously damage stove business."

"BURROW, STEWART & MILNE."

Another telegram saying that we are not equal to our fellow men, not equal to fight our battle on a fair line. A humiliating confession to make, but nevertheless they do not put the loyalty cry into it:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would close every sewer pipe factory in Canada."

"CANADIAN SEWER PIPE CO."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the country and ruin our business."

"OSBORNE-KILLEY MANUFACTURING MACHINISTS CO."

"We consider that commercial union would be most disastrous to our interests."

"HAMILTON COTTON CO."

That is the kind of telegram I like. They simply state that they are not able to hold their own in competition with their fellow-citizens, and with the men who dwell in the States. If men wish to take that position I have no objection, but I object to people working on their loyalty cant as they do in others of the telegrams. The Managers of the Wheel Works, who employ a large number of people, say:

"After considering the question of Commercial Union in all its different bearings, political, commercial and social, we are of decided opinion that it is not for the interests of this country to entertain the idea. It is but the stepping stone to annexation. As far as our particular business is concerned we are positive it would injuriously affect it, if not altogether destroy it."

Again I want to know whether it is their dread of annexation or their dread of their business being ruined that dominates in the minds of those men. Sir, it makes me suspicious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is both.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is both, I think the hon. the First Minister says. Well, he will agree with me in this. I have no doubt they are excellent gentlemen and enterprising men, but if unrestricted reciprocity should be carried and as a result it benefits the nine-tenths of the people of this country, is it necessary for the other tenth—comprising Mr. Gartshore, Mr. Beddoe, the Canada Sewer Pipe Co., and D. Morton & Co, who make the National Policy soap, and who say that unrestricted reciprocity if it came into force, they would at once take their business to the United States—is it necessary to keep those gentlemen up at the expense of all the other people of this country? That is the question that is to be considered. Now, they are very important men I have no doubt, and I also think that those gentlemen feel they are important. If Mr. Morton feels he must take his soap works to the United States I presume that Canada would be able to establish another soap works. I fancy so. There have been important men in this world. Mr. Speaker, Palmerston was considered a man of great importance and of great use in his day, but Lord Palmerston served his generation and he fell to sleep. The commercial affairs did not pause one moment in England. There was not even a lull in its rush, and he was quite as great a man as the makers of the National Policy soap. The late Emperor of Germany was

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

a man exercising great influence, and it was considered that it would be a serious matter if he should be removed by death. Death came and he was removed. But the German Empire exists to-day and the German Empire is going on. I fancy, Sir, that probably he was of as much use and as necessary to the existence of Germany as Mr. Beddoe is to the existence of Canada. I fancy that if those gentlemen feel that they must go that Canada will exist. It is not for me nor for you, Mr. Speaker, to take the position because the industries we have will be destroyed that we will not be in favor of a project of a proposal or of a plan that will given millions of increased wealth to be scattered among all classes of the community. And, Sir, I think it is a piece of unparalleled cheek for any member of Parliament to rise in the Canadian House of representatives and seek to sway the people from carrying out a measure designed, and admitted to be greatly in the interest of nine-tenths of the people of this country, because he has secured half a dozen telegrams from as many men in his city saying—"If you do that it will ruin our industries." Sir, I do not believe it would ruin our industries. I trust our manufacturers have got more backbone, pluck, spirit, courage and enterprise than they seem to manifest here.

An hon. MEMBER. Are they Tories or Grits?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Tories, every one of them. I do not know that, but I went over the list and I was told they were Tories.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Every man of them is a Tory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Now, Sir, it is not only those men who have said this. They can afford to do it. The representatives of the Canadian people have risen in their places, Ministers of the Crown have risen in their places, prominent supporters of the Government have risen in their places, and others will follow them I suppose, and told you "if you adopt reciprocal trade relations with the United States in manufactured goods you will destroy and wipe out the manufacturers of the country."

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." What an insult is implied in that "hear, hear," what are to the men of Canada, to patriotic men, for others to talk and mouth their loyalty and their patriotism, and declare to the whole world that Canada has produced a race of men inferior to the men growing in the United States. That Canada is unable to hold her own I deny, that Canada cannot compete in a fair field without favor from Americans or any other nation under the sun I deny too. The enterprising manufacturers deny it, and, Sir, if this proposition is ever given legislative effect I venture to say that the people of Canada and the manufacturers of Canada by their enterprise and their energy will cause the blush of shame to come on the cheeks of any one who in the past has risen to say that they were not able to hold their own with any man come from where he might, and against all nations of the earth, if they have but fair play. Sir, I ask that gentleman opposite as I ask any hon. gentleman opposite, do you deny that there are hundreds of thousands of Canadians in the United States to-day? You deny it not. Your census placed in your hands and prepared by your own officers declare it. I ask you what position do those Canadians occupy in the neighboring Republic? Are they hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I think not. Go into their cotton and other industries in the neighboring States, and what will you find? You will find that the energy, the enterprise, the skill, the brains, which have made those successful factories, have been supplied, and largely supplied, by the Province of Quebec.

Mr. FISHER. And members of Parliament too.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, go to the legislative hall, and high among the highest you will find Canadians. Sir, they undertook an enterprise of tunnelling one of the everlasting hills. The task defied the skill of their best engineers. Their State took hold of the enterprise, but was a failure; the work was stopped. Money was sunk; what was to be done? Two Canadians say: We will take the job, we will tunnel your mountain. They undertook it; they tunnelled it, and to-day it is a success—a wonder in the eyes of the world. Yet hon. gentlemen tell us we cannot hold our own with the Americans.

Mr. BOWELL. And they were cheated out of their pay.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, you say they were cheated out of their pay; but does that lessen the fact that Canadians were able to do the work that the most skilled engineers in the United States were afraid to attempt? Go into their churches, and you find that their pulpit orators are drawn from the people of Canada. Who are the foremost among their leaders in the legal and medical professions? They are Canadians. And take any position you please, and you will find Canadians at the top.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And who command the Gloucester fleet? Nova Scotia capitalists.

Mr. PATERSON. (Brant). Yes, who sail American ships? Why, Canadians. A great portion of the power and the development that has been given to that country has been given to it by Canadians; and I ask the hon. First Minister, if he is logical, to give an answer that logic demands to this question: If Canadians can leave this their native land, and go to that which is another land, and there, unknown and unfriended, take positions and work their way up to the highest places in the land—not a solitary instance here and there, but the most of them attaining positions as high as the most of the other inhabitants who are native born to that country—if under these conditions they can go and compete with the inhabitants of that which is a foreign land, will he say that they cannot hold the trade of their own country when it comes into competition with that of the Americans in a fair field and with no favor? Sir, I am glad that it is left to hon. gentlemen on the other side to declare that Canada has grown a race of men who are not able to hold their own with the people who dwell in the United States. Why, Sir, go to their marts of commerce, and there their finest business men are Canadians. Go and examine their farms, and then come back and tell me if they know how to till their lands as the Ontario farmers do. My experience is that they do not. No, Sir; in every department and walk of life, in every trade and profession, Canadians are the equals of the dwellers in the United States and the peers of any other people under the sun. But hon. gentlemen take the ground that we are equal to the citizens of the United States, but they claim that they have a larger field for their operations than we have, and therefore we are at a disadvantage. Well, if they take that ground, there is some force in that. A manufacturer in Canada could not be expected, in my judgment, to hold his own in Canada if the manufactured products of the United States were allowed to come into Canada free of duty, while the United States charged a high duty on Canadian manufactured products going in there. The Canadian would be at a disadvantage. The American would slaughter his goods in Canada, as we have been told; and therefore Mr. Blake took the position, and it was the policy of the Mackenzie Government, as it is the policy of this Government, only to a greater extent, to impose duties on articles coming from the States. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who spoke this afternoon, for he is a large business man, speaking of the slaughtering goods in Canada as a result of the adop-

tion of reciprocal free trade with the United States. Sir, if they could do that, I should oppose the proposition. I say Canadians are able to hold their own with the people of the United States, but I do not think you ought to ask Canadians to hold their own weighted down against Americans. But how are you going to slaughter goods under reciprocal trade between the two countries? It is absurd for hon. gentlemen to make a statement of that kind. They lose sight of the fact that the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford is not to take the Canadian bars down and leave the American bars up; it is to take all bars down, to let Canadians go into their fields and then come into ours, and to let the best men win. Under reciprocal trade relations with the United States we will suppose an American manufacturer to try to slaughter goods in this country. We will suppose that a manufacturer of the city of Ogdensburg comes to the city of Ottawa with that intention. He is dealing in a certain line of goods, the price of which at home is 10 cents a lb.; but he has manufactured more than he can sell at home and keep his price up to that figure; so he says: "I will run over to Ottawa and sell my surplus stock there at 8 cents, and I will not break my home price. I will do very well; I will get cost for what I sell in Ottawa, and for what I sell at home I will get 25 per cent. profit." That would be a very good arrangement, but how could he do that if the Canadian bars were down and the American bars were up? But the proposition is all bars down; and how long do you suppose it would be under those circumstances before my traveller from Ottawa would be in every store in Ogdensburg offering that same article at 8 cents a lb? Not twenty-four hours. It would be utterly impossible for slaughtering of goods to go on under reciprocal trade relations, because we could go into their markets and do the same thing there. We would be to all intents and purpose commercially one country; and therefore to say that Canadians cannot hold their own under perfectly equal conditions, is to say something that is not warranted by the facts. Now, I do not wish to read a great deal from the books, but I wish to read something which I think is rather valuable. If you remember, we had a committee on trade depression in the year 1876, when trade was very bad in Canada. There was a committee appointed by the House which took evidence to ascertain what was the cause of the depression in trade and whether any remedy could be applied. Some of the first men of the country were summoned before that committee and examined with reference to the condition of business, and the difficulties in its way. I have not time to read all the evidence; but there was one question put to all these gentlemen, as to whether reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States would remove the difficulties they were laboring under, the answer to which will be found interesting. Many of these gentlemen were advocates of the National Policy, and were seeking to impress upon the committee the necessity of imposing higher duties, which the right hon. the leader of the Government proceeded to do as soon as he obtained power in 1878. I will give you first the statement of W. G. Perley, lumber merchant—I suppose, the present member for Ottawa. Among other questions, he was asked:

"Q. Have the lumbermen any theory as to any steps that might be taken by the Government to relieve this depression of the lumber trade? Do you know of any remedy which the Government could apply? Mr. Perley answered. There is no definite theory among us that I am aware of. Of course, we are all anxious to have the privilege of sending lumber into the United States without duty, if we could have it on fair terms. That would help us greatly. I do not know that there is any direct way of relieving us in any other way.

"Q. Reciprocity, if it can be secured, is the only practical remedy that can be applied? A. I do not know of any other practical remedy."

That is the statement of Mr. Perley. The lumbering industry is the largest manufacturing industry in the country,

engages vastly more hands, and, I think, has four or five times more capital invested in it than any other except the flour industry. The next person examined was Mr. J. R. Booth of this city, also a large lumberman. He was asked:

"Q. Do you find the lumber business very much depressed at present? A. Yes.

"Q. Can you suggest any remedy that might be adopted by the Government for your relief? A. I think reciprocity and free trade would relieve it.

"Q. You think free trade would be the best relief you could get? A. In my opinion it would.

"Q. You mean reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes."

Mr. John Ferris, a very large lumberman from New Brunswick, was also examined, and gave the following evidence:

"Q. Your trade with the United States, because depressed when the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed? A. Yes, I have no doubt of it."

Mr. A. H. Gilmour who has been a large lumber merchant in his day was examined. He is a man of this House at present, and I need not read his testimony as he can speak for himself. His testimony was to the same effect as the others. They also examined Mr. George A. Drumond, manager of the sugar refinery, which is an industry that is a good deal talked about and its value to the country debated. Now, he was not asked that question direct. Mr. Drumond was complaining that he was subject to unfair competition by the United States, and what he wanted to urge on the committee was that they should lower the duties on the raw sugar which he imported or else impose a higher duty on the refined sugar; and I think you will find that he claimed he was not fighting the United States without the aid of any protection, but that he was fighting the United States refiner with 55 cents per 100 lbs. discrimination against him. He said:

"It is capable of proof for example, that under the old tariff of Canada I have been paying higher *ad valorem* duties on raw material than have been charged on refined sugar coming from Boston or New York. It must be admitted that I have been at a disadvantage. I have been carrying on my business not in consequence of the tariff, but in spite of it, not in consequence of protection but in spite of discouragement."

Now, there is the testimony of that gentleman, head of the sugar refinery, that he had held his own against the refiners of the United States, not on equal terms, as he would have under reciprocal free trade with the United States, but with the positive discrimination of 55 cents per 100 lbs. on the American sugar. If that were true, why could not that gentleman hold his own in competition with others? I want to refer to the flour industry, which is the next largest industry to that of the saw mills in this country. And here I might, in passing, allude to the remark of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who contended that under the old Reciprocity Treaty a large quantity of flour came into Canada, and that it was a very ruinous business. If that hon. gentleman would only take the trouble, he would find that if we brought a large quantity of flour into Canada from the United States under the old reciprocity treaty, we sent out a vastly larger amount, and the difference was what we imported we paid \$1.90 for, while for what we exported we got \$6 a barrel. We simply brought in their wheat and ground it into flour and made money out of the transaction. So the millers will not be found among those who will object to a reciprocity treaty. Let me read you the following letter from Mr. W. H. Howland:

"It may be said that, in spite of all disadvantages, in spite of the bulk of supply for the Lower Provinces comes from Ontario, and why? Because we poor devils have no other market on this side of the Atlantic; and if we do not sell to our own people, we must ship our stuff 3,000 miles away, and take very serious risks of markets. Rather than do this, we are glad to be permitted to undersell the Americans."

He thought we should shut out American flour because they charged duty upon ours. His complaint was not that we could not hold our own against the United States, but that we had to hold our own with our bars down while the United States' bars were up. Here is also the testimony of Mr. William Luke, of the Millers' Association, one of the fathers of the National Policy, whose testimony will certainly be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. He was engaged in a flour mill, and having been summoned to give his evidence, gave it as follows:

"Q. Why could you not manufacture a particular grade? A. From the fact that I am under the necessity of manufacturing a certain percentage of a very superior grade which must bring me a corresponding value with the American superior flour which they manufacture and sell. If we had the United States market to-day, we would be pleased.

"Q. Then that which would cure all your grievances, as far as legislation could cure them, would be reciprocity? A. I don't know that will be all we would ask. I would, as a miller, rather have the United States market than any tariff or duties.

"Q. If the United States markets were opened to you, you could fairly compete with the millers of the States? A. Yes. There are grades of flour manufactured in the United States at \$1 or \$2 per barrel higher than in Canada."

Now, then, I propose to give you the testimony of James Goldie, one of the largest flour manufacturers we have in the country, a gentleman who became a supporter of the National Policy, and who opposed my hon. friend from South Wellington, I think on three different occasions, but nevertheless he is one of the largest flour manufacturers in this country, and he was examined in reference to it; and what is his statement when he is asked whether he, as a manufacturer, would be afraid of reciprocal free trade with the United States and of holding his own with them. He was asked:

"If you had free trade with the United States, would you not be able to get wheat in this country from which you could make as good flour as the United States?"

He says:

"I would undertake to compete with all the world if we had the United States market to send it to."

Then he was asked:

"Q. What effect would reciprocity in wheat and flour with the United States have? A. I would not like to say.

"Q. You think that would be the best thing which could be had? A. Of course we would not ask any favors.

"Q. At the time you had reciprocity did you not manufacture very largely for the United States? A. Yes, very largely, and since that, even since paying the duty, I had a large trade—10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year."

It is absurd to state that a manufacturer like James Goldie, who sold 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year in spite of the duty, could not hold his own under free trade, with the United States with their bars down as well as ours. Then, there is the evidence of Mr. Millarky, boot and shoe manufacturer of Montreal, who, I believe, employs some 1,700 or 1,800 hands and has a very large amount of capital invested. What is his testimony in this matter? He was asked:

"Q. Then reciprocity of tariff you think would benefit you? A. Yes.

"Q. Would you prefer a rise in our tariff or a reduction of the American tariff? A. I do not care which it is.

"Q. Then you do not come here to ask for protection? A. I come here to ask for reciprocity of tariff with the United States. If they take their tariff away altogether, I am perfectly willing that ours should be taken away. If they ask for a 35 per cent. duty, I want a 35 per cent. duty.

"Q. You are willing to compete with the United States if we have reciprocal trade with the United States? A. Yes, I should be perfectly delighted with reciprocal trade.

"Q. Free trade then would suit you very well? A. Or reciprocity in tariff. It is immaterial which."

There is the representative of the Boot and Shoe Association of the Dominion, who was summoned here as a witness, to give his testimony in reference to that industry. Then, take the agricultural implement industry, which is one of the largest we have in this country, and is a growing and extending industry. Do you mean to tell me that the men who are engaged in that industry, who have built it up, the men who have the enterprise, and skill, and the inventive mind, the push and the determination of these men, would not be able to hold their own even in the New

York market with the Americans. I give their testimony, and first I give that of Mr. Frost, a well-known and prominent manufacturer of agricultural implements. He was asked:

"Q. How does the cost of material, rent and labor in the United States compare with the cost in Canada? A. The machine we sell at Prescott for \$75, twelve months' credit, is sold by the American manufacturers at Ogdensburg at \$100, American currency, cash down. The difference between the American and Canadian prices is 25 per cent. We can sell at 25 per cent. cheaper than they can in the United States."

"Q. Then it would be an advantage to you to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, we could undersell them."

He says further, when the question is asked:

"Q. You drove the Americans out by being able to undersell them? A. Yes, there was one firm at Worcester, Mass., which took machines into Nova Scotia, to Halifax, from Boston. They sold them for \$95 or \$100. We sent our machines of the same class down by the gulf port steamers to Pictou, and sold them for \$75."

So he does not fear that he will not be able to hold his own. Then John Watson, one of the most enterprising manufacturers in the west, is asked:

"Q. How does the cost of production here compare with the United States? A. I think we can produce as cheap as they."

"Q. What would be the effect, if we had reciprocity with the United States, in your line of business? A. We would hold up both hands for that. There would not then be so many manufacturers conflicting with each other here, for we would strike out with particular branches of the trade, say in one or two articles, and after we had supplied Canada, we could send the balance into the States."

He proposes to do a great business, as a live Canadian, and not to allow the Americans to do it for him. That is the stuff of which true Canadians are made. Then we have Messrs. Corsitt & Bro. They were not able to attend the sittings of the committee, but they wrote a letter which wound up as follows:—

"What we have written answers your enquiries, but we beg leave to remark that our idea of the cause of depression in trade is summed up in this: The supply exceeds the demands in all departments of trade, also, that if allowed an equal chance in honorable competition, we can successfully sell our machines anywhere against American manufacturers."

The Massey Manufacturing Company were not able to come here before the committee, but they sent a letter. They are known to be one of the largest firms we have in Canada, and they sent the following letter:—

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a communication received this day from the Clerk of Commons, would say. We are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery. Our average trade is about \$100,000 per annum, and this season we are increasing the business about 20 per cent., and with very fair prospects. During the past season we did a foreign trade in Germany to the extent of some \$8,000 or \$10,000, and we anticipate a continuation of that trade. We may also add that the existing tariff is satisfactory to us, and is sufficient protection; perhaps even a little less would also be. A still further advance in the tariff would certainly prove adverse to our interests."

Now, I have given all these industries and I propose to refer to the cotton industry. What did the manager of the Hochelaga cotton industry state in reference to this matter? He was asked:

"Q. There were a great number of Canadians engaged in the cotton mills of the United States, and now they are desirous of working in Canada, are they not? A. The majority of the help I have, learned in the United States. I have had applications enough from the States lately to fill two or three such mills as mine."

Why, Sir, I have often heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works talk about repatriating his fellow countrymen, and inducing them to come back to Canada. I should not be surprised if one of the results of the adoption of reciprocity were to induce them, that modest, temperate, moderate and able race of people to come back to Canada so that our manufactures could be worked by these men, who would be only too happy to come back to work under the flag they had to leave in order to get work elsewhere. This witness was also asked:

"Q. What would be the effect on your trade providing the duties of the United States were repealed? If we had free trade, could you compete with the American manufacturers? A. I should go for free trade very quickly."

22-1888-5

"Q. Do you think you could compete with the American mills? A. We would try."

Then, I give you another, the Cornwall Cotton Co., on page 143.

"Q. Can you produce in your mills, with the same amount of money, labor and machinery, as large an amount as they can in the United States? A. If we had the same labor, yes."

"Q. You say the cost of production in the United States is about the same as here? A. Yes."

He is asked again.

"How do your goods compare with American goods? A. They compare so favorably that we have no trouble in selling against them."

"Q. Are yours not superior to American goods? A. Some kinds are; the Americans make some very fine goods."

"Q. Do they not use more waste than you do? No; A. we try to make good use of all our waste."

"Q. How would reciprocity with the United States affect your business? A. I think that our people would be inclined to go for that, as it would give them access to a larger market."

"Q. You think you can compete with them in their own market? A. Yes; it might bother us for a little while, but I think in the long run it would come out better for us. It would give us what we want by putting us on an equal footing."

The managers of that cotton mill, the largest mill I suppose, we have in the country, give this testimony. I do not know that I have time to read it all, all the other testimonies given here; but I merely mention that the testimony of Robert Mitchell, brass founder, of Montreal, is to the same effect; the testimony of Samuel Platt, Goderich, in the salt industry, is to the same effect; the testimony of Edward Gurney, with reference to the foundry business and stove business, one of the largest manufacturers in that line, is to the same effect. I think it is worth while to put his testimony on record in reference to this matter, because it will be interesting to some to know what his views are, for he is a leading man and considerable importance is attached to his views. Edward Gurney is asked:

"Q. Have they any facilities for manufacturing stoves any cheaper than you can? A. No."

"Q. Suppose you were selling at cost, do you suppose they could sell as low as you can sell, looking at the rents, labor, taxation and everything? A. About the same when you come to take into consideration all the circumstances, and their having to introduce their goods into a new country."

"Q. But yours is an established business? A. Yes. Well, assuming what you presume to be the case, we could make the goods a little cheaper than they. Then we have connection in this country already established, and they have to form one, and any difference there might be would be overcome by this fact."

Then he is asked again.

"Q. If we had reciprocity with the United States in your business, you would be in favor of it? A. I would be more than content."

That is the testimony of Edward Gurney, one of the leading stove founders. Here is the statement of Mr. James Smart, founder, in reference to the same, only he does not speak as positively; the testimony of Wm. Buck, in the same industry, but he does not speak as positively as Mr. Gurney in reference to the matter; he declared that at the time he was making as good a stove as they could make in the United States; and I will vouch for it that he is making as good now. He says, theoretically, he believes free trade would be right, but he is not as sanguine as to holding his own as some others profess to be. I have not tried to overstate these testimonies. These are the men who say that if you give them free access to the United States market, you may let the United States manufacturers come in here and they will be able to hold their own. R. H. Smith, with reference to saws, knives and similar goods, and D. McCrae give the same testimony. In the Canadian market they can hold their own. B. Rosamond, woollen cloth factory, representing the tweed industry, the strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their candidate in the elections—let me read what Mr. Rosamond says with reference to our woollen cloth industry, on page 208:

"Q. Is the present rate of duty satisfactory to you? A. Yes, under ordinary circumstances it would be. We are in an exceptional position, being alongside of a country which has a high tariff against us; but, under

ordinary circumstances it would be satisfactory. The duty is certainly high enough; if we had a country alongside of us which was reasonable, as our people are disposed to be, we would have no difficulty.

"Q. You would be content to have reciprocity with the United States?"

A. Yes, I believe it would be for the benefit of everybody."

That is the testimony of Mr. Rosamond, of the woollen mills. I am afraid I have wearied the House with these quotations, but I thought it would be worth while to place the views of this gentleman upon record in order to show that he and others, who were contending against the Americans when gold was 112 and when there was only a 17½ cents tariff here, were willing and able, under those circumstances, before they had acquired the strength they have now after many years' prosperity, they were willing then and anxious, "they were ready to hold up both hands," as some of them expressed it, for reciprocal free trade with the United States. Now, the hon. the Minister of the Interior made one statement that struck me as having considerable force, and I gave it a good deal of consideration, as, I am bound to say, I endeavor to do with all the statements that come from the other side. He said that if we made a treaty with the United States, it would have to be necessarily a time treaty, and that at the expiration of that time, if the United States were to abrogate the treaty, we might find ourselves, as one result, probably, of reciprocal trade relations, with larger manufactures established, and running on special lines—he thought that we would find ourselves in Canada with large mills and a vast number of them, and would daily be shut up to the restricted market of 5,000,000 instead of having the enlarged mutual market of 65,000,000 as we had during the continuation of the treaty. I say, Mr. Speaker, that statement struck me as having considerable force, and I have given some reflection to it. I do not know whether the conclusion I arrived at would be shared by other hon. gentlemen, but it seemed to me to solve the difficulty, and to remove the danger which I confess I thought there might be. Under reciprocal free trade with the United States there would be an accession to the number of our manufactures here; and I believe, of course, there would be some displacement of capital, there would be some disarrangement of trade. I speak quite cognisant of the fact that I do not know how it would be in my own business. I do not know whether I should be able to hold my own with them. I would be sorry to say that I could not, but I am free to say this, as a representative of a Canadian constituency, charged with the duty of trying to promote the best interest of the people of this country, that I am bound to go for what I consider would be the best interests of the country at large, no matter how it might affect me. There will be displacement, no doubt, of capital, and some men may have to fall in the change. There are misfortunes overtaking people all the time; there are changes taking place even now, within our limits. These things cannot be avoided. Suppose this change were brought into effect, there would be warning given of it, men would arrange their matters accordingly, and I look for this, I believe Canada will not secure all the manufacturing establishments that are going to manufacture goods for the whole continent of America. I do not believe they will all come and locate in Canada; all I expect is that a certain number will, that we will get our full shares in some lines, that we are suited for, will get more than they will, and that having got them, there will be a prosperity to the country resulting from these reciprocal trade relations that will give us an increased population in a ratio greater, I believe, than we can venture to hope at the present time. Therefore, I think that is the solution of the difficulty suggested by the Minister of the Interior. Yes, we will have more factories, the ones that we have in existence will be enlarged and we will be enabled to turn out more than enough products for 5,000,000 people. But I consider before the time limited would expire you

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

would have as many more inhabitants as would make a market for such mills as were erected within the bounds of your own limits. Therefore that objection, to which I attach considerable weight when I first heard it, I have worked out to a satisfactory solution according to my own idea, whether it answers the difficulty in the minds of others I cannot tell. What is the condition of the manufacturers of Canada to-day. Some of them are enjoying very great protection and some are not, and one of the difficulties experienced by many hon. gentlemen on looking at this question is this: they percise the tariff and see that a certain article is proteced 20 per cent, another 25, another 30, another 35, and they say: If those manufacturers require that protection in order to exist, and you wipe out that protection, does that not mean the crushing out of the industry? That would appear to be so on the face of the tariff. I am glad the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is present, for he is a business man and will understand the argument I will address to the House, and will be able to correct me if it is not true. While it is a fact that there is that amount of duty levied on manufactured products in this country, you must bear in mind that the manufacturers are not protected to that amount of duty in many of those lines. That circumstance does away with a great part of the difficulty. Let me explain. I do not like to talk about my own business, but every man understands his own business best, and it may serve as an illustration, and no doubt the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) can give other illustrations from the locomotive works and other industries in which he is interested. The article may be taxed 20 or 25 per cent, and may increase the cost to the consumer, but it is not due to the manufacturer having, say 20 per cent. protection, but it is due to the system of protection itself running through all its ramifications, protecting that which is the raw material as well as the finished product, thereby increasing the cost to the consumer. The protection the Canadian manufacturer has is the difference in the duty on the manufactured article and the duty on the raw material out of which the article is manufactured. Applying that test you will find the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada are not enjoying a very great degree of protection at the present time.

An hon. MEMBER. Give them more.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No. The consumer has to pay more for the goods, but the manufacturer does not get the protection, owing to the pernicious system running all the way through and the duties imposed on raw material. For instance, one line in which I am engaged myself will serve as an illustration. There is a manufactured article upon which 20 per cent. duty is imposed. You would naturally say that the article is protected to the extent of 20 per cent. Not so, because on 40 per cent. of the raw material entering into the manufacture of that article there is a specific duty of 2 cents per pound, which is equivalent to from 25 to 33 per cent. duty. The House will, therefore, readily see that the protection that is upon the manufactured article is the difference in the duty between the duty on the finished article and the duty on the raw material. There is on some other goods of the same kind, sweet goods—I have been speaking of a line that embraces nine-tenths of all manufactures of that kind, while as regards the other tenth sugar comes into it, and as the Minister of Customs seeks to obtain as much revenue as possible, it comes in under the sugar duty—when you come to that class you have an extra cent a pound on the sugar, and 30 per cent. on the molasses, in fact all the ingredients that enter into it are protected, and therefore the protection given to the manufacturer is only the amount of the difference be-

tween the duty placed upon the manufactured product and the duty on the raw material. Take agricultural implements. There is 35 per cent. protection. It means an increased cost to the consumer, but the manufacturer does not get the benefit of the 35 per cent. protection, because the duty he has to pay on the raw material reduces the protection he obtains, and in this case again his protection is the difference between the duty levied upon the raw material and the duty on the implement itself. There is a firm, I may be pardoned for mentioning names, and I do not think individual instances prove anything, but the cases are useful as illustrations—there is the Osborne-Killey Manufacturing Company who declare that under unrestricted reciprocity they could not hold their own. But the Waterous Engine Company located in my own city, one of the most enterprising firms in the Dominion, have been doing for years an export trade and have successfully competed with the Americans in Australia, Hungary, Russia and Chili, and they say that if they have been able to hold their own against the Americans in distant lands, they would be able to hold their own against Americans in the United States, because much of the raw material that goes into the manufacture of their articles pays a duty of 30 per cent. on coming from the States, while in that case it would be free. They say give us the American market, and as proof of their desire to obtain it two of the sons of members of the firm have left Winnipeg, I am sorry to say, and have removed to Minneapolis, and in that young giant city they are carrying on business by their own energy and enterprise, and in a competition by tender for a fire engine they have been successful against rivals in the United States. Those young men who are unknown go into that city and build up an industry, and no wonder the Waterous firm says: If we can do that among people with whom we are unacquainted we can hold our own in this market and we will manufacture for the United States in portion as well. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), whom every one regrets is unable to say what he would like to say in this House, asked me to do this for him. He received a letter from a manufacturer and he desired a portion bearing on this question be read. He did not feel himself at liberty to mention the name of the manufacturer and therefore he could not give me permission to use it, and so if there is any danger of hon. gentlemen opposite requiring me to give the name after reading it I will prefer not to read it, and will not read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It bears directly on this question. I may state that this is from the president of a large wood working company who make waggons and agricultural implements and a great many other things in that line. After alluding to some private matters he says:

"There are some points that in my opinion have not been so fully demonstrated as they should be."

That is in reference to the discussion on this question.

"Take the injury to the manufacturers for instance. In our own business, that of the ———— Manufacturing Company, of which I am president, when Messrs. Fuller, Wiman and Smith commenced their crusade, Mr. ———— our manager, was wonderfully exercised and feared a flood of waggons from the American side would be slaughtered in our Canadian market, and that we could not receive any return therefor. I argued that free and unrestricted intercourse with them would open up a trade beneficial to both, and that we would get a fair share of American trade. He thought that impossible, but while we were discussing the question an order came from a railway contractor in the State of Maine for thirty carts, on condition that we should pay the duty. The price offered was such that we paid the duty of 35 per cent., and realised our regular Canadian prices, and subsequently sold 120 carts in the same country alone. Had we had free access to the American market our trade would have been largely increased and profitable. This is only one example. Give us a chance to enter the markets of America untrammelled and we have the energy, intelligence, skill and resources to take the lead in our own markets, and secure a fair share of the United States trade. The extra profit on stock, such as horses, cattle, &c., if sold to American buyers

without or free from duty impositions would more than quadruple the loss of such revenue. Dozens of American buyers come to East York annually to purchase horses, who plainly tell the farmers that, if it were not for the duty they, could and would pay \$20 to \$30 more for the animals they purchase than they now pay. So that our farmers, whether Reform or Conservative, are rapidly becoming supporters of unrestricted reciprocity."

I, Sir, was requested to read that. It is just on the line of what I have stated that our manufactures will not be inferior to any others in competition. I grant you that if there are a class of men who naturally may feel timidity in this matter it would be the manufacturer, but it is our bounden duty, as he says, in the interests of the whole country to take this course, and I believe that what is in the interest of the whole country must be in the interest of the manufacturers too. We cannot increase the wealth of the people of this country; we cannot put extra money into the pockets of the farmers and other industries of the country without their being able to expend more money, and in the end it must redound to the benefit of all. What has been the progress of our manufactures? They have extended and increased, I grant you, but to what extent? And what is their position to-day? Is there not a stage of congestion? Is there not debt? Is there not trouble? Is there no trouble among combines just now, and is it not being enquired into? What has brought about those combines? It is because men have combined, when they were not able to get prices that were remunerative, and when they were losing money, to try and form arrangements and agreements among themselves in order if possible that they might save themselves from bankruptcy. Others, I believe, have been formed for the purpose of getting more than a proper profit out of their investment. But, Sir, our over-supply and our export trade, owing to our protective system, is almost a nullity. In 1878 we exported some \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, but this year we have exported only a little over \$3,000,000. So it is that our Government recognises this state of affairs as much as anyone else, and to-day we have agents sent away to distant countries to try and open up trade. We have voted here year after year thousands of dollars to establish commercial agencies, and we are making expeditions out to Australia and different places in order to get an outlet for the excess that we are manufacturing in this country. But, Sir, just imagine for one moment sending agents thousands of miles away; sending agents away to Australia, to the Argentine Republic and to other countries in order to open up a trade with their people and to extend our trade and our commerce, while here is a proposition made by a nation of 65,000,000 of the richest people on the face of the earth to open their markets to us, and yet we find men rising in their places and saying that it would be an injury to us to accept this invitation. It is something marvellous that that line of argument should be taken in a Canadian House of Representatives, by men who ought to be as intelligent as Canadian representatives are supposed to be. Sir, the Minister of Marine made a very true statement in reference to this subject when he was speaking of the prosperity of Canada and regretting that we had not a very large import trade. He said:

"After all it is the inter-provincial trade that is of more profit to us than our foreign trade and we ought to cultivate that."

I agree with him that this inter-provincial trade and this inter-provincial commerce is an enriching, and profitable, and paying thing, but the trouble is here as has been pointed out by many gentlemen, that deeply as we regret it there is but a very small inter-provincial trade and the facts are these. There are geographical difficulties in our way as a Dominion. The hon. Finance Minister was, I consider, the father of the National Policy, and in my mind I give him credit for an earnest desire to promote inter-provincial trade as one of the features of his National Policy, but it has been tried, it has been in operation for years, and

we have failed to overcome the geographical difficulties that are in our way. We are forced to come to the conclusion that our inter-provincial trade has not been the success we would desire. I agree with the hon. Minister of Marine that if inter-provincial trade could be promoted, it would be a source of wealth to us, but there are great difficulties attending it. Carry out the proposition of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and give us commercial relations with the United States of America and what would happen? Why, Sir, we become entitled to participate and will participate in all the great inter-state commerce of that mighty republic, which has made it to-day one of the greatest nations of the earth. We become participants and sharers in the prosperity of that inter-state commerce which is two-thirds times greater than all their foreign commerce. We have access to the millions of people in the United States, and, Sir, if they have improved by this trade we cannot help sharing in that benefit, to improve also, as commercially we will be the one people in that respect. They will enter and trade with us, 5,000,000 of people, and we enter a trade with 65,000,000. Perhaps we may lose some inter-provincial trade, or part of it, that has been forced into unnatural channels, but we gain a vastly greater amount from that great intercontinental commerce which will sweep through this land, enriching it, I believe, as it has enriched the people of the United States. Sir, if it be an undenied fact that their interest commercially has been the great means of making them a rich and prosperous people, does it not logically follow that the securing to us as free a right as they possess to participate in that intercontinental commerce must be a benefit for us? And, Sir, are we not justified when we contemplate this in offering this resolution? Would the Ministry not be justified in taking that proposition into consideration, and, if they agree in the arguments that have been advanced in its favor, seeking to give effect to it, as they have been invited by Mr. Bayard to do. It has been argued—and I will touch this point very briefly—that this proposition discriminates against Great Britain. Sir, that is one thing I do not just exactly like—not so much because Great Britain has done so much for us in that regard; but it looks as if when a nation takes your products free you should not raise a wall against it, while you take down the wall that separates you from others. But I regard the matter in this way. We have been given permission—nay, more, I believe it is our duty to our Queen and country, as British subjects, located in the Dominion of Canada—to see that the interests of the Empire are furthered, and we can only do that in this part of the Empire by being true to Canada and Canada's interests. In that way we show ourselves the most devoted and loyal subjects of Her Majesty. But even in the tariff we have enacted you find discrimination. You find us taxing Britain now, and yet Britain is receiving our products by the millions and tens of millions year after year without taxing them; and what is the reason? Certainly not to benefit Canadians. She does it because it is to her interest to do it; and while she has received our products free, she has also received the products of other nations free. England has not treated us with greater favor than she has treated other nations.

Mr. HESSON. How about the cattle question?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is right in that; but speaking in the main, England treats us as she treats other nations. The English people look after their interest and we must look after ours. But we find that the very import duties designed by the hon. Minister of Finance to operate more against the United States than against Great Britain have actually discriminated against Great Britain and in favor of the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite the contrary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman must not say that, because I have figured the matter out, and I give the result as I have obtained it from the Trade and Navigation Returns. The values of the dutiable and free goods entered for consumption in Canada from Great Britain and the United States respectively during the year 1887 were as follows:—

| | Dutiable goods. | Free goods. | Total. | Duty Paid. |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Great Britain... .. | \$35,766,273 | \$ 9,195,960 | \$44,962,233 | \$9,318,920 |
| United States..... | 30,570,609 | 14,536,450 | 45,107,059 | 7,268,914 |

The value of the British goods imported was a little less than the value of the American goods, but we levied over \$2,000,000 more duty on the former than on the latter. The percentage of duty on the British goods, taking free and dutiable together, was 20½ per cent., and taking the dutiable alone, 26 per cent., while the percentage of duty on the American goods, free and dutiable together, was 16½ per cent., and on the dutiable alone 23½ per cent. The hon. Minister of Customs will also remember that these figures do not show as much discrimination against Great Britain as I believe will be shown by the figures for 1888, because the operation of the iron duties is not yet as manifest as it will be when we get the returns for this year. A loss of revenue is to be encountered, but we hope that retrenchment and economy, combined with greatly increased prosperity, will enable us to overcome that. I notice that the Government do not venture to ask us to vote down the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford on the ground of disloyalty to Britain, though speakers have greatly enlarged upon that; their resolution speaks of the interest of Canada, and of Canada alone, and that, I think, is as it should be. We have had great speeches on the subject of loyalty. I do not like to profess my loyalty in loud words, and very often I would rather act my loyalty than speak it. If I know myself, I am loyal to Great Britain; I believe I am loyal to Canada, and I think it is our first duty as Canadians—it will be regarded as our first duty by the people of England, by the Parliament of England, by the sovereign we are proud to have reigning over us—to attend to the interests of Canada, to build it up, and in building it up to bring added glory and dignity to the Empire. Now, Sir, I would say in conclusion, that one of the strongest reasons in my mind leading me to favor the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, is that if I am anything, I am a Canadian; I believe in Canada; I love Canada; I want Canada to go on to prosper, to increase, to expand, to develop, to become a Canadian nationality, on this continent, happy at present in the tie that binds us with the mother country, but fitting ourselves, if at any time it should be thought in the interest of the Empire better for us, to become, as the hon. First Minister himself has spoken of us, a kingdom—an auxiliary kingdom—that we should go on, so that if that time should come, soon or late, we should be able to take our position among the nations of the earth, and reflect honor upon that nation of which we now form so important a part. Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to say, and I say it with feelings of regret: I have been through the Dominion, or have endeavored to go through it not with much time at my disposal, but I have at intervals of a few years endeavored to take time enough from my own affairs, if possible, to make myself acquainted with the different portions of this Dominion; and in doing that, while I was rejoiced at the hospitality and the kindness with which I was greeted in all parts of the Dominion, I could not fail to notice that there are commercial difficulties in our way, which produce a certain amount of friction, and prevent the cement that ought to bind us together from hardening as fast and as strong as I, as a Canadian, desire it should. I could not blame the people, when I found them in certain Provinces saying: It is reasonable

that you should be more content with Confederation than we, because you have us for your customers, you send your goods down to us and you make us pay for them in hard cash. You take nothing in return from us, and we have to sell at reduced prices, at 20 or 30 per cent. less than the value of our goods to get the gold with which to pay you for yours. Sir, that is the difficulty under which these people labor; and we cannot wonder, under these circumstances, that that sentiment should be voiced in this House; for a man should be honest in his utterances, and if the Province from which he comes is dissatisfied, if there are grievances under which his people suffer, the way to heal them, the way to discover a remedy, is not to cry peace! peace! when there is no peace. Now, as I said, one of the strongest reasons that induced me to support the resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford is this, that I know, although I do not like to contemplate the fact, that unless we can develop a larger inter-provincial trade, unless we can become cemented more closely and firmly together than we are, unless the present difficulties are removed—and I do not see very well how they are to be overcome, unless that friction is smoothened away and the feeling of dissatisfaction engendered by this state of things dispelled, there cannot be that strong bond which it is desirable should combine the members of a new nationality. It is not because these men are discontented or dissatisfied with the Canadian flag. They are as proud of the Canadian flag, it may be, as we are, it is not that they have a dislike to Confederation politically, but it is because their material interests are not as well served by Confederation as they conceive the interests of the older Provinces are served. I believe if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we would open up natural markets for our productions; the people of Ontario would trade with the people with whom they desire to trade, and with whom it is natural they should trade, and the people

22—1888—6

of the other Provinces would do the same. We would lose perhaps some of the trade that we may have forced, by means of this high tariff, with the more distant Provinces, and some of the neighboring States might share part of that trade with us; but what could prevent our going in and taking our share of the immense trade that could be developed there and of participating with those people in its profits? Trading in our natural markets, the tariff barriers removed on this continent, there would then be peace and prosperity. All the Provinces of this Dominion, free commercially and prospering commercially, would politically become united and banded together as one, strong in upholding the Canadian flag, which I hope will ever be upheld in the hands of freemen worthy to dwell on the soil of Canada. I thank you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House, for having listened to me as patiently as you have, while I have gone over ground that has, no doubt, been gone over already. But I feel some interest in this subject. I feel that it is one of the most important subjects that has ever been before the country. I feel that its effects will be greatly in the interests of the country; and therefore I desired to say a few words in the hope that I might strengthen the arguments that have already been advanced.

Mr. RYKERT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:15 a.m. (Saturday).

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, March 26, 1888.

No. 23.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 26th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF PRINCE EDWARD.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election return of John M. Platt, Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

RAILWAY LEGISLATION.

Mr. SMALL moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee on Railways and Canals that they have power, if they think fit, to divide the Bill intituled: "An Act to confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and a certain agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company, "into two Bills."

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to explain what is contained in this motion.

Mr. SMALL. The Bill as originally introduced consolidated those several agreements. It has been proposed by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway that there should be two charters instead of one in confirmation of the agreements between those different lines of railway. The motion proposes two agreements and two charters, instead of one.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if notice has been given of this application? It is in the nature of a private Bill, and I think the practice is for a private Bill to be introduced and to be presented to this House, and not to originate in the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. SMALL. I was under the impression it ought to have been introduced in the Railway Committee. This motion has been made at the suggestion of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Has notice been given for the application of this private Bill?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, yes. The Bill is before the Committee and has been read a first time.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a mere matter of form, as I understand.

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government if they have come to any definite conclusion as to the adjournment of the House on Wednesday, and as to what time the adjournment would take place? It would be important to know this before getting through the present debate which we have now on hand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is contemplated that the House should adjourn on Wednesday at six o'clock, and stand adjourned until the following Tuesday at eight o'clock. While I am up I would say that, from all I can learn, there is not much probability of finishing the debate on the question before the House to-morrow night, and if a vote is not taken to-morrow night I would ask the House to adjourn the debate until we meet again after Easter on Tuesday night. The debate would then go on on Wednesday and I hope it will invite the House soon to come to a vote, as the House, I am sure, feels inclined to do.

BILLS ON BANKING.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the First Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce speedily the Bill with respect to banking which has not, as I understand, been printed yet—the Bill as to banks and banking?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no Bill on that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the hon. gentleman, or one of his colleagues, stated his intention to introduce a Bill with reference to banks and banking?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked the question as the impression had gone abroad, and a great many questions have been addressed to myself and my hon. friend about it. I take it for granted then, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, that there will, in all human probability, be no legislation on that subject by the Government this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In all human probability there will be no legislation in this respect during the present Session. I think that what I did say with respect to the question relating to banking was, that probably the Committee on Banking and Commerce would, during the present Session, strike a sub-committee for the purpose of considering that question. The charters expire in 1890, and

before that period I think the time and attention of those gentlemen who are accustomed to finance and fiscal matters should be directed especially to that subject, with a view to having legislation, if required or thought necessary, before the expiration of those charters.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I would remind the First Minister that the Bills relating to the Franchise Act and the Contested Elections Act promised in the Speech from the Throne have not yet been laid before Parliament. It is of the highest importance that those measures should be in the hands of members before adjournment takes place. We certainly want to know, and the country wants to know, what legislation the Government proposes. It is a matter of the first consequence, because it relates to the constitution of this House. Unless those measures are in the hands of members before the adjournment takes place, there will be no adequate opportunity of consulting the country with regard to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that not only those measures, but all the measures promised in the Speech from the Throne, and all the principal measures that the Government proposes to submit for the consideration of Parliament, will be laid before the House for immediate discussion and action on the reassembling of the House after Easter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That will not suit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might point out to the First Minister that this would render it very difficult to get the views of the constituents, unless we sit for an unusually long time, which I do not suppose that he nor anybody desires.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sceptic enough to doubt whether the time of the hon. gentleman during the short recess will be materially occupied in explaining any of the public measures to their constituents. I think my hon. friends opposite, and on this side of the House as well, will find their time fully occupied in looking after their own domestic interests and religious duties during the short recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have now been a month in session and have not had those measures yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take this opportunity of saying, for the comfort of the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces who use the Intercolonial Railway, that free passes will be given going and returning during the Easter recess.

THE CAPTAIN OF THE *NORTHERN LIGHT*.

Mr. WELSH. I have been waiting for the last few days for the Minister of Marine to be in his place, to ask when those papers I have spoken of in connection with the captain of the *Northern Light* will be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will take the opportunity at six o'clock to put the question, I will see that my hon. friend is in his place.

Mr. WELSH. That is all right.

COUNTY OF RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House the fact that the seat for the County of Russell is vacant, and has been vacant for some time. I notice that Mr. Speaker received the report of Judge Osler and the final report of the Supreme Court at the opening of the present Session. Looking at this re-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

port I find it is very much in the same line as the report of the same judge in the case of the County of Kent, and though the report has been before the House, and therefore, within the knowledge of the Government, for more than a month, the Government have not thought proper to take action, for reasons which I myself would agree justifies us in making the House consider as to the issuing of a Royal Commission to further investigate the matter. As the report is very much in the same line as the report made by the same judge in the case of the Kent election, that is to say, the question was whether further enquiry would be desirable, I think the House should not delay any further the issue of the writ. I therefore move:

That the Speaker do forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the Electoral District of the County of Russell in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to allow his motion to stand until to-morrow. The only objection I have to it is the rule which I think ought to be observed as much as possible, that in every case of this kind connected with the issue of a writ, we should act on a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion allowed to stand.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. RYKERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the only deduction that can be drawn from the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and from his speech in introducing that resolution, and the several speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite in support of it, is, that it is nothing but an insidious attempt to commit this House to the policy of free trade. Running through all their speeches from beginning to end is an evident disposition to advocate the policy of free trade. They seem desirous, as it were, by a snap verdict, to commit this House to a reversal of the National Policy which was adopted in 1878. It seems to me, Sir, that before this House can pass judgment in a proper manner upon a resolution such as that which is now before it, this House ought to be satisfied that some opinion has been expressed by the people of Canada in favor of such a policy as hon. gentlemen opposite have now adopted. I cannot understand why this

House should now, within twelve months after a general election, be called upon to reverse a policy which was then passed upon and approved by the people. If the National Policy has been a failure in this country, that fact has not yet been established by hon. gentlemen opposite; but the country having adopted that policy on three different occasions—first in 1878, when they transferred hon. gentleman opposite from the Treasury benches to the Opposition side of the House, in 1882, after the matter had been fairly and fully discussed before the people and in Parliament, and in 1887, when every person in the country was fully alive to the importance of that question—it seems to me that there ought to be some strong and satisfactory reason why this House should now be called upon to reverse that policy. There is no doubt, in coming to the conclusion they did, in 1878 particularly, the people of this country were largely indebted to the speeches made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). My hon. friend from South Brant has drawn the attention of the House to the year 1876, and I am glad he has, because I shall perhaps be able to refresh his memory as to some very important speeches made by him and by the hon. member for North Norfolk in this House and in the country. If there are any two persons in this country to whom we as Conservatives are indebted for the establishment of the National Policy and the education of the people in favor of it, they are those two hon. gentlemen; and I have no doubt that when they expressed their opinions in Parliament, they expressed what they really felt. At any rate, whatever they did say met with a hearty response from the people. Now, Sir, it would perhaps be well, as a matter of history, that I should refer to some of those speeches, so that some of the younger members of this House who were not here at the time, may be informed to some extent as to what were then the sentiments of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for South Brant would have been a little fairer, I think, if he had gone back one year, and had referred to the report of the Committee on the Manufacturing Interests made in 1874. He has made copious extracts from the report of the Committee on Agricultural Depression appointed in 1876; but I would also like to refer to the very important report made by a Committee of this House in 1874 when the hon. member for East York had control of the Government. The whole question of the effect of the then fiscal policy upon the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the country was then discussed, and a report was presented by the chairman of the committee, Mr. Wood, then a Reform member for the city of Hamilton, and that report, to my mind, has been vindicated by subsequent events. In that report I find this language:

"This disturbing element in the manufacturing industry of the Dominion, arising out of our geographical position and out of the trade policy of our neighbors, should induce even those who may regard free trade as a correct principle in the abstract, to recognize the necessity for a modification of that principle as a measure of self-protection, and your Committee respectfully recommend the enactment of such laws as will regulate, if it cannot altogether prevent, the evil complained of."

"2nd. The almost uniform testimony before your Committee was to the effect that an increased protection to manufactures will not necessarily increase the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer; and, in the opinion of your Committee, the witnesses have made out a very strong case in support of this view."

"It appears to be well established that the cost of manufacturing decreases as the quantity of goods manufactured increases. Thus a large manufacturing establishment can afford to sell its products at a lower rate than a smaller one. If, therefore, Canadian industry is relieved from the pressure of such undue competition as that referred to in the first paragraph of this report, the effect will be that the manufacturing establishments will be worked to their full capacity, and the cost of production, and the consequent cost to the consumer will be proportionately reduced."

Subsequent events have shown the correctness of that report. Manufactures have increased in this country, every-

thing has been reduced in cost to the consumer, and all over the country, instead of a slaughter market, we find a home market for the produce of our farmers. In 1876, when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), then Minister of Interior, made a motion asking for the appointment of a committee, the hon. member for North Norfolk, who was a very strong protectionist, uttered sentiments with which I think every member on this side of the House and the vast majority of the people of this country will agree. This language has been repeated in this House on several occasions, but, like a good story, it will stand frequent repetition.

"It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce and manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. * * * I believe that the interests of the nation would be promoted by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufactures being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away."

In that connection, to show that these sentiments were not only those of the hon. member but of leading gentlemen on the other side of the line, I would like to quote from a speech made by a gentleman in Congress in 1878 upon the Wood tariff, in which speech he seemed almost to have adopted the language of the hon. gentleman. The Hon. Mr. Tifton, on 3rd May, 1878, made these observations in Congress on the Wood tariff:

"Mr. Chairman, I want these gentlemen who favor this Bill to advise me where the operatives of all the manufacturing interests of this country are to find employment when the manufacturing interests are stricken down. I oppose this Bill because England is for it. I oppose this Bill because every English free trader in this country is in favor of it. I oppose this Bill because English manufacturers are for it. I oppose this Bill because I think it erring and inexpedient at this time. I oppose this Bill because it strikes down our home markets, by striking down labor, by striking down the consuming extent of the country—I mean the factories."

That speech made in the House of Congress is in entire accord with the speech made by the hon. gentleman. The speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk was seconded by that of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who, upon that occasion, seemed to grow somewhat wild in his endeavors to induce the hon. the Minister of Finance to adopt a fiscal policy for the protection of our manufactures. In his appeal to the House, he told them that he had pledged his electors that when he came to Parliament he would ask for protection upon wheat. He was satisfied protection upon grain would be a grand thing for the farmers, and, moreover, he told the House that if they did not agree to his recommendation, he would bring down a petition signed by 100,000 grangers asking the Government to grant his demand. He was kind enough, however, to tell the House that the Government had yielded, to a certain extent, as regarded the fiscal policy, and he pointed out the benefits which would accrue from the adoption of that policy as far as he, a manufacturer, was concerned. This is the language he used in his strong appeal to the Minister of Finance:

"I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands. I hope that other hon. gentlemen will speak on this subject, and whether the Committee is appointed or not, the interchange of views will lead the Finance Minister to bring in a tariff which will redound to the prosperity of the whole Dominion."

He pointed out that if one industry languished, all the others would. That was not the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech on Friday evening last. Then, on the contrary, he pointed out that if this resolution were adopted and the policy it proposed carried out, it might have the effect of destroying some industries. He thought, however, the larger industries would be able to hold their own although the smaller ones might collapse. He said:

"I have confidence that he will arrive at a conclusion on this point. I know the difficulty he will have in satisfying all parties, but we should

keep in mind the fact that we are one people, and when one of our industries prospers all must benefit, while if one languishes all must suffer more or less."

That was the language then used by the hon. member for South Brant. In speaking of the pledges he had made to his electors, in showing what the people demanded at his hands, and in order to satisfy the electors when he went back to them that he had redeemed his pledges, he, on the floor of Parliament, said :

"At my last election when my opponents told them that they need not expect any protection from the Reform Government, I had to assure them that whenever this subject came up in the House I would raise my voice in their behalf, and I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices."

I wonder what the hon. gentleman says now? Then, as I said, he threatened the Government with bringing down his 100,000 grangers to compel the Government to grant what he thought should be granted :

"It is true some hon. gentlemen here think the United States pursue a commercial policy that is utterly nonsensical in some respects ; but until the duties on agricultural products are removed, it is *prima facie* evidence that the farmers believe protection to be in their own interests."

We have often heard the hon. gentleman speak of immigration to this country. We have often heard him denounce the policy of the Government with reference to immigration, but in those days, when the question of immigration was in its infancy, when the policy of the Government of Ontario was strongly in favor of immigration, the hon. gentleman, in order to show what effect the adoption of the policy he recommended would have upon immigration, pointed out the advantage it would bring to some of our industries. He said :

"It is well known that we pay a cash bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. It is a fact that some of those who have been thus induced to emigrate to Canada have been compelled, from want of employment to which they have been accustomed, to go to the United States. I believe by a defensive tariff you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find the steam-whistle of our factories will be the call for them to come."

He also contended very strongly that the duty on wheat would not raise the price :

"I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices, because we raise a surplus and export it. Nevertheless, it will be a protection to our millers, and if any can be given to our agriculturists by a revision of the tariff they should get it. The party to which I belong, and which is led by the Premier, will make a mistake if they refuse to grant this Committee."

Then, in order to illustrate the beneficial effects of protection, the hon. gentleman points to his own industry. He said :

"The other year the Finance Minister, in revising the tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that a thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported, by the change in the tariff, to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits ; but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer receiving all the sympathy. It is inevitable that a like result would flow to other manufacturers under the same policy. If the Finance Minister finds such is the case, I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands."

Then the hon. gentleman was a little afraid that his friends from the Maritime Provinces might find some fault with the policy of protection, and he gave his opinion upon that question. He pointed out that if this policy was adopted, manufactures would spring up in the Maritime Provinces ; and he thought, if they would look at the latter squarely, they would be satisfied, on a full investigation, that a protective policy was the best system for those Provinces. He said :

"I would remind the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces that Ontario is not given up to manufacturing. That interest bears but a small proportion to others in this Province. It is the same in Quebec. That being the case, what is to prevent Halifax under a pro-Mr. RYKERT.

protective tariff from having its manufactories? What is to prevent the establishment of industries in St. John, Charlottetown, and the other towns of the Maritime Provinces? Protection does not mean Ontario's interests at the sacrifice of the interests of the Maritime Provinces. It is to stimulate the manufacturers of this Dominion irrespective of Provinces ; but if any part of Canada could more successfully compete in our markets I think it is Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, from the fact that they have coal and iron lying side by side. They would be able to manufacture cheaply and compete with Ontario."

That, Sir, is another of the strong arguments which the hon. gentleman made, and I think that we, on this side of the House, are strongly indebted to them for those arguments, and the effect they had on the country. There is nothing which had so strong an effect on the country, there is nothing which so strongly endorsed the opinions expressed by the leader of the Government, as the speeches made by those two hon. gentlemen. They corroborated everything laid down by our party, and the result was a change of Government, for which those hon. gentlemen have to thank themselves. Let me, for a minute, point out briefly what I consider the National Policy has done for Canada. I will not go into any elaborate statements, because this House thoroughly understands the question. It has been discussed over and over again, and it would insult the intelligence of this Legislature for me to go into the matter fully again, but the evidence is incontrovertible that we have got rid of the slaughter market of which we heard so much ; we have got a home market ; our manufactures have reached a much larger number, and a much larger amount of capital has been expended on them, and, instead of our farmers having to carry their produce 2,000 or 3,000 miles away, they have a market at their own doors. The hon. gentleman said that the prices have increased. Well, the other day, what I was going to call the Grit organ but I do not know where to place it now, I do not think it is the Grit organ now, the *Globe*, made a statement in regard to certain prices. It was in regard to the price of hosiery, and one of the manufacturers in Dundas was accused of making enormous charges. Mr. Lennard, of Bickford & Lennard, addressed a letter to the *Globe* saying that the prices in 1879, under the 17½ p.c. tariff, were for No. 1, \$1 a dozen ; for No. 2, \$1.20 a dozen, and for No. 3, \$1 a dozen ; that in 1883, under the 30 per cent. tariff, the prices were 85 cents for No. 1, \$1 for No. 2, and 77½ cents for No. 3 ; and that in 1888, under 10 cents a pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, they were 82½ cents, 95 cents and 75 cents respectively. Then in regard to agricultural implements. There is a firm in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, the firm of Harris & Sons, of Brantford, who sold agricultural implements in 1873 for \$300 which they sold in 1887 for \$159. That shows that the farmer has not been very much injured by this policy. There are one or two more items which I will point out for the benefit of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who I see is taking notes. In the years 1878 and 1887, we imported the following quantities of the grain and other articles named :

| | 1878. | 1887. |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Oats..... | 2,162,292 bush. | 19,797 bush. |
| Wheat..... | 5,635,411 " | 22,534 " |
| Indian corn..... | 7,387,507 " | 2,029,061 " |
| Flour..... | 312,864 bbls. | 168,124 bbls. |

When you come to consider the report of Mr. Blue, you will find what has happened during this period. He points out that the following was the difference in the growth of grain from 1871 to 1881 :—

| | 1871. | 1881. |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Corn..... | 3,802,830 bush. | 9,025,142 bush. |
| Wheat..... | 6,367,961 " | 20,247,452 " |
| Oats..... | 42,459,153 " | 70,193,131 " |
| Barley..... | 11,496,038 " | 16,844,868 " |

You will see that since the National Policy came into force the production has very largely increased, and, following it out to the present time, you will find that it has enormously increased. Then, if you look at the exports, you will see

where the farmers have got their markets. They exported to England the following articles in the years named:—

| | 1878. | 1887. |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Cheese..... | 36,331,358 lbs. | 73,185,517 lbs. |
| Sheep..... | 11,985 " | 68,147 " |
| Cattle..... | 7,433 " | 63,832 " |
| Wheat..... | 3,402,625 bush. | 5,048,084 bush. |

So you will see who got the market. I think that is strong evidence to show that the farmer has been somewhat benefited and that he has a market under the National Policy. I was somewhat surprised to read a letter which appeared in the *Mail* on Saturday, in reference to the farmers of Ontario, from Mr. Shaw, who is the recognised author of these pamphlets upon the subject of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. He says that Ontario is so much retrogressing, that the production of the farms has fallen off:

"That the day is not far distant when we will have to import rather than export coarse grains from Ontario eastward. At least these are the indications, and this will apply to all kinds of coarse grain except barley."

The question at the polls last January was not a question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, but a question between free trade and a protective tariff. We know what the platform was of the present Government, and that platform is fully laid down in the resolution passed by the Manufacturers' Association at a meeting which they held in Montreal in March, which says:

"Resolved, That the Conservative Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, with its clear, definite and emphatic policy of protection to Canadian industries, is alone worthy of support, and this meeting pledges itself to do all in its power to secure the return of candidates pledged to support the present Government, believing that the best interests of the country demand that there shall be no uncertainty in the tariff policy of the Dominion."

These gentlemen upon that occasion, as I understand, were compelled to accept the policy laid down in the Malvern speech of Mr. Blake, and the policy he laid down in Toronto was not a policy of free trade but a policy of revenue tariff. Upon that occasion in Toronto, Mr. Blake said:

"Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade. That is not the true issue. Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, for us, impossible, and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, 'or defective or unjust'."

"We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of, and a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet. And it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear."

There he was bidding for the manufacturing interest, and he stated there, as he did at Malvern, that there should not be any change. We remember that the Malvern speech came as a thunderbolt upon the people of the Province of Ontario, that it was the subject of discussion in *Grip*, and I recollect, Sir, seeing a *Grip* paper in that style (holding up the copy of *Grip*) called "The Sword Swallowed."

An hon. MEMBER. No, he is not swallowing it; he is showing how easy it can be swallowed."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Send it across when you have done with it.

Mr. RYKERT. It says:

Manager Cartwright.—"It's a real, genuine swallow, ladies and gentlemen! No deception! Any manufacturer in the country can come up and examine for himself."

Then we find some gentleman in the rear called

"Urgent Party in the Background.—H'm! wonder why he can't swallow this sword"—

that is, the Prohibition sword. At any rate, we had in this paper the idea that the people were staggered at the idea of the hon. member for West Durham bolting down all his former principles on the free trade policy, and he is represented as the clown, and Manager Cartwright the one who showed round the circus. Now, I say that the issue at the last election was plain and unmistakable, but it seems

rather extraordinary that on this occasion we could find these hon. gentlemen adopting a different course. Taking advantage, I suppose, of their leader's absence, they come down here with a policy directly antagonistic to the principles laid down by him in his speech at Malvern and also his speeches in Toronto and Hamilton. They pretend that the farmers of Ontario are in favor of this new kind of policy. I deny it *in toto*. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pointed out that a large majority of the Farmers' Institutes had passed resolutions in favor of commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or some thing of that kind. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the resolutions put to those meetings, with one or two exceptions, were not in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. But hon. gentlemen opposite embody all these—commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or reciprocity. At all these meetings, what did they say? Why, Sir, they said to the farmers: "Look how you flourished from 1854 to 1866." They pointed to the past history of the country under the treaty, and said, "You flourished then." But they said not one word about discriminating against England; they dared not say one word about direct taxation; they dared not say one word about annexation; they dared not say one single word about the revenues of the country being deficient. Upon the contrary, they said: "Gentlemen, look how you have prospered; would you not like to prosper in the same way again?" Every resolution carried was carried under false pretences. I attended one of these meetings, and they tried to bolt that down the electors of Lincoln, and the electors saw plainly the other side of the story. They were told—exactly as the hon. member for South Oxford stated at Ingersoll—they were told that there was danger of annexation, there was danger of direct taxation, there was danger of discrimination against England. They would not point out these things, however, at the meetings held all over the country, and they tried to get a snap verdict. They moved a resolution at the close of the meetings, and at every one of these meetings the question was not what the effect of commercial union would be, but what reciprocity was. On Friday last the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) took occasion to have a little fun at the expense of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and also the senior member for the city of Hamilton (Mr. Brown), and he read from speeches at the Dominion Board of Trade, and he also read a copy of the resolution. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had been desirous of being fair to the argument used by the member for Hamilton, he would have admitted that the language used by him, and which he read, was exactly similar to what he used in this House. On the 20th of March, in this debate, the hon. member for Hamilton said:

"I am most sincere when I say that the Americans are a people with whom we should live in the greatest amity, with whom we should have the freest commercial relations so long as they do not affect the status of this country as a part and parcel of the British Empire. We propose now to have the closest relations with the people of the United States, and our Government have put in the Customs Act a standing offer to interchange with the United States in natural products; but beyond that this country should not and will not go."

These are the sentiments expressed by that hon. gentleman the other night, and they are exactly in accordance with his speech before the Dominion Board of Trade. Now, what did the Minister of the Interior say? The hon. gentleman quoted a speech which the Minister of the Interior made before the Board of Trade, but he was not exactly fair. The hon. gentleman complained that I did not read the whole of his speech. Well, life is too short to read the whole of his long speeches; at the same time I think it but fair that in challenging the conduct of the Minister of the Interior and trying to show his inconsistency, the hon. gentleman should have read all that he said before the Dominion Board of Trade. I have it here on page 95, which

the hon. gentleman could have found in the library if he had looked for it. The Minister of the Interior, then Mr. Thos. White, said :

"It is quite true that the extension of our markets will be a benefit to the country. But it is equally true that a home market is the best of all markets, and we can create that by the building up of our manufactures. It would be a great boon to the farmers, if they will then have a market at their own doors for their produce. Therefore, I hold that anything injurious to the manufacturing interest cannot be to the advantage of the farming community."

Now, why did not the hon. gentleman read that? He did not think that worth his while, but he thought he would make a point against the hon. gentleman by misconstruing what he said.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why did you not read the whole of it? You have not read the tenth part of his speech?

Mr. RYKERT. I have enough to do to attend to the hon. gentleman. I have taken up the somewhat lengthy task of replying particularly to the hon. gentleman, and I do not feel disposed to read the whole of that speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then why does the hon. gentleman blame me for not reading the whole?

Mr. RYKERT. I think the hon. gentleman's speech is like grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. The hon. gentleman's speech seemed to me to point to the fact that he has some doubt about the policy now being enunciated. He has some doubts about the effect upon the country, he has some doubt about the effect upon his own industry, but he says, "I am a patriot, and I will sacrifice my own industry for the benefit of my country." That is the substance of the hon. gentleman's speech. Now, let me take the hon. gentleman again into my confidence for a few minutes. It is just as well that I should deal with him now. The hon. gentleman took up the Depression Committee Report in 1876, and he says, "Why, Mr. Gurney is against the National Policy—he is in favor of unrestricted free trade," and all that sort of thing. He took Mr. Massey, Mr. Goldie, Mr. Rosamond, and all those gentlemen. Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I took the trouble of telegraphing to all these gentlemen to know if what was said of them was correct. I have all their answers, and they are in the negative.

An hon. MEMBER. Read them.

Mr. RYKERT. I intend to read them. The hon. gentleman said, in reading a letter that the member for East York handed to him, that he did not mention names. Well, he did drop a name. Mr. Speight, manager. I happened to catch that name, so I took the liberty of telegraphing to that gentleman, and here is his answer, addressed to Frank Madill, M.P.:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufacturing industries and not benefit the farmer. Prices are low for all kinds of implements; further competition would destroy us."

That is from Mr. Speight, manager of the establishment to which the hon. gentleman referred.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He does not want to state what is not true. I did not say that Mr. Speight had testified. The Minister of Customs knows that. I give it an emphatic contradiction.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I do not.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, you do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know what you are trying to do.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman read the letter and referred to the name of Mr. Speight as the manager, and that is the way we found who the letter came from.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not.

Mr. RYKERT.

Mr. RYKERT. I said the hon. gentleman read the name Speight.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I mentioned the name of Speight.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Allow me to explain. If the hon. gentleman was a gentleman, and if he was carrying out—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman was carrying out what was the understanding at that time with the First Minister and the members present, when the name slipped out inadvertently, he would not have mentioned it. I did not complain that it was mentioned. I did not say Mr. Speight; indeed the letter in which the connection with Mr. Speight came in was in respect to the manager, and Mr. Speight differed from the manager, the manager holding that unrestricted reciprocity would not injure their business, Mr. Speight holding the opposite.

Mr. RYKERT. We have the letter. The hon. gentleman is very strong in his language, yet he has never shown himself yet in the character of a gentleman in this House. From the very commencement of his career in Parliament till now he seems to have fallen a little from grace.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have caught you.

Mr. RYKERT. I sent a telegram to Mr. Speight to know what he thought of it—Mr. Speight and the manager of that concern, and we have the answer and you have the answer now. I also telegraphed Mr. Massey of Toronto. The reply I got was:

"I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy."

Mr. Goldie was also put down as one in favor of free trade. He telegraphed me:

"I am not in favor of commercial union. I consider the country is prosperous under the present policy."

"JAMES GOLDIE."

I have a letter also from him, which arrived this morning, and which I will also give to the hon. gentleman. Those are the names he quoted. I knew very well they did not hold those views—perhaps they have changed, like hon. gentlemen opposite. We are now discussing what is best for the country at the present time. The letter says:

"GUELPH, 24th March, 1888.

"J. C. RYKERT, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR.—I am in receipt of your telegram, informing me that Mr. Paterson had stated last night that I was in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, and asking me if this statement was correct.

"I am opposed to commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, as it is called. I am opposed to our people begging reciprocity from the United States or toadying to them whatever. I believe we can build up a country of our own, the future of which will surpass the imagination of the most sanguine now. The present policy of our Government has done great good to this country, and I am as strongly in favor of it now as in 1879. I am bitterly opposed to the degrading spectacle of a number of our legislators—"

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for South Brant among the number, I suppose.

"begging reciprocity from the United States."

I have also a telegram from Mr. Rosamond of Almonte, another gentleman quoted by the hon. member:

"Paterson's statement altogether incorrect. Am as much in favor of National Policy as I ever was. Totally opposed to any agreement with the United States that would interfere with Canada's right to regulate her own tariff."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the hon. member how Mr. Rosamond knew the statement I made?

Mr. RYKERT. I telegraphed the gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I say the hon. gentleman telegraphed something I never said. What I read was those gentlemen said in 1876. Did he telegraph them that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman would not interrupt. It always leads to very unpleasant contradictions, and we had better proceed with the debate.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not object to it. The hon. gentleman does not know any better.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I always nail things when said.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hold that if an hon. member conceives that a misstatement has been made he has the right to nail it then, and that is the best time to set it at rest.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand that the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said there was a misrepresentation. He was only putting the question as to how the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) communicated with Mr. Rosamond. That is what I understood. If there had been any question of personal explanation or of misstatement or misrepresentation I would certainly have allowed it with pleasure, as I have done already. What I meant to say was this, that it is better for the House in a debate like this that hon. members should not interrupt a speech unless within the rule. I say it is against the rule, and it would be better to enforce the rule, because it always leads to something unpleasant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I will avail myself of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I distinctly claim that the hon. gentleman has made a misstatement. The hon. gentleman led off by saying that I had made certain statements with regard to those gentlemen, and he said he had an emphatic contradiction in regard to them, and he read certain replies. I asked how the gentleman knew the statement I made. He said: "I telegraphed him." The statements I read were read, as I said at the time, from the report of the Committee on Trade Depression in 1876. I read the questions, I read the answers published and submitted to this House. That was what I read. The hon. gentleman now rises and reads a telegram, having sent a telegram that Paterson said so-and-so—what I never said—that the gentleman is not in favor of commercial union. If you think that is an honorable course, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it in the judgment of the House.

Mr. RYKERT. It is quite evident what the hon. gentleman stated on Friday night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. After that has been raised, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) should, in courtesy and in justice to my hon. friend, read the telegram which he sent.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) induced this House to believe on Friday night that these gentlemen were in favor of this resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. That was his sole object in reading it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read the telegram.

Mr. RYKERT. His sole object in reading the extracts—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Produce your telegram.

Mr. RYKERT—was to satisfy the House and the country that they were in favor of it. I asked: Are you in favor of it or not?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly think the hon. gentleman should read the telegram he sent. Here is a question of veracity raised between the two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman does not seem to grasp the question altogether. They had better wait till I get through with them and perhaps they will be satisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The telegrams.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman knew that the whole question before the House that night was reciprocity or free trade.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The House knows what I said; it is here in *Hansard*.

Mr. RYKERT. I took the opportunity of reading the evidence that was taken. If the hon. gentleman wants more reading I can give it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; but there is a question of veracity.

Mr. RYKERT. There is no question of veracity. My word will go as far as that of the hon. gentleman, and I have a record of 500 majority to prove it. The hon. gentleman came to my city during the last election, and the result of the election was to increase my majority to over 500. It was never more than 100 before that time. The people were so thoroughly satisfied that the hon. gentleman was talking nonsense that they increased my majority very largely. If hon. gentlemen opposite hope to disconcert me by this kind of interruption they are very much mistaken: I rather like it. I want to give the hon. member for South Brant the evidence of a person nearer home, that is, J. K. Osborne, one of the leading members of Harris & Co., of Brantford. This gentleman addressed a letter the other day to the *Empire*, in which he gives his opinion on this question. He says:

"The avowed object of Commercial Unionists, from a commercial standpoint, is to secure for Canada the cheapest markets in which to buy, the largest markets in which to sell, and the development of her natural resources, which it is claimed would immediately follow. That such would be the result of unrestricted trade with the United States I very much doubt; but, granting that these expectations would, in some measure, be realised, would not far greater benefits accrue to Canada by making Great Britain, instead of the United States, the objective point for closer commercial relations."

He goes on to say:

"It may be true that Canadian agriculturists might derive some benefit from free intercourse with the United States, and it is on this large mass of the electorate that the strongest guns of the Commercial Unionists are brought to bear. I believe that the vast majority of the Canadian farmers are as well, if not better off, than those of the United States, and until something more tangible than a bare statement to the contrary is presented, will stick to my belief. I believe this to be true of all Canadian farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if a comparison is instituted let it be a fair one, say Ontario farmers against those of New York, Ohio or Michigan, and Manitobans against those in Minnesota and Dakota.

"Unrestricted trade with our southern neighbors would certainly not enhance the price of wheat, cheese, butter or fruit, for the market for these great staples is Great Britain, and the farmers of the United States are our competitors in these markets. Our cattle also find largest sale in Great Britain, and if care was taken in the breeding of horses the market in Great Britain would be a limitless and a paying one. Even in smaller items, such as poultry and eggs, England will be our best customer as soon as the proper way of shipping is known and adopted.

"It is a mistaken idea, too, to imagine that were all the restrictions of trade removed, the Canadian article would be enhanced by the present American duty placed upon it. Such a result could not be expected by the most sanguine. The American buyer takes our horses and our barley because he needs them, not because they are cheaper, but they are better adapted for his purpose than any other. Were the tariff barrier removed there might be more trade, but it would not be at greatly enhanced prices to the Canadian seller. The American consumer would largely reap the benefit of the reduction of duties, otherwise the whole argument of free trade falls to the ground."

This is an important letter coming from one's own town. I have here a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, who has sent it to me unsolicited. It reads as follows:—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I would give a most unequivocal denial. Were I called upon to say whether my individual business could compete with United States manufacturers, I should probably declare my belief that it could, but that is not the question, but would it be wise to readjust my whole business,

involving the sacrifice of two-thirds of my plant, on the basis of a treaty with such neighbors as we have on our southern border, to which I reply it would be the greatest blunder ever advocated by a business man, and what applies to the individual is equally applicable to the whole manufacturing and mercantile community. I write this with some haste, as I leave immediately."

That is the letter sent to me by Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, without his being solicited for it or even spoken to. The only inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks is just as I indicate, that the hon. gentleman quoted those gentlemen as being in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, otherwise what would be the use of quoting them at all. It seems somewhat singular, Mr. Speaker, that those hon. gentlemen should have so suddenly changed their front in this House. In the early part of the Session a resolution was given notice of by the member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), to this effect:

"That in the opinion of this House, commercial union with the United States would be mutually advantageous to both countries, and it is therefore the duty of the Government to use all proper means to secure such union."

Sir, after that resolution had been on the notice paper for a few days we find it suddenly withdrawn and a new motion introduced which is now the subject-matter of discussion in this House. My purpose in alluding to that is simply this, that those gentlemen do not seem to understand what they really want as regards this question. It is necessary for the members of this House to know exactly how they do stand when we come to discuss and express an opinion on this resolution, and I think I will be able to show the House what the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is. If they want union upon this question, I think, Sir, that I can show them that they themselves possess different opinions on the same question. I look upon this matter as simply a question of triumph for the *Globe* newspaper. That newspaper has come out in favor of direct taxation and free trade, and after it came out with this policy the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Wellington (Mr. Innes) went in for it too. I think I can show to the House and to the country that those gentlemen have no views of this question at all. First, we find commercial union thoroughly discussed by them, and we find it discussed by every newspaper in the country, then we find unrestricted reciprocity, then we find continental free trade discussed by the *Globe* newspaper and all the papers throughout the country, and then, at last, when the Opposition have been for a couple of months without a policy, the *Globe* comes out in favor of direct taxation and continental free trade, or something like that, and the Opposition members follow suit. I think I can show satisfactorily that that is not the opinion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I think he is not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. He will not answer that. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity? Yes. The hon. gentleman nods his head. I shall recollect that, because when I come to it by-and-bye I think I can show that he is entirely opposed to it, and I think it is our duty in discussing this question to know whether its advocates are sincere or not, whether they thoroughly discussed it and considered it, and whether they thoroughly understand it and are sufficiently in favor of it to propound such a policy for acceptance by the country. We are told in the plainest possible language by the mover of this resolution that he voiced the sentiment of the country. I would like to ask just here, why is it if this policy which is to be inscribed on the banner next election and which the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has told us he "has nailed his colors to the mast and will go to the polls," I should like to know, Sir, why the leader of the Opposition is not the mover of this resolution? Why, if this is going to be the policy of the Reform party, is the leader of the Opposition not the mover and propounder of this policy? I will tell you why, Sir. It is because he

Mr. RYKERT.

is not in favor of it; it is because he has not made up his mind on it, he has never made up his mind on it and as far as the records outside of the House show he has not pronounced an opinion on it. When I heard the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) state that he voiced the sentiments of the people of this country, I felt inclined to take exception to it, because I knew from what I had read that even his own party were not united on it. I read the *Advertiser*

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) I have nothing to do with the *Advertiser*.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh, no. I read the *Guelph Mercury*, the *Brantford Expositor*, the *Canadian Post*, the *Galt Reformer*, or whatever you call the Liberal papers up there, I have read all those papers published in the Reform interest and I find they are opposed to the *Globe* on this question. I find that they are all at sixes and sevens whether they shall have unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union or free trade and direct taxation. I find all those different opinions expressed and I have the right to ask myself how is it those gentlemen can come here now and boldly assert that the policy expressed in this resolution before the House is one in the best interests of this country? The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said he expressed the opinion of the country. I take issue on that point. I say he does not, and I am prepared to show it before I sit down. He used those words:

"It is true that I am fortified and encouraged in bringing forward this motion by the knowledge that in so doing I only voice the opinions of the representatives of the Liberal party in this Parliament; and, furthermore, that I have every reason a man can have for believing that when I give utterances to their opinions I also give utterance to the opinions of the vast majority of those who support us and of a very important section, to say the least of it, of those who, on other questions, have differed from us very widely."

That is what the hon. gentleman said. Well, let us see what his leader said. The hon. leader of the Opposition made a speech on 3rd October, 1887, in which he said:

"I am not quite certain that those who have constituted themselves the champions and promoters of commercial union can now present it as a certain or definite principle. It is yet vague, but the substratum in an aspiration towards reciprocity. The idea is still uncertain, it may be unhappily expressed, but the substance of it is that the most advantageous thing that, commercially, the people of Canada could look to, would be some form of reciprocity with the United States."

Then, the organ of the hon. member for South Brant, the *Brantford Expositor*, on 28th January last, had something to say on this subject; and I want to see whether the views of hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs are in accord, because there is no use of our voting for the resolution unless we know that hon. gentlemen opposite are in favor of it themselves. That paper, referring to the *Globe* said:

"We regret that such a powerful exponent of public opinion should seek to disseminate the idea that it is only by a free trade propaganda or something of that sort, that the Dominion can be redeemed from its unsatisfactory régime. We do not believe it, and we would ask to emphasise the fact, that the *Globe* in its new departure does not voice in any sense the views of the political party of which it is a leading advocate."

We also find that the *Sentinel Review*, of Woodstock, which has been fighting the *Globe* on this question for some time and discussing it very intelligently, on 20th February, discussed the policy advocated by the *Globe* in the following terms:

"The Liberal party needs a platform more stable than the shifting sands of evasion and inconstancy, and so long as the leader could be held responsible for the utterances of their hitherto recognised organ, it was absolutely necessary to repudiate the free trade dogma. It is not a grateful task, but until it is done throughout the whole country the Liberal party in Dominion politics will be a ghastly case of suspended animation."

There does not seem too much unity among leading Liberals of the country on this subject, although the hon. member for South Oxford, says he leads them. Then we find the

Lindsay Post denouncing free trade and direct taxation as follows:—

"The *Globe* in a month or two is like the little boy with the potatoes—will be digging up the hills to see if the free trade direct tax potatoes or principles it has been planting have really been making any growth. When the *Globe* essays to lay down a new line of policy for the Reform party it is time to pound a little common sense into our contemporary."

The hon. member for Halifax spoke in very strong terms the other night on this question, and in the city of Halifax on 8th December, 1887, he made use of this language:

"I know there is a strong feeling in the United States against admitting wheat free from Canada in competition with their own, and I believe there is equally a strong objection taken by the coal interest against placing coal on the free list. Cannot then these articles be eliminated from the contract?"

Then, we find a gentleman in this House distinguished for the cordial support he gives to the Opposition, speaking of the "unfortunate differences" in the party. I see him smile; no doubt he recognises the phrase. The *Guelph Mercury* came to the relief of the party as it thought it was going to pieces too rapidly, and that it was time for it to settle its differences. On 11th February, just before Parliament met, it said:

"The *Globe* has had pretty good proof by this time that his advocacy of the absolute free trade and direct tax finds no sympathy, and has had no support from the Liberal party of Canada, with two exceptions, that we know of, nor have its views been endorsed by any member of the party as far as we are aware. Of course the *Globe* is only responsible for its own utterances, but it is regretted that a paper which had for many years voiced the sentiments of the Liberal party, should now with a singular want of judgment go off at a tangent and take up a platform which in its sober senses it must know is utterly impracticable in the present condition of the country, and which were the Liberals, as a party, to adopt, would lead to its disintegration and ruin."

The hon. gentleman I suppose will not repudiate the *Guelph Mercury*; and we find him on 11th February opposing this very resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. He opposed the principle laid down by the *Globe* newspaper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes; and the resolution brought before the House to-day is entirely in accord with what has been laid down by the *Globe* newspaper. And we find articles in that paper day after day calling upon this House to vote for that resolution; but hon. gentlemen opposite, finding that commercial union has been pronounced to be a political humbug, come down and go for something else. The *Brantford Expositor* is also very strong on this subject. In an article of 10th February, 1887, headed "Putting on the brakes," it says:

"It is pretty tough for those who differ from the *Globe* in its free trade direct tax platform to be dubbed the protectionist tail of the Liberal party. In fact, we may say it is cheeky for it to spring a new departure on the country, and coolly appropriate the whole Liberal party, always excepting the tail, as thoroughly imbued with its new found belief. And we would like to know where the protectionist tail of the Liberal party is? If it ever had one, those whom the *Globe* designates the rats of 1876 constituted it, and the leading organ's attitude towards them afforded little expectation of their ever returning to the fold."

Now, Sir, I give these extracts to show that when the hon. member for South Oxford stated that he was in accord with the Liberal party and with the great majority of the people who, though not belonging to the Liberal party are in favor of reciprocity, he does not voice their sentiments at all. On the contrary, I think I have shown that the different organs of the party are opposed to the resolution. What I object to in hon. gentlemen opposite is the course they have been pursuing on this question. I would like to know how we stand to-day as a Parliament. We stand as a Parliament with a resolution on our Statute-book pledged that as soon as the United States shall agree to reduce their tariff on certain articles, we shall pass an Order in Council admit-

ting the same articles into Canada on the same terms. The Act of 1879 enacts as follows:—

"Any or all of the following articles, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees, shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked) and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation by the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

That is the position we occupy here to-day as a Legislature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman approve of that resolution? That is contrary to the National Policy.

Mr. RYKERT. I will state what my own views are on that matter in a very few minutes; and, perhaps, they will not be in accord with those of the hon. gentleman, or those of hon. members on this side altogether. Now, that is our proposition, and that has been on our Statute-books since 1879. We, a short time ago, through the mouth of our representative in Washington, made overtures of which this House is well aware. Sir Charles Tupper, then acting as one of the commissioners on the treaty question, made a proposition with which all the hon. gentlemen here are familiar, but this proposition was not accepted by the commissioners on the other side. This was the proposition Sir Charles Tupper made:

"That with a view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Then we find the answer. Now, if the American commissioners were disposed to treat on the terms laid down in our Statutes, there would be no difficulty whatever in at once arriving at a conclusion. But they were not prepared to accept that, and they would make no counter proposition. They refused, on the contrary, to discuss the question at all, their answer being:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd instant as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

That shows, that so far as the present condition of affairs is concerned, we are willing to adhere to our offer of 1879, or even go further, as expressed by our plenipotentiary. The hon. gentleman asked what my view of the matter is? I will tell the hon. gentleman that I retain the same views on the question which I expressed in 1865, when addressing the Agricultural Society of Ontario, as their President, in the city of London. It was the year before the abrogation of the treaty, and I then publicly declared that I did not care whether the treaty was abrogated or not, because I believed that the Province of Ontario, and the Dominion at large, could flourish without it. I still am of the same opinion. I still believe that we can go on and prosper without a reciprocity treaty. I still believe that we can go on side by side with our neighbors in generous rivalry and prosper, as we have shown we can in the last fifteen years. But while I am of that opinion, I stand pledged, as a member of the Parliament which adopted that resolution, to support it as far as it goes and no further. I am not prepared to go

further. That is my position in the matter. I am somewhat surprised—though perhaps I ought not to be—that hon. gentlemen opposite should persist in crying out that this Dominion is in a dilapidated state. It seems to be a matter for rejoicing to them that this country should not be in a prosperous condition. We all recollect that, some years ago, when speaking about the Budget, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was called upon to reply to the Finance Minister. That hon. gentleman then expressed the opinion and the hope that before very long Canada would come to that position when she would be in a state of almost degradation. He hoped to see the day when we would not be prosperous, and looked forward to the time, which, he said, has now arrived, when we would be in a state of decay. In response to the speech of Sir Leonard Tilley, then Finance Minister, he said:

"This country will, as I have said, pass through a period of stringency and trade depression as well as of prosperity, and I venture to prophecy that in two years from now, the hon. Minister, if he still retains his position as hon. Minister of Finance, will find that he will be compelled to offer apologies; he will explain how this factory and that factory was closed; how wages in this department were lowered, and how it occurs that the exports have declined. I believe this, and I am confirmed in my views by writers in commercial journals, equally well informed with the hon. Finance Minister. And then we, on this side of the House, will have the satisfaction of knowing that though we have had to wait for it a few years, till a period of trial came round, yet it was bound to come at last."

I hope the hon. gentleman is quite satisfied, now that he says we are in a state of decay, that there is no prosperity whatever in the country, and that we are rapidly going to the dogs. That cry has been raised throughout the whole country by hon. gentlemen opposite. The sentiment of every right thinking man must at once condemn their line of action. As was stated the other night, you may go to the other side of the line, and you will not find an American in his place in the Legislature or out of it, crying out against his country. Americans may be driven from the cities to the country, they may be driven from the East to the West, they may fail in their efforts to secure a competence, but you will never find them going back on their country. In this respect, they offer a striking contrast to hon. gentlemen opposite, to the hon. member for Bothwell and the others who seem to rejoice in declaring that our country is in a state of despondency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What did you say in 1877?

Mr. RYKERT. Nothing that I am aware of.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell.) Read the resolution of your leader.

Mr. RYKERT. I said nothing in 1877 about it. I am answerable for my own statements. The hon. gentleman has referred to that resolution, but he will find nothing of despondency in it. The right hon. gentleman who moved it speaks hopefully of the future, but he said that the policy then pursued, if it were continued, would be disastrous to the country, and that the only remedy was the adoption of a new policy.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell.) And we say that is disastrous. We say the same thing of your policy as you did of ours.

Mr. RYKERT. But the hon. gentlemen opposite have been shown to be false prophets. These hon. gentlemen talk a great deal about their organ. I want them to listen to what I am going to read from their own organ on this question. The measure of these gentlemen is accurately taken by their own mouthpiece; their organ seems to fully understand what they were at; it seems fully to understand that they are determined to smash Confederation and destroy the whole country. No later than 8th September, 1887, I found this article in the *Globe*:

"One of the standing misfortunes of Canadians consists in the existence within our borders of many pessimistic individuals, often active and able, who have no desire to perpetuate our Confederation,"

Mr. RYKERT.

and who further movements, good or bad indifferently, with a single aim to create general despair. For years past these men have been telling the people, who live together harmoniously enough, that it is obviously impossible for them to continue to jog along in agreement to disagree about creeds. Instead of trying to calm race disputes, they have seized every occasion to exacerbate these, that Ontario and Quebec, Canada and *Canadien*, might join in declaring any political fate more endurable than the continuance of the effort to build up a Canadian nation. They are the wailers over Canadian geography,"—

There they are—

"the whettors of every prejudice"—

There they are—

"the moaners over the wrongs of great majorities, the foes of tolerance"—

There they are—

"the enemies of all who counsel the people to make the best and not the worst of one another"—

There they are—

"the magicians of business troubles, the spreaders of panic, the growlers over every difficulty in Canada's development"—

There they are—

"When they join in demand for reform they cry that life is not worth living without it; when the reform is wrought they weep that the situation is as bad as ever."

The *Globe* took accurate stock of these gentlemen. Now, I entirely dissent from their statement that the Province of Ontario in particular and the Dominion in general is retrograding, and I am prepared to show from their own organ that to-day Canada is more prosperous than ever it was. There is an old saying that chickens come home to roost. In 1886—and I commend this to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, though I am sure he does not join in the crusade of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I observe that up to the present time we have not had any indication of his views upon this question. In 1886, a discussion was raised in the Ontario Legislature in reference to the terrible expenses of the Ontario Government. Of course, that was enough to make anyone cry out, because the leader of the Opposition knows very well what a terrible expensive Government that has been. When they are charged with the increase of expense which they were guilty of, we find the organ of the hon. gentleman—I beg his pardon—we do not know which is his organ, but it used to be the organ of the party—I find this language in the *Globe*, and I commend it to the attention of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House because they will find in it the absurdity of their continuing to decry the country from day to day:

"The critics of the Budget in the Legislative Assembly have undertaken to show that the Government is extravagant because the expenditure is greater now than it was fifteen years ago. Do those persons believe that Ontario has been standing still for fifteen years? If they do not—if they admit that there has been growth and expansion—are they able to show that the country has not got value for the money paid out, or that payment has been in any degree disproportionate to the service? Let us have a knowledge of the facts before we condemn any party."

"In 1871 the Dominion had a population of 3,577,176, and an area of land occupied of 37,041,073 acres, while Ontario had a population of 1,618,245 and an area occupied of 16,128,999 acres. In 1881 the population of the Dominion—inclusive of the new Provinces and Territories—was 4,321,919, and the area occupied was 45,322,694 acres; while the population of Ontario was 1,920,337, and the area occupied was 19,224,362 acres. This shows that in the former the increase of population was 20·8 per cent., and of area occupied 22½ per cent.; while in the latter the increase of population was 18½ per cent., and of area occupied 19 per cent."

"No Province or State of America, we make bold to say, has such a record as this Ontario of ours; and if our representatives in the Legislative Assembly have the courage to act as true sons of Ontario, regardless of party ties in another place, and to insist upon a policy of 'hands off' when its rights and interests are threatened, the men of this generation will live to see it become the wealthiest and most populous commonwealth of the continent, as it is now the best governed."

There is the evidence of their own organ that Ontario is more prosperous than almost any country in the world, and is prospering and increasing in every respect. Let us

go a little further. We have the report of Mr. Blue who has charge of the Bureau of Statistics in the Province of Ontario, and his words are very significant as to the growth of fall wheat, spring wheat, barley and oats in the Province of Ontario, showing that it is ahead of any ten States of the American Union. Let us take them in their order. The following is the average production of cereals in Ontario and the principal grain growing States of the Union in bushels for five years :—

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Fall Wheat. | |
| Ontario | 21 |
| New York | 14 |
| Pennsylvania | 12 |
| Ohio | 13 |
| Michigan | 16 |
| Indiana | 13 |
| Illinois | 12 |
| Mississippi | 10 |
| California | 12 |
| Kansas | 15 |
| Spring Wheat. | |
| Ontario | 16 |
| Wisconsin | 12 |
| Minnesota | 13 |
| Iowa | 11 |
| Nebraska | 12 |
| Dakota | 10 |
| Barley. | |
| Ontario | 26 |
| New York | 23 |
| Wisconsin | 24 |
| Minnesota | 23 |
| Iowa | 22 |
| Nebraska | 22 |
| California | 19 |
| Oats. | |
| Ontario | 37 |
| New York | 29 |
| Pennsylvania | 22 |
| Ohio | 32 |
| Michigan | 32 |
| Indiana | 34 |
| Missouri | 31 |
| Minnesota | 34 |
| Iowa | 34 |
| Mississippi | 26 |
| Kansas | 31 |
| Nebraska | 32 |

Let us see what he says in his report, and I commend this to the attention of the croakers against Ontario :

"Take the Province of Ontario, in the Dominion of Canada, as a sample. There, substantial wealth or a reasonable competency is within the reach of every industrious man whose efforts are intelligently directed. The penniless pioneer of a few years ago is the substantial, independent farmer of to-day. The uplifting of the people in social and material comfort is a process as visibly going on from year to year as the revolution of the seasons. Its progress is recorded in the annual advance in the value of their accumulated property, in the increase of their trade both in imports and exports, in the establishment and development both of religious, educational and benevolent institutions, in the spread of social refinement, in the cultivation of the sciences, in the appliance of every art that ministers to the happiness of human life. Nor are these conditions the result of long and painful evolution taking generations for their development."

That is the opinion of Mr. Blue. He also speaks in his report of 27th February as follows :—

"The farm lands in Ontario having increased in value from \$632,242,560 in 1882 to \$648,009,828 in 1886, farm buildings from \$132,712,575 to \$183,748,212, farm implement from \$37,029,851 to \$50,530,536, and live stock from \$80,540,720 to \$107,208,935, or a total of \$989,497,911 as against \$882,625,610—a gain of \$106,872,301 in four years instead of 'a loss of 30 per cent.'"

We also find in that valuable report that the different counties in the Province have increased in a great ratio for the last year.

"In the group comprising Essex, Kent, Elgin, Norfolk, Haldimand and Welland, the value of land had risen in 1886 by about \$2,000,000 over 1885. In the group comprising Lambton, Huron and Bruce the increased value was over \$3,000,000. In Grey and Simcoe the increased value was \$600,000. In the group comprising Middlesex, Oxford, Brant, Perth, Wellington, Waterloo and Dufferin the increase in value in the short period of one year was \$2,750,000. In the group composed of Lincoln, Wentworth, Halton, Peel, York, Ontario, Durham, North-

umberland and Prince Edward the increased value in a year was \$3,600,000. In the group comprising Lennox and Addington, Frontenac, Leeds and Grenville, Dundas, Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Renfrew and Lanark, the increase in value was for the year \$7,500,000. In the group comprising Victoria, Peterboro', Haliburton and Hastings the farm lands increased in value in twelve months by \$2,100,000; and in the group composed of Muskoka, Parry Sound and Algoma the increase was \$220,000. The total increase in value of farm lands in the whole Province in 1886 over the preceding year was nearly \$22,000,000."

So you will see from that report from Ontario, that the Province is not going backward, but, on the contrary, that everything is in a good condition. The hon. gentleman also, in order to show that he is still in the same despairing mood, refers to the great debt under which we are laboring. I might ask him to go back as far as 1875, when he declared that the debt which existed had been incurred for works of general utility. He went home to England, and there publicly declared over his own signature that all this debt was created in erecting works of public utility, and he went on to show what they were; therefore I say that it does not lie in his mouth to go beyond 1885 for the purpose of decrying this country, and showing what the existing financial affairs are. Now, I will quote from the organ of the party. As late as November, 1881, the *Globe* newspaper, in referring to an article of Goldwin Smith, which ran in the same direction as the speech of hon. gentlemen opposite, denounced this statement as improper and incorrect, and said the debt was not created in the manner which Mr. Smith described. It says :

"Who does not see that Mr. Smith wants the same thing for Canada, and is ready to decry this country if so he may injure its credit, and thus prevent development of its incalculable resources and induce the people to look to Washington or despair; it is true that the debt of the Dominion is large, but nineteen-twentieths of it have been incurred for productive purposes, and the interest has always been promptly paid. With no debt and without works, in which the money have been expended, the country would be infinitely poorer than it would be were the debt doubled without adding to the works."

Now, Sir, there is an article showing that the debt was created for works of public utility; but in the face of that public declaration these hon. gentlemen talk quite differently now. The hon. gentleman again said :

"In these twenty years they have trebled our debt, in these twenty years they have trebled our taxes, and when the Budget comes to be brought down I think the House will find that the liabilities of the people of this county are very far indeed from being fully discharged or measured, even, by our present enormous debt."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see for one moment about this debt. In the year 1875, when the hon. gentleman gave the people of England to understand that the debt was created for works of public utility, we had a debt of \$116,008,378. In 1886 the debt was \$223,159,107, or an increase during that time of \$107,150,729. Now, during that period, while the debt increased that amount, we paid for public works and the debts of the Provinces, \$118,965,802, so that we actually expended, by increasing our debt, \$11,815,073. That does not look very bad after all. Then we have the evidence of a gentleman whom they will not doubt. In a speech made by Mr. Blake, the member for West Durham, in Russell, he says :

"The expenditure had increased since 1878 by about eleven and a-half millions. Part of that increase was justifiable, although the Conservatives in opposition were not wise enough to know, or not honest enough to state, that an increase was necessary in a young and growing country like Canada."

In answer to all that we have the public declaration of the hon. member for South Oxford that the whole of this debt has been incurred for legitimate purposes. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen followed in that bawling style of his, which characterises the speeches from the other side of the House, and he spoke about the exodus from this country. In view of what has taken place in the records of this Parliament, I think he ought to have hesitated before speaking of the exodus in the manner he has done. Of course, the hon. gentleman has always been anxious, and the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) likewise, to make the people believe that the country was going to the dogs, and that people were leaving it as rapidly as they could. They take the evidence furnished by the collector at Port Huron. The hon. member for South Oxford, in speaking about this exodus said :

"But I will point to this merely, that if you are to accept the customary standard laid down in the United States, if you can venture to hold that every able-bodied man who comes to North America is worth, when he lands on the dock, \$1,000 to the State, then, Sir, whatever may be the cause, the result of all this is, that in losing these 2,000,000 of people we have lost 500,000 able-bodied men, or thereabouts, and we have lost an equivalent, according to that calculation, to \$500,000,000."

It was well said by an hon. gentleman a few nights ago that a country that could loose \$500,000,000 must be a rich country indeed. He goes on :

"What shall I say of the folly of supposing that it is anything but a great misfortune, a great calamity, a great injury to the people of the country that so huge a portion not only of those who come to settle in Canada, but of those who belong to us, of those who are our own flesh and blood, our own kinsman, have been obliged for lack of opportunity to leave Canada and seek a home elsewhere? I say that this is proof positive that we are in a state of retrogression."

Then he goes on and points out about the two millions. He repeats no less than four times in his speech that two million people have left the country. He says :

"These men have not hesitated to carry out a policy which has been responsible, in my judgment, for driving two millions of Her Majesty's North American subjects into exile, and which had risked the loss of all British North America to the Empire. It is time that we should clear our minds of cant on this subject. It is idle for any human being to rise up and tell this House that, when we have lost a number equal to half the whole population that now remains, things are satisfactory with us. There is not another country, except perhaps Ireland, that has sustained so heavy a bleeding as we have done during the last few years."

Now, Sir, this House well knows that some time ago, when the charge was made that a great exodus of young men was going on from this country, an investigation was made by Mr. Lowe, and his report was laid before the House. It was charged upon that occasion that no less than 71,424 persons, settlers, had entered at Port Huron and gone to the United States. Upon examination Mr. Lowe found that instead of that number there were only 2,422 who had left our country for the purpose of settling in the United States, and that the total number of passengers passing out of Canada, of all kinds, was 64,168, including 13,804 who went to Manitoba *via* the United States. I find, Sir, in the report of the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation, of 1884, the following :—

"The immigrant settlers during the year included 34,987 who entered from the United States, making entries of settlers' effects at the Custom houses, the names of the settlers, the numbers of persons in the family, and the nationality being registered in all these entries; these figures being thus obtained by an exact registration, are absolute and show a very considerable movement from the United States to Canada, owing, doubtless, to two causes, one being ready employment in manufactures and on railway works, and the other the attraction of our lands in the North-West."

I commend that to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We had no less than 34,987 people who came back from the United States during that year, while it was actually found that the total going out was only 2,422. Now, let me read something else on that point. I know hon. gentlemen opposite will believe the *Globe*, and here is what it said on the 14th April, 1882 :

"The Dominion Government should now take means to represent forcibly to the Government of the United States the extreme and seemingly wilful inaccuracies of the figures published at Washington as truthful. If the American Government refuses or neglects to furnish evidence upon which statistics rest, no more need be done than to publish the fact in Europe where American figures already enjoy none too sweet a reputation."

That is what the *Globe* said, and the *Globe* thought the report made was entirely correct. We had evidence taken on that occasion, because we found among the list of immigrants actors, clergymen, dentists, druggists, lawyers, Mr. RYKERT.

bakers, barbers, blacksmiths, laborers, milliners, tailors, servants, speculators, and people without any occupation, the total number being 45,393. A declaration was made before the United States collector. This declaration contains the statement that :—

"Charles Irwin and myself got up those returns entirely by guess work, and copying off the old returns, and before my time he helped Crawford and others of my predecessors to get them up. The idea was to make the immigration look as big as we could. I know myself of large crowds of men going to the lumber woods in the fall being taken as immigrants, although we knew perfectly well they would all go back to Canada in the spring."

And further this declaration says :

"In getting up the returns, the way we got at the occupation of the immigration was this : We took so many thousand persons, called so many carpenters, so many blacksmiths, so many painters, &c., so many doctors, so many lawyers, so many preachers, &c., and the balance we called farmers; in fact, the whole thing from beginning to end was nothing but guesswork."

He was also examined before a Committee of this House, as follows :—

"By the Chairman :

"Q. Did you assist in obtaining the immigration returns? A. I did not; I made out the returns, but there was no obtaining of them at all. I made out the returns, but did not obtain them in any way, shape or form, except by simply—you may call it guesswork, or estimating them."

"By Mr. Trow :

"Q. Were those returns made under oath? A. No, Sir; not by me."

"By the Chairman :

"Q. How long were you employed in performing those duties? A. I was employed for some time previous to my connection with the Customs. When I was baggage master for the Grand Trunk, the Deputy Collector in charge at Port Gratiot asked me to make up those returns for him, as he knew nothing about them, so I did that work for about two years previous to my connection with the Customs, when I was baggage master there."

"Q. Do I understand you to say that in making up these immigration returns, you did not take any means of verifying the correctness of the returns made to the Government, and that the statements or returns sent to the Washington Government, and published by them as authentic, were, in point of fact, not authentic? A. Yes; you can clearly understand me to say that there was no attempt made to get at the actual registration of these immigrants whatever."

So when hon. gentlemen opposite cite the returns obtained at Port Huron and other American ports as authentic they must be aware that they are entirely incorrect. And no one knows this better than the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Trow). So satisfied were the American authorities on this point, that the returns were fraudulent, that a letter was sent by Mr. Secretary Manning on 20th February, 1886, to the collectors in the different ports in which he says :

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 20th February, 1886."

"To Collectors and other officers of the Customs :

"Since it appears to be impracticable to procure under existing laws, accurate statistics of immigrants arriving in the United States from British North American possessions and Mexico, you are hereby directed to discontinue the collection of statistics of such immigration until otherwise directed."

"DANIEL MANNING,

"Secretary."

So satisfied were the Americans as to the inaccuracy of their reports that Mr. Secretary Manning put an end to their collection, and they have not since been made, yet hon. gentlemen opposite rise and state that the number of immigrants is something enormous, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the cool affrontery to say that over 2,000,000 of people have left this country and gone to the United States since the present Government assumed power. Is that an honest and an upright statement, a fair representation for the hon. gentleman to make? He knows right well what the records proved, and yet he has the coolness to say that the exodus is still going on. Let me make a comparison in order to see how we stand, and that perhaps may be satisfactory to some hon. gentleman while unsatisfactory to others. I hope it will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite that we are increasing at a greater ratio than our neighbors across the line. I have taken for purposes of comparison the

Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario on the one side, and on the other the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York and Ohio. The following is the result :—

| INCREASE OF POPULATION IN PROVINCES AND STATES. | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1871. | 1881. | Increase. | Per cent. |
| Nova Scotia..... | 387,000 | 440,572 | 53,572 | 13.84 |
| New Brunswick..... | 285,594 | 321,233 | 35,639 | 12.68 |
| | 672,594 | 761,805 | 89,211 | 13.56 |
| Quebec..... | 1,191,516 | 1,359,027 | 167,511 | 14.00 |
| Ontario..... | 1,620,851 | 1,923,228 | 302,377 | 18.65 |
| | 2,812,367 | 3,282,255 | 469,888 | 16.74 |
| P. E. Island..... | | | | 15.87 |
| Nova Scotia..... | 3,484,961 | 4,044,060 | 559,100 | 16.04 |
| New Brunswick..... | | | | |
| Ontario..... | | | | |
| Quebec..... | | | | |
| | 1870. | 1880. | | |
| Maine..... | 626,915 | 648,986 | 11,071 | 1.76 |
| New Hampshire..... | 318,300 | 346,991 | 28,690 | 9.01 |
| Vermont..... | 330,557 | 332,286 | 1,729 | 0.52 |
| New York..... | 1,275,766 | 1,328,283 | 52,517 | 4.12 |
| Ohio..... | 4,382,759 | 5,082,871 | 700,112 | 15.97 |
| | 2,665,258 | 3,198,062 | 532,802 | 19.96 |
| | 8,323,785 | 9,609,196 | 1,274,411 | 15.31 |
| Nova Scotia..... | | | | 16.04 |
| New Brunswick..... | | | | |
| Ontario..... | | | | |
| Quebec..... | | | | |
| New York..... | | | | 15.31 |
| Ohio..... | | | | |
| Maine..... | | | | |
| New Hampshire..... | | | | |
| Vermont..... | | | | |

Have we reason to complain of this result? I hold we have not. This statement distinctly shows that, instead of decreasing in population, Canada is increasing at a greater ration than those States across the line. Take the great cities of New York, Buffalo and Cleveland, and we find them increasing rapidly, but no more rapidly proportionately than is our own country. Yet in the face of these facts hon. gentlemen opposite despair and hold up their hands, and say we are going to the dogs. That, however, is simply a repetition of what they declared in 1878. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at that time bewailed the fate of Canada, he declared he was perfectly helpless and could not do any more for the country; yet hon. gentlemen opposite have seen the country prosperous during the last six, seven or ten years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. "No," says the hon. gentleman. There is the best evidence of it. I have shown the prosperity of the country in the figures I have submitted, and I have shown that the increase of population in the United States is less than in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take the Yankee almanac and prove an exodus to their hearts' content, but their figures are not correct. Secretary Manning says that the immigration statistics are inaccurate, and cannot be relied on. We have the sworn statement that instead of the immigration of Canadians at Port Huron being 45,393 in 1873 it was only 7,222. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite says we are going to the dogs, and, in fact, we find all of those hon. gentlemen making similar declarations. We have another and a very good authority. There is an agricultural college in Ontario, and in connection with it there is a distinguished authority by the name of Brown who certainly does not belong to the Conservative

persuasion, but who is a gentleman holding high rank in the Reform-Liberal party, and that gentleman, in a letter to the *Globe*, on 15th December 1887, gave his opinion in regard to the condition of Canadian farmers, as follows:

"I have no hesitation, therefore, in again repeating that you are not only doing well and making money—whether placed in the bank, in improvement or on mortgage—but you are actually wealthy. When any farmer can pay 6 per cent. on what he gave for land and working appliances, give his family \$100 to help keep the house, and then have one-fourth of the whole left to lay past or speculate with in future crops, he is second to no profession I know."

Now, Sir, there is a gentleman whose opinion on all those questions is well known. It does seems to me remarkably singular, in the face of the publicly declared utterance of men who ought to know and in face of the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industry and other documents that those gentlemen should in face of all that keep crying against and bemoaning the fate of Canada. The whole record points to the conclusion and shows that Canada is second in prosperity to no country in the world, and it proves too that no country has made such rapid progress. Let us take and compare with the State of New York. That is a great State and one of the richest and most prosperous of the States of the Union, and yet we find that official documents declare that the ratio of prosperity in the Province of Ontario is greater than in the State of New York. Yet, Sir, those gentlemen are now inviting us to go away from our home, they want us to go and leave this terrible and god-forsaken country, they say we are handicapped with debt and that the people are leaving the country by scores and thousands—two millions, I think they state left the country in the course of eight or nine years. Those gentlemen opposite complain about the institutions of this country and the reckless expenditure of the Government and everything of that kind. Where do they ask us to go to—to that blessed land on the other side of the line pictured by them in the most beautiful and glowing terms. But what did the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) think of the Yankee land in 1878? What did he think of this land we ought to rush to, this land into whose arms we ought to fly, this land under which we ought to submit ourselves to be taxed just as the American please, and to which we are to humble ourselves just as they wish to humble us. Speaking in the lower Provinces in 1878 he drew a far different picture of the United States and held up to us the progress of Canada. He said:

"We, Sir, have studied the example of the people of the United States and we see in the condition of that country almost everything which ought to warn you, not to allow yourselves under any plea or pretense to be deluded into imitating the system which has wrought so much mischief there. We see in the United States according to the testimony of their wisest writers, of their own most experienced statesmen that the result of their foolish system, is that capital to the extent of several thousand millions has been worse than wasted, that labor has been diverted from its proper channels, that the foreign commerce has been almost annihilated, that almost every evil has been brought upon the country—evils far exceeding, so far as regards the effect in their material prosperity, those which resulted from civil wars, and we have no desire to assist in bringing those evils upon the people whose welfare, for the moment, we are responsible. Have made up our minds, be it for weal or for woe, they will adhere to these principles that they believe are the only ones capable of extricating you from your difficulties, and that most assuredly they will not allow themselves to be cajoled into adopting a system from which as proved by the example of the United States we can expect nothing but ruin and decay."

Yet, Sir, after this the same gentleman now invites this House and this country to join this very same people. Sir, we have other evidence of the kind of country these hon. gentlemen wish us to go to. The *New York Times*, of February, 1888, speaks about the enormous debt upon different States. It says the States are heavily mortgaged and continues:

"The amount represented by the face of the farm mortgages in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, is \$3,422,000,000. The actual value of the farms in these 10 States is to-day about \$13,931,000,000. All talk relative to this vast sum of money being paid is utter folly. No agri-

cultural people can pay such sums. Profits derived now from American agriculture are so small as to be unworthy of the slightest consideration.

The paper goes on to show that the farmer will not average \$294 for each farmer, and of this small sum they will have to pay for labor, seed, rents, supplies, and they and their families live besides. It is not possible for these farmers to lift these mortgages. Yet those gentlemen say "go to that country," that country which is flowing with milk and honey, leave your own benighted Canada and see where you land. But let us think of what a bountiful time our farmer would have with \$294, and what luxury he could enjoy. Why, after paying the rent and taxes he would have very little left to speak of. Let us see what this is I have here. It is an official paper from Minnesota. Here, Sir, is an eight-page advertisement of the tax sales of land in Polk county. There are 4,890 residents going to be sold out for taxes, and 2,875 non-residents advertised to be sold out for the same cause. There is where some of the hon. gentlemen want us to go, Polk County, Minnesota, there is the beautiful and blessed Yankee land for us to go to and be happy,—the beautiful land in which we find there are 7,765 lots to be sold for non-payment of taxes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was going to ask the hon. member whether he was not one of the parties who held up that country and its prosperity to us as a reason for adopting the National Policy?

Mr. RYKERT. Never.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Your leader did.

Mr. RYKERT. I never, Sir, never said one word on behalf of that country, and, I hope, I never shall, Sir. Well, Sir, let us go on a little further. We find what the *Scientific American* says of Dakota, that blessed land of the blizzard, to which we are asked to go,—the land which a short time ago was described as the land of the wild cat and hyena. The *Scientific American*, speaking of Dakota, says:—

"Good beef steaks were sold for 2c. per lb. live weight, and farmers kick at the low price; hogs are worth 4c. per lb.—"

Hope the hon. gentleman knows what that means,

"which is thought an excellent price. Corn 21c. per bushel, or say \$5.75 per ton, allowing 70 lbs. to the bushel—very cheap. Some farmers talk of burning it for fuel, as it is considered as cheap as Pennsylvania hard coal at \$11.80. Corn in the ear is said to be first class fuel by those who have used it."

And that again, Sir, is the blessed country, the beautiful paradise to which we are all invited to go. I, Sir, as a Canadian cannot feel justified in asking and advising my countrymen to go there; I cannot, Sir, as a Canadian feel myself justified in running down my country as hon. gentlemen opposite do. If our country is burdened with debt there is a way to overcome that, for if hon. gentlemen can satisfy the country that the ruin which they speak of has been brought about by gentlemen on the Treasury benches they and the country have a remedy. But they have proclaimed all this before the people on three different occasions and the people said that they had no confidence in what they stated. The people found them wanting and they rejected their professions. In the same way the gentlemen opposite are now crying down and belittling their country and asking us to go to that beautiful Yankee land of paradise such as Polk County. There never was a more inopportune time to discuss this question than at the present, because we find that the people on the other side of the line are discussing the question of altering their tariff. We see day after day reports of bills being introduced into Congress, in which the question is being discussed about altering or reducing the tariff in the United States. If, Sir, those ideas are carried out, if they meet with any response at the hands of the American people the tariff will be largely reduced and if the tariff

Mr. RYKERT.

were reduced what is to become of the revenue those gentlemen say we are going to have when we get unrestricted reciprocity? When our business has been built up by the National Policy, when our industries have been established and when we have a home market for our farmers it is unwise for us to discuss this question. It is crying down our country and impairing our credit in England and elsewhere. We ought to be the last people in the world to do this, but the whole stock in trade and the whole capital of hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be to cry down their country. There is too much anxiety on the part of those gentlemen for unrestricted reciprocity under which they can join the people of the United States. I can quote no higher authority than the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this subject. Some time ago he thought it humiliating in a large degree for Canada to have reciprocity at the hands of the Americans. Speaking on 6th August, 1878, at Halifax, the hon. gentleman said:

"It was alleged that England herself was turning towards protection. In that case, she could undoubtedly discriminate against us, and what then would become of our surplus products, for which we now find a market in the mother country. It was unpatriotic to make Canada's existence dependent upon the United States granting reciprocity, and he repudiated the notion that reciprocity was as necessary to us as some have tried to make us believe: We are already in a fair position to compete with the United States on the markets of the world."

That is the opinion the hon. gentleman expressed on that occasion. He thought that it was humiliating for us to go to the United States and demand reciprocity. Then, the hon. member for Bothwell, in a speech made at Mount Elgin, in 1878, quoted with approval the following language of Sir Alexander Galt:—

"It is, therefore, thought desirable, and indeed our manifest duty to show them, not in a spirit of hostility, but certainly in that of independence, that while we value their friendship, and value their trade, we will not confirm to unreasonable terms, and would not have either our commercial policy or our political allegiance dictated to us by a foreign country."

At Charlottetown in the same year the hon. member for South Oxford delivered himself in strong language, and surely what he said then has equal force to-day. The circumstances of Canada have not much changed, except that the country has gone on and prospered more than any other country in the world, and how can he possibly say to-day that we ought to knuckle down at the foot of Brother Jonathan any more than then? The hon. gentleman said on that occasion:

"They say we must have reciprocity and we cannot live without it. For the Dominion of Canada I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships, and 'will carry the war into Africa.' We will find new markets for ourselves, and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

Can any person dissent from the argument of the hon. gentleman? No, we are entirely in accord with that, and what was applicable then is all the more applicable now in our present state of prosperity. Then, I will quote again from the organ of the hon. member for West Ontario; at least I assume that it is his organ. Between the *Mail* and the *Globe* I am not sure which is his organ. I believe in a long race the *Mail* is the better paper; it is better written, and gives better literature. But the *Globe*, referring I have no doubt to the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. member for Bothwell and several others who at that time were barking at his heels, on 28th December, 1887, said:

"Now it happens that these people see in the natural wish of Canadians to extend their trade with their neighbors, occasion for preaching that the extension must be had instantly and at any price lest Canadians shall surely die. Though it is not easy to exaggerate the advantages of unrestricted reciprocity, they do manage to exaggerate them by taking that attitude. Not only so, but they compromise the prospects of success for the movement they profess to have at heart. To proclaim that we cannot exist without commercial union,

to argue that we should sacrifice even our political status to get the boon, is the very method by which our republican neighbors will be induced to withhold it, if they have a desire to annex Canada. Does any reasonable man doubt that the pessimists understand that? They are too able not to be well aware that they actually obstruct unrestricted reciprocity by declaring, in effect, that the Canadian Provinces should even separateto obtain it. And why should they thus obstruct? The answer is surely plain. Have they not avowed their wish to smash the Confederation into its original fragments."

Now, Sir, in corroboration of what the hon. member for South Oxford said in 1878, we find the *Globe* following it up with the following strong language:—

"Is it a wise policy on the part of Sir John and his organs to show to the Americans such great anxiety to secure free trade with them? Is not that the way to prevent a reciprocity treaty? Is not the American answer under such circumstances certain to be that of the New York *Sun*: 'Reciprocity with Canada? Why, yes, certainly; we are ready for it, only it would be convenient for the several Provinces of the Dominion to be admitted among the United States as a conditional precedent.' The true attitude in reference to the United States is that which the Reform party has always taken: 'We can live without your trade; we are flourishing under our present tariff arrangements; we are not willing to annex ourselves, and are not anxious for any change but we are willing to make a fair reciprocity treaty which will benefit both countries.' Which is the more statesmanlike, this position or that adopted by Sir John and his organs?"

Thus you will see that the sentiment then pervading the Reform party and those who were then leading the party, was that it would be unwise and impolitic on their part to place on the Statute-book any declaration admitting that we were prepared to have reciprocity; and it does seem to me, in view of the opinions I have given you, expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is utterly unwise and impolitic for us at the present time to seek to get reciprocity on any terms except on the fair and reasonable terms proposed by Sir Charles Tupper. We have already had an opportunity of ascertaining how the American people feel on the question. If the hon. member for South Oxford is prepared to define what his resolution means, what kind of a treaty he wants, then we shall be able to judge exactly what his proposition is. We are asked to pass a vague and meaningless resolution; but we want to know what kind of a treaty hon. gentlemen opposite propose. Do they ask for a treaty more extensive than that of 1874? If they do, I say they have no chance of getting it. The question has been discussed over and over again in Congress and almost every place in the United States, and the unanimous testimony of the American people was that even the Reciprocity Treaty of 1874 went too far. If there is any meaning at all in the resolution of the hon. gentleman, you would have manufactures of every kind passing across the line without paying customs duty.

It being six o'clock, the House adjourned.

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT. When you left the Chair, Sir, I was about to discuss the terms of the Treaty of 1874, and to show that it was not acceptable to the people of the United States, although it was far more extensive in its provisions than the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, which existed down to 1866. I may here remark that his new found scheme of Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth is nothing but the resurrection of an old scheme which was propounded some years ago in the House of Representatives. I find that, in a debate which took place in that body, this whole question of commercial union was discussed, and although a very strong and a very plaintive appeal was made to that representative body on behalf of the scheme, yet they paid no attention whatever to it, but thought it unwise and impolitic. I find that the whole matter has been treated in a speech made by the hon. Elijah Ward in the House of Representatives, on 18th, May 1876. In that speech, he pointed out all the propositions which Mr. Wiman has laid before this country, and comparing the speech made by Mr. Ward on that occasion to several made by Mr. Wiman

since, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Wiman has simply resurrected the scheme which was propounded years ago in the House of Representatives. Mr. Ward, in the course of his remarks, made these observations:

"As many manufactures in both countries are made of material imported from various parts of the world, it would manifestly be impossible to establish a completely free system of commercial intercourse with Canada, except under duties not only corresponding but also equitably divided on the productions of the countries. This is the chief obstacle to any fair mutual advantages and complete arrangement of reciprocity between us."

And he goes on to discuss the scheme from the same standpoint as Mr. Wiman does. I merely mention this to show that the scheme is not a new one, and to show that it is not one which is at all likely to be acceptable to the United States; and I maintain there is no use in our proposing an arrangement to which the people of the United States have shown they are decidedly adverse. I take the ground as a Canadian, that we ought not to humble ourselves at the feet of the United States. We should rather see what our country can do by itself in the march of progress; we should rather see if we cannot compete with the United States, and I would like to see our country pursue the course we have hitherto pursued of working and advancing in a spirit of generous rivalry with our neighbors, and resisting every attempt to merge ourselves in the institutions of the United States, either politically or otherwise, as such a policy must inevitably end in annexation. The Treaty of 1874, which was framed by the Hon. George Brown, was one of a more comprehensive character than that of 1854. It provided for the introduction in Canada of the manufactures of the United States and *vice versa*, and was in fact much more extensive in its provisions than we would be prepared to go at present. It went much further than I, as a representative of the people, would consent to go, as long as I hold a seat in this Legislature. But even that treaty met with the universal condemnation of the people of the United States comprehensive and extensive as it was, embracing as it did manufactures of every description, as any hon. gentleman will see by looking at the treaty itself, it did not meet with favor on the other side; and if I refer to it now, one of my reasons for doing so is to give the opinion pronounced on it by a very prominent Reformer, then member for Toronto, Mr. John McDonald, now Senator McDonald, who was considered as level headed a man as we have in the whole Dominion. Mr. McDonald denounced that treaty in the most unmeasured terms, and consequently came under the censure of the organ of his party, as must inevitably any person who has the hardihood to differ from its opinions. That, however, is a compliment which most men like to have paid them, and I have no doubt the censure of the *Globe* had no effect on Mr. John McDonald. Speaking of reciprocity, he said:

"Upon no clause of the Reciprocity Treaty but those relating to our own trade, do we desire to express an opinion. It needs but little reasoning to prove what the results will be when the American goods referred to are admitted into our country duty free. To the Canadian manufacturer—ruin. To the Canadian dealer—loss. To the projected manufacturing interests—stoppage. To the Canadian consumer—direct taxation. To the entire trade of this country—disturbance, uneasiness and uncertainty."

That is the opinion of Senator McDonald, then member for the city of Toronto, and I have no doubt his opinion would have great weight. But, in the same connection, allow me, Sir, to show you the opinions of gentlemen of the United States, who thoroughly understand the question. We have the opinion of Mr. Blain, who was at that time candidate for re-election to the State of Maine, and this treaty was then being discussed on every platform in the United States. Mr. Blain said:

"The treaty of that name which was terminated in 1866 was cruelly oppressive to the people of Maine and inflicted upon the people of that State, the 11 years of its existence, a loss of \$50,000,000. It presented

the singular anomaly of giving to the Canadians the control of our markets of certain leading articles on terms far more favorable than our own people had ever enjoyed. Let us simply place Canada on the same basis with other foreign countries, taxing her for duties or admitting them free, according to our own judgment of the interest of our revenue and the needs of the people, always bearing in mind that in governmental as well as friendly matters "charity begins at home."

So you will see that he had no respect whatever for that treaty proposed by the Hon. George Brown. He looked upon it as something which the United States people could not accept, because it was not at all in their interest. To show the opinions of the American people on this question, we have had a certain amount of literature placed before us by the American papers during the last two months, and I propose to lay before the House some evidence of the terms on which the Americans would be willing to admit us into commercial union, and what a beautiful position we would occupy if we should put ourselves at their mercy. The *Chicago Times*, speaking of an unconditional surrender on our part said:

"Unless, therefore, the Dominion is prepared to make a complete and unconditional surrender of all control over its own tariff and accept whatever tariff our Congress may choose to enact from time to time, the scheme of commercial union, in the sense in which the phrase is used, is entirely out of the question."

The *Chicago Times* says further:

"It must not be forgotten, that this proposition (commercial union) implies a complete surrender by the Dominion Parliament to the American Congress of all control over the principle of the Dominion's revenue—the tariff. Whatever it may please the American Congress to do regarding the tariff, that the Dominion Government must forthwith accept. Our Congress would have even more power over the Dominion under this arrangement than it would in the event of political union, because the people of the Dominion would have neither vote nor voice in Washington under the proposed commercial union, while they would have both under political union. Not only would our Congress prescribe and change at pleasure all the tariff taxes exacted from the people of Canada, but our executive officers and our courts would make all the rulings and decisions affecting rates for the Dominion as well as for the United States."

That is the position we would occupy in the opinion of one of the best writers in the United States, and he further expresses his opinion by saying:

"The fact seems to be that very many Canadians who are talking about this project imagine that they are talking about something like the old Treaty of Reciprocity, and it is probable that if the real wish of the Canadians could be ascertained, it would be found to be for reciprocity and not for a surrender by their Government of all control over their own tariff—a thing almost necessarily involved in the customs union scheme."

Then we have the *Philadelphia Record*, which says:

"No scheme which would give to Canada an equal voice in the determination of federal taxation could be considered. She would have to accept the position of a State in the Union, with only such power in the determination of the tax rate as her comparative population would entitle her to. How this could be effected without representation in Congress is a matter hard to determine."

So, as far as we are concerned, they do not propose that we should have anything to say in regard to taxation or revenue, but we must be contented to take whatever they choose to give us, and for the balance we must resort to direct taxation.

Mr. TROW. You are speaking of commercial union now, not of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Siamese twins.

Mr. RYKERT. I think I shall be able to show the hon. gentleman in a short time that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade are all the same thing, but he had better consult the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in regard to that matter, because at Jarvis he made a speech in which he said that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity were both means to arrive at the same end. This paper goes on and says:

"If Canada wants free trade with this great country, she can get it once and for all by casting in her lot with us. Nobody who has any
Mr. RYKERT.

sense should strike a blow to annex her territory to ours, but when the Canadian people, kindred to us in blood and language, and living in a land which nature has made a part of ours, wish to become incorporated with this great Republic, they will be cordially welcomed; and we may confidently affirm that they will never secure permanent free trade with us until this movement occurs."

Now, what does the hon. gentleman say to that? He is a free trader, and according to the doctrine laid down there, even a free trader cannot expect to have access to the markets of the United States unless he joins hand in hand with the people. A few days ago, we had a speech made by a young offshoot of Mr. Blaine, young Mr. Blaine, in which he indulges in the flowing and beautiful language which we sometimes hear on the other side of the House and which we often hear on the other side of the line. He says:

"American fishermen will never rest content, and this vexed and vexatious problem will never find abiding solution save under some such agreement as that of the Treaty of 1783 or 1854, honorably enforced and maintained in spirit and in letter. There are many ways doubtless by which such an end may be gained, but if this be the best treaty which Great Britain and Canada will grant negotiation is not to be numbered among them. Two measures at once suggest themselves, punishment and persuasion. The means for the first are furnished in the resolution of Congress authorising the President to inflict retaliatory measures; for the second, in the lately much-discussed commercial union. Deprive Canada of all business relations with the country or grant to her, not a treaty framed on the lines of the ridiculous, one-sided reciprocity of Lord Elgin, but on the basis of unrestricted interchange of products, with the enactment and enforcement of our tariff laws."

So none of these gentlemen will accept us unless upon their own terms, that is, that we should accept their tariff laws and allow them to change them as they please, no matter how it may affect us or how it may affect our revenue. They do not appear to want any such makeshift policy as hon. gentlemen advocate. The *Rochester Democrat* says: "This country does not want any such makeshift policy," but it says it "is willing to unite the interests of the two countries in a bond which will be effective as against the competition of the mother country." Then we find also that the *American Manufacturer* says:

"We are not anxious to annex 'hopeless and helpless' people, but we assume will be obliged to take a few of this kind along with the rest. Under the inspiration of American citizenship they may become hopeful and helpful. Possibly after all Canada becomes thoroughly ripe for annexation, the Goddess of Liberty will hold out her apron and catch her as she involuntarily falls from the parent limb."

That is a fine position for the hon. gentleman to place us in. Here is a paper, the *Minneapolis Tribune*, which has always shown a great deal of sympathy for the people of Canada, and no doubt has strong feelings in our favor. That paper says:

"The followers of the present Conservative Government oppose commercial union as destructive of their policy of national development. A Government which has had the courage and spirit to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in furtherance of its idea of a great northern confederation, knit together by common interests and strong national feeling, is not going to surrender its policy tamely. That policy contemplates the building up of Canadian industries by a protective tariff against the United States, England and the other manufacturing countries. The Canadian who does not shrink from the idea of political union with the United States as the ultimate destiny of his country, may well favor commercial union as advantageous. The Canadian whose ambition for his country is an independent position as a member of the family of nations, may well pause before committing himself to the plan of free trade across the line."

So you see, from the quotations which I have made from the American newspapers, that we have no sympathy with the policy initiated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Whether you call it commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, or direct free trade, they are one and the same thing, and I think I can show that from the hon. gentleman's own utterances. I will quote again from my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has been showing himself very conspicuous in advocating free trade and in educating the young Liberal idea in that direction. At Waterford, he said:

"The two plans are different modes proposed of arriving at substantially the same result."

At Jarvis, on 4th November, he said :

"It is simply a customs union between two or more independent states, where a common tariff and excise laws are adopted and the revenue collected, and after deducting expenses of collection so divided among the participants in the basis of population or any other basis that might be agreed upon, while all trade restrictions between them were removed."

So you will see that commercial union, as far as the hon. member for North Norfolk is concerned, means the abandonment of the customs line between the two countries, the pooling of receipts, and the dividing of the pool according to population or according to some other means which may be suggested; and the result of that must be a deficiency in our revenue which must be made up by direct taxation. No hon. gentleman on that side who has spoken, either in this House or in the country, has intimated that we could receive more than \$5,000,000 from the pooling arrangement, which would show a deficiency according to our present expenditure of over \$10,000,000, which would have to be made up by direct taxation, and the consequence would be that, no matter what we had this year, we could not know what we would receive the next year. We must be dependent upon the amount received from the United States for the amount required for our expenditures, and we must find out whether we would receive enough to carry on future improvements before we could settle our own taxation. The result would be that all future improvements must be abolished, that no more railways must be built, that no railway subsidies must be granted, and that we must resort to direct taxation. We all know well, and I will be able to show before I sit down, how direct taxation will work. Now, as regards commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, and I think they are one and the same thing, according to the definitions made by the hon. gentleman. A few days ago Mr. Cluxton, of Peterborough, made a speech in which he said :

"That commercial union meant unrestricted reciprocity, unrestricted commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, or in other words the obliteration of the customs line between the two countries, in fact the abolition of all tariff and customs duties."

Now, we find what it really means. We find that this celebrated Mr. Hitt, who is now making himself conspicuous in the Congress of the United States upon this question, at a banquet in the city of Boston, pointed out what are really meant by reciprocity and commercial union :

"We in the West would like you, manufacturers of New England, to have access to that great market of Canada. With a reciprocity treaty, or, better still, commercial union, you will have the preference over English, French and German goods; and in two years' time after it is adopted goods from Yankee manufacturers will be in every retail store from Montreal to Victoria."

That is a beautiful prospect for the manufacturers of Canada. Hon. gentlemen will find that, if their policy is carried out, the result will be that every retail store between Vancouver and Halifax will be filled by American manufactures. More than that, he goes on to let the cat out of the bag, and I suppose our friends from the Maritime Provinces will like to hear this. He says :

"In a commercial union, with a common tariff and the border free, probably a larger part of the imports of Canada than at present would enter by way of New York and New England ports—and the receipts of Canadian ports would, of course, correspondingly fall off."

We will be entirely at their mercy; they will so arrange matters that our cities upon the shores of the Atlantic will be completely deprived of that volume of trade which has done so much to build them up during the last few years. Then there is Mr. Shaw, who seems to be an authority upon this commercial union question, who takes the same view. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seems to have the same view of the matter. Then we find that

the *Farmer's Advocate* says that they don't know what they are talking about, they don't know what it really means. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a definition of unrestricted reciprocity ought to have been given by the hon. gentlemen in moving this resolution. They ought to tell us what they mean by this proposition; they have failed so to do, and they leave us in a state of obscurity. Now, I do not feel disposed, and this House will not feel disposed, to accept any proposition which is surrounded with so many difficulties, and so many uncertainties as this proposition made by the hon. gentleman. We find that the hon. member who moved this resolution spoke some time ago in the town of Ingersoll, prior to the meeting of the House, and he there discussed the question of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. He says they are one and the same subject, one and the same thing. He says it is so surrounded with difficulties that it is utterly impossible to tell exactly what will be the result, but of one thing he is certain—that unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, will lead to discrimination against England. He is certain also that it will depreciate and reduce our revenue; he is certain that our political system must sooner or later be abolished and that in consequence we shall be absorbed into the American Union. Now, Sir, these are matters, it seems to me, of very serious import. In the speech made a few nights ago, the hon. gentleman points out all these difficulties; he points out the difficulty with regard to our revenue, and the difficulty with regard to discrimination against England; but in his speech at Ingersoll he said of the two alternatives, we should choose that of annexation in preference to refusing to accept the benefits of commercial union. The hon. gentleman, as reported in the *Globe* newspaper, seems to have made up his mind on that point. He seems to have made up his mind that direct taxation must come, and the sooner it comes the better :

"I speak strongly and I feel strongly on this matter; the more so because it is quite manifest that the very men whose corrupt and extravagant mismanagement have mainly contributed to bring about this shameful state of things are now impudently declaring that the very consequences of their misconduct form an insuperable barrier to obtaining this great boon for the people of Canada!

"The argument is worthy of the men.

"Nevertheless it is quite true, and it would be folly to deny it, that we do enter into any negotiation with the United States at a serious disadvantage by reason of our own folly."

Again he says :

"Now you will see that I have put the case against us as strongly as even the fiercest opponents of the scheme can desire, and therefore you may feel assured that the difficulty is not insuperable. I am not speaking at random when I say that even so I decline to admit that this forms any insuperable difficulty.

"In the first place I have given you the worst aspect of the case. In the next I am very clear that the great mass of the people will profit largely, and be, therefore, better able to bear additional taxes.

"In the third place, it is likely that our remaining taxes will produce more, and finally, what is of most importance, it is a mere shifting of taxation, and you will not have to pay one cent more on the whole.

"We have to raise \$30,000,000 anyway. It is simply a question of the mode in which you will raise it.

"It will not cost the people of Canada one cent more, but rather the reverse, if they elect to raise a portion of this money by direct instead of indirect taxation."

So you see that the hon. gentleman has surrounded this question with a great many difficulties, and therefore I say it is one that this country ought not to accept. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, as I said before, stated that he voiced the sentiments of the country, he voiced the sentiments of the Liberal party in the House and outside, and of a very large majority of the hon. members who are not in political accord with the Reform party. But I would like to point out that while these gentlemen are in favor of this policy, the leader is entirely opposed to it. Mr. Blake, in his Hamilton speech, is entirely opposed to it. He said it was utterly impossible that we could adopt a free trade policy at the present time—entirely out of the question; and these gentlemen who are trying to make us adopt this

resolution—the hon. member for Bothwell shakes his head. What does he mean by free trade? I shall show from his own organ that he means free trade, before I get through. Mr. Blake, then, declared positively that the Government should not change our fiscal system, that it would be detrimental to the best interest of this country. Now, Sir, it is rather strange, when we look at the history of the past few months, to see the wonderful changes that have come over different members of that party. It seems to me they have no right to ask this House, or to ask the country, to adopt a policy upon which they are divided, upon which they cannot form one concerted opinion. On the contrary, I say, they are as diverse as the poles. The *Globe* newspaper, which is now the organ of that party—it seems to have triumphed now in this little race; this resolution is according to the principles of the *Globe*, but in opposition to the *London Advertiser*, the organ of the hon. member for Bothwell, and other papers which profess to represent that party in Ontario. The hon. member himself was in favor of commercial union pure and simple against unrestricted reciprocity. A little while ago, I think he shook his head when I said that, but I think I shall be able to refresh his memory in a few minutes. But this we do know, that the Liberal organ discussed commercial union and then unrestricted reciprocity, and when the East Northumberland election came on the whole question discussed then was commercial union, and a strong protest was made immediately after that election to the Reform party because they had not carried commercial union. Now, I find in the organ of the hon. member for Bothwell, this language. The article is headed "Commercial Union, versus Unrestricted Reciprocity":—

"The *Toronto Globe* is devoting itself to the advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity in opposition to a plan of commercial union. We wonder whether our contemporary has been encouraged in this line by the success of Mr. Cochrane against Dr. Mallory. Commercial union lies within the range of practical politics. In our opinion unrestricted reciprocity does not. Reciprocity in natural products is practicable because the natural products of no other country are likely to find their way across the American border from Canada."

I think the hon. gentleman was in accord with my individual opinion, and he seems to favor the proposition laid down in the Statute of 1879 in favor of reciprocity in natural products. He says:

"The wheat, the barley, the oats, and whatever else we may produce that we might send in to the market of the United States under a reciprocity treaty are not likely to be interfered with at the border, but this would not apply to manufactured goods. Unrestricted reciprocity would necessitate the continuance of all the custom house officers upon the frontier that are now found there, and the right to make a different tariff would be of no value to us, the more especially as free trade with a neighboring Republic would imply a higher rate of customs duties as against others, and as we are in greater need for purposes of revenue, than the United States of high taxes, we have nothing to gain and much to lose by isolated action upon the tariff. They can afford to do with a lower rate of taxation than we, and everything at the present time points to the possibility of the American side of the border falling below the rate of taxation here."

I have now established beyond all controversy that the hon. gentleman who shook his head this afternoon is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) evidently somewhat disconcerted at the position of the Reform party at the late elections, and finding they were demoralised and without a policy, desired to secure a policy. The hon. gentleman said, at the Farmers' Union at Waterford, that it would be a good idea to adopt commercial union as the Liberal platform. The hon. gentleman then thought that commercial union would be a grand plank in the platform of the party, and he evidently seized it with some degree of pleasure. He thus started the question upon its journey, and now we find it introduced in this House as the platform of the Reform party. I should like to know what difference there is between the two terms—commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. I say there is no difference; and, in

Mr. RYKERT.

fact, the hon. member for North Norfolk says they are one and the same thing. He said:

"This Farmers' Union will naturally and legitimately look into the question of our trade relations, our natural markets, &c., and it will at once be confronted with the question of commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. This is not yet a political issue. It is receiving the favorable consideration of men of all parties. Perhaps it may yet answer the despairing demand for a policy made by that portion of the great Liberal party of Canada who were not satisfied with a mere policy of negation, but at the present moment the issue is not a part of the political creed of either of the great parties. Perhaps it may lead to a recast of Canadian political parties, but it now appeals upon its own merits alone for favorable consideration."

Again I am constrained to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the Liberal leader has not yet opened his mouth here on this question. What has that hon. gentleman to say in regard to the opinion of his party friends in Lower Canada? He appears to be afraid of the issue, for he has allowed his deputy leader to assume all responsibility and thrust upon this House and the country a policy which cannot be acceptable, because he himself says it is not a feasible policy. What did the hon. member for Quebec East, the leader of the Opposition in this House, say? He said at Somerset:

"I am not ready to declare that commercial union is an acceptable idea; I am not ready on my part to declare that commercial union is a principle which ought to be adopted. There are a great many considerations and there is a great deal of preliminary study to be gone through before a stand can be taken one side or the other. Commercial union may be possible, perhaps, but it may be surrounded with insurmountable difficulties, but the time has come when the policy of reprisals must be left out, and Canadians must show the American people that they like fair play."

The hon. member for Bothwell again took up this question and discussed it in answer to the *Montreal Gazette*, and I will show what the views of that hon. gentleman were upon it. He said on the 19th December, 1887:—

"The *Montreal Gazette* says that commercial union is objectionable because it would take from Parliament that control over the revenue which has ever been held as the main source of strength in the Commons in their struggle for supremacy in the state. A more absurd proposition could not well be put into a single sentence. Commercial union no more takes from Parliament control of the revenue than does any ordinary treaty of reciprocity. The *Gazette* says that commercial union would take from the Parliament of Canada the right to make a tariff. It would do nothing of the kind. It would take from Parliament the right to impose taxes upon articles produced in the United States."

We find the leader of the Opposition is called upon to take part in the election contest in Haldimand. The first time he appeared in Ontario as leader of the Liberal Party he was called upon to express an opinion upon this question of commercial union, at the time he was endeavoring to run out Mr. Montague. He said:

"Tory politicians call me a rebel, but, rebel as I am, the great difficulty to my mind—a difficulty which I have not solved—is the one that I am not quite sure commercial union would be consistent with the duty we owe to the mother country."

That is what I like to hear, but pass this resolution and see how far you can keep in line with the mother country. The very moment this proposition is adopted, that very moment you draw down the barriers between this country and the United States, and you erect a barrier against Great Britain.

"I feel that the time has not yet come for me to discuss this question and to give the solution which I shall some day be called upon to give."

I said a few moments ago that the policy was a shifting one, the party being for commercial union, then for unrestricted reciprocity, and then back to commercial union. The organ of the hon. member for West Ontario, the *Toronto Globe*, was terribly annoyed at the result of the election in East Northumberland, and it expresses its opinion upon this question in the following terms on 23rd December, 1887:—

"We suppose every Tory organ from Cape Breton to Vancouver will this morning overflow with joy on account of the glorious defeat of a commercial union candidate yesterday. * * * What the election proves—and to this we would like to direct the attention of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—is that in the past election in which commercial union was made an issue, the anti-commercial union candidate, backed by the

entire strength of a victorious Government came within a hair-breadth of being defeated."

Again the *Globe* pins its faith to commercial union and looks hopefully to the future. On 24th December, 1887, it said:

"Though the Opposition must regret that the unrestrictedists have won a seat in East Northumberland, the Commercial unionists have reason to congratulate themselves on the very good run made by their candidate. Mr. Cochrane beat the commercial union candidate by nearly twenty votes, that is, we say, very strong evidence that unrestricted reciprocity will sweep the country whenever taken up by a regular party organisation and presented to the people as the sole issue in a general contest. We can remember no scheme of so short a presentation before the electors of any country gained so large a proportion of votes as commercial union has polled in East Northumberland. All political experience suggests early success by the party which flings aside all other questions and stands on this only."

So even at that time the *Globe* kept prominently before the people commercial union. We have also the opinion and no less an authority of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that the scheme is entirely impracticable, and under any circumstances it is utterly impossible for the Reform party as a whole. That hon. member, who is given somewhat to literature, describes the difficulty in this way, in one of his celebrated letters he sent to Mr. Wiman:

"We are often told that unrestricted reciprocity would 'sweep away all the custom houses upon the frontier.' If that were to be done it seems clear, for several reasons, that we would have to agree upon a uniform customs tariff with the United States against the rest of the world. In other words, the entire tariff legislation of both countries would be brought to a standstill during the duration of the treaty, and it is scarcely conceivable that either Canada or the United States could arrive at a satisfactory uniform tariff to last for that period."

And yet in the face of that declaration the hon. gentleman is going to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. He points out the utter unsatisfactory condition of the whole scheme and that we could not possibly carry on the affairs of this country with a tariff which is likely to be shifted about from one end to the other.

"Mr. Chamberlain, at his interview with the press in Washington on the 18th inst., is reported to have stated that 'the most important reason why the project of commercial union could not be successfully inaugurated was the fact that the Tariff Acts of the two countries do not agree, and that it would be difficult to devise a plan which could meet this objection.'"

"It is useless to deny that there are both practical and sentimental difficulties in the way of establishing a uniform tariff for the two countries against the rest of the world, and of maintaining this uniformity during the life of a reciprocity treaty. I suppose these difficulties are not insuperable."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) again wants reciprocity pure and simple. I find that on the 12th December, 1887, in his organ he says:

"We shall be pleased to obtain reciprocity in natural products with the United States; we shall be pleased, failing this, to get unrestricted reciprocity; we believe that it must be greatly to the advantage of this country, and that it would affect the revenues much less than unrestricted reciprocity with the mother country."

You see, hon. gentlemen, that he wants reciprocity pure and simple, and failing that, he wants unrestricted reciprocity. He goes on to point out in an article of the 19th November the difficulties of having a common tariff, and the difficulties in the way of importations from both countries. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, the member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills) who, as I said before, was strongly in favor of commercial union as against unrestricted reciprocity, got quite annoyed at the unrestricted reciprocity advocates, and gave them a bit of his mind and opinion in his organ some time afterwards. On the 19th November, 1887, he says this is a very "serious mistake, and continues:

"We observe that some of our contemporaries are declared in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, as they call it, rather than commercial union. They say that in case of unrestricted reciprocity we would be left free to make our own tariff, while the United States might make theirs and so we would have absolute free trade with the United States with reference to the products and manufactures of the two countries without being bound with them in a common tariff. In our opinion those who take this position are making a most serious mistake, as it is certainly not a proposition which will be entertained by our neighbors, and which would have all the burdens and inconveniences attending it which belong to the present system."

The hon. gentleman thinks if they cannot accept commercial union it was better abandon all idea of unrestricted trade with the United States. He goes on to say:

"If our people are not prepared to accept commercial union they had better abandon all idea of unrestricted trade with the neighboring republic, we must have a common tariff, we must, if we have unrestricted trade, get rid of the customs houses along the entire frontier, and that we could not do except by agreement with our neighbor upon a common tariff."

He points out the objections:

"How are the people of the United States to know that the cottons which we propose to send in are Canadian bleached cotton? How are they to know whether the tweeds and flannels are manufactured in this country or in Scotland?"

So from this evidence we see that the hon. gentleman was first in favor of commercial union as against unrestricted reciprocity. Then we find that although the organs of the party were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity he suddenly changed front in the month of January, 1888, and he turns around in favor of commercial free trade. Then, Sir, we find that all the organs of the party headed by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the member for Wellington (Mr. Innes), and the member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville) at once raised a cry against the new policy of the Reform party and against the *Globe* newspaper. Let hon. gentlemen bear in mind this which I take from the *Globe* of 20th January:

"But unrestricted reciprocity would not greatly reduce anything except agricultural implements. Woollens, for instance, are dearer now in Dakota than in Manitoba. On the whole, the Manitoba farmers' supplies, harring machines and tools, are as cheap as in Dakota. Under free trade with the world the Manitoba farmer would obtain untaxed implements and untaxed British goods as well. He would gain nearly all that unrestricted reciprocity can give him. In addition his entire list of necessities would be reduced fully 30 per cent. Freedom of railway building, important as it is, will never be worth as much as free trade to the North-West farmer, grazer or merchant."

You see that the *Globe* was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Unrestricted reciprocity would do as much for him as annexation, his position would be nothing like as good under annexation as under free trade for the whole world. Now, Mr. Speaker, again I find that this unrestricted reciprocity on which you are now called to pass judgment in this House, is also condemned in the very strongest terms and the results that would follow from it are pointed out by the *Globe* newspaper again:

"It is not useless, as the pessimists declare, to keep before the country that unrestricted reciprocity, though the most desirable of changes, is not the only alternative, nor even the most profitable policy for Canada. If we wished to produce public despair we might preach that commercial union is the one salvation from the present bad position, and that that salvation should be sought at all costs. But we are content to leave that false and abominable teaching to our good neighbors the pessimists, the gentlemen not Canadian in any respect who have set out to smash the Confederation."

This was referring to the member for Bothwell's organ, which had been attacking the *Globe*.

"It is their business to profess despair and create it."

Which they are doing in the House all the time.

"The lengths that they will go may be understood from two particulars. Professor Goldwin Smith's favorite journal recently suggested that the Canadian fisheries should be surrendered for nothing but to placate our neighbors so that they might perhaps incline their hearts to give us reciprocity! And the distinguished writer himself said: 'One touch of the Retaliation Act would bring the policy of separation and restriction down with a run.'"

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that so far I have established beyond all question, that unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, continental free trade and free trade are one and the same thing so far as those gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are concerned; and that we had at one time or the other the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity or in favor of free trade. What, sir, will be the result of this measure so far as Canada is concerned? We have been told by hon. gentlemen who have spoken that the result of

this proposition if adopted or crystallized into legislation must end in direct taxation, and that the revenues of our country will not be able to meet the extraordinary and growing expenses required for carrying on government; so that we must have direct taxation. This, Sir, has been fully pointed out. I have a letter here written by Mr. James Young, the former member for one of the Waterloos, who lives in Galt and whose opinion on this question is well worthy of consideration. That gentleman has given the matter a great deal of study and some of the most interesting literature contributed to this question during the recess has been contributed by Mr. Young. Mr. Young in one of his pamphlets shows that the result must be direct taxation, and I venture to say that quoting such a high authority as that hon. members, on the opposite side of the House will not be inclined to question it. Mr. Young says:

"One of the first results of commercial union would be the loss of nearly \$7,000,000 of revenue annually collected by us from American imports. The total customs revenue of the Dominion for 1886 was \$19,373,551, and notwithstanding our high taxation, there was a deficit of \$3,834,000. How could we pay our public creditors and prevent financial embarrassment if we gave up our control over the tariff, and at the same time threw away \$3,769,000, or over one-third of our total customs receipts, which was the amount collected from the United States goods last year?"

"It will not do to 'pooh pooh' this question instead of answering it. It is a matter of the most vital consequence. The solvency or bankruptcy of the Dominion may depend upon it. The seven millions of revenue would have to be raised and how could we do it? We could not raise it by higher duties on imports, for we would be under the continental tariff which we wouldn't control, and if we even trebled our inland revenue taxes it is extremely doubtful if the amount would be forthcoming, for the rates would be, in many cases, prohibitory, inducing smuggling and other evasions of the revenue. But even if we could easily raise the \$7,000,000, what class of Canadian tax-payers, least of all our farmers, who have the brunt of the burden to bear now, would ever dream of taxing themselves for commercial union to such an extent."

That, Sir, is the opinion of a gentleman well informed on all those questions. I think that evidence proves beyond doubt that the result of this policy must be direct taxation. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech a few nights ago refers also to the same question and speaks as regards direct taxation. He admits there would be some difficulty in meeting the revenues and he shows the only way it could be done would be by direct taxation. He does not look upon that as a very objectionable feature, but Sir, we know that if the leader of the Liberal party were here he would oppose this very scheme. The hon. member for West Durham, in appealing to the electors last February, at Hamilton, said:

"Fiscal system of Canada for many years. What is that system? It is the system of raising revenue by indirect taxation. Direct taxation for the Dominion is, in my judgment, a practical impossibility. Indirect taxation must be the source of our revenue."

The hon. member for South Oxford is also at issue with the hon. member for Bothwell. In moving his resolution the other night, he said:

"Sir, I desire to say that, in my judgment, we ought not, I do not think that Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish, to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fishermen, on the miners, on the lumbermen, on all the great producing classes in this community. I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper place and time, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hard-working, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it, although I doubt greatly whether you need, with proper economy, have recourse to it, that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable, well-to-do, monied classes must be made to pay their fair proportion—no more should be asked—to the burdens of the country. This proportion they most assuredly do not contribute to-day, and never will under a system of purely indirect taxation."

Does the hon. member for Bothwell agree with that proposition? He will not answer; I will give the answer for him.

Mr. RYKERT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I expressed no opinion upon it. I said that it was a suggestion for an income tax.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman's memory is a little defective. I noticed that he applauded the hon. member for South Oxford when he made that speech, and being such a high authority on political economy the hon. gentleman I know entirely approved of it—that customs duties should be done away and the taxes should be levied by direct taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He never said so.

Mr. RYKERT. I read it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, I will read it again:

"I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper time and place, that among the many faults with which our system abounds—"

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The protective system.

Mr. RYKERT. No, he does not say that at all.

"—perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hardworking, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it, &c."

What did the hon. member for Bothwell say a short time ago? He said it would be absurd to have direct taxation. It is really hard to catch him; now you have him, and now you have not. On 23rd December, 1887, the *London Advertiser*, his organ, says:—

"Mr. Mills in his celebrated work on political economy pointed out the reasons why a fairly imposed customs tax is preferable to direct taxation and the reason he assigns are of general application. Direct tax must be paid at some stated time, whether it is convenient for the tax-payer or not, and it never can be imposed upon the community, in such a way as to impose upon each individual burden in proportion to his ability to pay. A customs tax, if the principles of free trade are kept in view, and if levied for the sole purpose of revenue, is really an income tax in the expenditure of each family, in the purchase of imports, bears a much closer proportion to the income of each person, than if an attempt were specially made to tax income."

Now, if the hon. gentleman is logical and consistent, he will oppose this resolution, because its effect must be as stated by himself and others—direct taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, the hon. gentleman said so himself, and the hon. member for South Oxford said so in his speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, he does not, nor does he in the extract you read.

Mr. RYKERT. He said:

"We will suppose for argument's sake."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentlemen do not disconcert me in the least. I can stay here until to-morrow morning if necessary—

"We will suppose, for argument's sake, that we have to face this bugbear of direct taxation—direct taxation, be it remembered, not for all our revenue, but a trifling portion of it alone. Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House in that connection to certain important facts. First of all, no man who has paid any attention to this subject will, I think, dare to deny the fact, which, I think, is recognised by every political economist, that direct taxation properly levied takes a great deal less out of the pocket of the people than direct taxation; most of all, indirect taxation, levied as our system of indirect taxation is levied now."

That is what the hon. gentleman says. He says that we require a revenue of \$35,000,000, that in pooling the most we can have is \$25,000,000, and that the rest will have to be raised by direct taxation. He said that distinctly at Ingersoll. I believe the hon. member for Bothwell is opposed to direct taxation, and he says the whole Reform party is opposed to it; and yet the organ of the party is in favor of direct taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, we will see before I get through. The *Globe* on 22nd September, 1887, said :

"The only objection to the adoption is that some part of the Dominion revenue might have to be raised by direct taxation. To our mind that is another recommendation. To pay a considerable share of taxes directly would induce the people to be very careful as to whom they committed the administration. Still it appears to be true that direct taxation is much of a bugaboo to politicians, especially to French Canadians."

So you see the *Globe* is in favor of direct taxation, and says it is only bugaboo raised by the French Canadians. Then we find that the *Globe* says commercial union would result in direct taxation. On 22nd January, it said :

"If the advantages are what he states, is the objection that free trade involves direct taxation a powerful one? Certainly not from unmitigated Commercial Unionists. That reduction of the United States tariff is certainly imminent, will reduce the American revenue so much that, if Canadians paid to it according to consumption, and shared in it according to population they would have to resort to direct taxation in order to provide the Federal Government with the necessary revenue."

The *Globe* says further :

"If it be objected that continental free trade cannot be had in any terms having Canadians free to making more fiscal progress our answer is that the *Globe* has never favored commercial union in any terms."

There the *Globe* denies having been in favor of commercial union; yet I pointed out that it was in favor of commercial union at the time of the East Northumberland election, when, urged on by the hon. member for West Ontario, it called on the party to gather its forces together and show the country that the Reform party was not quite dead. Now, we have again, on 28th December, 1887, the *Globe's* opinion, as follows :—

"It is said that Canadians cannot be educated up to direct taxation. Bah! The very pessimists who affect to believe so much in public stupidity admit that a considerable revenue would have to be raised by direct taxation under commercial union. If the Americans reduce their tariff, as President Cleveland proposes, the revenue to accrue to Canada from the projected customs union would be quite inadequate to her needs, and her Government would have to raise by direct taxation an amount no easier to collect in that way than the total sum needed for governmental purposes. That is nothing against commercial union. Sir Richard Cartwright faced the prospect boldly and honestly. He pointed out that direct taxation must come of continental free trade. So much the better, say we. Direct taxation is a good thing of itself. The people can be convinced of this without any more trouble than is necessary to carry any great wholesome reform. What pusillanimity is that which shrinks from the advocacy because the good cause would be defeated 'if submitted at the polls to-morrow.' And what dishonesty that the very persons who allege 'direct taxation' to bar 'abolition of custom houses' should make nothing of 'direct taxation' as a bar to the scheme which they propose to favor!"

So you will see that they are in favor of direct taxation. The *Globe* is in favor of continental free trade as opposed to unrestricted reciprocity and also as opposed to commercial union, and then, as I have shown, the *Globe* is entirely in favor of direct taxation. What I find fault with also, and what the hon. gentleman has pointed out himself in moving the resolution, is that it must result in discrimination against the mother country. That, I think is a very important matter. So important was this question of discrimination considered in 1879, when the National Policy was under discussion in this Parliament, that the then hon. member for West Middlesex, the Hon. Mr. Ross, now Minister of Education in Ontario, made a very strong appeal against it, based on the fact that it would discriminate against England. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) also took the same ground, and gave instances to show, by selections from different portions of the tariff that it meant discrimination against the mother country. Now, these hon. gentlemen, however, are willing to abandon all that, they are willing to withdraw their former statements and are prepared to accept a resolution which certainly means discrimination against England. Although they hold that the Government were wrong in the policy they adopted in 1879, they are yet prepared to adopt a policy which, as regards discrimination, must have the same effect as they contended the Gov-

ernment policy of 1879 had. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was then very much annoyed at the idea of discriminating against England, and he animadverted a good deal on what he called the "lip loyalty" of this side of the House. At page 451 of the *Hansard*, he is reported to have said :

"But a few weeks have passed, and both sides of the House were uniting and expressing the gratitude to Her Majesty for having confided her child to our care. If that illustrious lady were to return to England, I am afraid she will be obliged to tell her Royal Mother that the practical outcome of all this lip loyalty was a policy directly antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain, a policy which whatever may be the intentions of the Finance Minister and his colleagues, seems on its practical results especially designed to injure British interest and hamper British trade."

But the hon. member for South Oxford, in speaking at Ingersoll, did not think discrimination against England any objection whatever to his new policy. He there said :

"Anyway, let us have no cant on this subject. We are not called on to be more British than the British themselves."

"Our total trade is not of much consequence to Great Britain, and the loss of a small fraction of it, if they do lose it, will do them very little harm."

Now, it has been said over and over again that the treaty of 1874 forced the Hon. George Brown to discriminate against England. In delivering his speech in Parliament upon that treaty, he pointed out that it would not discriminate against England in the following language :—

"I come now to the objections which have been urged against the treaty from such quarter as entitle them to a formal answer. The first of these is the allegation that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain in favor of the United States. Nothing could be more unfounded than this. It was perfectly understood from the opening of the negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States that was not also free with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment."

You see now that while these gentlemen in 1879 were opposed to discrimination against England, they are prepared to vote to-day for a resolution involving such discrimination, and the hon. gentleman who moved it does not care about that. The trade of England, he says, is very small, and England can look after herself. Another objection which, in my judgment, is a very strong one against this proposed arrangement, and which the hon. the mover of the resolution admitted to exist, is that it will inflict serious injury on our home manufactures. Even the hon. member for South Brant, on Friday evening, was obliged to admit that it would affect some manufactures, and he thought it might affect his own; but he was so patriotic as not to care about that, so long as the best interests of the country were served. This afternoon that hon. gentleman found considerable fault with me because I had telegraphed to several manufacturers with reference to what he said on Friday evening. If the hon. gentleman had no object in showing to the country that these gentlemen were in favor of the resolution, why did he mention their names? He found fault with me when I telegraphed to know whether what the hon. gentleman had said in their regard was true or not. I read a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, a gentleman whom I have never met, but who, having listened to the hon. member for South Brant in this House, for he had occupied a seat in the gallery during a part of the hon. gentleman's speech, voluntarily wrote me this letter in which he says that the statement of the hon. member for South Brant with reference to him was not correct.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that in his letter.

Mr. RYKERT. You heard the letter read.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that I made a statement that was not correct.

Mr. RYKERT. He said he understood you had said so, and it was not correct. I simply read the letter, and I am not going to be baffled and thrown off my balance by the hon. gentleman's interruptions, which are most unseemly. Since my observations, this afternoon, I caused a telegram

to be sent to Mr. Rosamond, to which the hon. gentleman will probably not take any exception. Why did the hon. gentleman quote Mr. Rosamond and Mr. Gurney and all those manufacturers, if not to show that they were in favor of the resolution; if not to show that they were opposed to ordinary reciprocity, but were in favor of this resolution. This telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond:

"When you stated, in 1878, before the Depression Committee that reciprocity would be of benefit to everybody, did you mean unrestricted reciprocity or a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty?"

The answer is:

"The old reciprocity treaty, certainly."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman quoted from the evidence given before that Depression Committee, to show that Mr. Rosamond was in favor of the resolution. Mr. Rosamond has replied that he was in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty, but is not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. The ground we take is that we are in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty; we are in favor of —

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to call his attention to what the hon. member did say.

Mr. RYKERT. Let the hon. gentleman take his seat. He will be able to speak by-and-bye. We have had constant interruptions, and they have led to unpleasant remarks being made across the House which do not tend to improve the proper conduct of business in this House. Whenever the hon. gentleman is cornered, he gets nettled, but I propose to take my own line in this matter. I have heard what the hon. gentleman has stated, and I have asked the manufacturers if they were in favor of the resolution before the House, and they state distinctly that they are not. Now we come to other evidence which I propose to place before the House. At a manufacturers' meeting at Toronto on 10th February last, at which both Mr. Massey and Mr. Goldie were present, whose names have been mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, the following resolution was passed unanimously:—

"Whereas strong and constant efforts are being made to bring about commercial union between Canada and the United States; and

"Whereas the inevitable result of such a move would be the sundering of the political ties which bind us to the mother country, and annex us to the United States;

"Be it therefore resolved: That the Canadian Manufacturing Association is entirely opposed to commercial union with the United States and to any other political proposition that might imperil our existing relations with Great Britain, or prejudice the political status of the Dominion or the welfare of the Canadian manufacturing industries."

I assume that that resolution, passed by a representative body, will have more weight than a dozen speeches, and distorted speeches at that, of the hon. gentleman. I pointed out, this afternoon, that a leading member in his own city (Mr. Osborne) had written to the *Empire* as to his views on the subject, and Boards all over the Dominion have expressed their opinions in the same way. We have also the evidence of many manufacturers to the same effect. Mr. John Hallam, of Toronto, who is, I believe, a celebrated Reformer of that city, says:

"I am in favor of commercial union in the fullest acceptance of the term, providing that England and Canada could have free trade on a reasonable revenue tariff with the United States. I am not in favor of commercial union between Canada and the United States as against England and the British colonies throughout the world.

"I believe that we can buy everything we need in England and the British colonies at lower prices and of better quality than we can in the United States, with the exception of a very few special articles.

"Commercial union between Canada and the United States to the exclusion of Great Britain would not, in my opinion, be of general benefit to the whole of Canada. I think the Maritime Provinces are so situated geographically as that they would be benefited by commercial union. The same, in my opinion, will apply to Manitoba.

Mr. RYKERT.

"For these and other reasons I am opposed to the scheme of commercial union as advocated by Goldwin Smith and Erastus Wiman. I want more light on the subject.

"However much Canada might favor commercial union or a more liberal trade policy with the United States, I am of opinion that the United States will not grant it, and I think it extremely foolish for us to agitate such a question until we are reasonably sure that such a policy would be entertained by the Government of that country."

So you see that these gentlemen are opposed to commercial union and in favor of ordinary reciprocity. Then we have also Mr. John Dobson, who gives the same opinion. He says:

"I am decidedly opposed to commercial union. Canada is yet a young manufacturing country, hence the principle to preserve a close balance between consumers and producers at home has not been applicable hitherto.

"A nation should encourage trade with one not producing the same products as itself. Canada and the United States have similar products.

"Great Britain has different; therefore Canada should encourage trade with the latter.

"Canadian manufacturers would be for a time undersold by the longer established firms in the United States and would be finally forced to shut down. Then prices would be increased to the loss of Canadian farmers.

"It would undoubtedly mean annexation, and both countries are safer and better apart. Britain has been the true friend of Canada in sunshine and in shadow. It would be base ingratitude to grant favors to a stranger that would be denied a friend.

"I am, therefore, opposed to commercial union, which is only annexation in disguise."

As I pointed out, if you have this commercial union, every retail store would be filled with goods from the United States. I have also a very high authority on this subject—at least I know he thinks himself a high authority—I refer to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)—and he points out this difficulty in a letter to Mr. Wiman, that it is going to affect the manufactures and disarrange the trade of this country for a long time to come. He says:

"I wish now to refer to an objection, which is raised in Canada, against a proposal to place manufactured goods, as well as natural products, upon the free lists of the two countries. It is contended, with much force, that the early, sudden and complete removal of these duties would have a serious effect upon the trade of the country. It is true that stocks in the hands of importers, upon which duties had been paid, would be ruinously depreciated by suddenly throwing open the door to the admission of the same goods, free. The stocks and raw material of manufacturers, upon which duties have been paid, would also depreciate, and much of their plant might be useless until adapted to the new requirements of their business. The striking off so many customs duties at a blow would also reduce the Canadian revenue to an extent that could not be borne by our finances at the moment, for time would be required to re-arrange the public income and expenditure. For all these reasons it must be conceded that extensive remissions of duties upon manufactured goods should not be made suddenly, but only after ample notice; and, even when the reduction begins, it must be gradual. In this way alone would importers have an opportunity to work off their old stocks, and to regulate their new importations to suit the new openings for trade."

So high an authority as the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is not in favor of this resolution being adopted by the country at the present time.

Mr. EDGAR. I am, certainly, that letter is in favor of it.

Mr. RYKERT. The first letter says that it is impracticable.

Mr. EDGAR. Will not my hon. friend finish reading the letter which he read a part of?

Mr. RYKERT. I have read all his letters, though I have not read them all here.

Mr. EDGAR. But you have not finished reading that letter.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not propose to place that kind of light literature on the pages of *Hansard* at this time. I do not think that would be conducive to the welfare of the country.

Mr. EDGAR. That is exceedingly fair.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman shows that it is impossible to carry out this scheme, that it will seriously

affect our manufacturers and will disarrange our trade. That is why I point it out. It is going also, in my judgment, to be very injurious to the farmers, and I will support my judgment by reading an article from the *Globe* on that point, and particularly in reference to the North-West farmers. I know, hon. gentlemen opposite, like to hear that authority quoted, but I must confess that I have not much confidence in my witness on general questions, though occasionally it tells the truth. It says:

"Now the selling price of North-West wheat would not be appreciably increased by unrestricted reciprocity. It will fetch almost as much sent over the Canadian Pacific Railway to England as sent to Minneapolis. To increase the profits of its growers they require cheap supplies. But unrestricted reciprocity would not greatly reduce anything except agricultural implements. Woollens, for instance, are dearer now in Dakota than in Manitoba. On the whole, the Manitoba farmers' supplies, barring machines and tools, are as cheap as in Dakota. Under free trade with the world the Manitoba farmer would obtain untaxed American implements and untaxed British goods as well. He would gain nearly all that unrestricted reciprocity can give him."

So, as far as the farmer is concerned, unrestricted reciprocity would not be of much benefit to him, and Mr. Wiman pointed out a few days ago, when speaking in Winnipeg, that it might even hurt the Manitoba farmers. No doubt, therefore, the farmers would be hurt by it to a considerable extent. The question was raised a few nights ago by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) as to who pays the duty, and he then stated that his opinion was that the exporter of barley from this country paid the duty. His language was:

"Take the case of barley. As has been stated to-night already, we exported last year 9,437,717 bushels, the value of which was \$5,245,000; but I ask hon. gentlemen, did the farmers get that 5,250,000? They did not, because they had to pay in duty, \$943,000."

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman were present, I would like to refer him to a high authority on that question. I will give him the answer from one of his own leaders, a gentleman whose opinion, no doubt, he will take, that is the hon. member for Bothwell. He seems to have solved that question as to who pays the duty. He has expressed a decided opinion that so far as barley is concerned, the exporter does not pay the duty but the consumer does. I was surprised at the hon. gentleman making those remarks in presence of the hon. member for Bothwell. The hon. member for Bothwell some time ago, in addressing the electors in the campaign, made a speech which is reported in a campaign document, called "Reform Government in the Dominion." The hon. member for Bothwell was then Minister of the Interior, and he, in a speech he then made, answered the question of the hon. member for North Victoria,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You don't agree with that.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not agree with much the hon. gentleman says, but I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will wilfully mistake what the facts are. I give the answer for the benefit of the hon. member for North Victoria. This is what the hon. member for Bothwell said relating to barley:

"He says in regard to the taxes put on Canadian barley, that the Canadian farmer undergoes that much loss, and so pays a large amount of money into the treasury of the United States. If that be true, why all this row about the imposition of one cent on the pound of tea? Why, according to the doctor, that comes out of the Chinaman. My view is the consumer pays it. But if the doctor is right, the Chinaman pays it. If the doctor is right, the tax on broadcloth is paid by the English manufacturer, and that on cottons by the manufacturer of New England. Why then this complaint of the burdens of taxation. We are, according to Dr. Orton's views, simply taxing the foreigners to trade with us. Our opponents are wrong upon one point or the other. Well, if we pay the tax that is imposed upon the produce of other countries, we certainly do not pay the tax upon the product of Canada going into the United States."

He goes on further to say, page 96:

"It is said the Americans have been injuring us by sending into Canada wheat, flour and Indian corn, and I wish to call attention to this question. Before doing so, perhaps I had better give you some evidence of the fact that duties imposed by the American Government

on the various products of the agriculturists of Canada have in no wise affected the prices of various articles which have been sent into the American market from Canada."

And he goes on to give the prices of the various farm products for the twenty-two years from 1854 to 1876; and then he adds:

"I might go over the prices of barley, rye and other cereals with much the same result, thus establishing the uncontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

Now, Sir, that is the answer I give to the hon. member. The hon. member seemed to find considerable fault when I asked him a question the other night. Now I give him the answer from one of his own leaders. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored, in these observations, to show that the scheme is an impracticable one. I have shown from their own mouths that the scheme is surrounded by great difficulties that it would be utterly impossible to get rid of, if we adopted the resolution of the hon. gentleman. In my opinion it is impracticable to discuss this proposed treaty at the present time, because a discussion is going on the other side of the line in reference to a proposed change of tariff. Under any circumstances I feel it would be unwise; and I do not think the Americans will concede that treaty at the present time. I am not in favor of humiliating Canada at the foot of the United States. I am in favor, as I said a few minutes ago, of remaining as we are. We have made material progress and great advancement during the past 15 or 20 years. Unmistakable evidence surrounds us that Canada has prospered in a greater degree than almost any other country in the world. I have shown by statistics that Ontario and Quebec have increased in a greater ratio than the neighboring States of New York and Ohio, notwithstanding that they had the large cities of New York, Buffalo, Cleveland and Cincinnati to contribute to their prosperity. I have shown that the progress of the Maritime Provinces has been greater than that of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York and Ohio. I have shown further that the ratio of increase, even in Prince Edward Island, of which hon. gentlemen complain so bitterly, is greater than that of New York State—15.47 as against 15.40. I say that having confidence in the future of my country, I am not prepared to advocate any scheme which will have the effect of humiliating us, as is proposed by this resolution. Reciprocity may be very well in natural products, but the time has not come when we should ask the Americans to give us reciprocity upon any other terms than those we have already offered. They have shown they were not favorable to the Treaty of 1874, which was a liberal and a wide treaty, and was as far as our party is prepared to go, and yet that proposition was treated with disdain. So long as I have been in Parliament I have not been in favor of any treaty that would place us in a humiliating position. So long as we continue our present rate of progress, I am not disposed to alter our system. I believe that Canada is destined, in the future as she has done in the past, to make rapid and gigantic strides. We have within ourselves all the elements of greatness, we have everything to make a great country; we ought to take advantage of our position, and if we do so I believe that we will make Canada one of the best countries in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Representing, as I do, one of the best and one of the wealthiest agricultural constituencies in the Province of Ontario, I feel it my duty, both to myself and my constituents, not to allow this motion to be put without giving a few reasons why I think it would be injurious to the best interests of this country to adopt the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). My first objection to the resolution is that it has been moved purely in the interest of the Reform party in this country. It is a well known fact that that party has

had no policy for sometime past. As a proof of that I will read from one of the organs of that party, and I am sure that it will be accepted as an authority, for it is the only religious daily published in Canada. Here is what the *Montreal Witness* says of that party:

"The Liberal party has no policy on any subject, for the simple reason that it accepts as members all who oppose the Conservative Government of the day, whether they oppose it from principle or merely from personal prejudice. Thus there are protectionists and free traders, monopolists and anti-monopolists, railway promoters and anti-railway promoters, prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists, men of all stripes in its ranks, and it, therefore, cannot formulate a policy on any subject. What is the party for anyway? 'The business of the Opposition is to oppose,' said Lord Randolph Churchill, but the Canadian Opposition does not even fulfil that conservative function effectively."

That is what the *Montreal Witness* says of that Reform party. It is true that before they met here during the present session, they were without a policy. One of the members of the Opposition an honest farmer, who thought commercial union was the platform of the Reform party, put a notice on the paper declaring in favor of commercial union. Then a hurried caucus was called, and the party formulated the policy laid down in the resolution now before the House. But I oppose the resolution for other considerations than mere party. I believe that if it were adopted and carried into effect it would prove disastrous to the agriculturists, to the manufacturers, to the laboring classes as well as the mercantile interests of the country. I say it would prove injurious to the farmers, from the fact that we here produce similar articles of produce to those produced in larger quantities in the United States, and as the produce of the United States comes into direct competition with the produce of the farmers of this country, and as their seasons are much earlier than ours, the effect is that they are able to export produce to this country to take the place of Canadian produce, and consequently a certain amount of our produce has to be exported. An hon. member speaking the other night made reference to the fact that our exports under the National Policy were less than previous to the adoption of the National Policy. He was answered by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House that as our manufactures had increased there was more labor employed in the country and more of our produce was consumed here. But I will give a better reason than that. I take the imports of grain from the United States in 1877 and compare them with the returns for 1887, on grain entered from home consumption, as the statistics appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns. The following is the result:—

GRAIN Imported from the United States and entered for Home Consumption:—

| | 1877. | | 1887. | |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Bush. | Value. | Bush. | Value. |
| Oats..... | 1,697,968 | \$ 610,632 | 19,797 | \$ 7,741 |
| Corn | 8,260,079 | 4,259,543 | 2,029,061 | 884,125 |
| Wheat..... | 4,589,051 | 4,845,824 | 22,540 | 18,313 |
| | 14,547,098 | \$9,717,059 | 2,071,398 | \$910,179 |
| | 2,071,398 | 910,179 | | |
| Decrease in 1887.. | 12,475,700 | \$8,806,880 | | |
| Wheat flour..... | 549,063 | \$2,964,273 | 169,629 | 638,618 |
| Rye flour | 1,969 | 9,616 | 135 | 503 |
| Corn meal..... | 294,342 | 678,477 | 126,137 | 310,864 |
| | 845,374 | \$4,852,366 | 305,901 | \$950,085 |
| | 305,901 | 950,085 | | |
| Decrease in 1887... | 539,473 | \$2,902,281 | | |
| More in 1887 on grain | | \$ 8,806,880 | | |
| More in 1877 on flour | | 2,902,287 | | |
| | | \$11,709,161 | | |

What do these statistics mean? They simply mean that those grains, ripening sooner than the Dominion product, were forced into this market and displaced \$11,000,000 worth of the produce of Canada, which had to be exported to make room for the American product. Those are the

Mr. TAYLOR.

true facts of the case, and it would continue if we had the commercial union to-morrow. The same may be said of fruit, vegetables, and all other farm products. I take the returns for apples, and I find the following:—

| Apples. | | | |
|---------|-----------|--------|----------|
| 1877. | | 1887. | |
| Brls. | Value. | Brls. | Value. |
| 173,968 | \$203,067 | 26,835 | \$56,484 |
| 26,835 | 56,484 | | |
| 157,133 | \$146,583 | | |

Decrease in 1887.

I say, therefore, that in regard to those items, our trade would suffer very materially, to say nothing about our cattle trade. Had we unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, our cattle would be scheduled the same as American cattle on entering the United Kingdom. What would that mean? It would mean a loss of from \$1 to \$6 on every animal exported from this country to the British market. A similar result would follow in regard to our dairy industry. We saw by the newspapers a few days ago that the Colonial Office had given instructions to enquire if Canadian cheese was adulterated by the products of animal fat. Why was this done? Simply because the Americans wanted to put their bogus cheese on the English market as Canadian cheese. We have noticed that large quantities of American cheese are sent to Montreal over the Grand Trunk railway, and there shipped to the English market. A similar result would also follow in regard to our butter industry. American bogus butter is at present shut out by legislation, yet if unrestricted reciprocity were brought into force that bogus butter would come in here and inflict great injury on our dairy industry, as was the case before that legislation was enacted. My hon. friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) read the other day the statement of one of the presidents of the Agricultural Institute of New York, stating that the value of their land had depreciated 25 per cent. during the last ten years owing to the fact of bogus butter being allowed to be made in the United States; yet hon. gentlemen opposite who take the farmers to their breasts and desire to do everything beneficial to them want to have the same state of things brought about that was in existence a couple of years before the legislation prohibiting the importation into Canada of bogus butter was passed. We have also requests made for legislation to protect the farmers against bogus lard, and I fancy before this Session closes legislation similar to that respecting butter will be passed. So much for the farmers of the country. Then I referred to the fact that I believed the adoption of the resolution would injure our manufacturers. I know this that there is hardly any manufacture in the United States without a combination of all the manufacturers engaged in the same line of industry. If we had unrestricted reciprocity our manufacturers would either have to join the combination or they would be crushed out; if they joined the combination they would simply have the trade they have now worked up to a certain extent, but the result would be that nine out of ten of them would be killed. I also realise the fact that our laboring classes would be injured. I believe so from this fact, that there are nearly as many men in the prisons of the United States engaged in manufacturing goods as there are free laborers in Canada, and if we had unrestricted reciprocity the free labor of Canada would come into direct competition with the prison-made goods of the United States. I need say but very little to show the effect it would have on the merchants of the country. I have already said enough to convince the House and the country that with unrestricted reciprocity our farmers, manufacturers and workmen would suffer, and these all suffering our merchants would also suffer likewise. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) said the other night that the National Policy had done little or nothing

to develop our industrial trade. When I was home on Saturday I was in one of our manufacturing concerns in Gananoque, when the manager handed to me a letter, which, he said, contained a pretty decent order. It was dated Summerside, P.E.I.; perhaps the hon. member for Queen's knows where that is. West and McLeod, P.E.I., perhaps he knows those gentlemen. The order was for about \$20,000. It was not for wheat or pork or beans or something of that sort to feed the starving farmers. That \$20,000 was for luxuries, it was for top buggies to drive those poor farmers around the country in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Too poor to walk.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, too poor to walk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the name of the firm?

Mr. TAYLOR. West & McLeod, of Summerside, P.E.I. You know them probably. He also showed me another order from Fredericton signed by a man named Johnson, for \$30,000 or \$40,000 for similar articles. Here now we have \$60,000 of an order to a Canadian manufacturer and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman where those orders would have gone only for the National Policy? Would they not have been transferred to Boston and would not the manufacturers and mechanics of Boston have the pleasure and profit of making those goods while the American farmers would have had the pleasure of feeding them in place of the farmers of my own county selling their produce to Canadian mechanics and manufacturers. For these reasons I think the National Policy has developed an inter-provincial trade. Those orders were from gentlemen living down in the Maritime Provinces, and they represent the benefits to one factory in Ontario. But the same thing is being repeated all over the Dominion. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was making that blue ruin speech of his which we have often heard in this House before and was telling us that we lost one out of every four of our native-born population and one out of every three of our emigrants, there was a remark made by the hon. gentleman who sits beside, which did not get into the *Hansard* or into the newspapers, but which is too good to lose, and I think I will repeat it. When the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was dwelling on the great exodus my friend remarked: "My goodness, it makes one feel lonely to think we are losing our friends at that rate." I do not blame the hon. member for making the remark. If the exodus was going on at the rate it was pictured we would feel very lonely indeed, because we would be left alone all by ourselves. The hon. gentlemen opposite have told us in their speeches that the farmers of this country are being ruined by this National Policy, that they are being taxed to death, and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), stated that the annual tax on the average family was \$35 a year. I heard that figure mentioned before from a gentleman in my county, and I fancy they both must have got their information from the same source. Those speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite are made, I believe, for a purpose, and that purpose is to try to prejudice the farmer, and to raise a feeling of discontentment among the farmers of this country, and try to make them believe that the manufacturers and merchants are ruining them and that they are being taxed to death to support the manufacturers principally. I have made the statement before and I make it here in my place again, that it is possible for a farmer, a working man or for a gentleman, and many of them do live in this country and enjoy all the necessities and even some of the luxuries of life; without contributing one dollar a year to the taxes of this Dominion. I made that statement and an intelligent, respectable, well to do Grit farmer in my county contradicted me, and he said: "My taxes amounted to \$35 last year." I asked him who

he paid that to and who collected it? He said: "The tax collector collected \$33." I said: "Where did the tax collector put it, where did it go?" and I told him I would resign my seat in Parliament if he would prove that one cent of the \$36 that tax collector got from him found its way into the Dominion treasury. I said that was spent by your own council that you elected in the spring, it went for maintaining bridges and roads and paying the school rate except what went to the county council, and was probably expended in maintaining the court house, the jail and the registry office, and your reeve looks after that. Probably not one cent of it went to the Government." He said: "The *Globe* says we pay \$35 a year and I believe it. It says we must pay it on everything we eat and wear," and I replied: "the *Globe* does not tell the truth and I will prove that to you." I said: "Here is a statement of the *Globe* made for the benefit of you farmers, and we will work it out and see how far it is true. The *Globe* says the gross debt is \$281,000,000 and the net debt \$220,000,000, and then it goes on to tell about how much that represents for every man, woman and child. It says the debt has increased \$75 a minute under Tory rule, and the annual interest \$21 a minute. Now let us take the debt at what the *Globe* says, \$220,000,000. The average interest is three and a-half per cent. and that represents \$7,700,000. Now what will the interest be at \$21 a minute? There sixty minutes in the hour and twenty-four hours in the day and 365 days in the year and multiplying those figures together we find that it would amount to eleven millions some hundred thousand dollars, that is just about \$4,000,000 of a mistake, which is not very much much for the *Globe* after all. Now let us take the other calculation of \$75 a minute as the gross debt. There are sixty minutes in the hour; let us multiply 75 by 60, there are 24 hours in the day multiply that result by 24, and there are 365 days in the year and we multiply that again by 365. We have had Tory rule for fifteen years, and we say started out at Confederation without a dollar of debt, and the Mackenzie Administration did not increase the debt; let us multiply our former result by 15 (the number of years of Tory rule out of the twenty years since Confederation) and this would make our debt \$591,000,000 if the *Globe's* calculation was right. That is only a little over \$300,000,000 of a false statement for the *Globe*."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is nothing of a mistake.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is about on a par with the mistakes they make on the other side of the House. I told the farmer: "There are the figures the *Globe* has given to you, and it is trying to make you believe that you pay \$35 a year taxes." He said: "But we pay it on what we eat." I said: "Well, I will go to your house, and I will sit down at the table while you are eating your dinner and we will see what you pay. Do not you raise on your farm every bit of meat and flour, and butter and eggs that goes on your table. Is there any tax on them?" He could not say that there was. I said: "Unless you drink whiskey or smoke cigars, which you are better off without, you do not contribute anything to the taxes of the country, except a few cents on the pepper and spices, and other little items that go to make up a tasty dish of hash. There is nothing else you pay on among the necessities of life. When the Mackenzie Administration were in power they taxed your tea. There is no tax on your tea now." I had a suit of wool cloth on at the time, and I told the farmer if it was good enough for me it was good enough for him. I pointed out: "You grow the wool yourself, you take it down to your own mill and it is made there, and you pay no tax. It is the same way with your cotton. The raw material comes in free. It is made here, and you as a far-

mer feed the hands that make it, so you see there is no duty on your cotton, for if you wish to go and buy in the United States and bring it here then you pay the duty. I said to him: "I will give you a practical illustration of who pays the duty." Here are two men keeping house; each keeps a cow. They each want to lay in a couple of barrels of flour for their family during winter. They say instead of buying the flour we will go out and buy the wheat. One man goes out and buys ten bushels of wheat at 80 cents a bushel. He says to the miller: "How much a bushel will you charge me for grinding it, giving me the offal required for my cow." This man gets his wheat ground and has his flour and the offal for his cow at \$9. The other farmer does not believe in befriending the Canadian farmer or miller, and he says he will go to the American farmer and buy 10 bushels of wheat for 80 cents a bushel. He takes it to the American miller and gets it ground, with the result that suppose he gets it at the same price of \$9 as the Canadian farmer; but then when he tries to bring it across the line, the custom house officer says he has to pay \$1 duty on his two barrels of flour. This raises the price to \$10, because the man had to pay the duty, which he would not have to pay if it were manufactured in Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. And he has to pay duty on the offal besides.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was just giving this as an illustration. That man paid the duty, and so does every man who brings anything across the line—the consumer pays the duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we pay the duty on what goes out, and we also pay it on what comes in. The hon. member for South Oxford stated that we produce many articles in Canada that are not produced in the United States, and *vice versa*. I dispute that statement. I ask the hon. gentleman to name an article, the produce of the farm or the factory, that is made in Canada and that is not made in the United States. On the other hand, there are a large number of articles made or grown there that are not made or grown in Canada. Now, I purpose dealing for a few moments with an article that I am very conversant with, that is barley, and I will try to satisfy my hon. friends opposite as to who pays the duty on barley. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) made the statement, the other night, that the farmers pay the duty, and he gave the right hon. leader of the Government as his authority for the statement, and asked me if I agreed with him. He quoted from a newspaper report of the right hon. gentleman's speech, and I read his quotation in *Hansard*, which was a misquotation, for I have read the speech of the right hon. gentleman on two or three occasions. That speech was made previous to the National Policy in 1878. At that time American grains were allowed to come into Canada free, while our grains going into the United States had to pay a duty. The right hon. gentleman, in advocating a policy of protection, described a farm on the boundary line of Maine, where the line is an imaginary one, and he said a farmer having a farm on each side of the line grows barley, and he had hundred bushels on one side and a hundred bushels on the other side. He takes his American barley to the American buyer, and sells it for \$1 a bushel and gets \$100. He also takes his Canadian barley over and has to pay 15 cents a bushel, and there sells it for \$1 a bushel, and therefore he has only \$85 for his Canadian barley. That statement is correct, and if the farmer did that, he paid the duty on the 100 bushels. But I want hon. gentlemen to understand that when he took his Canadian barley across the line it lost its identity, and simply sold at the price State barley was worth. But if he had taken that barley to the Canadian buyer on this side of the line, he would have sold it for \$1 a bushel as well as in the

Mr. TAYLOR.

United States, and the buyer would have taken it to the States and paid the duty upon it himself, from the fact that Canadian barley in the United States was quoted at 15 cents a bushel more than it was in Canada. I have been buying barley for twenty-five years on the shore of the River St. Lawrence, and right opposite me on the American shore is an American buyer, and during those twenty-five years that buyer has not paid for American barley one cent more than I have paid for Canadian barley on this side. I will show you how the Canadian barley loses its identity when it crosses the line. Previous to the adoption of the National Policy American barley came into Canada free of duty. I was buying on the Canadian shore, and American farmers used to put barley on their boats and bring it to me. I paid them for it in Canada money; as Canada money was worth a premium at that time, it was an inducement to the American farmers to bring their barley to this side. No man will tell me that barley grown here is better than barley grown six or ten miles further south. No maltster can tell the difference between Ontario barley and that grown in the State of New York; but the maltsters control the price and they buy their barley at an export price. They want all the bright barley grown in the United States, and rather than let ours be exported to England, they pay the duty on ours. The barley that I bought from American farmers previous to the National Policy was consigned by me to commission merchants at Oswego or New York, and was bought by the American maltsters at 15 cents a bushel higher than the American barley, and I made profit on it. Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell me who paid the duty on that barley? Here are the quotations of barley in the *Mail* newspaper of 8th November, 1881, when the duty on our barley going into the United States was 15 cents a bushel. No. 1 bright Canada, \$1.15; Rhode Island State, \$1.00, just 15 cents difference between American bright No. 1 and Canada No. 1, the amount of the duty. What happened? The maltsters of the United States, knowing that they paid the duty, went to Washington in 1883, where it is reported they spent \$150,000 in lobbying the Government to get the duty on barley reduced. They did get it reduced from 15 cents to 10 cents a bushel. Did the Canadian farmer get the benefit of that reduction in the duty? If he did not, would he get the benefit of the removal of the entire 10 cents? Here are the quotations from the same paper just after the reduction in the duty: Canada No. 1, 75 cents; choice State, 65 cents, just 10 cents difference, the exact amount of the duty. Now, who paid the duty? If the maltsters went down to Washington and got the duty lowered from 15 cents to 10 cents, did they do it in the interest of the Canadian farmers, or in their own interest? They simply changed the price, and ever since the reduction of the duty to 10 cents, the difference between the price of Canadian barley and State barley is just 10 cents a bushel. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, our barley would simply lose its identity. The maltsters would buy the crop of Canada as they do the crop of the United States to-day. They would buy on an export basis, and pay for it just what it is worth to send to England. That is the way they buy their own crop, and if we had unrestricted reciprocity, they would simply do the same with ours, so that if we could not make any more money out of it by exporting it than by selling it to them, we would sell it to them. The Americans have three quotations for barley to-day: The Western, State, and Canadian. Had we unrestricted reciprocity, there would simply be two lines, the western and eastern barley. Now these are the facts with regard to barley; and there is no gentleman in this House or out of it who can prove otherwise than that the maltsters of the United States pay the duty on Canadian barley; and after an experience of 25 years in shipping barley to the United States market, and on buying barley on the American side,

especially State barley, I am satisfied that had we unrestricted reciprocity the farmers of Canada would not get one cent more for their barley than they do to-day, and they would suffer very materially in having the surplus produce of the United States, which ripens earlier than ours, displace so much of their produce. Our farmers would also have to compete with the bogus butter, bogus lard, bogus cheese of the Americans, and would lose by having their cattle scheduled; nine out of ten of our manufactories will be closed, and our laboring classes would be reduced to poverty. I have no hesitation in saying that in the interests of my county, I will vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford and support the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is with some feelings of diffidence that I arise to address the House on this very important question. We have had a very long and undoubtedly important debate on the resolution before the House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has treated us to-day to a very long speech, and proved himself once more to be the champion reader of quotations in this House. Backed by his scrap book, which always supplies him the necessary fuel, he is enabled on every occasion of this kind to keep on speaking for hours; and I would suggest to the Government that, in the interests of economising our valuable time, it would be a prudent act on their part to place a small sum in the Supplementary Estimates with the view of buying out that scrap book and committing it to the flames. If they would do so, they would effect a considerable saving to the country, and do an act which would be a decided advantage to this House. The hon. gentleman's speech reminds me of the verse in the Good Book with regard to the impure fountain which casts forth fire and dirt, a good deal of which we have had this afternoon and to-night from the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman treated us to a very long speech before recess, and after dinner he evidently turned over his manuscript and went back over the same ground again. Some of his quotations he gave us as often as four times, showing himself to be very anxious to talk for a considerable time, and, no doubt, he served a useful purpose to the Government in that respect. We have had a perfect showerbath of quotations from the hon. gentleman. I do not know that I can remember an occasion in which the hon. gentleman, though he is always liberal in that respect, gave us such a liberal supply of extracts as he did this afternoon. In many of his quotations he was not correct. I had the honor, on a previous occasion, of following the hon. gentleman in a speech he delivered some years ago, and I found out in one case, when I came to examine the source of a quotation which he gave, that he had given the quotation in so garbled a manner as to convey a meaning directly the opposite of its intent; and when I gave the quotation over again, with the portions he had left out, it proved to be the very opposite in meaning to what the hon. gentleman said it was. As regards the telegrams which the hon. gentleman read to us to-day, it is quite clear he sent telegrams of a peculiar kind so as to obtain answers that would suit the occasion and his own purpose. The best evidence of this is that he refused to read the telegrams that he sent, although challenged to do so. He would give the answers but would not give the messages he had sent. That is the hon. gentleman's forte. We have heard some rumours that the hon. gentleman, in this lengthy speech, has been making his *depart*; we have heard rumours that he is to be sent to the Upper Chamber; and in this connection, I may say that an hon. gentleman whose decease we all regret, who once had a seat in this House and afterwards was sent to the Senate, in a discussion on some important question, made a speech, which an hon. gentleman on this side characterised as being a diarrhoea of words with a constipa-

tion of ideas. I do not think the Government could cast the mantle of the deceased gentleman upon a more appropriate member of this House than the hon. member for Lincoln. Now, we have heard a great deal said about the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently afraid that their pet policy is in danger, and are doing everything they possibly can to prevent the farmers from getting the impression that the National Policy is not an advantage to them. They evidently fear that if the farmers should wake up and discover the true secret of the National Policy, in operating against their interests and in favor of the interests of the manufacturers, they would record their votes against this policy. They also evidently dread that our fishermen and all our laboring classes will record their votes in opposition to the National Policy. I admit that the Government have been exceedingly fortunate in misleading and blinding the eyes of the farming community, the laboring classes, the lumbermen, and the fishermen during the last three elections. In the first place, the right hon. the First Minister said that what he intended was merely a readjustment. He did not intend, he said, to increase the burdens of the people. When the second contest was fought, in 1882, he was not willing to appeal to the country on the same terms as in 1878, because he was a little scared that the farmers might possibly see the hollowness of the National Policy from their standpoint; so before appealing to the people, he made up his mind that it would be prudent to readjust and gerrymander the constituencies and he went to work. He felt afraid that when the question came to be discussed before the people, a sufficient percentage in each constituency would become convinced of the hollowness of the National Policy from their standpoint to defeat his policy. In 1887, again we had the Franchise Act. We know the grounds upon which that election was carried, we know perfectly well that the Riel question was made to do duty as far as it possibly could, and in the next place we know that grants to railways in all directions, promises of post offices, promises of piers, promises to make public improvements in all parts of this Dominion, were held out in order to secure the people's votes for the Government on that occasion. And they were undoubtedly successful. These inducements, with the money which was spent and the promises of improvements which were made, carried them into power for the third time. The hon. gentleman who has addressed the House stated the advantages that the National Policy had produced to the people of this country, and went on to show something in connection with the statements which Mr. Blake made in his Malvern speech in regard to the manufacturers. He did not quote Mr. Blake any more correctly in that case than he did in others, and I will come to that part later on; but the National Policy of 1879 is not the National Policy of the present time. The First Minister declared that it would be a readjustment, but, in place of that, they have added to the taxation until now it is very much higher on every article that is imported which we manufacture here than it was at that time. We have never objected to grant certain protection to our manufacturing institutions. We have always held that a revenue tariff should be the basis of taxation, and that permitting our manufacturers to bring in the raw material for purposes of their manufacture, within the limits of that revenue tariff, was all that they could reasonably expect. But hon. gentlemen departed from that principle and adopted a protective tariff, and they have left themselves entirely in the hands of the manufacturers. The result is that from year to year the manufacturers come to the Government, imploring them to grant them increases from time to time in the duties, and to-day we have the unfortunate exhibition of rings being formed for the purposes of raising prices on articles that are manufactured in the country, and are manufactured, by a few people. To-day we have a committee of this House appointed

to investigate these matters, and the evidence is that these people have got more advantages than were necessary for them, and it is clear that, if the Government had adhered to a revenue tariff instead of adopting a protective tariff, that would not have occurred, because they could have replied to the applications made to them, that the necessities of the Dominion Treasury did not require that they should increase the taxation. The result would have been that there would not have been the opportunity to form these rings. In 1877, Mr. McCarthy found a great deal of fault with the Government of that day for having increased the expenditure. At that time it ran up to something like twenty-three millions and a half, and he introduced a resolution condemning the Government for going beyond twenty-two millions. He declared that the Government should not exceed that amount. We find that, although on that occasion hon. gentlemen were anxious to keep down expenditure, they have departed from that view, and now we are expending something like thirty-nine millions annually. There is another question that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) referred to, and that was the question of importing wheat and other products from the United States. He gave some quotations in regard to imports which he said were entered for home consumption in 1878. Well, since that time, when they import, they do not enter for home consumption. There is a privilege under the National Policy by which, if a miller wants to import a certain quantity of wheat for the purpose of manufacturing, if in six months he manufactures a certain amount of flour and ships it out of the country, he is allowed to draw back the amount of duty he would pay on his importation. The result is that, when they do import, they import for the purpose of exportation, and get their wheat in free of duty. They import corn and they import wheat. The last hon. gentleman who spoke said that, if we had the system in force which we had in 1877, the crops of the United States, coming in so much earlier than ours in Canada, would result in our being able to bring in wheat and oats and corn at an earlier period than they become ripe in this country, and that, in that way, it would interfere with the Canadian farmer. Well, they have all these powers under the National Policy. They import wheat to grind into flour, and they can ship it out or turn it into the Canadian market and sell it, and, if within six months they can get Canadian wheat and grind it into flour and ship it out, they can draw back the duty paid on the imported wheat. It is the same in regard to corn. The distiller brings in corn and manufactures it into whiskey and he exports that whiskey, and he is allowed a rebate on the amount he paid for the importation. That is the case of the distiller and the miller. It is the same in regard to the oatmeal miller. If he wants to import American oats before the Canadian oats are ripe, he can bring them in and sell the oatmeal on the Canadian market, and, if within six months he can get Canadian oats and manufacture them and send the oatmeal out in a sufficient quantity to meet the quantity of American oats that he imported, he can draw back his duty? Can a farmer do that? He cannot. Take a farmer who has a large amount of feeding. Can he go to the United States, and buy corn when it is cheap, and feed his cattle, and ship the cattle to England, and get a rebate for what he paid for the corn? Not a bit of it. The man who manufactures the corn into whiskey and sends the whiskey across the Atlantic can get a rebate on what he pays for the corn, but the farmer who imports the corn and turns it into beef cannot get any rebate. The whiskey man gets his rebate, but the farmer gets no rebate. It is said that reciprocity would destroy our manufactures. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) dwelt upon that question, that reciprocity would destroy our manufacturing institutions, and would not benefit the farmer. It is a most amusing thing that, at all the meetings that have been

Mr. McMULLEN,

held of manufacturers throughout the country, and particularly the one in Toronto, they declared that, after carefully and deliberately considering the question with regard to commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, they believed it would be a great injury to the manufacturers and would not benefit the farmer. It is a wonder that they give so much attention to the farmer. Why do they not allow the farmer to decide the matter for himself? Why do they not allow the Farmers' Institutes to decide the matter? No, the manufacturers, in their wisdom and sagacity, feel that, unless they take charge of the poor unfortunate farmer, he would be left at sea and would not amount to anything. The manufacturers have not had a single meeting at which they have not passed resolutions declaring that it would be an injury to the farmer as well as to themselves if we had commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Now, the hon. gentleman was boasting to-night with regard to his majority. He was telling us that he had 500 majority. Permit me to say that I was rather surprised at the hon. member taking such a bold and determined stand in opposition to unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. If there is any man in the House that should be prepared to endorse closer commercial relations with the United States, that man is the hon. member for Lincoln. Why, Sir, it is said that if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, they are such sharp, cute fellows that we could not hold our own. Now, there is one hon. member who is in this House, and we have evidence that he was able to hold his own, and that was the hon. member for Lincoln. That hon. member possessed a timber limit some time ago, he sold that timber limit to an American, and he made a nice sum of money out of it, and yet he made that money when we did not have commercial union. Now, if we had commercial union, those who hold timber limits—and I am sure some of his friends, if we could consult the records, are yet possessors of timber limits, they could get better prices for their timber limits than he got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh no, they could not get more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that he got about all he wanted out of the Americans, and he does not want any more connection with them. I think that explains why the gentleman who bought the timber limit is opposed to commercial union. I dare say that if any person went to him and asked him "Mr. Sands, are you disposed to favor commercial union with Canada?" He would say "No, I am not." "Why are you not?" "Because I had one transaction with those fellows over there, and they are the worst lot I ever met, and I don't want anything more to do with them." I have no doubt that would be his reply with regard to commercial union. The hon. gentleman says that he had 500 of a majority in Lincoln this last election. Well, I question every much, if the hon. gentleman had not sold his timber limits, whether he would have had that majority; I think that largely explains the fact; and I dare say that if there had not been a technicality in the court proceedings, we would have the best evidence that such was the fact, evidence that would show that he got out of that position just the same as he has crawled out of a great many other difficulties he has been in during his Parliamentary life. Now, he went into a comparison of the farmers in the United States and in Canada. He pointed out some cases, and he exhibited a sheet that he held up in his hand with regard to a large tax sale that took place somewhere in the United States. I have no doubt that in some parts of the United States they have their drawbacks, sections of the country that are not worth very much, the same as are to be found in all countries. They have, I dare say, towns that have been surveyed and located, and that have been found afterwards not to be desirable sites to settle

upon, and the result is that in all probability some of these lands were sold out to pay taxes. We have in our own country examples of that kind. Now, the principle bugbear that they keep continually exhibiting before the eyes of the farmers of the country, and that the hon. member for Lincoln has held up to-night, is the bugbear of direct taxation. They say it is impossible to conduct the affairs of this country if we are going to have reciprocity with the United States, without direct taxation. Well, I believe, from their standpoint, it is impossible; I believe that according to Tory rule, it is quite impossible. I believe that these men have become so accustomed in the past to a continuous increase of expenditure that they have become so completely ignorant of the true methods of economy that they would not be able to conduct the affairs of the country unless they had an enormous amount of money beyond what was really necessary. Year after year, they have added to the expenditure. I believe one Minister of the Crown has said that he would rather undertake at any time to defend a thousand dollar increase, than to justify a hundred dollar reduction. I believe they act upon that principle all the time, and the result is that ever since they have taken office, they have run up the debt of this country and have increased the annual expenditure to an enormous amount. I do not think it is wise. I believe when you take into consideration the enormous number of hangers on they have got, the barnacles of state that we see around this Chamber, and that are scattered all over this country, it will be evident that there is going on an enormous drain of our public resources. It is impossible for them to conduct the affairs of this country and reduce the sum down to what would be necessary if we had unrestricted reciprocity, even supposing we had to lose some 5 or 6 or 7 million dollars. Now, I believe that if we had unrestricted reciprocity and were called upon to reduce our annual expense 5 or 6 millions, there would be very little difficulty in doing so. I think, although I have never held an office of any kind, that I can look over the pages of the Auditor General's report and prove what I say. I think if you appoint a committee of earnest honest men to investigate that report in the interest of this country, they would be able, without much trouble, to cut down the payments very materially. I have no doubt that they might be cut down some 5, or 6, or perhaps 7 millions. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln says that he is pledged to the National Policy, he is bound to stand by it. That appears to me to be the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think they know what they owe to the manufacturers of this country; the manufacturers have stuck by them like bricks, they have stuck by them in the last three elections, and they have, no doubt, contributed largely to the election funds. We have reason to believe they have done so, and the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot very well turn their backs upon National Policy men and the manufacturers. They are undoubtedly disposed to stick by them, and I suppose they will, until once they realise the fact that they are not able to carry them into power any longer; then, I think, they will throw them overboard and enter into alliances with some other classes. The hon. member for Lincoln characterised the Ontario Government as a very corrupt government; he said it was a corrupt House. Now, if there is any man in this Chamber who should have hesitated in making a charge of corruption against the Ontario House, it is the hon. member for Lincoln. That hon. member once held a seat in that House himself, he once had the honor of performing the duties of a representative, and he has a record there, and I am going to give this House a little of the hon. gentleman's record during the time he sat in that House. I do not know that I should have done so if he had not pronounced the Ontario House a very corrupt House. While he sat there he certainly sowed the seeds of corruption himself, and if they have not been eradicated

it is simply because there are men of his stamp there still. I will read a report, Mr. Speaker, of a Committee that was appointed for the purpose of looking into certain irregular transactions on the part of the hon. member for Lincoln:

"After hearing all the evidence submitted for their consideration, they find as follows:—"

"First—That the Great Western Railway of Canada, on or about the 1st day of February, 1870, paid the said John Charles Rykert, the sum of \$1,000 for Parliamentary services, rendered by the said John Charles Rykert to such company in the then recent Session of the Legislature of Ontario."

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. McMULLEN—

"Second—That one Edward D. Tilson gave the said John Charles Rykert"—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman is digressing. These personal charges, unless they are to be followed up by some distinct proceedings against the hon. gentleman, should be avoided. I do not think they conduce to the good feeling of the House or in any way serve the public interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you will allow me, Sir, to point out that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) made a distinct charge of corruption against the Ontario Legislature, and by his own act he has brought down on himself the exposure which the hon. gentleman was proceeding to give.

Mr. RYKERT. I made no charge against them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This has proceeded far enough. The charge, as stated by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), was one of those usual, although hardly justifiable, expressions that occur in debate, and I think such is quite different from specific accusations laid against an hon. member, unless it is the intention of the hon. gentleman making them to ask some other action on the part of the House, which I presume is not intended here. I would deprecate proceeding with that branch of the subject any further.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have read sufficient, I think, to satisfy this House, I am sure I have satisfied those outside of the House, that the hon. gentleman was wrong in making the charge of corruption against the Ontario Legislature in the way he did. I think when an hon. gentleman undertakes to make a charge against a House that is not represented here by any person to defend it, at the least the hon. gentleman's own record when a member of that House should be unspotted. The hon. gentleman has acted I think unfairly in doing as he has done. I will not dwell further upon that question. The hon. member for Lincoln read a number of extracts from papers of the United States to show the views held over there with respect to commercial union. He endeavored to show that the American press was opposed to commercial union. He tried to leave the impression on the House that even supposing the Canadian Parliament and the people of the Dominion should consent to commercial union, the press of the United States were opposed to it. I would meet that argument by saying that we have the reports of meetings of Boards of Trade in the principal cities in the United States that have endorsed the movement in the direction of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. Those boards have declared their belief that it would be advantageous to both, for their country as well as ours, and I think those boards are as well posted with respect to what changes in commercial relations would be advantageous to the United States as well as to Canada as the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has also spoken at considerable length with regard to free trade. He has tried to place the Reform party in the position of advocating free trade, and he has tried to shoulder upon Mr. Blake a charge that he had advocated

free trade, and he misquoted Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern, in much the same way as he misquoted other speeches. I will give to the House Mr. Blake's speech upon this question. When Mr. Blake uttered the words to which the hon. gentleman referred he was speaking with respect to free trade, and he declared it was impracticable to have free trade in a country like ours with our enormously increased burdens. This is what Mr. Blake said:

"You know well that I do not approve of needless restrictions on our liberty of exchanging what we have for what we want, and do not see that any substantial application of the restrictive principle has been, or can be, made in favor of the great interests of the mechanic, the laborer, the farmer, the lumberman, the shipbuilder or the fisherman. But you know, also, that I have fully recognised the fact that we are obliged to raise yearly a great sum, made greater by the obligations imposed on us by this Government, and that we must continue to provide this yearly sum mainly by import duties, laid to a great extent on goods similar to those which can be manufactured here; and which results as a necessary incident of our settled fiscal system that there must be a large and, as I believe, in the view of moderate protectionists, an ample advantage to the home manufacturer. Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade. That is not the true issue. Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, impossible for us, and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, or defective and unjust. I believe it to be, in some important respects, defective and unjust."

It was in this connection that Mr. Blake used the words that the hon. gentleman quoted; but the hon. gentleman did not go the full length:

"And it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any readjustment should be affected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase 'all concerned' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any readjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes, to the lightening of taxes upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich."

Those were the words Mr. Blake used, and they were used in connection with the question of free trade or a revenue tariff. During this debate a great many references have been made to Mr. Blake's report, and to the fact that some statistics show there has been a great decrease in the value of land. I will show before I conclude my remarks that there are very great differences of opinion with respect to that subject; in some sections the people hope the lands may yet regain their former value, while in other sections they say that the value has very materially reduced. You cannot, therefore, rely upon these reports as absolute evidence of the price of the land being kept up. With respect to the arguments the hon. gentleman presented as regards our population, the hon. gentleman went on to criticise the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and to show that his statement with respect to the exodus of population could not be correct. He quoted the reports made at Sarnia by the American officer, in which he admitted that those reports were taken from previous records and were made out for numbers about the same as in previous years. In answer to that we simply ask, where have the inhabitants gone? They are not in Canada—our own statistics show they are not here. If they have not gone by Sarnia, they must have gone out of the country by some other route. Our immigration statistics show that we brought them here, and our provincial statistics show that our population has not made even the natural increase, without taking into account immigrants brought into the country. When the hon. member for Lincoln was dealing with this question, he might have shown the House where those people have gone, which would have been some satisfactory evidence on the point. We say they are not here, and we prove it by the statistics of the different Provinces. Where, then, have they gone if not to the United States? If they have not gone there, they must have gone to some other place. That is the best answer

Mr. McMULLEN.

to an argument of that kind. Then, Sir, he went on to compare the several Provinces with the several States of the Union. He said there had been a reduction of population in some States, but the difference between our reduction of population and theirs is this: Their census shows decidedly in the increased number that they have in the new States that the population has gone from east to west. If our increased population in Manitoba was caused by a very large number of the people who had left the east and gone to the west to settle in Manitoba that would be satisfactory. But they have not done that. While in the United States those who have left the older States have gone to the west and settled in Dakota, Minnesota, Washington Territory and other places, those who have left the east of Canada are not found in the west. They are not found in Canada at all, and that is just the mistake made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they compare the United States to Canada in this respect. Now with regard to this tax sale list exhibited by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I should state that the mode of advertising tax sales in the States and here is very different. It is well known that in several States of the Union that, if immediately a tax is levied and not paid, the farm is advertised for sale, while in our country we hold land for some three or four years before advertising them for sale. In the States they advertise them right away if the taxes are not paid. I have been trying to deal with some of the arguments that have been used by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and I shall now present some reasons why I think it my duty as the representative of an agricultural district to give my support to the resolution brought before the House and moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question of bank deposits and deposits in our savings banks have been referred to almost by every man in this House who has spoken on the question, and it has been declared that deposits in savings banks are decisive evidence of the prosperity of the country. They say there is no better evidence of our prosperity than the increase in the savings banks deposits. Let us, Sir, take that and compare the statement with the general condition of things in England. In the year 1866, 1867 and 1868, when they had one of the greatest financial crises they have had in England during the present century, we find that the bank deposits in England never reached as high a point before as they did during those three years. Now in England at this time they ought to have had good times, and they ought to have had prosperity if we were to judge of the financial condition of the country by the savings bank deposits. They certainly had not good times, and we all know that they had the worst period of depression during the present century. This shows that on the whole the bank deposits are no criterion to judge by in regard to the condition of the country. In dealing with this question we have got fairly to face the fact that we have been doing a considerable trade with the United States for several years. Our trade with that country has been increasing, and notwithstanding the efforts made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to prove that the farmers of this country do not pay the duty I think there is not a farmer, not a sensible man in this country who does not realise the fact that he does pay the duty on what he sends across to the American side. That is the feeling of the farmers of this country. Before I conclude I shall give a few extracts to show that the intelligent portion of the farming community are under that impression. I hold that it is our duty under present circumstances to try and remove that burden off the shoulders of the farmers if we possibly can. When I come to consider that the farmers are the most important class in this country and that they ship one-half of the entire exports of this Dominion, we see that they are undoubtedly the most important class, and they deserve our first and best

consideration. We must remember that the manufacturers only ship about one-twenty-third part of the exports of this Dominion, and it is unfair to say that the interests of the farmers, of the laboring classes, of the lumbermen and of the fishermen should be sacrificed simply because manufacturing institutions have got to be sustained at all hazards although they only export one-twenty-third of the entire shipments of this Dominion. We know that in 1886 we imported from Great Britain \$40,600,000 worth in the year and from the United States \$41,800,000 worth. Then of a total export trade of \$74,975,000, we exported to England \$36,700,000 and to the United States \$31,463,000. Now on our exports to the United States of all the different commodities of products as well as cattle we paid about \$3,500,000 duty. We paid that each year. And I think if we can, by any change of our fiscal policy, remove from the shoulders of our farmers that very heavy drain upon their resources it would be a wise and prudent act on the part of this House. We shipped to the United States last year 10,200,000 bushels of barley, on which we paid \$120,000. Barley is an important factor in this Dominion, and we are coming to that period when if the older Provinces cannot make money on growing barley they cannot certainly make money on growing wheat, when we come to consider the low prices for wheat. The probabilities are that the price of wheat will still go lower when we remember the enormous production of wheat in India and the very cheap rate at which it is now carried to Liverpool. We must therefore look for low prices as far as wheat is concerned. Four years ago it cost 64 shillings to take a ton of wheat from Bombay to Liverpool, to-day it can be carried for 21 shillings and 4 pence or just about as low a price as we can take a ton of wheat from Toronto to Montreal. When we take this fact into consideration together with the very low rate of wages in India and the enormous development in the constructions of railways there we must expect low prices for wheat. The farmers of the older Provinces must give up growing wheat if they cannot grow it lucratively and consequently barley becomes a very important product. If we can increase the annual receipts of the farmers who grow barley by relieving them of the taxes or duties they have to pay to get it into the American market, it will be a decided advantage to them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in treating this subject, said that wherever we had a natural outlet for our surplus produce, and where it was wanted, was undoubtedly our best market. We have a natural outlet in the United States for barley. It is wanted there and it is the best place we can send it to. If we can change our policy so as to enable this people to receive it from us without our farmers having to pay the duty, it would be a step in the interests of the farming community. I know it is said that if you open up the American market for the shipment of our surplus produce including horses, sheep and lambs, the result would be we would flood that market. I intend to prove that it is impossible for us to flood that market in this respect. The United States barley crop amounts to 90,000,000 bushels a year, and we send them 10,000,000 bushels, or one bushel in nine that they raise themselves, so that we cannot possibly flood that country with barley, even suppose we had the advantage of unrestricted reciprocity. Then take the item of horses and we have the same result. In 1866 we sent to the United States 21,000 horses, in 1887 we sent them 18,500 horses, and the duty paid was \$442,000, and our census returns show that we had altogether 570,000 horses in this country at the last census. According to the census of the United States, the number of horses in that country is 10,357,000. Then, if we divide the number we send to the United States into this number, we find that we virtually send them one horse for every 500 they possess, and if we sent them all the horses they import in one year, we would only send them about one in every twenty. So it is utterly impossible for us to flood the

American market even if it was entirely open to us. Again in regard to sheep; in 1886 we sent them 363,000, or 1,000 sheep every day in the year; in 1887 we sent them 363,000, so that the shipment of sheep is about the same each year. According to their census returns, they had themselves 35,192,000 sheep, so that we only sent them one sheep for every 97 they have themselves. The same is the case with cattle. The United States had some 36,000,000 cattle last year, and we sent them in 1886 36,000 and in 1887 45,767. Our trade with the United States in cattle is evidently increasing and if we could get the duty of 20 per cent. removed it would undoubtedly be a decided advantage to the farmers of this country. The farmers of this country must pay attention principally to cattle and sheep and the growing of peas, barley and oats, the only industries they can follow with any hope of profit; and if we can, by a change of policy, such as is proposed open to them unrestricted markets in the United States, we shall add to the gross receipts of the farmers of this Dominion \$3,500,000 a year. Now, when we come to look at the financial condition of this country as compared with that of the United States, I am sorry to say it does not appear in a very favorable light. I am sorry to say that year after year we have been adding enormously to our indebtedness, while the United States have been reducing their debt. I know it was said last year by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the indebtedness of the several States, taken along with the Federal indebtedness, is in excess of our indebtedness in the Dominion of Canada. That I am going to prove is not correct. The State, city and county debt, in the United States according to their own census in 1880, amounted to \$1,055,584,000. Their population being then 50,000,000, their *per capita* debt for State, county and city purposes was \$21 a head. Then, the federal debt in 1887 was \$1,700,771,000, while their population being taken at 65,000,000, would amount to \$28.30 *per capita*. Taking these two amounts together, we find that their total debt, federal, state, city and county, amounts to \$49.30 *per capita*. The net debt of Canada is \$227,000,000; and our provincial, city and county debts do not amount to less than \$200,000,000, making a total of \$427,000,000, or a *per capita* debt of \$85 a head, as compared with \$49.30 in the United States. But this does not include all our debt, because we have railway bonds and other indebtedness to a very large extent. Now, Sir, the London *Economist*, one of the best financial journals in England, made an estimate last June of the entire indebtedness of Canada to England. That estimate was based upon information gathered from all sources. It estimated the entire debt of the Dominion to Great Britain, at \$675,000,000. It took our net debt as \$200,000,000, when in reality, it is \$227,000,000; our provincial, harbor, municipal and railway debts at \$325,000,000; and loans on stocks, mortgages and other securities at \$123,000,000, making \$675,000,000 in all. The interest on that sum at 4 per cent., amounts to the enormous sum of \$27,000,000 a year, on a population of 5,000,000, or \$5.40 a head. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln, when speaking of statements made to the people of this country at the last general election, said the Government had presented true and correct figures on that occasion. He stated that they had presented the financial condition of the country in a manner that had drawn from the people their confidence. Now, I hold that the statements the Government made in that election, whether knowingly or not, were not correct. Every Minister of the Crown started out on his election tour, one to the Maritime Provinces, one to Quebec and one or two to Ontario, everyone making the same statement, that the net indebtedness of this Dominion was \$196,000,000. They also stated that the *per capita* tax was \$1.63, only 3 cents above what it was during the time of the Mackenzie Government. Would any man in this House dare to get up and

say that these statements were true? The evidence that has come to our notice since they were made proves that they were not true. We know that the net debt was really \$227,000,000; we know that the *per capita* interest, based on that amount, was at least \$1.93, if not \$2, instead of \$1.63. Yet it was on such statements that the confidence of the country was secured. The present Government have increased the burdens of the people of this country enormously. I have in my hand a statement, made up from the Auditor General's report, which shows that the present Government have increased the indebtedness of this country since 1880 to the present time, \$106,559,000. In 1880 they added to the debt \$15,000,000; in 1881, \$5,000,000; in 1882, \$85,000,000; in 1883, \$3,000,000; in 1884, \$40,223,000; in 1885, \$22,221,000; in 1886, \$8,461,000; and, in 1887, \$4,154,000. In seven years they have added \$15,000,000 a year. They have added \$1,250,000 every month. They have added to the debt every day the sum rose since they took office, \$41,333 a day since 1880. These figures show plainly the course in which this Dominion is drifting; they show the cause of the hard times; they show profligacy in the management of our affairs, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to bear the responsibility, in this generation and in generations to come, of the enormous increase in our debt, and the constant yearly drain on the people's resources. The *per capita* figures during the time I have referred to is \$21 a head. Take the case of the United States by way of contrast. The United States came out of a civil war with a debt of \$2,500,000,000 and with a loss by death of nearly a million subjects. They have reduced their debt since that time \$1,362,000,000, and they have increased their population from 33,500,000 to 60,000,000. The yearly reduction in their indebtedness is as follows: In 1882, they reduced their debt \$145,000,000; in 1884, \$132,000,000; in 1885, \$63,000,000; in 1886, \$93,000,000; in 1887, \$109,707,000; in all, in six years they reduced their debt \$542,542,707, or at the rate of \$9 per head, while we have added to our indebtedness at the rate of \$20 a head.

Mr. HESSON. In what way did they accomplish their reduction?

Mr. McMULLEN. By economy. By devoting their surplus revenue to the payment of their debts, in the place of squandering it.

Mr. HESSON. By taxing the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have taxed the people more than they.

Mr. McMULLEN. In 1870, the net debt of Canada was \$227,341,000, which, with our population of 5,000,000, makes \$45.46 a head, while the indebtedness of the United States shows but a *per capita* amount of \$19 a head. In dealing with the question of how far unrestricted reciprocity would be an advantage to the farmers of this country, I shall give you a calculation which I made, which, I think, will bear investigation, and I am willing that it should be submitted to every farmer in this Dominion. I claim that unrestricted reciprocity would be, at the very least, an advantage of \$1 an acre to every cleared acre of land in this Dominion. Take, for instance, a farm composed of 100 acres, with 75 acres clear. Let us say that the farmer is able to sell one colt for \$100, the duty on which will be \$20; one yoke of steers at \$40, on which the duty is \$8; 12 lambs, on which the duty is 50 cents each, \$6; 300 bushels of barley at 10 cents duty, \$30; 5 tons of hay on which the duty is \$2, or \$10; 30 bushels of potatoes on which the duty is 15 cents, \$4.50. Now, any farm of 100 acres, with 75 acres cleared, would easily furnish that quantity of produce in a year. There is not a farmer in this Dominion who claims to hold

Mr. McMULLEN.

a farm at all, who would have less produce to dispose of than that. The entire duty would be \$78.50, which does not include the sale of poultry, fresh butter and vegetables. Now, I hold that any farmer who will seriously consider the question will easily come to the conclusion that the calculation I make is really below the mark. I will prove that it is below the mark, by a reply made by a farmer whom I dare say some of you know. I allude to Mr. Patrick McCallum, who owns one of the best farms in Pittsburgh township. It is named Spruce Lawn, and is not far from Kingston. Mr. McCallum, like many of his class, feels the duties on his exports to be burdensome in the extreme, and calculates that the sum of money he pays into the treasury of the United States on his exports amounts to a sum equal to what would be considered a reasonable rent for the part of his farm under cultivation. He was asked:

"How would commercial union benefit the Ontario farmer?—In many ways. The duty they now pay to the United States they would put into their own pockets, and they could get cheaper goods in many cases than they do now."

"What do you export to the United States at present?—I export barley, hay, horses, cattle, sheep and wool."

"What is the extent of your farm?—It is 500 acres, 400 of which are under cultivation."

"Can you give me any figures as to the quantity of produce you export?—Yes, as regards the leading products. Last year I exported to the United States 200 tons of hay, 800 bushels of barley, 6 horses, 80 sheep and lambs, and 1,000 pounds of wool. The duty on hay is \$2 per ton, making the total duty \$400 on my shipment. The duty on barley is 10 cents per bushel, so that the 800 bushels which I exported cost me for duty \$80. On each of the six horses I paid \$20, making \$120. I paid \$1.50 a head on my sheep, they are superior sheep, which amounted to \$120, and 10 cents per pound for my wool, which cost me \$100. That is a total of \$820, or at the rate of \$2 per acre for each acre I cultivate. From these figures, which I have no reason to believe are exceptional, you will see that the loss caused to the farmers by the tariff is \$2 per acre, or a sum equal to an ordinary rent in these times."

These are the statements of a man who is a practical farmer. I want to show also something with regard to the values of land, concerning which we have had quite a discussion, some hon. gentlemen quoting Mr. Blue's report, and others other statistics, to try and show that land has not decreased in value, but I hold in my hand a copy of the report published by the Dominion Grange at their last meeting in Toronto:

"In five counties, viz, Waterloo, Durham, Bruce, Grey, and Peterborough, farm property was said to have depreciated in value, the depression in Durham, according to a delegate from there, amounting to a 'marked decrease.' In Halton, Mr. Fisher, who spoke for that section, said the value of property had not fallen to any appreciable extent. In Haldimand, it was 'difficult to sell,' in Peel, Wellington and Simcoe land values 'were stationary,' in Welland and Oxford values were 'still holding their own, but with a downward tendency,' and 'the mortgage debt was increasing.' The farmers who rent farms and those whose land is mortgaged—and these two classes probably constitute the majority of those engaged in agriculture in this Province—naturally feel the pinch more severely than the comfortable few who have got out of wheat and gone in for raising well-bred cattle and cattle products. Hence the partial failure of the crops this year, added to the fall that has taken place in prices, has broken the backs of many weak men; and loan companies and private mortgagees find themselves compelled to foreclose and throw their property on the market, to the injury of the solvent farmer, whose land is depreciated by the forced sale. In several parts of the Province well-to-do farmers have become disheartened, and are selling out with a view of trying their luck at storekeeping."

That is the report of the Dominion Grange that held their meeting in Toronto a short time ago. I was referring to the amount that each class contributed to the exports of the country in 1887. The forests supplied over one-third in value of our exports, the fisheries one-twelfth, the farmers one-half, and on the other hand the manufacturers only furnished one twenty-third part of our entire exports.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is correct, why does the Ontario Government put up the price of the royalty on the forest?

Mr. McMULLEN. I claim that, notwithstanding the statements which have been made with reference to the prosperous condition of the farmers, if any man will go

through the several sections, especially in Western Ontario, with which I am best acquainted, he will find that the farmers are not in as good a position as they were some years ago. I listened to the statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the farmers were generally content, that generally they were better off and making better financial progress, that they were doing well. Well, I would like that hon. gentleman to go to his own constituency or to any constituency west of Toronto, I would like him to advertise a meeting of farmers, to ask them to meet him, and to ask them to pass a resolution stating that they are making progress financially, that they are better off than they were before, and that their prices are better than they were years ago. I think the hon. gentleman would have some difficulty in getting such a resolution passed. Even in his own constituency, with could all the influence he exercises there, I do not believe he get a resolution of that kind passed. I also maintain that the Minister of Fisheries, notwithstanding his declaration that the farmers are doing well, would have great difficulty in getting any number of the farmers in his Province to agree to any such statement. As I have said before, barley, pease, sheep and cattle are the staple products of the older parts of this Dominion, and if, by a change of policy such as is proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), we can open up for our farmers, who are in financial embarrassment, better markets for their produce, markets free from the exactions to which they are now subject, such a proposition well deserves the attention of the people of this Dominion. The farmers are the backbone of this Dominion. They are the people upon whom the country's finances rest, and if we leave them to continue to contend with the difficulties which they have now to contend with, we may find out too late that we have neglected the means required to relieve them, and through them to assist the country that we live in. Have they asked anything unjust? Have they asked anything different from what the manufacturers asked in 1878? No, they have not. At that time the manufacturers asked for a positive increase in the tariff in order to give them advantages over imported goods. They asked that the farming community and the consumers of this country should be subjected to an increased taxation on certain commodities which they were going to manufacture, in order to enable them to manufacture them. Do the farmers ask now that the manufacturers should be subjected to any amount of taxation in order to benefit their condition? They do not. They simply say, give us free and unrestricted markets, markets where we were sending our stuff, and where it is evident we will still have to send it; remove the restrictions if you can, by any policy you may agree on with the United States, and give us the advantages which that change will bring to us, and that is all we ask; we do not wish you to subject the manufacturers to any special tax in order to benefit our condition, but we simply ask you to relieve us from these restrictions. That is all they ask, and I say it is only fair that we should grant them that request. They have labored under their disadvantageous circumstances for ten years. They have waited long for the fulfilment of the promise of the First Minister that their prospects would be improved by the adoption of the National Policy. I remember hearing the Finance Minister, who is now the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, state that free traders never received better prices than were received under the National Policy. That hon. gentleman, I am sure, is possessed of more wisdom and common sense than not to know that he was simply humbugging the people of this country in making that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call the gentleman to order.

23-1888-5

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to withdraw the statement if it is out of order, but it cannot be too forcibly put to the members of this House and to the people of this country as to the deceit which was practised in holding out the advantages which were held out to the farmers under the operations of the National Policy. They have not received the advantage which was promised them, they have not got the increase in prices which was promised them, they have not got the home market which was promised them; our shipments show that they have not got that home market, and, in place of getting that home market they have been compelled to seek another market for a larger portion of their produce than ever before. In order to illustrate the way in which the farmers of the country have been used, I may tell a story or an anecdote of a Scotchman and an Indian who went out together to shoot. The Scotchman was a longheaded Scotchman, something like the Premier of this Dominion. They made a bargain that, when they came home at night they would divide the game. During the day they shot a duck and a crow. At night the longheaded Scotchman said to the Indian, "Now, Indian, you take the crow and I'll take the duck, or I'll take the duck and you take the crow." "But," says the Indian "you always say crow to me." Yes, every change that has taken place in the tariff, the farmer has got the crow and the manufacturer has got the duck. That has been the case every time, and so it will continue as long as we have our present trade policy. Now, I shall not say anything with regard to combines, except on one point. Very few have any idea of the extent to which these combines exist in this Dominion. I know a man in my section of the country who wanted to go into the undertaking business, and could not get the necessary supplies unless he went into the combine. He was compelled to pay \$30 as a fee to go into that combine, and he could not get the necessary trimmings for his business unless he produced a certificate that he was a member of that combine. Has it not come to a pretty pass in this Dominion, that, after paying all the extra and increased amount that we are compelled to pay for the special benefit of manufacturers, we cannot even commit our deceased friends and relations to their last resting place unless under the auspices of a combine? It is an outrage that things are in the condition in which they are. Now, it is always said that our manufacturers cannot compete with the United States. I maintain that our manufacturers can compete with the United States. There is nothing in the world to prevent them. But the reason that they do not want to compete is that under the operations of the National Policy, they have got a soft thing, and they think to themselves that they would be fools to part with it so long as they can hold on to it, and as long as they can persuade the Government and the people of this country that they cannot compete, so long will they hold on to the advantages which they now enjoy. That is the reason why they are not disposed to compete. Why can they not compete? Cannot raw material in the articles of cotton or sugar be laid down in Canada as cheaply as in any other place? I was amazed at the remarks that fell from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the article of sugar. He challenged the correctness of a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford with regard to our interest in Bahama. He said we owed a certain debt of national honor to England, and he went on to explain that statement, and before he got through with the speech he said, take the article of sugar. It was carried in British bottoms from the place of production to England, it was there transferred to railways and carried on British railways to British factories, it was there manufactured by British labor, and was then re-shipped in British bottoms and brought to our shores; on that article we paid the duty after it had been brought to

the highest condition of manufacture. "Now," said he, "take the condition of things as we find them at present. We bring sugar from the place of production, in our own ships to our own shores, we manufacture the sugar ourselves, our own people get the advantage of all the labor, and all the profit goes into the pocket of our own people." Well, now, I thought that if he was so strongly devoted to the interests of England, if he wished to hold so determinedly to his allegiance to the manufacturers of England, he certainly should not have made that comparison, because it clearly shows the truth of the statement made by the First Minister, when he said that if the National Policy endangered British connection, all the worse for British connection. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite never say a word about the smuggling going on from the United States into Canada, of which there was never more done than at the present moment. At one time, after the close of the war, all the smuggling was out of Canada into the United States, simply because goods were cheaper in Canada than in the United States. Now, I want any hon. member on the other side of the House, who advocates the National Policy, to say why it is that under the operations of that policy the tide has turned, and that to-day goods are dearer in Canada than they are in the United States. There is a very large smuggling going on; I know from personal knowledge that I have obtained from parties who live in Buffalo, that the goods are smuggled into Canada as far up as Brantford, bought there and taken into this country free of duty. Now, this shows that while in our country articles have been increasing in price, they have been lowering on the American side. Now, who is going to be at the expense of preventing all this smuggling? Before things got to this condition the Americans had to pay the cost of a large staff of preventive officers to prevent smuggling; now, our Government will have to pay that cost. The Americans have no fear of goods being bought in Canada and carried across to the States, simply because people can buy them in their own country cheaper than they could here. They have reached that point in their history that they will be relieved to a large extent of that expenditure. Here we have an enormous frontier of several thousand miles across which goods will be continually smuggled so long as the respective prices remain as at present. I say in order to relieve us from that enormous expense it would be much better to have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in the natural products of the soil as well as in manufactured goods. Now, it is said also that we should be loyal to the Empire; we should be loyal to ourselves. Well, Sir, I will venture to say that perhaps there is not an individual within the reach of my voice who has not got a relative in the United States; I would venture to say that from one end of this Dominion to the other, you will meet with but very few who have not got relations over there. Now, is it to be looked upon as a national crime on our part because we send to our own relatives across the border, things that they want, and we take from them things which we require and that they have to part with. And is it looked upon as disloyal that we should trade our own blood relations? You will not find on the face of the earth two nations so near together, so conveniently located for trade in many respects, the same race of people, that are subjected to such absolute restrictions in trade as exist between Canada and the United States—caused, first by the National Policy introduced into the United States after the close of the war, when they put on a very large duty; and secondly, caused by the foolish and unwise course we have adopted in increasing, from year to year, the duty upon goods coming from there, so as to make this absolute wall of separation. Now, hon. gentlemen are very loud with regard to the question of loyalty. You would fancy, to hear them speak, that there was not a loyal man on this side of the House,

Mr. McMULLEN.

you would fancy we were all rebels, that we are all annexationists, that there was not a drop of loyal blood in our veins, and that we are disloyal to the core.

Mr. SPROULE. Correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we had better go back and review the history of this country. The best way to judge of a party is in the same manner that the hon. member for South Oxford stated at one time that he judged of the First Minister of this country; he said he never took much stock in what he said, he always took stock in what he did. I think that is the best way to decide our loyalty. We had better go back and see what they did in the past. We had Parliament buildings in this country burned at one time; I do not think the Grits did it, they were never charged with doing it. We had a Governor General in this country who was stoned and rotten-egged on a certain occasion; I never it heard it was the Grits who were charged with doing that. Then again we had an annexation manifesto signed at one time; I never heard they were all Grits who signed that manifesto. Now, when hon. gentlemen undertake to lecture us about loyalty, they should look back over their own record, and see whether there are any black spots on it before they attempt to charge us with being disloyal. Now, the next question I shall touch upon is the iron duties. Last year we had increased iron duties put on, and we know that England remonstrated with regard to the increase of iron duties. It is said, of course, that no change in the tariff should ever be made that would be likely to offend the mother country or estrange it from us; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to have given that consideration much attention when they increased the iron duties. We find remonstrances in regard to the iron duties made by the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, by the British iron trade, all the iron associations joining in denouncing the increase in the iron duties. They went on to show that this was not a friendly act on the part of Canada towards the mother country and that the imposition of those duties was very likely to strain the friendly relations existing. When these protests were made one of our Canadian journals undertook to prove that these duties were not imposed for the purpose of striking the English iron trade, but for the purpose of striking the American trade, and after that paper had used the argument the Minister of Finance took it up and used it likewise. The statement made was as follows:

"It was implied that the Canadian duties on certain lines of iron goods were only a little over 25 per cent.; whereas a writer in the *Liverpool Post* shows that the duties referred to range from 40 per cent. on pig to 55 per cent. on bar iron. Lastly, the statement made by one of the Ministerial journals and re-echoed by Sir Charles Tupper, to the effect that the iron duties had been imposed out of a sincere desire on our part to strengthen the Empire, struck the English press as peculiarly audacious. It would have been more ingenuous in Sir Charles, they thought, as well as more complimentary to British intelligence, to have confessed at once that our aim was to protect the Londonderry venture regardless of British interests."

It is thus apparent that hon. gentlemen opposite were not so particularly anxious about our relations with England when they imposed the iron duties as they now appear to be in regard to unrestricted reciprocity. They now hold up before the eyes of this House and the country that such a policy is likely to strain the friendly relations between the Dominion and England; but, as I have said, when they imposed the iron duties, this never seems to have entered their minds. In discussing this question further and in connection with commercial union English manufacturers say it matters little to them how we supply ourselves with iron if the duty is placed in such a way that they are virtually shut out of the market—they say it matters not whether we produce the iron ourselves or take it from the American side.

"If it be said that under commercial union we should have to adopt a higher tariff than the existing one, and that British exporters would

therefore be injured more seriously than they are at present, the answer is, that whilst the tendency in the United States is to reduce duties the tendency in Canada is to increase them."

So much for the imposition of the iron duties. When the Minister of the Interior addressed the House upon this resolution he said that a number of people who had gone to Dakota were returning. In my section of the country I can assure the hon. gentleman that there has been quite an exodus to the Western States, but I do not know a single instance of a man who has returned. I would indeed be glad if they did return. I was rather amused that the hon. gentleman, in comparing the prices received for farm produce in this country and the United States, went all the way to Milwaukee for prices to compare with Toronto prices. Another peculiar point in the discussion is that hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready, as stated by the Minister of the Interior, to give the largest measure of reciprocity, consistent with the National Policy. Only keep the National Policy in tact, only protect the manufacturers, and if you can by any side wind, or in any other way, give a little advantage to either the laboring classes or the farming community all right, but do not disturb the National Policy. I notice also that the operatives are threatened with being thrown out of works; hon. gentlemen opposite say they will not have the labor, that this resolution strikes at them as well as at the manufacturers. Manufacturers coming from the United States into Canada can come across the border without paying any duty. There is no protection on labor coming in or going out. How, therefore, is unrestricted reciprocity to strike the laboring classes? I noticed, the other day, that a certain railway company ran out of engineers, and the company sent to Montreal and from the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway obtained almost all the men they required. The men had no duty to pay on going to the United States, as Americans have no duty to pay on coming here. Consequently, there is no protection for the laboring man, while there is a protection for the manufacturer. If a manufacturer comes to this country he has to pay duty on the machinery and raw material he uses, and in that way he has protection. I was rather amused by the Minister of the Interior saying we did not want reciprocity or commercial union. It is singular that he should express that view when the Government in their tariff policy of 1878 stated they would be only too glad to accept reciprocity if the Americans would give it to us, but now they are not willing to accept it. The hon. gentleman also made reference to Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern. That speech appears to be a source of comfort to hon. gentlemen opposite; but if hon. gentlemen will turn up the proceedings of the House they will find that on the very first occasion last year Mr. Blake took the opportunity of showing that he did not intend and did not accept the National Policy as a necessity. Mr. Blake has always held to the principle of a revenue tariff, so adapted that it would give the manufacturers incidental protection by allowing them to import their raw materials free. He has not, on any occasion, departed from that view, and when he spoke at Malvern he merely wished to convey the idea that there was no question as between free trade and protection but as between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff, because those were the great questions then before the country. The Minister of the Interior declared that up to this time we had been without a policy. We will not be a party without a policy any longer. We have a policy, which we will try to make the people understand and which will be fully explained to them. Some hon. gentlemen seem to be terribly confused with regard to this reciprocity question and do not realise what it is, although we have endeavored to grind it into their understandings in very plain and pointed speeches. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cart-

wright) in a very able speech very plainly and pointedly declared what in his opinion would be the effect of unrestricted reciprocity, and if hon. gentlemen are in ignorance of the true meaning of that principle, it is because they have not listened to the statements made. In 1879 the Minister of the Interior said that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had offered reciprocity and had done their best to secure it. No doubt that Government did try to secure reciprocity, and hon. gentlemen opposite have declared by the National Policy that they were prepared to accept reciprocity when the United States were prepared to give it. I believe that clause in the protective tariff was inserted for the purpose of misleading the farmers. They went to the farmers and said: We are willing to have reciprocity with the United States just as soon as they are willing to give it to us, and I have no doubt that when another general election takes place in this Dominion you will find the amendment proposed to the resolution now before the House by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, hawked around every constituency and the supporters of the present Government will say: Do you doubt that it is not our intention to give you better trade relations with the United States? Look here, there is a resolution moved by us in the House of Commons and your friends opposed it and voted against it. We are earnestly anxious to do everything that we can for you and we are going to give you reciprocity just as quickly as we can get it. That will be in accordance with the promise made in 1878, when the party opposite was going to give the farmers home markets, and better markets, and better prices, for all products than ever they got in previous years. Another statement the Minister of the Interior made was when he told us that the farmers of this country did not send 10 per cent. of their stuff to the United States. If he looked up the returns he would have seen that the farming products exported to the United States last year amounted to \$15,000,000. Well now if 10 per cent. is taken that will be \$150,000,000 of products. I can hardly think that he intended to make such a statement, but it is evidently a statement made without due consideration. He also spoke in regard to the increase of population and wealth in the city of Toronto. Allow me to tell the hon. the Minister that Toronto has increased at the cost of the outside towns. I know that in my own town that there have been I am sure quite 150 of our population who have left and gone to Toronto. The reason for that is that manufacturers are being centralised largely there. I also know the town from which the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) comes, and I think he will not dare to deny the statement that a large manufacturing institution in that town has established a branch institution in the city of Toronto, and they were just about to move their entire plant there when the town legislature decided to give them a large bonus to keep the manufactory or part of it in that town. In my own town we have lost very seriously under the operation of the National Policy, and how? Why, Sir, those blacksmiths and carriage makers who in a quiet and small way produced what the people wanted, have been compelled, owing to the extensive manufacturing institutions that have been put up, to quit the business altogether. We have to-day in our town two foundries and a carriage shop standing idle and not a single hammer going in either of them—monuments to the destruction the National Policy has worked in those trades. This is simply because under the operation of the National Policy the tendency is to centralise and get up large factories while those small places have been ruined. I believe this is the case with many places as well as the town I come from. While we rejoice at the progress which has been made in the city of Toronto, we claim after all that it is largely caused by the influx from the country towns and villages around of manufacturers, laborers and others, and that it is not a growth that has been caused by

the influx of population from other parts of the world. I come now, Sir, to say a word or two with regard to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I am sorry he is not in his place. He ought to be because Ministers are paid annually their salaries to attend to the duties of the House, and they are paid a sessional allowance to be here and discuss public questions. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries in the introductory part of his speech found fault with some expression used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He tried to show that that gentleman was in the habit of using certain words very frequently and he said that one word "it is clear, it is clear, it is clear" was used several times in his speech. I remember on a former occasion the hon. the Minister of Fisheries undertook to reply to the hon. the then leader of the Opposition and he commenced a criticism at the same time. He said he had read over his speech on that occasion once, and read it over a second and a third time, and all he could find in it was a repetition of the word "maybe, maybe, maybe." The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) on that occasion undertook to deal with the hon. the Minister of Fisheries and he compared him to a bird of prey flying over the landscape which he failed to behold and flying over the beauties of the river, which he failed to behold and missing the grandeur of the landscape his only object was to light on some dead horse in the fence corner and stick his bill in the carcase up to his eyes. We find the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries still a bird of prey. He has started on the same course again and it appears that his classic ear is wearied of the use made of the Queen's English in this House. He has no doubt been hobnobbing at Washington, and I suppose he takes it upon himself to criticise all that is said and done within this Chamber. The hon. gentleman had better perhaps not be too severe in that regard for although he holds a portfolio in the Government just now the days were when he used to deliver lectures on temperance at \$10 apiece. I am told he has stabled his temperance horse for the present, but he might be yet called upon to take it out and saddle it and do the same duty with it again. It is for him to say. I notice he has pretty well avoided his temperance sentiments, but he does not care just now. It does not serve any good end and as long as he is permitted to occupy a seat in the Cabinet with \$7,000 a year he puts his temperance sentiment to one side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I request you to confine yourself more closely to the question under debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. He stated in his address that the only market or outlet we could get for our surplus product was where it was wanted. I would like to know if the United States is not our natural market for what we send there, and if our only market is to be found in England? The reason why we send them there is because we get better prices for them there than we can get in other places. He spoke also with regard to the population in his own section who have left there. He said the reason they went to the United States was because they wanted freer and better and broader lands. Now, Sir, that is rather a peculiar admission for a Minister of the Crown to make. I thought we had as broad and free lands here as could be got in any part of the world. I thought we had a great deal to boast of with regard to the extent of our fertile territory in the North-West, and that the inhabitants of New Brunswick should go to the Western States to get broader and freer lands I cannot understand. He referred also to the quantity of coal that is carried over the Intercolonial Railway, as an evidence of the growth of international trade. I do not think that this is much evidence. The fact of the matter is, when we take the

Mr. McMULLEN.

history of the Intercolonial Railway and notice that it is run at a very serious loss of income and consider the fact that last year the Minister of Railways and Canals acknowledged that coal was carried at a loss, I do not think it is a very great advantage to this entire Dominion that we are working up at an annual loss an international trade in the matter of coal. He also stated that if we got an international trade, it would tend to increase the "combines" rather than reduce them. He pointed out that "combines" existed in the United States. They may possibly exist, but an argument that extending our commerce and obtaining trade with an extensive country, composed of 60,000,000, would tend to increase the number of "combines" is a rather peculiar argument. According to that argument, if the whole world had adopted free trade, then there would be huge combines, because the more extensive you make the trade relations of a country the greater inducement there is to "combines." The hon. Minister of Marine also stated that Sir Charles Tupper, when he was in Washington made a demand for closer trade relations with the United States, but that demand was declined. It is very singular that he made a demand for what a number of hon. gentlemen opposite hold we do not want. One reason why we contend that it would be a decided advantage to the Maritime Provinces, as well as to Ontario and Quebec, to have unrestricted trade with the United States, is that the large population in the border cities would afford excellent markets for the products our people have to sell. When we consider that we have within twenty-four hours' run, New York, with 1,206,000, Brooklyn, with 555,000, Buffalo, with 155,000, and Rochester, with 100,000, it must be clear that with closer trade relations these cities would be large consumers of our surplus produce. In this connection I will read a letter which was written by a gentleman whose name I am sure is respected by every man in this House—a letter addressed by John Bright to Joseph Aspinall, of Detroit, in answer to an invitation to be present at a convention in favor of reciprocity between the United States and Canada. It is as follows:

"The project of your convention gives me great pleasure. I hope it will lead to a renewal of commercial intercourse with the British North American Provinces, for it will be a miserable thing if because they are in connection with the British Crown and you acknowledge as your chief magistrate your President at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free as if you were one people living under one government."

That is the view held by Mr. Bright of what should be the prevailing sentiment in regard to reciprocity of trade. Now, Sir, I have some quotations here from the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine. He says, speaking of the farmers:

"But I have full faith in the intelligence of the farming community, that, if this question comes to be a serious question, to be fought out before them, and both sides of it are fully ventilated, the farmers of this country will hold themselves aloof from the bait held out to them, and will keep themselves to the connections they have to-day, well assured that by so doing their future will not be prejudiced, but, on the contrary, will be prosperous."

Well, Sir, I would like to hear the hon. gentleman address a large gathering of farmers and present these views to them; I think he would find they would not be prepared to endorse them. I believe he would realise that the time is past when farmers can be misled by statements of that kind, and that they are not willing to listen to promises of good prices and better times as they were in 1878. The hon. gentleman said again:

"A large proportion of the clothing he and his family wear is also paid for out of the products of his farm, and no taxes paid."

I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman comes to that conclusion. Again, in dealing with the farmer, he says:

"Oh, but my hon. friend says, there is the tariff on coarse woollens, and consequently the man who wears these woollens pays a heavy tax on every yard he uses. Does he? The farmer has sheep on his own farm, which he often shears himself, and whose wool he has often made

up in the mill of his own locality, and his family wear the clothes thus manufactured. Where is the tax that is paid on these?"

At the present time there is not a single woollen manufacturing establishment in this Dominion that will take wool from a farmer, and manufacture it into cloth. The manufacturers will take his wool at the market price, and will sell their manufactured goods to him at the market price, with all the advantages of the tariff under which they manufacture, but there is not a single one of them who will take his wool and make it into cloth for him. They know too much, because under the operations of the National Policy they know that they have the advantage of the farmer, and they take all the advantage they can get. Again the hon. Minister says:

"If we consider advisable to discriminate against Great Britain, we have the right to do so. We have our own interests and they are paramount, and that assertion was made still stronger to-day by the hon. member for Queen's, and it was echoed by my hon. friend from South Oxford. The hon. member for South Oxford says: If it does discriminate against Great Britain, we have a right to do it, our own interests are paramount."

That part of the statement I referred to a short time ago, showing that under the imposition of the duties on sugar the hon. gentleman was not consistent in holding those views. I shall now say something with regard to the value of lands. Mr. Blue's book is quoted as an authority on this subject. Mr. Blue does not go back and give full quotations, but he gives quotations for only some years. I notice that in 1882 the value of farm lands was \$632,000,000, in 1883 \$664,000,000, in 1884 \$625,000,000, in 1885 \$626,000,000, and in 1886 \$648,000,000, a considerable decrease on what it was in 1883; so that when hon. gentlemen attempt to say that farming lands are still getting more valuable they are mistaken, even basing their arguments on the evidence produced by Mr. Blue.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Blue reports farm lands throughout Canada as lower to-day than they were last year?

Mr. McMULLIN. Mr. Blue may be correct with regard to some sections, but I say he is not with regard to all sections. Then, Sir, we had the production of wheat. The hon. member for Lincoln gave us some idea of the amount of production of wheat in 1882. The following are the figures of our wheat for several years past:

| | Fall Wheat. | Spring Wheat. | Barley. |
|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| 1882 | 31,277,048 | 9,665,995 | 24,284,407 |
| 1883 | 11,656,957 | 9,726,063 | 18,414,337 |
| 1884 | 20,717,631 | 14,609,661 | 19,119,041 |
| 1885 | 21,478,281 | 9,129,881 | 16,533,587 |
| 1886 | 18,071,142 | 9,518,553 | 19,512,278 |

In 1885 the average yield of fall wheat was 20.4 bushels per acre, and the largest yield was in Hastings, where the average was 26.2. In 1885 the average all over the Province was 24.5 bushels. Of spring wheat the average yield in 1886 was 16.5 bushels. In 1885 it was but 11.4 bushels. The average yield of barley in 1886 was 26.5 bushels. In 1885 it was 27.7 bushels. The average yield of oats was 36.2 bushels in 1886 and 35.8 bushels in 1885. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said what the prices were. Let us see what the prices were for the last seven years. The prices, taking an average of what was paid in all the principal Ontario markets, were:—

| | Fall wheat, per bu. | Spring wheat, per bu. | Barley, per bu. | Oats, per bu. | Peas, per bu. |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1882..... | \$1 01 | \$1 05 | \$0 65 | \$0 43 | \$0 74 |
| 1883..... | 1 05 | 1 07 | 0 57 | 0 38 | 0 71 |
| 1884..... | 0 80.5 | 0 81.4 | 0 53.6 | 0 33.1 | 0 64.4 |
| 1885..... | 0 81.5 | 0 80.6 | 0 55.2 | 0 31.5 | 0 58 |
| 1886..... | 0 73.6 | 0 72.5 | 0 51.3 | 0 32 0 | 0 52.6 |

This table proves that,—in place of the farmers getting increased prices, the prices have been running down every year; yet still the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares the farmers are getting good prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. Give us the prices for 1876 and 1877.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, with regard to the price of farm lands, I can speak only for my own section, and I can say I have had considerable experience both in selling and buying lands, both for myself and for other people. I know personally that four miles from the town where I am, a man in 1880 was offered \$7,500 for his farm. He refused, and rented the farm for five years. Before the five years were up, he died, and the farm was sold, under his will, for \$1,900. I also know the case of a man who went to Dakota and borrowed money on his farm for which he was offered \$3,200. He refused the offer and left his property in the hands of his land agent and of another man who was to take some interest in its disposal, to be sold. It was advertised three months for sale, but not an offer was made for it. It had then to be sold by auction, and was bought in for \$3,800, or \$400 less than the owner was offered for it when he went away. These are cases that came within my own knowledge, and I care not for what Mr. Blue or any other man may say, when I have personal knowledge that furnishes undoubted evidence that land in our section is not holding its own. I could make similar statements with regard to North Perth, where I know some of the lands are not holding their own. I have been making valuations, and I know that in my own section of country to-day, there are no less than six farms put up at public auction under mortgages, and in not one single instance has a buyer been found. I know of an instance where a farm was brought for \$3,700 in 1879. The owner mortgaged it, and he was offering it within the last month for \$2,300 without being able to obtain a buyer. To say therefore in the face of these facts that farm lands are holding their own is an absurdity, as regards my section at any rate.

Mr. HESSON. I will give you evidence about North Perth.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have had some discussion with regard to the article of butter. An hon. gentleman the other afternoon contended that England was our market for our butter, and that we could always get good prices there; and that even if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we could not sell our butter there. I have a letter from a practical gentleman addressed to the *Mail*. In this letter, Ambrose Zettel, a Bruce County farmer and secretary of the Formosa Butter and Cheese company, gives some excellent reasons for his belief in commercial union:

"At the end of last season our company had 20,000 pounds of very fine butter on hand for sale. The English market, however, was so overcrowded that the buyers would not give a satisfactory price and the company were forced to look to the United States. My brothers, who own a creamery in Minnesota, informed me that our butter would bring from 25 to 26 cents a pound any day in St. Paul, and the same class of butter was quoted in the Buffalo wholesale market at from 28 to 30 cents. The duty, however, was in the way and the company were forced to keep their stock in the hope of getting a market elsewhere. We kept it until the holidays, when the patrons of the factory, becoming anxious to receive their money, insisted on a sale at whatever price could be obtained. The price obtained was 20½ cents and the butter was shipped to British Columbia. The patrons thus lost about \$1,200 on their stock by being kept out of the Buffalo market. Other factories lost even more in the same way, as they were obliged to sell at even lower prices. Mr. Zettel states also that even in the face of the duty, large numbers of fine stall fed cattle are shipped to the United States. If the buyer had no duty to pay they would not only buy more cattle, but would pay our farmers just so much more for them, for we have better facilities for raising and breeding cattle and are nearer the Eastern markets than the Western farmer. I advise Canadian farmers to study this question carefully, aside from party politics, and I feel convinced that if they do so they will be almost to a man in favor of commercial union."

That is the view which that man holds in regard to butter and in regard to stock. I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) state that commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was putting in the thin edge of the wedge of annexation. I do not see how he can reconcile that with the position that hon. gentlemen

opposite take in regard to extended relations with the United States. During the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866, I do not think that our people were more inclined to join the Americans than they are at the present moment. I believe that, instead of our people becoming Americans, they will continue to be Canadians, but I believe that, unless you carry out unrestricted reciprocity or give our people some advantage in the way of extended markets, you will compel them to become Americans by going over there to live; but if you give them an opportunity of parting with their stuff in a lucrative way, the probability is that they will remain in Canada and will continue to be Canadians. The hon. gentleman also stated that he was afraid he would lose his nationality by the adoption of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, that, after that had been in force for a year or two, we would not be able to say whether we were Americans or Canadians. That reminds me of a story. An Irishman, whose sister got married, met a friend of his about a year afterwards, and said: "Dan, did you hear the news?" "No," said Dan, "what is it?" "Why," said he, "my sister has presented her husband with her first born, and the peculiarity is that I don't know whether I am an uncle or an aunt." So, the hon. gentleman said, that he would not know at the end of a year whether he would be an American or a Canadian, and therefore he was so much afraid to encourage reciprocity. Another thing which is said is that the result of this will be to wipe out all our industries. I do not think it is right to impress upon the people of the country that there is any such intention on this side of the House. We are willing, and we always have been willing, that our industries should have all the advantages that justice to all the other sections of the country will allow them. We do not believe in burdening the people who are now in financial embarrassments, in order to keep up the manufacturers. We are willing that our manufacturers should continue to prosper, and should have all the advantages which we can extend to them, but, if they think the rest of the population of the country are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for their advantage alone, they should be made to understand that the people of this country will not bear with anything of this kind. They should be willing to get from this House justice, and no more. They have been getting more than justice for ten years. They have had all the advantages, and the other portions of the people have been having all the injustices, and it is time that these manufacturers should be asked to stand alone without drawing on the resources of the consumers to an unjust extent, as they have been doing. There has been no case in the history of any country where those restrictionists have been willing to give way when once they have obtained an advantage. Look at the United States and see how manufacturers there are fighting against the reduction of the tariff, because they have had for many years the advantage of a high tariff, and consequently have been making millions, and the history of every country shows that, when once a high tariff gets a foothold, the manufacturers will fight for the continuation of the advantages they have, and that will be the case with the manufacturers of Canada. Hon. gentlemen have declared that we will lose \$7,000,000 if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity. They cannot think it possible for us to conduct the affairs of this country under those circumstances, without direct taxation. In their hands, it may be impossible to do so, but I believe that, in the hands of gentlemen on this side of the House, it would be possible. I believe we could make such reductions in expenditure that the government of this country could be conducted without direct taxation. I believe that hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared to pledge their word to the people of this country that they will so handle the affairs of the country that direct taxation will not be neces-

Mr. McMULLEN.

sary, even with unrestricted reciprocity. I could quote some articles on which I think they could save at least five millions and a-half. For instance, there are legal expenses on which \$61,000 was spent last year. There is outside printing, which could be easily done under the contract with the Government here, for which we paid last year \$97,500. At least we could make a reduction in that amount. Then there is outside advertising, which amounted to \$68,000. Reduce that by \$50,000 and you still leave \$18,000. Then there were payments to extra clerks or to clerks hired in the several departments for extra work, amounting to \$120,000. I think that the clerks should be made to understand that all the duties they perform should be done within hours, and that no extras would be allowed for work after hours. If they understood that would be the rule, I believe they would do all the work without extra allowance. Last year we paid \$3,542,406 for reduction of debt, though the estimate was \$2,097,958. I do not know whether the extravagant commissions which were paid were the result of the absence of the High Commissioner from London, but, when he was appointed, we were told that he would save us an enormous amount of money by living in London in connection with these commissions. On that item, \$1,444,000 should have been saved. On Civil Government, I think, \$150,000 could be saved, and on Civil Government contingencies there could be a reduction of \$100,000. I think we could save \$100,000 by economy in our penitentiaries. If you compare the cost of our penitentiaries with that of the Central Prison in Toronto, you will find that the latter is managed for \$55,000 a year, while one of our penitentiaries, which accommodated about the same number of prisoners, costs, \$106,000. We have not a penitentiary in the Dominion which is conducted on the same economical basis as the Central Prison in Toronto. That expense could be easily reduced by \$100,000. Then, we could very well do without the superannuation system, and I was glad to see that a Committee which was introduced to one of the Ministers recently petitioned the Government, amongst other things, to do away with superannuations. If you abolish that, we will save \$150,000. Then, again, if you will do away with pensions, this change will save \$160,000. Then in regard to public works, we spent last year something like \$2,500,000 in that branch. We might cut that sum down by \$1,000,000, and we might make less expensive post offices, such as we have built down in St. Jérôme, in the constituency of the Secretary of State. There are some 300 or 400 people in that village, and we pay the round sum of about \$16,000 for a post office—I forget exactly what the postmaster gets. We appropriated last year \$10,000 for that post office, and I notice in the Estimates this year \$6,000 more are asked to build a post office down in a little village where there is no necessity whatever for it, but simply because the Secretary of State wanted it in his constituency to strengthen his cause with the people. It will be a benefit to him when the elections come round; I suppose it was a benefit last election. Go into western Canada, and there is only one town in the county of Wellington that has a post office, that is in Guelph. I live in a town of 2,500 inhabitants, where the returns are something like \$1,400 a year, but there is no post office. The returns at St. Jérôme are not one-half that sum, I think the entire receipts of the office are something less than \$800, I do not know that it reaches that sum. You could make a reduction of \$250,000 in the matter of immigration. Then again you could reduce our legislation expenses by \$100,000. We could easily reduce our railway expenses by \$150,000 by dismissing all the unnecessary officials and running railways on economical principles. Then again you should apply to the purpose what is voted towards the sustenance of the savages of the North-West, in place of giving it to a whole lot of officials. I think there is about a million altogether spent in connection with feed-

ing the Indians, and I think about one-half of the money goes into the pockets of officials. Now, if you were to establish a system whereby the public money would be economically expended I think we might save in connection with the Indians \$400,000 a year. Then again on Miscellaneous, we might save \$140,000 in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. We add to the capital of that line about \$1,000,000 a year, and I think we could well do without it. During the time of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, they closed the capital account, and made up their minds that they could make the road pay its own expenses, and I think they did, or nearly so. It is time it should be done, but this Government have opened a capital account, and year by year they have added to it. Well, Sir, all these expenses I have read over to you amount to \$5,644,000. Now, I wonder if any economical Government cannot go to work and reduce the expenses of this country by at least six millions, if they are disposed to do it. But hon. gentlemen opposite never will do it, because they are not in the direction of reducing the expense, their direction is rather to increase it. Now, these hon. gentlemen talk to us loudly about their loyalty. We come across things at times that show their loyalty is from the lip out. They deprecate, strongly and pointedly, investments outside of our own Dominion. Why, I can remember last year when some members of the Ontario Government were supposed to own lands in Dakota, what hue and cry there was, a perfect yell, that Ministers of the Crown of the Province of Ontario should be owners of land in Dakota, and they were taken very pointedly to task in the Conservative press because they were supposed to have invested some money out there. Well, now, Sir, we come across an investment that was made by some hon. gentlemen opposite some time ago, away down in the State of Texas. We find there, Sir, a gentleman—I do not know who he is—but I find that his name is William Bullock Ives. I do not know where he lives, but I notice that he has led a whole lot of them into the bullock business down in that wonderful bullock producing state of Texas. I do not know whether he has made it a profitable investment or not, but I know that he has been the principal instrument. I find that there are a great many prominent men who have invested in this bullock business. There is the Hon. Senator Cochrane, who is a large stockholder. The Hon. Hugh Ryan is a large stockholder to the extent \$133,000. Then R. R. Pope—who he is, whether he is a relative of the Minister of Railways or not, I do not know, but he is a stockholder to the extent of \$20,000. I find, that this individual, William Bullock Ives, is a stock holder in two companies, in one for \$14,500, and jointly with Mr. Pope for \$33,000. I find, Sir, in the list—who do you think? The Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Finance Minister of this Dominion, who is a stockholder to the extent of \$21,000. They are all stockholders in this wonderful company away down in the State of Texas, in which they have invested quite a lot of money. I notice, amongst other names, that of Alexander Ferguson, \$5,000; and I notice that they have got one Grit, in the city of Montreal, I do not know how they got hold of him—he is a stockholder to the extent of \$80,000. Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he was a stranger to them, politically, and they took him in. I do not know if he has made any money by going in with them; from all I can learn he has lost about all he has put in. It is rather amusing to think that our Finance Minister who, by the way, was home at the Indian and Colonial exhibition in London all last year, and who, no doubt, was telling the people that he interviewed of the enormous resources of our North-West, the enormous amount of land, the grand ranching country we had there, without its equal on the con-

tinent of America, the grandest place for producing stock that possibly could be found—and while he was telling them all that, he was going secretly away down into the State of Texas and investing \$21,000 himself. That plainly shows that he has no confidence in the country. If he had confidence in the ranching capacity of the North-West he would not have gone away down in Texas to invest his money. Now Sir, there is one peculiar thing. Of course these men are very lofty; if a lot of Grits were to invest their money in that way, there would be a terrible yell about it, and every Conservative paper in this country would publish that the Grits were untrue to their country, that they were not faithful to its interests, that they were taking their money to invest it in the United States instead of using it to develop the resources of their own country. Now, Sir, the First Minister of this Dominion has had a very peculiar career. He has held, or attempted to hold, the reins of power in this country for a great many years. Well, he has held them in a very peculiar way. His policy has been to distribute the loaves and fishes to his followers. His appeals have been to the needs and the greed of the people with regard to railway subsidies, public buildings, and advantages of one kind and another. And, Sir, he has had a following in this country, yes, quite a large one, I admit, a following that has followed him, not because of his statesmanship, not because of his ability, not because of his patriotism, but they have followed him from day to day, and year to year, and Parliament to Parliament, because they do eat of the loaves and fishes and are filled at the country's expense. They get advantages, offices, and positions of one kind and another, until our country to-day is filled with officials of this Government from one end to the other sucking the life blood out of the people of this Dominion. I say it is time we had an end of this thing, and I believe the day is not far distant when the people of this country will wake up and will declare that they will not put up any longer with the extravagant condition of things that exists in this country; and when they will call to account, very pointedly, the men who are at the head of the Government for the manner in which they have handled its public affairs. The First Minister has quite a record. He has erected a monument to his memory; his friends will not require to erect a monument to him as they did to Sir George Cartier. The right hon. gentleman has erected a monument of \$150,000, 000 of national debt, under which the people will grind for years after we have ceased to take part in public discussions, a monument which generation after generation will feel the results of, and future generations will feel the extravagance that characterised the acts of the Government over which he presided, and in consequence of the manner in which public affairs were administered by his Government the people will be called upon the bear burdens and meet the consequences.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:45 a.m., (Tuesday).

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, March 27, 1888.

No. 24.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 27th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved the adoption of the first, second and third reports of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. BERGIN. It is simply the account for printing. The account for printing is the first one, the second one is the report of the said committee auditing the account, and the third, the report and the documents ordered to be printed last meeting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a question of a quorum.

Mr. BERGIN. Yes, a question of a quorum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the quorum?

Mr. BERGIN. Nine.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 71) to grant certain powers to the St. John's, and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories. He said: I make this motion now for the purpose of having the Bill stand for a second reading at as early a day as convenient after the recess. The Bill is on the lines of the measure introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he was Minister of the Interior. It provides that the North-West Council shall have the character of a legislative assembly, having not less than 21 nor more than 25 members. A schedule of the constituencies is now under consideration, and is not yet attached to the Bill. It is proposed that the nominated members of the council shall cease; but as there are at present no legal men in the council, nor is there much chance of there being many legal men in the first assembly, it is proposed that the Government may have power to appoint certain legal experts, not exceeding three, who shall sit and assist in the drafting of Bills, and have the power of discussion but not the power of voting, something like the representative delegates from the territories in the United States Congress. That provision is intended to apply to the present term of the legislative assembly; it is hoped that in the second term some legal gentlemen may find their way into the assembly and enable us to do away with that provision. It is proposed to extend the term of the existence of the legislature from two or three years. The qualification will remain the same, household suffrage with the addition of an income suffrage. The Lieutenant Governor shall no longer sit with the council or assembly, but shall, as in the Provinces, be a separate estate, and the assembly will be presided over as this assembly is, by a Speaker. There is an extension of the powers of the assembly which I need not trouble the House with now, but the subject will be fully entered into when the Bill is under discussion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about executive councillors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not propose to have executive councillors. There is a proposition of that kind in one of the petitions of the North-West Council which is before the House, but after consideration those gentlemen are opposed to it themselves. They say that it is really a retrogressive step, rather than one in advance. These are the principal features of the measure.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not aware that the resolutions of the North-West Council with respect to this matter have been placed before the House. If they have not been, I suppose the hon. gentleman will place them before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am sure the House will be glad if the hon. gentleman would afford us some further information on this important Bill. The people in that

country have made considerable progress in number and in the development of the country, and a government a little more approaching that of a Province than that which at present exists there is no doubt required; but in all our Provinces we have parliamentary responsible government, and I do not understand from the hon. gentleman's observations how he proposes that the executive government shall be carried on. The proposition he has made relates purely to matters of legislation. Does he propose that the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories shall have the power of vetoing the measures of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories? Does he propose that when the Legislature meets and passes a law which it believes to be for the good of the Territories, within the limits assigned to it, the Governor in Council here shall have the power, by instruction, to disallow it? Does he propose that the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories shall have an executive council to advise him with regard to the administration of the affairs of the Territories? For you will observe that the powers possessed by the Governor in Council there now are not purely legislative powers, but administrative and executive powers as well. How are those administrative and executive powers to be exercised? Are they to be exercised by the Executive of the Territories, acting under the advice and approval of the majority of those whom the people have elected to represent them? Does the hon. gentleman propose they shall act on the advice which they may, from time to time, receive from the Government here? Now, I say that these are matters of the very first importance, and that before we are asked to take any step in advance in the legislative and governmental development of that country, we should note precisely what we are called upon to do; for it does seem me to be rather extraordinary to admit that the people of the territory are so far advanced, by way of organization, into a political and social community, as to make it necessary that they should have what may be considered a mature system devised for the purposes of legislation, and yet that that the legislative and administrative affairs of the country should be in the hands of an irresponsible body. Certainly the power of legislation and administration should go hand in hand. If the community are entitled, and I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman is doing right in recognising that they are entitled to complete legislative control over those matters which are exclusively assigned to them, they should have equally independent control over the executive and administrative affairs of the territory, within the same limits. They should be made commensurate with the legislative authority; they should be governmental to the same extent, and it would be a wholly anomalous condition of things for the executive and administrative affairs to be directed, not in consonance with the views of the majority of those whom the people have returned to the Legislature, but should be controlled by instructions given, from time to time, to the Lieutenant Governor from Ottawa. That would be simply Downing Street over again. It would be simply introducing into the North-West Territories precisely that condition of things which existed in Upper and Lower Canada before responsible Government was established. They had legislative bodies that could represent the people, but they had an executive Government that represented Downing Street, and it would be rather a retrograde step to introduce any analogous system of government into the North-West Territories. I am sure the House will be anxious to know precisely what the hon. gentleman proposes to do in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is perhaps not the time to discuss *in extenso* the various questions which the hon. gentleman has raised. In the first place, I must tell the hon. gentleman that in the North-West they have a

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

most holy horror of responsible government. The representations are, I may say, without any exception, against the premature introduction of responsible government. If the hon. gentlemen were in the position of the Minister of Interior, he would find that the one cry is: do not at all at present give us a government of that kind. I take it the assembly, although sitting separate from the Government, will have the same administrative as well as legislative powers which they had when under the name of a council. The relations between the Lieutenant Governor there and the Government here will continue to be the same as they were before this Bill was introduced—

Mr. MILLS. They cannot be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—or the same as between the Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces and the Governor General. All these are important matters, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to these points. They will be discussed more conveniently after the Bill is in the hands of the hon. members.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can understand that a certain class of the people in the North-West should have a holy horror of responsible government, but, in my opinion, the experience of the past few years shows the people there should have a holy horror of bureaucratic government. I am glad this question has come up for discussion. It is a very important one, not only for the people of the North-West, but for the people of the whole of Canada, who are interested in seeing that administration of public affairs in the North-West should be a little different in the future from what it has been in the past.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Now the Governor votes with the council, and if he happens to be in the minority he is outvoted and has to submit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman proposes, by this Bill, to separate the Governor from the legislative body. What is his position? Has he any voice at all in the legislative assembly?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that he has much. I take it that the veto by the Lieutenant-Governor is like the veto by the Queen. It is, in fact, gone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Queen is advised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The utmost we could do, and I think it ought to be reserved to him, is to reserve that power.

Mr. LAURIER. Has he to sanction the Acts passed by the Legislature?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a veto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Her Majesty sanctions all the Bills, but she never has in Her long life exercised the right to veto.

Mr. LAURIER. She has it in *esse* if not in *posse*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Her Majesty is advised by those who sit in both Houses. Now there is nobody responsible for the legislation. The Governor exercises no control whatever in the initiation of measures in this assembly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not now.

Motion agreed to; Bill read first time.

REPORT.

Mr. CARLING laid on the Table, Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1887.

RUSSELL ELECTION.

Mr. LAURIER. I now beg to renew the motion which I made yesterday:

That the warrant issued by Mr. Speaker for a new writ of election for the electoral district of the County of Russell, Ontario, as appears in the Journals of this House, on the 23rd January last, be withdrawn, and that Mr. Speaker do forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After considering, I have come to the conclusion that this motion ought to carry. The House knows that I consistently and persistently have pressed that such matters in connection with elections should go to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and in two cases, the one the rather celebrated case of Queen's County, New Brunswick, and the other that of the County of Kent, there were points of law raised that had to be settled, and we considered, and the majority of the House considered, that whenever a question of that kind arose, it ought certainly to be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. WELSH. May I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the papers in connection with the *Northern Light* will be laid upon the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to Captain Finderson?

Mr. WELSH. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be ready for the hon. gentleman after Easter.

Mr. WELSH. Immediately after?

Mr. FOSTER. Nearly so.

Mr. WELSH. I suppose they are under consideration.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

On order to resume adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. MILLS. Before we resume the adjourned debate I propose to make some observations. I have on two or three occasions asked the Government when they proposed

to introduce their measures relating to parliamentary elections, voters' lists and controverted elections. All those are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and last week, in response to an enquiry which was made to the Government, the Minister of Justice informed the House that these measures would be brought down early this week. If I understood the statement of the First Minister yesterday, those measures are not to be brought down until after the vacation. That seems to me to be a very highly objectionable course. The Government must have considered the present law to be very defective when they proposed to amend it, and, when they so advised His Excellency on the 23rd February, it must be taken for granted, that Ministers had, at that time, marked out the lines they proposed to follow in amending those Acts. We have been in Session nearly a month. We know that our usual Sessions last about three months. Up to this time, we have no knowledge of the changes which are proposed in the law, and that is a procedure which has never been adopted in England. I have on two or three occasions before brought under the attention of Parliament the practice in England in relation to the amendments proposed to the Franchise Act, the Representation of the People Act, and other important measures, and I have shown that in fifty years there has scarcely been an instance in which those important measures, which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne are not brought down within the first three weeks of the Session. We know that in England the Session extends for six or seven months, so that several months are allowed for the country to consider the matters which are submitted to the House. That is not the course adopted by the hon. gentleman. In this country we are peculiarly situated. In England the members receive no sessional indemnity and no salary for their attendance. Here it would be impossible to constitute Parliament in that way. Here members receive an indemnity which is supposed to cover the expenses to which as members they are subject, and we know that our usual period for a Session is three months, and that the indemnity allowed to members has reference to the ordinary period of a Session. What is the plan the leader of the Government has adopted during the whole continuance of this Parliament? The hon. gentleman keeps back important measures in regard to which there may be differences of opinion on both sides of the House and between the different parties in the country—he keeps them back until near the period for the conclusion of the Session, and then they are submitted to Parliament, not with the view of giving the country an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the contents of those measures, but simply to convert this House into a mere registry of the Government, whose business it is not to criticise, not to supervise, not to exercise an efficient control over the legislation submitted to it, but simply to approve of what hon. gentlemen choose to submit to us.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman indicate the nature of the motion he proposes to move?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I propose to move the adjournment of this House. I was going on to say, when you, Sir, interrupted me by your observations, that the course pursued by the Administration was altogether at variance with the principles of responsible government. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches are a committee of Parliament, they form a permanent standing committee, possessing for the time the confidence of the Crown and the confidence of the people's representatives, and it is the business of those hon. gentlemen, acting on behalf of Parliament, to advise Parliament in reference to the measures they propose to submit, before Parliament votes the supplies which are necessary to carry on the works of the country. We know the course that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have pursued with re-

ference to these measures before. Has any hon. member in this House forgotten the Gerrymander Bill, the circumstances under which it originated, and the solution which the First Minister and his colleagues proposed in order to secure to themselves a majority of the representatives from Ontario by the vote of 1884. We know what he did at that time, and we know also what he did in regard to the alteration of the franchise, when he proposed to confer upon the wards of the Government the controlling influence in certain constituencies; and we know what he did when he took the control of the voters' lists out of the hands of the municipalities, and we know the result. We know that under the old system it cost the Government nothing to obtain the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman took that matter out of the hands of the local authorities, and, in the eleventh week of the Session, he introduced a Bill which occupied the attention of the House for three months afterwards; we know that he would consent to very few amendments being made, and that, after he succeeded in carrying that measure at the end of a Session of nearly six months, he found that it cost upwards of \$400,000 to prepare the voters' lists. That was the result, and, while it was contrary to the promises of the hon. gentleman, it was consonant with the predictions made on this side of the House as to the result of that Bill, that the hon. gentleman did not allow that measure to continue in force, but last Session introduced a suspensory clause, providing that last year no voters' lists should be prepared. At present there is no provision by which these voters' lists can be prepared. There is no law by which it can be done. Yet we know that there is a variation of about 10 per cent. in every constituency every year. That being the case, I think that, at the period of the Session at which we have arrived, we ought to know what proposition the Government has to submit to the House in this respect. The country is entitled to be consulted in regard to it. Some of the supporters of the hon. gentleman, when discussing this motion put forward by my hon. friend as an abstract proposition, have said that we have no mandate to alter the fiscal policy of the country. I would like to know what mandate the hon. gentleman has had to legislate in regard to these two matters which he promises to deal with this Session, in regard to elections. What is the policy adopted in England? Does any Government there propose to adopt radical changes in the representation of the people without giving an opportunity to the people of expressing their views on the subject? What were the views expressed by Mr. Disraeli when Mr. Gladstone introduced his measure to disestablish the Irish church? He said, We are entitled to allow a certain length of time to elapse, in order that this Bill may be sent to the country, and that we may have the views of the country on the subject. What opportunity does the hon. gentleman give us, in regard to the policy which he is adopting, to consult the country on the measures affecting the representation of the people which he proposes to submit? My constituents are intelligent men, and I daresay that those who returned the First Minister are intelligent men. Have they no opinions or views on this subject? Are they not entitled to be considered? Are they not competent to advise the hon. gentlemen upon the subject of the measures which they propose? Why, Sir, no Ministry in England would think of carrying through an important measure of this sort without giving the country an opportunity of considering its merits, without giving those who choose to express opinions upon the subject, an opportunity of consulting their representatives. But the hon. gentleman, from the first time he took his seat on the Treasury benches to this hour, has denied to the country an opportunity of considering any important measures submitted to Parliament. Why, Sir, when the hon. gentleman proposed his National Policy, he proposed a resolution here and was prepared to go to the country upon it. Why,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

then, is he so much averse to giving the country an opportunity of knowing what he proposes to do upon this important matter? I say that the course the hon. gentleman is taking is one which converts parliamentary government into a farce. I say it is one which denies to the representatives of the people an opportunity of exercising that controlling influence over the policy of the Administration which is necessary to the preservation of parliamentary government. Why, Sir, if those hon. gentlemen who sit behind the First Minister and support him, did their duty to the members of the Government and to the country, they would refuse to sustain the Government, no matter what might be the character of the measures, unless they introduced them at such a time as to give them an opportunity of fairly considering them. Why have these hon. gentlemen had commissions issued in their case, and put their judgment under the control of the First Minister? If not, how is it that they have not failed to remonstrate with him and with those associated with him in the Government? On this very important matter, I will move Sir, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am very sorry, indeed, that the mere circumstance that the hon. gentleman will not have an opportunity of spending Good Friday in considering the Electoral Franchise Bill has induced him to occupy the time of the House in making an attack upon the existing law, upon the subject of the National Policy, and upon everything else that was remotely removed from the subject on which he rose to speak. With regard to the hon. gentleman's contention that we ought to follow English practice with regard to the introduction of those Bills, I would remind the hon. gentleman that procedure there in connection with the time at which measures are introduced, and the time which is given for their consideration, are wholly different from the condition of things in this country. It is, as the hon. gentleman says, not uncommon in that country for Government matters to be introduced at a very early period of the Session; it is not at all uncommon, in that country, to see Bills, after having been so introduced, stand over from year to year because Parliament had not time to consider them, or any important business which the Government desire to bring forward. The condition of things during the present Session, in which the hon. gentleman's indignation is more particularly excited, is that never in the history of this Parliament has Government business been so far advanced as it has during the past four weeks. The time of the House, not only on the Government days, but on nearly every private members' day, has been fully occupied with the consideration of the business which the Government had presented. In regard to the Bills which are indicated in the Governor General's speech, there are nine mentioned, four of which are now before the House, and not one of them has the House had time to take up and dispose of; and yet the hon. gentleman makes a grave complaint against the Government because the other five are not laid upon the Table of the House waiting the consideration which the House has not time to give them. I think that the fact that the Railway Bill, the Bill relating to the North-West Territories, the Bill mentioned in the Speech relating to the law in Manitoba, and the Bill relating to the procedure in Criminal Cases, are before the House, removes the hon. gentleman's complaint altogether from the province of reasonableness. Now, with regard to the hon. gentleman's complaint with regard to the Franchise Act, I think the hon. gentleman was led, by his desire to find fault, into a mistake, when he assured the House that there was at the present time no machinery by which a voters' list could be established. The hon. gentleman by this time has reflected that there is a full and complete enactment by which a voter's list can be established during

the present year, and, therefore, that criticism, made on the ground of finding fault with the Government for not having brought forward earlier the Franchise Bill, certainly appears to be of little weight. It is true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that when the House approached the subject a few days ago, I expressed the view that early in the present week these Bills would be ready to lay upon the Table of this House; they are not so ready, and as the First Minister has informed the House, they cannot be presented until after the recess, when I hope they will be laid upon the Table the first day after the re-opening. Until then I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be more decorous to reserve his reproaches about radical measures, and his discussion of what these matters are to be, and the necessity of submitting them to the people at the polls, because I venture to say that when they are introduced, they will be found to be measures that even hon. gentlemen cannot ask to have delayed until the opinions of the voters have been expressed upon them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact I think the hon. Minister of Justice is seriously misinformed when he supposes that the Government business is more advanced in the present Session than it has been in former years. Unless my memory is altogether at fault, I could refer him to two or three years, at least, under the presidency of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) when we had passed pretty nearly all the estimates before the fifth week in the Session, besides bringing down a very considerable number of Government measures to a vote. Now, it appears to me that reason and common sense, and the convenience of members on both sides, are wholly on the side of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mill). There is no doubt whatever, that it would be a saving of the time of the House, that it would save us very many prolonged and inconvenient sessions—at the close of the ordinary Session—if full information was given in good time of the measures which the Government proposed to introduce. Sir, when measures are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we have a right to suppose that they are ready for introduction. Those measures, a reference to which is put into His Excellency's mouth, ought to be so far advanced that they merely required to be printed and placed into the hands of members. That is, as both the First Minister and the Minister of Justice know, in conformity with English practice and precedent, and, as I have said, with common sense, and the convenience of members. Now, Sir, it is doubly so in this case. The hon. gentlemen summoned us together, in the first instance, for the end of January, a proper thing to do, a very good time for the meeting of the House. Then, for reasons connected, I presume, with the fishery negotiations at Washington, they put us off until the 23rd February. Now, they were doubly bound, under these circumstances, to have all their measures ready. It will be, as everybody knows, extremely inconvenient if we are thrown into the summer, as we have been once or twice, inconvenient to hon. gentlemen on that side quite as much as to hon. gentlemen on this. Therefore it is exceedingly to be regretted, I think, that the hon. gentlemen, with their customary habits of procrastination, were not ready in the first or second week of the Session to inform us what they proposed to do. Now, there is an additional very strong reason which justifies my hon. friend in calling attention to the state of things. Every one knows that there are an unusual number of very important questions which will probably occupy a very large proportion of the time of this House, over and above our ordinary and necessary work. We have in the first place, I presume, to discuss the fisheries treaty and the negotiations there anent, a subject which will undoubtedly occupy the House for some days. We have the budget to be discussed, a matter that cannot

be got rid of in an afternoon, even if hon. gentlemen, as indicated, do not propose any considerable changes in the tariff, because, unless I am very much mistaken, it will be found, whether changes in the tariff are made or no that very heavy additional liabilities are likely to be inflicted upon the people of this country before we separate. The hon. gentlemen have stated from their own places in this House that they expect a deputation from Newfoundland, and I presume there will be a discussion, an important discussion, with respect to the proposals those gentlemen may bring. And there is, as everybody knows, a very important question indeed, involving probably many other important questions, the action to be taken with respect to the Province of Manitoba. I forbear to speak about that at this moment, but I have no doubt a good deal will have to be said on both sides of the House before that matter is disposed of, and therefore it is exceedingly important that we should have in our hands, at the earliest moment, the Government measures, unless, indeed, the Government are prepared to assure us, as the Minister of Justice, in a sort of way, did, though not very emphatically, that those measures, when brought down, will be of a very perfunctory nature, or, at all events, of a character which does not involve any important changes. I agree with my hon. friend in thinking it is a very great mistake, and a thing very much to be regretted, that the Government, when they introduce measures into the Speech from the Throne, do not, at the earliest date, place the House and the country too in possession of their intentions in detail.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the discussion of the question before the House I promise one thing, and that is, that I will be brief. I will not attempt to follow the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in his periphrastics in search of scandals or of evidence to show that distress prevails in the country. I will merely take up a few of the points and leave the House to judge of the balance. I hope in the few words I have to say that I will be able to avoid anything that has heretofore been gone over in this House, and I think hon. members will agree with me that this is a very difficult task at this particular stage of the debate. I may just say here, as it may be referred to by hon. gentlemen who may follow me, that a meeting in favor of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, which means one and the same thing, was held in my county a few days ago. I have looked at the paper, and I find all the men at that meeting, with the exception of one, were opponents of mine at the last election, and would continue forever to be opponents of mine. They are an unforgiving people and they remain Grit, and will eternally remain Grit, I suppose. I found, however, one of those Reformers, a strong and substantial and influential one, raised his voice against Commercial Union, and notwithstanding the fact that that meeting was almost exclusively composed of Reformers, they only carried the motion by a three-fourths majority. I will say, before going further, that in my section of the country and throughout the Niagara district we are large growers of fruit of all kinds, and only two years ago I was requested by the Reformers and Conservatives in the counties of Lincoln and Welland to endeavor if possible to have further protection placed upon the fruits grown in that district. I may say also that I was petitioned in 1883, the first Session I sat in this House, to see if an increased duty could not be placed upon oats and coarse grains, in order to protect the people of those counties against the importation of coarse and cheap grains from the Western States, brought down by vessels and thrown upon the markets on the Welland Canal. So I am not afraid at this time, or at any other time, to discuss this question. It was said in my county that

I had better wait to see how the cat jumped before I came to a conclusion on the question. On any matter affecting my county I have an opinion of my own, and unless I can lead the people of my county I will retire from my seat in this House. I do not believe in swinging on the coat tails of public opinion in a matter of this kind; every man ought to have an opinion and express that opinion fearlessly, and I am not afraid of this question. I might just say here that I am in favor of a reciprocity treaty as will be fair to both contracting parties. I say we should have a voice in determining what that treaty should be, and it should be a treaty that would be fair and honest to every particular department of trade and agriculture in this country. I am entirely opposed to unrestricted reciprocity, as I believe it would not only injure the manufacturing industries of the country, but would injure the farming industry as well. I will endeavor to compare those two industries before I close, and I think hon. gentlemen will concur with me that the manufacturing industry is not even second to the agricultural industry—and I am an agriculturist myself—in point of money and value. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) talked of the scrap book, and said the Government ought to make an appropriation to buy the scrap book and burn it. I undertake to say that every hon. gentleman opposite would vote for that appropriation. It is the most inconvenient thing for hon. gentlemen opposite, because they never have a solid opinion upon any subject but are always wavering, they are found on every twig of the bush when it suits their particular purpose, and accordingly they do not wish their acts put in record. But the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who spoke last night, has a scrap book containing the history of every hon. member opposite, as well as hon. members on this side of the House, and he is always ready and prepared to bring it forward. The hon. member for Wellington took occasion to speak of a certain timber limit, and he said that that timber limit was the cause of the election of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in 1887. I can tell the hon. member for Wellington that if during thirty years he continues to represent his present constituency and then stands half as well in the estimation of the people of his county as does the hon. member for Lincoln, he will have a good record. There is no man in this House who has fought a bolder and nobler party battle than the hon. member for Lincoln, and for that reason he has opprobriums thrown across the floor at him, and he is admired by his constituents and by every one in the Niagara district, in my constituency and in the adjoining constituency, as a fearless opponent and one worthy of his position, and he will adorn the Upper House should he get there. I will now follow rapidly a few of the observations made by the hon. member for Wellington. The first point is with respect to increasing the burdens of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite now complain that our importations are decreasing. If duties place a burden upon the people and our importations are decreasing, the burdens of the people must be decreasing as well. Now, Sir, he speaks of "combines," and I will run over that subject hastily. Why, on the other side of the line, as to the matter of combines, it is well known that the combines regulate the whole trade of the country, and yet this is the country the hon. gentlemen invite us to go to. The hon. gentleman refers "to the poor innocent farmers of Canada." The only evidence I see of the "innocence" of the farmers of this country is the presence of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in this House. I have remarked, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate that not a solitary word can be said in derogation of the people of the United States but that gentlemen on the other side of the House jump up to defend and explain away those remarks. That is very strange. They are pre-

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland.)

senting such a spectacle as is not to be found in any other legislative assembly in the civilised world at the present age. It is a strange spectacle to see nearly one-half the representatives of the people standing upon the floor of their own Parliament, ready and prepared to refute any little thing that may be said in favor of their own country, and standing up in defence of a neighboring country. Such a spectacle has never been seen before and never probably will be seen again. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) rises in this House and apologises for the land sales in the State of Dakota, and he says that there must be something wrong and that Dakota is a haven of rest and joy instead of what it has been shown to be. Let me just give an answer to one of his arguments. He says the farmers of this country pay the duty upon horses. I will deal with that question further on, but I would just ask this question in answer to his assertion. If the farmers of this country pay the duty upon all horses exported to the United States, how is it that the United States Government found it necessary to make half the horses imported, free of duty? Was it for the purpose of saving the people of this country from paying the duty? I think not. It was for the purpose of saving their own people from paying the duty, or they would not have taken the duty off. That I believe is an answer to this argument. Now, Sir, it is said that the United States have reduced their debt, and I will deal with this question further on, but I assert here that they have reduced their national debt at the expense of increasing their State debts, and I will show that. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has made a calculation upon the farmer selling a colt and a steer and matters of that kind. I want to know how many farmers find a market in the United States for colts and steers? Nine-tenths of all the products of our country are sold in our own markets, and I will show that there is no market in the United States for the products of the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman contends that farming produce is reduced in value, but he must know that this is due to the reduced prices on articles of export in the Liverpool market, the only market there is for the produce of the farms in North America. This is not due to the National Policy, and I will be able to prove my statement. He further contends that the farmers in Canada are not in as good a position as the farmers in the States. I will prove from the statistics of Mr. Blue's report that the agricultural interests of this country have grown to a proportion that is not equalled even by the farmers of the United States. We will take Mr. Blue's report, in preference to the tale told by an hon. member in this House, of a particular farm which he drove somebody out to see and which did not suit the somebody because perhaps the percentage required on the sale was too small. I want to ask the hon. gentleman also whether the farmers in the United States are not in a worse condition than they were in a few years ago? He must know that throughout the known world complaints are now made in all agricultural industries that the farmer is not in the position that he was a few years ago, and that this is simply because of the over-production of farm products, which has reduced the values, and as the values are reduced so the value of the farming industry must reduce. The hon. gentleman tells us that 150 people have gone from his county to the city of Toronto, and that Toronto's population and wealth is enhanced by reason of the population coming from the surrounding country. He must remember that if we had unrestricted reciprocity those 150 people would have gone to the United States, and that 300,000 people in this country who are engaged as artisans and mechanics would have gone there also. He complains that Toronto has grown at the expense of Listowel, but were it not for the National Policy some States would have grown at the expense of Listowel and of Toronto as well. The

hon. gentleman, as well as the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), spoke of the markets in Buffalo, Detroit and Rochester, but they must be aware that there is more produce grown in the neighborhood of those cities than those people can consume, and that they are even exporting almost every article that the farmer of this country has to sell. Why, Sir, they can get wheat cheaper at Cleveland and Buffalo from the city of Chicago than they can get it from any point 100 miles from the frontier in the Province of Ontario. It only costs $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel to place wheat from the elevators in Chicago into the city of Buffalo and you cannot send wheat from the city of Toronto to the city of Buffalo at that price. Neither can you send it from the city of London, nor from any point in Ontario to the city of Buffalo at so low a rate. They can send it far cheaper to the city of New York when they get in the route of the canal boats. The hon. gentleman has also spoken about oats and butter, and I will tell you my experience of what the export of those articles means in a border country. When I left home oats were selling in the city of Buffalo at 42 cents and I had to pay 53 cents in my own town. As regards butter, in Niagara Falls we had to pay 25 cents during the winter season and I know of others in the township of Berth whose names I need not give who were selling their butter for 24 cents. When I went down there I told them that they could get 25 cents for their butter in Niagara Falls and they were surprised to hear that they could get more there for it than they could in Buffalo. There are a great many other articles of our commerce which are exactly in the same position. I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a higher price for the produce of the farmer in Canada than there is to be found in the United States. There is more raised with an easier access to the markets of the States east of Indiana than would feed the whole people of the Eastern States, and they have even a surplus to spare. So that from Indiana east they are large exporters of everything that the farmer produces in this country, and we can find at home a more profitable market for our produce than we could in the United States. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), said that the right hon. the leader of the Government had built up a monument that would stand in history as a "disgrace" and all the rest of it by the debt of the country. If the hon. gentleman had been candid enough he would have told us that \$109,000,000 of that debt which he says has been heaped up by the right hon. gentleman was taken by him, from the shoulders of the Provinces, and at the time when it was paying an interest of 5 per cent. by the Provinces, and he has placed it to the debt of the Dominion at an interest of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. thereby saving over a million dollars to the people of this country. I wish there were forty monuments of that kind and it would be all the better for the country generally. I do not intend to deal with this public debt question just now. But, Sir, I say that provincial debts which we assumed relieved all the Provinces of about 5 per cent. interest which they could only realise on at about par, and the Dominion has taken those debts and at the same time relieved the Provinces, while paying only $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. To-day the bonds are selling at 116 in the European market. Hon. gentlemen talk about deterioration, about woe, despair, and desolation in this country; but the most sensitive test to be found in the world as to the prosperity and financial condition of the country is in the money markets of the world; and a complete answer to all the speeches made on the other side of the House is this, that the credit of Canada is continually rising in the money market of the world—that in the opinion of people who have not an interest to get into office in this country, we are steadily advancing and increasing in prosperity. The hon. member for North Wellington ought to know this,

if he knows anything, that the name of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will live in the hearts of a grateful people when the memory of his detractors will be forever forgotten, and history will give him the credit of having made a country. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke about the Intercolonial Railway, and, although he was very minute in all his facts regarding everything that might damage his country and injure the Government of this country, he was not so particular in his facts about the management of the Intercolonial Railway when the hon. member for East York had control of the affairs of this country. He forgot to tell the House that instead of its running to pay expenses at that time, there was a deficit of about three-quarters of a million on the running expenses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. member for North Wellington said last night that the right hon. the leader of the Government kept himself in power, not by his statesmanship or by any virtues he possessed, but by buying all of us who are sitting on this side of the House. I should say, judging from the hon. gentleman's conduct in this House, that if I wanted to get a supporter for money, I would go across there. When he stands up in this House, and accuses others of that sort of thing, I say he would be one of the first men who would offer himself for sale, and his price would be small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to order. You were good enough, or the hon. gentleman who occupied your place last night was good enough to interrupt the hon. member for North Wellington a great many times for far less offence against the decorum of the House than the hon. gentleman has committed. I call upon you to press the hon. gentleman to withdraw his words.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If I have used language that is unparliamentary, and I suppose I have, I will gladly withdraw it, but the provocation was very great. Now, I said I would endeavor to compare the product of the farm with the product of the factory in the United States, and I will take the year 1880, for it is the last year for which I could get returns. The total value of farm products for that year was \$3,764,743,327. The capital of the factories was \$2,790,223,506; the number of hands was 2,738,930; and the total amount of wages paid was \$947,919,674, or nearly a thousand millions a year paid to the factory hands of the United States. The value of the products of the factories of the United States was \$5,369,667,706, less raw material, say one-third, \$1,789,889,235, making the net products of the factories \$3,579,778,531, about equal in value to the products of the farm. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen say that the factory is of very little consequence in this country. I say it is of great consequence, and I think I shall be able to show that it is. The net product of the factories of the United States is equal to \$65 per head of the total population of 55,000,000. The product of labor is the only source of wealth in any country, whether that labor is expended on the farm, in the factory, in the mine, or anywhere else. Now, let us compare the product of the factory in Canada with the product of the farm. The total value of the field crops in the Province of Ontario in 1886 was \$110,764,623; for the whole Dominion, say three times as much, which is fair calculation, making \$332,293,869. Now, let us see what the factory has produced. In the same year the total value of the product of the factory was \$160,000,000, less raw material, say one-third, \$153,333,333; leaving the net product of the factory at \$316,666,667, or within \$6,000,000 of the total value of the field crops. Now, we find that the amount of wages paid to the hands employed in the factories of this country was no less than \$85,000,000. What does that amount of

money represent? It represents a market for the products of the farm; but hon. gentlemen opposite desire to transfer that \$85,000,000 across the line, along with all the capital invested in factories, and they ask the farmers of this country to sell their products across the line instead of to people in this country. Now, the total farm population of Canada is estimated at 3,400,000. Thus we find that the wages paid by the factories amount to \$26 per head of the farming population; that is to say, the wages paid annually to the factory employes secure a market to every farmer in this country of from \$160 to \$200 a year, which is about the total value of the products he is able to spare off his farm. Now, the \$85,000,000 which is paid to the factory hands is about one-fourth of the total value of the field crops of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have a market in the United States, and I propose to deal with that subject in a few words. In 1886 the United States exported:

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Animals..... | \$ 12,518,660 |
| Breadstuffs..... | 125,848,558 |
| Beef products..... | 18,599,017 |
| Pork products..... | 58,072,932 |
| Dairy products..... | 10,876,466 |
| Imitation butter..... | 93,363 |
| The oil..... | 2,954,954 |
| Clover, timothy and other seeds..... | 1,949,990 |
| Fruits..... | 2,967,801 |
| Hay, hides, skins, honey, hops, eggs, oil cakes and meal, broilers, vegetables and wool..... | 12,741,259 |
| Total..... | \$246,621,000 |

Now, this is the market that hon. gentlemen tell us will be of great value to the farmers of this country; yet the great majority of these articles are raised within easier and cheaper access to the eastern markets than the products of the farms of Ontario. Transportation from Chicago is as cheap or cheaper. Canada's exports of sheep to other countries during 1887 was as follows:—

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| To Great Britain..... | \$ 568,433 |
| Germany..... | 20,975 |
| Belgium..... | 368 |
| British West Indies..... | 1,285 |
| British Guiana..... | 580 |
| Newfoundland..... | 19,017 |
| St. Pierre..... | 7,227 |
| Total..... | \$617,685 |

The United States took \$74,282, or very little more than we exported to other countries. Now, Sir, take horned cattle. Our exports for the year 1887 were as follows:—

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| To Great Britain..... | \$5,334,375 |
| Germany..... | 23,040 |
| Belgium..... | 71,000 |
| Newfoundland..... | 133,408 |
| St. Pierre..... | 26,619 |
| Total..... | \$5,588,442 |

To the United States, \$887,756; or we sent to the United States only 15½ per cent. of our total export, and we are asked to drop a market to which we sent 5½ million dollars worth in order to accept a market to which we only sent \$887,000 worth. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make us believe that every horse we sent to the United States was charged with a duty of 20 per cent. Well, I find that the United States imported in 1886 \$6,944,000 worth of animals, and out of that \$6,944,000, we find that \$3,330,595 worth was free of duty, or one-half of the importation of animals into the United States is now free of duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, when they make their calculations, should take this into account. And, Sir, the other half we sent through in bond and otherwise to the European markets. Now, the United States is not a market for the Canadian farmer, but it is the home of the middlemen, who buy in the Canadian market for transshipment to Liverpool. We want these middlemen to reside in the cities of Montreal, Quebec and Toronto and not in the cities of the United States. Let them be stationed in our cities and buy the products of our farms, and in place of sending our products to the United States for the Liverpool market, we will ship them direct from Canada and have here all the profit and advantage which now goes to the middlemen in New York. I desire for a few moments to show this House how the debt of the United States stands, because in this paradise, in this promised land, we ought to see how things stand before we take the leap we are invited to make. My opinion is that should we take this leap, we would find that we had jumped out of the fryingpan into the fire. If we are highly taxed here, we would still be more highly taxed there, and under unrestricted reciprocity, we would have to resort to direct taxation in order to pay the interest on our public debt and meet our other expenditure. Let us see how the debt of the promised land stands at present:

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| In 1880..... | |
| Net State debt..... | \$234,436,261 |
| Net County debt..... | 122,877,686 |
| Net municipal debt..... | 698,270,199 |
| Total, 1880..... | \$1,056,584,146 |
| Total, 1870..... | 868,676,758 |
| Increase in 10 years..... | \$187,907,388 |

Or an increase of 22 per cent. in 10 years. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the increase in our debt, but it is well known that our Provinces are very little in debt, and that we have but little municipal debt, while the municipal debt of the United States, the county debt and the State debt, in 1880 was \$21.07 per head in every State and Territory of the Union, every cent of interest on which has to be paid by direct taxation. Let us take the debt of the different States. The public debt of the different States is shown by the following statement:—

| | Net State. | Net County. | Net Municipal. | 1850. Total Debt. | 1870. Total Debt. | Population. | Total Debt per Capita, 1880. |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|---|-------------|------------------------------------|
| Arkansas..... | \$ 4,039,737 | \$ 3,135,749 | \$ 763,298 | \$ 7,938,784 | 80 per cent. \$ 4,151,152 | | \$ 9 89 |
| California..... | 3,306,614 | 7,312,489 | 6,136,585 | 16,755,688 | 18,089,082 | | 19 38 |
| Colorado..... | 212,814 | 2,492,441 | 889,441 | 3,594,296 | 512 per cent. 681,158 | 194,327 | 18 49 |
| Connecticut..... | 4,967,600 | 101,409 | 16,932,661 | 22,001,661 | 30 per cent. 17,088,906 | 622,700 | 25 33 |
| Illinois..... | None. | 14,181,134 | 30,999,788 | 45,180,922 | 42,191,869 | | 14 68 |
| Kansas..... | 1,087,700 | 7,950,921 | 6,967,232 | 16,005,853 | 250 per cent. 6,442,282 | 996,096 | 16 07 |
| Maine..... | 4,682,741 | 451,809 | 17,272,300 | 22,486,850 | 40 per cent. 16,624,624 | 648,936 | 34 53 |
| Massachusetts..... | 20,159,478 | 1,371,219 | 69,753,222 | 91,283,913 | 45 per cent. in 10 years. 69,211,538 | 1,783,085 | 51 19 |
| Minnesota..... | 2,565,000 | 901,412 | 5,009,652 | 8,476,064 | 240 per cent. 2,788,797 | 780,773 | 10 86 |
| Missouri..... | 16,259,000 | 11,923,312 | 29,249,010 | 57,431,322 | 46,909,865 | | 26 48 |
| Nebraska..... | 375,582 | 5,120,362 | 11,929,813 | 7,425,757 | 255 per cent. in 10 years. 2,089,264 | 452,402 | 16 41 |
| New Hampshire..... | 3,561,209 | 779,034 | 6,383,936 | 10,724,170 | 11,153,373 | | 30 91 |
| New Jersey..... | 813,675 | 6,668,463 | 42,064,964 | 49,547,102 | 116 per cent. in 10 years. 22,854,304 | 1,131,116 | 43 80 |
| New York..... | 7,536,732 | 12,399,308 | 198,787,274 | 218,723,314 | 33 per cent. in 10 years. 159,803,234 | 5,082,871 | 43 03 |
| Ohio..... | 5,732,500 | 2,962,649 | 40,058,805 | 48,753,954 | 120 per cent. 22,241,988 | | 15 24 |
| Dakota..... | | | | | | | 7 39 |
| Montana..... | | | | | | | 19 41 |
| Idaho..... | | | | | | | 7 22 |
| Wyoming..... | | | | | | | 9 88 |

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman please inform us where those statistics are taken from?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). From the Bureau of Statistics to be found in Washington.

Mr. CHARLTON. The debt of New Jersey, as given last year, was \$1,496,000.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Let the hon. gentleman look at page 305.

Mr. CHARLTON. The discrepancy is so great that I thought proper to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to it, and it would be more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would give us the statistics for 1887.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. Here is another report of the same kind.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The United States raised for State purposes in 1886 by direct taxation no less than \$62,773,366 including the Territories. This amounts to \$1.12 per head of the population of 55,000,000, and I think that is a fair calculation for the population of that year. We pay about 80 cents per head of the population to the Provinces for provincial purposes. Then, if we take that \$1.12 a head for their taxes for State purposes, and add to it

the 80 cents which we pay for provincial purposes, it will make a difference of \$1.92 per head for every man, woman and child of our people, in our favor. Take our population at 5,000,000; that would amount to \$9,000,000 in favor of our people, which would allow this country to pay off her national debt at that rate, in case we would submit to the taxation which is placed upon the people of the United States. Together with that, it will be remembered that the tariff of the United States is somewhere between 20 and 30 per cent. higher than the tariff in Canada, so, if the tariff in this country is, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, the measure of the taxation of the people of this country, they must add 20 or 30 per cent. which the tariff of the United States is higher than ours to the taxation of the United States, as well as the amount of \$1.92 per head, and what do we find in that case? The State of New York—and the hon. gentleman will find it in that red book, and it is the highest authority on this continent—raised in 1886 for State purposes \$9,512,813. Placing the population of that State at 5,000,000, that would be equal to \$1.90 a head of the population. Now, compare that with the Province of Ontario. The State of New York is taxed by money taken out of the pockets of the people directly by the tax collector \$1.90 per head. Add to that 90 cents which we receive, and that would make a difference in favor of the people of Ontario of

\$2.70 per head for every man, woman and child. The comparison with the State of Maine is about the same, with the exception that it is more favorable to Canada. The taxation there was about \$2 per head of the population taken from their pockets and collected by the tax collector, so that would make a difference in favor of our people of \$2.80 per head. We can find, in that red book which the hon. gentleman has, what the taxes were for State purposes in 1886, the amount raised on real and personal property, and the hon. gentleman will find that it is as follows:—

| Amount of Taxes. | | |
|---------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| New York..... | \$9,512,813 | 3 mills on the dollar. |
| Maine | 1,301,270 | 4 do |
| New Hampshire | 400,000 | 1½ do |
| Vermont..... | 371,697 | 1 do |
| Massachusetts ... | 2,005,937 | 0½ do |
| Connecticut | 1,463,328 | 1½ do |
| Colorado..... | 534,228 | 4 do |
| California | 3,861,644 | 5 do |
| Arkansas | 966,000 | 4 do |
| Alabama..... | 1,041,898 | 6½ do |
| Illinois | 3,000,000 | 4½ do |
| Iowa | 1,148,396 | 2½ do |
| Nebraska..... | 1,117,934 | 7½ do |
| Nevada | 516,861 | 9 do |
| Kansas | 1,082,477 | 4½ do |
| Minnesota | 658,998 | 1½ do |

This shows an average taxation of 4 mills on the dollar in these States. Then, take the taxation of the American cities which the hon. gentleman will also find in that red book, and we find this as the amount of taxation on each \$100 of taxation:

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| 1883 Chicago..... | \$3.37 |
| 1883 Jersey City..... | 2.90 |
| 1883 Louisville, Kentucky..... | 2.35 |
| 1882 Lewiston, Maine..... | 2.25 |
| 1883 Milwaukee..... | 2.50 |
| 1883 Minneapolis..... | 1.92 |
| 1883 New York..... | 2.25 |
| 1882 Peoria, Illinois..... | 5.76 |
| 1883 Philadelphia..... | |
| 1882 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania..... | 2.92 |
| 1883 Portland, Maine..... | 2.15 |
| 1882 Poughkeepsie, N.Y..... | 2.53 |
| 1883 Rochester, N.Y..... | 2.86 |
| 1882 Schenectady, N.Y..... | 3.00 |
| 1882 Savannah, Georgia..... | 3.00 |
| 1882 Springfield, Illinois..... | 3.00 |
| 1883 Troy, N.Y..... | 4.16 |
| 1882 Topeka, Kansas..... | 2.75 |
| 1883 Toledo, Ohio..... | 2.50 |
| 1882 Scranton, Pennsylvania..... | 2.40 |

All this is for municipal purposes. You may add 4 mills on the dollar, which is the average for State purposes, and you will find that the taxation in the United States is from 3 to 4 per cent. of the total value of the real and personal property. If we would submit to that heavy taxation, we could easily pay off our national debt in a short time. I want now to give you the United States market, and the hon. gentleman will find that statement in the same book, comparing the twelve years of the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, and the twelve years succeeding the Reciprocity Treaty. I will take the statistics as given in the city of New York, giving the lowest and highest prices in the years named:

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland.)

| Year. | Beef, Mess. | Butter. | Cheese. | Flour. | Hams. | Wheat. |
|-------|---------------|----------|---------|--------------|----------|--------------|
| | Bbl. | Lb. | Lb. | Bbl. | Lb. | Bush. |
| | \$ cts. | Cts. | Cts. | \$ cts. | Cts. | \$ cts. |
| 1852 | 8 25 to 17 00 | 15 to 29 | 6 to 9 | 4 25 to 6 00 | 8 to 10 | 1 03 to 1 15 |
| 1853 | 7 00 " 11 25 | 13 " 24 | 8 " 10 | 4 87 " 7 50 | 8 " 10 | 1 22 " 1 80 |
| 1854 | 8 00 " 13 00 | 15 " 24 | 6 " 12 | 7 25 " 10 75 | 7 " 11 | 1 75 " 2 50 |
| 1855 | 8 25 " 14 00 | 17 " 28 | 6 " 12 | 7 50 " 10 18 | 8 " 11 | 1 96 " 2 80 |
| 1856 | 8 00 " 12 00 | 13 " 28 | 6 " 11 | 5 20 " 8 31 | 9 " 11 | 1 30 " 2 17 |
| 1857 | 9 50 " 15 00 | 16 " 28 | 5 " 14 | 4 25 " 6 79 | 6 " 10 | 1 25 " 1 95 |
| 1858 | 9 00 " 12 00 | 13 " 25 | 3 " 10 | 3 75 " 5 25 | 9 " 13 | 1 20 " 1 50 |
| 1859 | 5 00 " 9 75 | 14 " 27 | 2 " 11 | 4 00 " 6 50 | 9 " 12 | 1 30 " 1 65 |
| 1860 | 4 50 " 5 20 | 10 " 21 | 9 " 12 | 4 25 " 5 50 | 10 " 13 | 1 35 " 1 70 |
| 1861 | 5 00 " 6 25 | 8 " 22 | 2 " 10 | 3 90 " 5 65 | 7 " 11 | 1 20 " 1 69 |
| 1864 | 5 00 " 16 00 | 21 " 48 | 12 " 27 | 7 15 " 11 75 | 11 " 17 | 1 72 " 2 75 |
| 1863 | 5 00 " 9 00 | 14 " 30 | 8 " 16 | 5 00 " 8 00 | 5 " 8 | 1 30 " 1 55 |
| 1865 | 9 00 " 14 00 | 20 " 38 | 10 " 16 | 5 00 " 8 80 | 11 " 23 | 1 25 " 1 88 |
| 1866 | 11 00 " 21 00 | 25 " 60 | 5 " 23 | 5 25 " 11 70 | 11 " 22 | 2 20 " 3 45 |
| 1867 | 12 00 " 28 00 | 15 " 48 | 7 " 20 | 6 25 " 11 30 | 10 " 16 | 2 30 " 3 40 |
| 1868 | 11 00 " 24 75 | 28 " 60 | 7 " 19 | 5 50 " 9 75 | 11 " 18 | 2 05 " 3 25 |
| 1869 | 5 00 " 16 50 | 16 " 55 | 11 " 23 | 4 95 " 6 40 | 17 " 24 | 1 45 " 2 18 |
| 1876 | 8 50 " 11 00 | 15 " 33 | 8 " 13 | 4 00 " 6 00 | 7 " 18 | 0 84 " 1 27 |
| 1877 | 9 50 " 11 25 | 13 " 14 | 8 " 16 | 4 75 " 8 00 | 10 " 14 | 1 06 " 1 85 |
| 1878 | 9 00 " 13 50 | 6 " 20 | 3 " 14 | 3 75 " 5 50 | 7 " 12 | 0 83 " 1 31 |
| 1882 | 11 50 " 16 00 | 16 " 38 | 9 " 13 | 4 65 " 8 75 | 11 " 16½ | 1 03 " 1 43 |
| 1885 | 10 00 " 16 50 | 11 " 20 | 6 " 10 | 2 90 " 3 70 | 9½ " 12½ | 0 88 " 1 05 |

Averages prices, 1854 to 1866—12 years.

| Beef Mess. | Butter. | Cheese. | Hams. | Wheat. | Oats. | Mackerel. |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Bbl. | Lb. | Lb. | Lb. | Bush. | Bush. | Bbl. |
| \$ cts. | Cts. | Cts. | Cts. | \$ cts. | Cts. | \$ cts. |
| 6 94 to 12 16 9 55 | 15 to 31 23 | 6 to 14½ 10½ | 8½ to 13½ 11 | 1 44 to 2 08 1.76 | 43 to 69 56 | 15 12 to 20 41 17.76 |

Average prices, 1867 to 1878—12 years.

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 8 02 to 15 37 11.69 | 16½ to 40½ 28 | 7½ to 17½ 12½ | 8½ to 13½ 11½ | 1 41 to 2 02 1.71 | 45½ to 67 56 | 13 06 to 23 61 18.33 |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|

The hon. gentleman can get the statistics in that book; let him go over all the figures and he will find my calculation is correct; you can take any year you like; you can take the average of 12 years succeeding reciprocity, and the 12 years of reciprocity, and the former period gives a higher price for the total products of the country than the 12 years of reciprocity, with the exception of one article; in the article of wheat there is a difference of 5 cents only. I was going to deal with the value of farm property, but I will not do so now. I think, you will agree with me, Sir, that I have given you figures enough; they are all correct, and they will, to some extent, at least, satisfy the House that when comparisons are made, figures do not redound to the advantage of the scheme of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if, during the election of 1887, the Liberal party had succeeded in reaching the Treasury benches, would this proposition ever have been brought before the House? No, Sir, it would not. It is brought here now because they are disappointed and have been rejected by the people of this country. They are taking their sweet revenge upon the people of the country because they would not place their confidence in them during the late election. Now, as long as they go on in this way, decrying their country, doing all manner of things to injure their country, the people never will have confidence in them. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what the object of this discussion is, at this particular time. It is not for the purpose of forming a

party policy, because there is no election in view. Then what is the object? The object is to strengthen the hands of the opponents of this country at Washington. They tell the people at Washington: "Stay your hand, wait, and you can get better terms." Sir, it would be a curious thing if, during the negotiation of that treaty for the settlement of difficulties between the United States and this country, the people of this country should, in their legislative halls and public occasions, say to the United States: "Do not sign the treaty, wait, and we will give you better terms." There can be no other motive, no other object. If there is a motive, if there is an object beyond that, I would like to hear it, and I will gladly withdraw the accusation, because I do not like to think it, but I am forced to think it. Now, Sir, there is another point which I will just mention. A very strange thing was said, that we could have our tariff, and they could have their tariff, that we would have control of our tariff, and they would have control of their tariff under free trade between the United States and Canada. What would induce the people of the United States to join hands with us? Only one of two things—they either want our market, or they want our territory. If they want our market, what use would it be to them unless it was protected in the same degree that theirs is protected? No, Sir, they never would submit to join hands in equal trade, or free trade, unless we made the protection of our market as high as they are protected themselves. If the United States, for instance, want a 40 per cent. tariff to protect their market against outsiders, what use would this market be to them if we only had a tariff of 20 per cent.? Of no value or use at all. Sir, we could not have two tariffs. They may just as well acknowledge the corn at once, and say commercial union. Then I say that if there is commercial union, we must have political union. You cannot have commercial union with one nation and political union with another. Why, Sir, what would be the result of commercial union? A barrier set upon the shores of this great Dominion against the whole outside world, whether it be Asiatic or European. We set up a barrier, and we say to the outside world: "You shall not trade with us, we are a people within ourselves, we can trade within ourselves, and we do not want you at all." That would be the result. Ships would be withdrawn from our shores, the trade of the St. Lawrence would be dried up in a short time, Montreal would cease to be a commercial centre, Toronto would disappear as a commercial centre, all the ships crossing the Atlantic would come to New York city, the leading commercial houses would be there, and we would have none of that trade whatever. Why, Sir, we would be abandoned by the rest of the world. What would be the result if Mr. Hitt's Bill should become law. Let us see what he says of it himself:

"I say that this treaty, if we had a treaty to-morrow for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, that treaty would last just so long as it suited the American people and no longer."

The moment it ceased to suit them, they would then abandon that treaty, and might is right, and would be right, because we would be abandoned by the rest of the world. Besides that we would be a small people and they would swallow us up. Their invitation, if there is any, is the invitation of the spider to the fly; they will take us in and consume us, and then they are done with us. No, Sir, what does Mr. Hitt say?

"But we can at any time withdraw from commercial union if it works unfairly."

That is just what they are after, Mr. Speaker, they want to get us into treaty, a commercial union with them, and then, Sir, these combines that exist in the United States, both agricultural and manufacturing, would pour down their surplus upon us here for the purpose of extinguishing every member of life and every industry in

this country. Just as soon as they succeeded in extinguishing that, then the whole of the capital of this country would be transferred to the United States, and when they had all our artisans also on the other side of the lines, they would say "we want your treaty no longer," and might is right in this case, as I have already said. Then in what position would we be placed? It would cost us to try the experiment, and it would be only an experiment; what? It would cost us about three hundred thousand artisans. What do three hundred thousand artisans mean to this country? Each one of those artisans and his family are worth to Canada at least \$1,000, and you can multiply three hundred thousand by one thousand dollars and find the cost. We would lose that to start with. We would also lose two hundred or two hundred and fifty millions of capital now invested in manufactures. And what would we lose besides? We would lose the respect of every right thinking man, not only in this country and in Great Britain, but of every honest, patriotic and right thinking man in the United States, who would look upon us with scorn and contempt. That is the situation in which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to place Canada. I repeat that this question has not been brought up for the purpose of forming a party policy, because it is useless now; it has been brought up for some other object, and I wish some hon. gentleman opposite would relieve me from the suspicion that it was not taken up with the object of promoting the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, after the numerous and elaborate speeches which have been delivered on both sides of the House since the beginning of this discussion, I feel it would be idle on my part to attempt to review at any length the different branches and details of the question or to read long statistics which would probably have no other effect than to weary the House at this advanced stage of the debate. To say, Sir, that free trade between Canada and the United States is a question which is highly interesting and popular is simply asserting a truth, which is so manifest, so palpable, so vulgar, if I may use the expression, that no one would venture to deny it. The people of Canada remember that under the old treaty of 1854 they enjoyed a prosperity unknown to us before, and since its abrogation they have continuously wished its renewal. Before the abrogation of that treaty the Canadian Government took steps towards its renewal, and since its abrogation they have on different occasions attempted to negotiate a new treaty, one on a wider and more liberal basis. Subsequently, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, being the leader of the Opposition and perfectly acquainted with public opinion in this country, thought he could do nothing better to win the confidence of his countrymen and be restored to power than to persuade them that it was in his power to give reciprocity of trade with the United States to Canada, that he had found the means whereby that beneficent measure could be secured—he would apply reciprocity of tariff and within a few years that measure would produce reciprocity of trade. In 1879 the National Policy was inaugurated under the auspices of the right hon. gentleman. He had placed on the Statute-book of the country a declaration by which he gave proof to the people of Canada that he was determined to fulfil his promises and to carry out the reciprocity policy which he had enunciated and promised on the hustings, as soon as the Government of the United States was ready to reciprocate. But they did not reciprocate. Eight years have elapsed. During the interval we have had the National Policy, and we are still waiting for a reciprocity with the United States. But will it be said that the people of Canada have become indifferent towards reciprocity with our neighbors? Surely no one will pretend to make such an assertion in face of the numerous meetings that have taken place

from time to time, and in the presence of the correspondence which has taken place recently between the Canadian and American Governments. On reading that correspondence it is reasonable to hold that the Canadian Government, by proposing to the Americans to make some arrangements providing for freer commercial relations between the two countries, intended, if they succeeded in negotiating a new treaty, to obtain a treaty on broader, wider and more liberal terms than the old Reciprocity Treaty, because the American Government had already refused to renew simply and purely the old treaty. These facts to which I have referred show conclusively that the Government of this country, from the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854, held that reciprocity between Canada and the United States was a desirable measure and one advantageous to Canada. It seems as if they had changed their programme on the other side of the House, for to-day you can hardly find any vestige of reciprocity on the other side of the House. By the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the gentlemen opposite have entirely banished reciprocity from their programme. Since that amendment was placed before the House reciprocity has met with an unfriendly feeling on the other side of the House. Let us hear what that amendment says:

"That all the words after 'That' be struck out in order to add the following:—'Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.'"

What is the real and precise meaning of this language? What is its interpretation? According to the hon. gentlemen opposite, it means this, that Canada in the past has been desirous of securing reciprocity with the United States, but as for the future, Canada is no longer desirous of securing such reciprocity as would interfere with the National Policy. That, Sir, according to my humble judgment, is the true meaning of this amendment. We all know, Sir, that the National Policy has been formed not only for the purpose of protecting the manufacturers of this country against foreign competition, but it has also been instituted for the purpose of protecting the Canadian farmers against competition on the part of the farmers of the United States. Surely, Sir, no man will pretend to say that even reciprocity limited to the exchange of natural products between the two countries can exist, to such an extent, without interfering with the National Policy of this country. I hold, Sir, that if this amendment contains the real opinions of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House with regard to this question, that they are to-day opposed to any sort of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. It is true that we have heard some of those gentlemen express opinions favorable to limited reciprocity, but at the same time I have noticed and I found it very strange that their whole line of reasoning on this point, if not positively antagonistic was very far from supporting such a policy. We heard the Minister of the Interior—for whose talents and eloquence I always had a great admiration—say that he was favorable to that "limited reciprocity," and by limited reciprocity I mean reciprocity only in the interchange of natural products between the two countries. He said he was in favor of such reciprocity, but at the same time he took care to tell us that the United States produced more natural products than they could consume in that country. It is easy, Sir, to see the inference from that statement. The last speaker who has just taken his seat has spoken in the same way and expressed views in the same direction. He said that the Western States produced a large surplus and that the United States were bound to export a surplus of those products to other

Mr. BECHARD.

countries. What does it mean? It means that the United States market is not after all so good a market for the exports of the natural products of Canada. Those two gentlemen are not the only ones who spoke in the same strain. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) whom I am glad to see in his seat opened in the same way. That hon. gentleman told us in a short speech a good many things which going to the country need I think some discussion. He told us exactly the same thing as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—that the United States possessed a large surplus of natural products and that they are bound to export them to other countries, and that we in Canada must expect to send our surplus of natural products to markets where they are needed. What is the meaning of this language? How do you interpret it, Mr. Speaker? I do not know, Sir, although I am aware of your abilities and of the very logical mind that you possess—that you would interpret it in the same way as it would occur to my mind. But the interpretation which I make of it is this: That the United States possessing a large surplus of natural products; a larger quantity than is needed to supply their own market, that the market of the United States is not the real market to which our farmers ought to export their natural products. Yet in the same breath those hon. gentlemen tell us that they are in favor of reciprocity so far as the free interchange of natural products is concerned. I would ask my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat for what reason, under such circumstances, would they be favorable to reciprocity at all? Under circumstances such as they have described, of what avail would it be to them at all? My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) said in his remarks that the great prosperity enjoyed by this country under the Treaty of 1854 was principally due to the American war. My hon. friend had forgotten surely that the treaty was inaugurated in 1854, and that the war began only in 1861, and that therefore seven years elapsed from the beginning of the inauguration of the treaty to the breaking out of the war. Surely during that long interval the farmers of Canada enjoyed great prosperity. I regret to see—I deeply regret to see—the attitude my hon. friend has taken with regard to this question. I have much personal esteem for my hon. friend. Our counties lie adjacent to each other. Both are agricultural constituencies having identical interests. Although my friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and I have not often agreed in politics, I did hope that upon a question of this kind we could stand together. It is true that my hon. friend advocated and supported the National Policy, but I thought that like his distinguished former leader he had supported it only as a means in order to secure free trade—or reciprocity—between Canada and the United States. My hon. friend said that our farmers were satisfied with the National Policy, that they were making money under its operation, and that some of them had deposits in banks. Well, Sir, I do not think the fact that some farmers have deposits in banks is conclusive proof that their business is actually good and prosperous. It may show that they enjoyed some prosperity in the past, which enabled them to make some savings. But, Sir, we all know that the farmers as a class do not generally keep their money in banks. They are rather inclined to suspect the stability of those institutions, and they are not satisfied with the small profits they draw from their deposits. They generally prefer to invest their money in land; but, Sir, within the last few years business has been so dull—I speak of the farmers of the Province of Quebec—that those of them who have been most prudent and have made some savings, prefer to have their money in the banks to investing it. Some of them have invested their money in land, but they find themselves pledged to obligations which they cannot

fulfil, and some of them have been obliged to go to the United States. But those who kept the money in the banks are now waiting for better times to bring them opportunities for investing it. That a large number of the farmers have been for a time satisfied with the National Policy I do not undertake to deny. They were led to hope that that policy would make them all rich; but a change of times has brought a change of mind, and to-day those farmers have their eyes open. They understand that the great prosperity they enjoyed a few years ago is not to be attributed to the National Policy, but to the abundant crops with which we were blessed in this country, and the great increase in the demand for our natural products in Europe, where the crops were comparative failures. They understand to-day that the high prices which they obtained for their products during those prosperous years were not fixed by the National Policy, as they understand that this same National Policy is powerless to raise the low prices that prevail at the present time. Sir, the farmers in Rouville are not any more indifferent than these in the other counties of Quebec to free trade with the United States. They know very well that the horses they sell are shipped to the United States. They know that a large proportion of their cattle, their sheep, their wool, their barley, their eggs, and their poultry which they sell is shipped to the American market; and they know that every ton of hay which they sell is shipped to the United States. The hon. gentleman for Rouville knows that in many counties of the Province of Quebec hay is one of the principal products of the farm, and the one upon which the farmers depend most to make money. There are large tracts of land in the Province of Quebec which are natural meadows, the soil being specially a hay producing soil; and there are other large tracts where artificial meadows are made. For a number of years our farmers, finding that they could produce hay more profitably than grain, have given their attention to that industry, and they are to-day producing large quantities of hay, the surplus of which is almost wholly shipped to the United States. The hon. member for Rouville, I regret to say, endeavored the other day to create the impression that this hay trade has been diminishing in importance within the last few years. He quoted statistics to show that the importation of hay by the United States has been decreasing since 1865; but if the exports of hay from Canada to the United States have brought less money to the farmers this year than last year, that does not prove that the trade is decreasing, because the reduction in the value may be due to the fact that the price of hay is lower in the American market this year than it was last year; and it may also be due to the fact that the hay crop has been smaller this year than last year, and therefore that a smaller quantity has been exported. Now, Sir, I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that in 1885 the whole of our exports of hay amounted to 134,936 tons, of which the United States imported 127,820 tons, leaving only 7,000 tons as the quantity exported from Canada to other countries. In 1886 the whole export was 93,944 tons, of which 85,490 tons were exported to the United States, leaving a balance of 8,000 only exported to other countries. In 1887, our whole export was 76,843, and from that quantity we exported to the United States 69,450 tons, leaving 8,000 tons for export to other countries. You see by these statistics that the trade between Canada and the United States is not losing its importance. I repeat what I said a few minutes ago that the farmers in the constituency of my hon. friend are not indifferent, but are far from being indifferent to reciprocity with the United States. Does not my hon. friend remember that a few years ago some leading men of his constituency made strenuous exertions to secure the construction of a railway which has placed the greatest portion of that constituency in direct communication with the Boston mar-

kets? Does not the hon. gentleman remember that some of the municipalities, through which that railway has been built, voted bonuses in order to secure its construction? Why, he knows that his town, where he lives, voted a bonus of about \$40,000 to that company, in order to secure the construction of a branch which would connect it with the railway to which I have just referred, and consequently place it in direct communication with the markets of the Eastern States. These facts show conclusively, according to my humble judgment, that the farmers of Rouville, as well as the farmers of other constituencies in Quebec, consider the markets of the Eastern States good markets for the sale of a large portion of their products; and they explain that they are good markets for our products on account of the good quality of our products, and because we are in closer proximity to the Eastern States than are the Western States, which produce the large surplus exported by the United States. Here I must pay my respects to my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont) to whose speech I listened with great attention. I noticed that he could not understand why we should grant free trade to the United States when we did not grant it to England. The reason seems obvious. It is because, if we have reciprocity with the United States, we discriminate in favor of the United States against England, and in return the United States will discriminate in our favor against the whole world, while England, in receiving free of duty all our products, confers no favor upon us, but does for us what she is doing for the rest of the world. My hon. friend told us that we pay 20 per cent. duty to-day on our exports to the United States, but that with unrestricted reciprocity, we will pay much more than that by direct taxation. If my hon. friend is as friendly as he professes to be to the farmers of Canada and the farmers of his constituency and Province, he should go in heart and soul for unrestricted reciprocity, for that would have the effect of removing immediately all those obnoxious taxes which are weighing so heavily, according to my hon. friend, upon the farmers of the country. The National Policy has always been, and shall always remain, powerless to relieve the farmers. With unrestricted reciprocity, when a farmer in Rouville sells a horse worth \$100, he will not be obliged, as he is to-day, under the National Policy, to lose \$20 on the price, so as to pay the American duty, but he will receive the full price without any deduction. To prove that the opinion that the heavy duties on exports to the United States are paid by the producer is correct, I may mention the fact that the hay merchants who buy our hay and sell it in the United States have been endeavoring for the last few years to get refunded by the American Government the extra duty which was exacted during several years by the American customs officers. That shows that in the minds of these merchants, as in the minds of those whom they buy the hay, it is the Canadian producer who pays the duty. My hon. friend is afraid direct taxation will be the consequence of unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I confess that if I were persuaded such would be the result of the policy, I would not only hesitate to vote for it, but I would unhesitatingly vote against it. I am far, however, from being persuaded that such will be the result of the adoption of this policy. My hon. friend from South Huron, in his able speech the other day, explained in a satisfactory manner the various ways by which we could compensate for the loss of revenue that would follow the adoption of that policy. Sir, we governed this country with the expense of \$23,000,000 a year when the hon. member for East York was at the head of the Government; and I do not see why we should not still govern the country with about the same amount. Reduce the expenses of the country to that figure, and there will never be any fear of any direct taxation. Unrestricted reciprocity, instead of leading to direct taxation, would have the effect of rendering us more economical. It

would be the antidote which would cure the spirit of extravagance that now reigns in the expenditure of public money. Hon. gentlemen opposite object to unrestricted reciprocity, because they fear it would injure our manufactures, and on that account my hon. friend for Rouville told us that he would not sacrifice the manufacturers even to give reciprocity to the farmers. He said that with unrestricted reciprocity, the American manufacturers would not come to Canada to manufacture but would slaughter our market. Well, market slaughtering can only occur under certain conditions. No market can be slaughtered unless every other market is perfectly glutted and goods are sold at a great sacrifice. Under such circumstances I can understand that large quantities of goods may at some time be poured from the glutted market into the other market, which may then become glutted, but, with unrestricted reciprocity, there will no longer be a Canadian market and an American market, but they will be one and the same market where the prices of goods will be the same from one end to the other. I cannot understand, then, this idea of slaughtering. I admit that some manufacturers will be injured in their interest perhaps, by unrestricted reciprocity, and especially that class of manufacturers, who, taking advantage of the high tariff which protects them, have enriched themselves and supplied the consuming public with an inferior article. They will surely be condemned to choose one of two alternatives, either to improve their manufactures or to disappear from the scene and make room for others, and I think that their disappearance would be no loss to the country. But those manufacturers who have sufficient intelligence to conduct their business properly, who do not depend entirely upon the tariff to give stability to their industries knowing the great natural advantages which have been given to this country, knowing that labor can be procured here as cheap, if not cheaper than in the United States, knowing that living here is cheaper than in the United States, knowing that improved machinery can be obtained here cheaper than it can in the United States, and knowing that our raw material can be bought here as cheap as it can in the United States, I say that those manufacturers do not fear competition, because already they have taken care to equalise the conditions of manufacturing between themselves and all possible competitors. Those manufacturers do not dread competition from the United States, but what they dread is the narrow market in which they are situated, and what they want is the broad market in which they can easily sell their products. The National Policy, according to the intention of its promoters, was to accomplish one great thing amongst others. It had for its mission to stop the emigration of our countrymen to the United States, and not only that, but to bring back those who had already emigrated. How many of them did they bring back home? I do not think it would be a very difficult task for the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to count them, and we all know that the emigration has been going on just the same. If you go to the Province of Quebec at this season, every Sunday you will hear, after divine service, the announcement that farmers are going away, that they are selling their farms and selling their stock because they are going to the United States. This is the state of things in the Province of Quebec. But, with unrestricted reciprocity, that which no policy has been able to cure would find its cure, because that would increase the manufacturing industries of this country, and I venture to say that, under that policy, within ten years, the manufacturing industry would have taken such a stand in this country as could never be obtained in half a century under the National Policy. Those who now go to the United States would find here what they are seeking, and that is the only remedy which would keep them in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have raised the cry of annexation. I cannot take my seat

Mr. BECHARD.

without making an observation on that point. Those hon. gentlemen seem to think that annexation would be the unavoidable result of the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, and they seem to dread that result so much that they are inexhaustible in their expressions of loyalty. It is not the first time, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, that I have witnessed such an explosion of loyalty. I have never yet spoken of mine, because I always thought there was no reason for it, and, if on this occasion I briefly refer to it, it is not because I think that my own interests will be served by it, but I will do so in order to prove to hon. gentlemen opposite that loyalty is not their exclusive property. I am not an annexationist. I think we enjoy as much liberty in this country as they do in the United States. I think, if there is any difference between the two countries, the difference is in our favor, because I think that sometimes their idea of liberty in the United States goes a little too far, and is contrary to the preservation of good order. Like the rest of my French-speaking countrymen, like the rest of the French Canadians, I am loyal to British institutions, although, not being of British extraction, I may consequently not feel in my bosom that same degree of filial affection for England which burns in the hearts of her own sons. Yet, Mr. Speaker, from boyhood, I have been led to admire and to love England. I have studied her history, I have admired her great achievements and the genius of her great people. To a certain extent, I have been acquainted with her literature, and have been charmed with her poets. I have endeavored, although I have succeeded but imperfectly, to learn the language of her sons, amongst whom I am happy to count some good friends and men for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. But above all, Sir, from boyhood I have been imbued with her principles of self-government, which she has taught the civilised world. Being born a British subject, and with such a training, you will easily understand that I could not help loving and admiring the great nation to whose destinies the fate of my native country was bound. But, Sir, permit me to add that while I love and admire England, I love Canada more, and should anything occur in the course of events to compel me to choose between my loyalty to England and my loyalty to Canada, I would not hesitate to side with my native country. I feel in my heart that by doing so I would be playing the part of a patriot. But, Sir, the contention that annexation must be the unavoidable result of the adoption of unrestricted free trade with the United States, is untrue. I cannot see any reason why a broad and liberal measure of reciprocity between these countries would accomplish more in that direction than has been accomplished by a narrow and small measure of reciprocity such as the Treaty of 1854 gave us. Sir, before the Treaty of 1854 was entered into, annexationists were found; men of high standing became annexationists, and published a manifesto expressing their annexation opinions, which was spread broadcast throughout our country. Annexation meetings took place in some of our rural districts, where resolutions were passed endorsing annexation. I was a young man then, attending college, but I remember quite well those meetings. I have particular reasons to remember them. I remember that all persons whose names were published as being connected with those meetings, or as having endorsed those resolutions, were dismissed by the then Canadian Government from the honorary offices which they held under the Crown, such as justice of the peace, or an officer in the militia. Well, Sir, these facts show that there was an annexation feeling which, at one time, found favor in Canada. Sir, a very old axiom says *si vis pacem para bellum*—if you want to preserve peace, prepare for war. Let me tell this House, let me tell the farmers of this country, that if you wish to prevent the development of an

annexation feeling in this country, give to the Canadians unrestricted free trade with the United States.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, this, as has been very often said, during the course of this debate, is a matter of very great consequence to this country, and I could not give a silent vote upon it inasmuch as it is a matter that has never come before the people yet. It is only a year ago in February that we had a general election, and then we went to the country with all the matters of practical politics that had been talked about for years past; and one would have naturally thought that if there was to be such a very strange and startling departure from our fiscal policy, hon. gentlemen opposite and the hon. leader of the Opposition, who was then in the country leading that party, would have promulgated it and brought it before the people in order to give them an opportunity to decide upon it. The National Policy was no new thing. It had been spoken about from the hustings, from every school house in every part of the country from 1878 until the date of the last election, and at the general elections and at every bye-election changes were rung on the National Policy, on the one hand upon the great benefits derived from it by the people, on the other hand upon the great ruin it brought upon the people. One would have naturally thought that if a great change was to be placed before the people, that not only were we on the brink of a great calamity that might have been averted by hon. gentlemen opposite, but we had actually fallen into the abyss of misery and despair and there was no help for us now except by this heroic treatment of which we have heard,—one would have naturally thought that the country being in such a desperate state, requiring such heroic treatment, those hon. gentlemen would have taken the people into their confidence, would have spoken to them as a physician would speak to his patient, would have asked the patient the seat of the pain and the seat of the disease, and having ascertained what was the trouble would have prescribed accordingly. But we heard nothing about it. On the other hand, candidates who were running in opposition to the Government not only did not oppose the National Policy, not only did not speak against it, but in very many instances within my own knowledge, they came out as advocates and supporters of the very National Policy which for many years before they had so bitterly denounced. What was the excuse for this turn-about? Their leader had come to the conclusion that the country was so much involved in debt, that it would be dangerous to introduce any new fiscal policy, and therefore they had perforce to accept the policy of their opponents, and they told the people that if they would entrust them with the reins of power they might rest assured that the industries of the country would not be interfered with. That was the state of things in February last year. We heard nothing about this new policy during the last Session of Parliament. The leader of the Opposition was then in his place in this House, and yet we heard nothing of this terrible calamity that in the meantime had overwhelmed the country, and nothing of the necessity of this heroic measure being adopted. But after that hon. gentleman, through indisposition, was obliged to leave this country, temporarily, I hope, then we find this policy is introduced suddenly upon this House. Now, I take it we are in this position—I am in this position and every other hon. member is in this position—he is not here as the representative of this new fangled idea. The people have not sent representatives here to say what should be done in this crisis. On the contrary, the majority of the members have been sent here as supporters of the National Policy, as members

pledged not to interfere in any way with our industries or to change our fiscal policy in any way whatever. I would be recreant to my trust if I did not carry out that pledge, and I would never hesitate one moment about the way I would cast my vote on this matter. If I thought differently, if I agreed with hon. gentlemen opposite, having been sent to represent certain principles, I would feel it my bounden duty rather than vote with the opponents of those principles, although I agreed with their contentions, to resign my seat and go back to the people and ask them what they thought about the matter. That is the only logical way of doing in such a case. Is this country in that despairing state that hon. gentlemen opposite have depicted it? With the permission of the House I would like to take a brief retrospect of our history in Canada. It is not a very long history. Although born in Canada myself and not a very old man, I recollect the day, and it does not seem very long ago, when there was not a single railway in Canada and not a single telegraph line here, when all the passenger traffic between Montreal and Toronto was carried on by a single coach each way per day. Now look at the contrast. That was probably up to 1854, and the Grand Trunk, I think, commenced in that year; and not very long before that, probably in 1858, the first telegraph line was built in this country. Canada in those days was, comparatively speaking, a wilderness compared with what it is to-day. With the permission of the House I will read a short extract from a work by Mr. Talbott, the son of Governor Talbott, I think, who describes the country then in better language than I can use. He said:

"Nature has probably done more for Upper Canada than any other tract of country of equal extent; and art seems to conduct herself upon the modest principle, that it would be an act of unpardonable presumption in her, to attempt the further improvement of a country so greatly indebted to the kind indulgence of her elder sister. Here is the finest field for the exercise of human industry and ingenuity; a soil not only capable of producing in abundance all the necessities of life, but equal to the culture of its greatest luxuries; a climate not only favorable to the human constitution, but also eminently calculated for the cultivation of every species of grain and fruit. And yet, so great is the delusion under which many Europeans still labor, with respect to the real character of this fine country, that most of those who have not seen it compare it with the deserts of Siberia; and receive all that travellers relate in its favor with no more candor than can be expected from persons who evince no wish to be undeceived."

I think we are a good deal to blame for the idea that the people of England and other countries have of Canada. It seems to be thought that the only things we can send from Canada to represent the habits of its people and the products of its soil, are small articles made by Indians, little canoes, snow shoes, toboggans, a miniature of the ice palace at Montreal, all of which go to give people in England the idea that Canada is a perfect desert, just as Mr. Talbott wrote over forty years ago. It is said that Canada is not well known in England and other countries. Why it was only the other day that an historian—a very celebrated man—came as far as Buffalo and when he looked across Lake Erie and saw the waste of waters, and saw the ice floating about, he did not think that he ought to come to Canada, and he afterwards talked about our country as a perfect Siberia. I am sorry he did not come into this country because he would have found that it was a different place from what he represented. I have told the House the position Canada occupied in 1840 and 1850. In 1854 the Grand Trunk Railway was commenced and in 1853, I think it was, the Crimean war began, and those two influences gave a very great impetus to trade in Canada. For instance land went up to a very high figure. In 1856 I went from Cobourg to Lindsay, in the county of Victoria, and I have lived there since. Farms which you could have bought for \$20 an acre went up to \$60 an acre at this time, and town lots that were sold in Lindsay—quarter-acre lots—at \$700 in 1857 and 1858 are not worth one-quarter the money to-

day. There was an extraordinary advance in the price of land at this time, and there was also an extraordinary advance in the price of grain. I recollect that wheat sold at \$2.50 a bushel, and farmers thought there was no end to their wealth, and they were prepared to buy any amount of land either in town or country. This state of things could not, of course, last forever. The land from being an extraordinary price had to come down somewhat, and it did come down, but I do not admit it has come down to such an alarming extent as gentlemen opposite have stated. I wish to say a few words in reference to the remarks made by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), and I am sorry he is not in the House, because I told him I was going to comment on his speech and on some very extraordinary statements that he had made. In the first place he states that he was alarmed to find the extent that farmers in his county were ready to go in order to obtain access to the American markets. I suppose what he meant by that was that they were in favor of this motion now before the House, or rather commercial union, because it was commercial union that was talked about at the time that he must have met those persons. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that statement, although he is their representative I know the people of North Victoria probably far better than he does. As I told you I have lived in the town of Lindsay, in the centre of the county, about thirty-three years, and I know the people, and I know further that there is no constituency that will give a more decided vote upon unrestricted reciprocity than will the electors of North Victoria. Were my hon. friend here I could tell him what he probably knows, and that is, that he represents that constituency to-day not because they love him more but that they would have nothing to do with the party who was there before. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) seems to have loaded himself up with figures and statistics gleaned from I know not what source, because they are very erroneous indeed. I think that he has well earned the name and title of "Baron Statistics the Second." He told us that he wanted to be very accurate, and that he had gone to a great deal of trouble in order to make out his facts and figures correctly. Notwithstanding this he makes the astounding statement that in the county I have the honor to represent there are 31,563 farmers. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are just about 1,700 farmers in North Victoria, and that is all; yet he has added on over 12,000 more than the entire population engaged in other industries. I wish there were 21,000 farmers engaged in agriculture in North Victoria, and if there were it would be a splendid county. But this statement shows that the hon. gentleman, knowing nothing whatever about the facts, loads himself up with those figures without knowing what he talks about. I will not quote the figure of speech used by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but I may say that we have heard a great many gentlemen in this debate and "an avalanche of figures with a deluge of facts." It is an extraordinary thing that of over 200 representatives chosen by the people of this country for the purpose of coming here and legislating for the good of the country, we cannot find out such simple matters as to who pays the duty on horses or barley or butter, and when they have got to go to all kinds of figures and statistics, both in Canada and the United States, to find out whether or not the United States pays the duty on horses exported to that country. I think the best thing we can do is to get two or three practical men to solve that question, because after all it seems to me to be an important question in this debate as to who pays the duty on horses or lumber, or anything of that sort.

Mr. SCRIVER. You solve it for us.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You have not succeeded in having it solved yet. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—
Mr. HUDSPETH.

for whose ability I have a great respect—as I understand him, says that the Americans pay the duty on barley. I am quite willing to take the hon. gentleman's opinion because I think he is correct, but then the great majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite are not content to take that opinion and they have not yet solved the question. I must congratulate the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) who spoke last on the very sensible speech that he made, and I could agree in a great measure with his remarks were it not that I am so very strongly attached to British connection, and I cannot bear to do anything that would in any way lessen the bonds that bind us to the mother land. Were it not for this, Mr. Speaker, I think I could agree with everything he said, but I will have some remarks later on to make about matters on which I think he is a little mistaken. Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about the depression in the value of land. There is no doubt that owing to the Crimean war, owing to the extraordinary expenditure in Canada by the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway and other railways, and owing to the American war which followed in 1861 and which paralysed all the industry and trade of that country, not only during the years of the war but for many years afterwards, there was an impetus given to every kind of business in Canada, and to the farming interests it gave a very extraordinary impetus. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to have my opinion and I express the belief that it was those wars and this large expenditure of money which increased the price for horses, cattle and all kinds of products and which raised the price of land to an abnormal extent. There had of course to come a reaction. When the Americans recovered themselves, as they did very rapidly, they no longer paid such high prices for grain and everything we had to sell, and the influences of those wars passed away. The large expenditure of money for railways in Canada, ceased to a very material extent; our North-Western country was opening up; an immense territory in the Western States had been opened, large wheat-growing tracts in South America and Central America as well as in India were being developed. All these things combined to pull down the prices of our farm products. I think it is absurd for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to argue that the National Policy alone could raise the price of everything we produce. It has assisted, no doubt, but there are other powers and influences at work. Nor can I agree with hon. gentleman opposite that the National Policy has been a bad thing for this country. I think it has been a good thing for the country on the whole. I think we ought to protect our industries, and it would be a very silly and foolish thing to attribute the depreciation in the value of land and the lowering of the prices of our products, to the National Policy; the man in the moon has got just about as much to do with it. Now, I am not going to trouble you with very many statistics, because they are not very reliable things after all. You can prove almost anything from statistics, I have heard one hon. gentleman say, and I believe there is a good deal of truth in that. But I will give you this for what it is worth—it relates to my own riding of South Victoria. I wrote to the county treasurer, without the slightest idea of what the result would be, to send me the assessed value of property in that riding from 1876 to 1887, inclusive, which he has done. I find that there has been no very material change in the value of the land. The township of Mariposa was assessed in 1876 for \$2,712,940, and it varies very little. It goes down a little in 1877, 1873, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, and 1884, and then it goes up again in 1886 and 1887. In 1887 it was about a dollar more than it was in 1876; so there is very little change in the value of land in that township from 1876 to 1887. In the township of Ops the assessed value has decreased some \$300,000 in 1887 from what it was in 1876. In Verulam it has decreased \$100,000

odd. In Emily it has increased enormously. That shows how little reliance can be placed even on this class of statistics, which is probably the best that can be obtained. My idea is this: Different assessors are appointed, and they have different ideas of the value of land. Then, a few years ago the Ontario Legislature passed an Act requiring the assessors to value the land at its actual cash value, that is, at the price at which it would sell at an ordinary sale. So, I think these figures are probably as good as any could possibly be, and are worth something. I do not say that they are actually reliable, because a man would assess his farm at a great deal less than he would sell it for; but if you took all the municipalities throughout the Province in the same way, you would be able to see whether the land had depreciated to the enormous extent hon. gentlemen opposite say. Now, the town of Lindsay was one of those places which was boomed by the construction of the Midland Railway in 1857, and the assessment of lots in that town must have been very high in the years immediately succeeding 1857. Notwithstanding the depreciation in the value of property in most of the towns of the Province—and we in Lindsay, like other neighboring towns, have felt very materially the effect of the land booming in the city of Toronto—yet the assessed value of Lindsay in 1887 was \$2,000,000 higher than it was in 1876. We have got over our depression; and although Lindsay is not what you might call a manufacturing town, we have a few manufacturing industries in it; the town is going ahead; we have not a single vacant house in Lindsay, and preparations are being made for building a great many houses as soon as spring opens. The hon. member for North Victoria spoke of the exodus which is going on in many parts of this country, and he mentioned one young man who left Lindsay to better his fortune in the United States. If he had applied to me I could have given him other instances. I know that a great many have gone from his constituency in the last few years, since the North-West has been opened up, and I do not blame them a bit. There is in North Victoria a great deal of very poor land, for instance, in the township of Carden; you would think no man would inflict such a punishment on any man as to compel him to go and live there. The Ontario Government built a colonisation road; settlers went in and built their houses; and as long as the lumbering operations went on, and they were able to cut beaver hay, and grow a little oats and a few other things, they were able to make a living in the shanties in the winter. But after the lumbering was finished, they borrowed all the money they could from some unfortunate company on the rocks they occupied, and went to the North-West or to the States, whichever would suit them better. Travelling through that country a little over two years ago, I passed a great many empty houses which had no doubt been deserted in that way. But this is only the case on those poor lands. There is nothing of the sort in South Victoria, and nothing of the sort in North Victoria where the land is good. But I will tell you what is a great cause of the exodus. As hon. gentlemen know, the great majority of the farms in Ontario, at any rate, only comprise 100 acres each, and many are even smaller. The consequence is that a man who has a good farm, and is quite able to maintain his family comfortably, finds that if he has two boys, he is not able to buy land for them at \$60 an acre, and the result is that one boy gets his father's farm, and he gives the other what he can afford, and lets him go to the West and take up land for himself. Now, that will go on, and continue to go on, and I do not care whether you abolish the National Policy or have commercial union, or annexation, or whatever you will, it will not better that state of things. It is just as natural as that the bird shall leave the nest when it can fly. These people must have lands to live upon, and if they cannot get

them here, they will go elsewhere. If our Government see their way to develop the North-West Territories, and in every possible way give advantage to these settlers, I have no doubt that in a few years our young men, farmer's sons, instead of going to the Western States, will go to our North-West Territories, and make their homes in their own country, but that exodus must go on. Another thing which has a great deal to do with it, is education. Our farmers are educating their sons, our professions are crowded with their sons; they cannot find sufficient field for their talents in Canada, and they must go to the States. They will go to the wealthy country. Do you mean to tell me, Sir, that annexation is going to remedy that? You might as well try to keep Scotchmen as Canadians out of New York, if they can better their circumstances in that city. There are more Scotchmen in London to-day than in Edinburgh, and more Irishmen than in Dublin, and it will ever be thus. The large centres will attract the clever men; and if you educate your sons you must expect they will go where their education will be appreciated. Why, we had two school teachers in the town of Lindsay, to whom we paid \$300 apiece, and since the first of January last we have lost them both. One went to Chicago and got there \$600 a year, and she telegraphed to the other, who joined her, and who also gets \$600 a year. I could not blame the girls; no one could. They had a perfect right to better their fortunes. It was not because of the National Policy that they left Canada, but because they got \$600 in the States, when they could only get \$300 here. I know of two of our young men who left the town of Lindsay for New York, where they are now getting \$2,500. You could not blame these young men. They did not leave the country because they hated it, for no more loyal men could be found anywhere, but they went to New York as Scotchmen go to London, because they had a field there for their abilities; and I am proud to say our schools are doing good work, and our farmers and mechanics and even laborers are giving their sons such an education as no other country on the globe gives them. The consequence is that for a time at least we must have an exodus of these young men. To say that can be cured by heroic treatment, such as annexation to the States, is utter folly; and I do not believe hon. gentlemen opposite believe it can be cured in this way. As to the value of lands, my experience is that they have not much depreciated in value. Within the last three or four weeks two transactions have taken place in my presence which do not show evidence of depreciation. In one case, in Mariposa, a farm of 98 acres with very poor buildings on it was sold for \$6,100 cash; and in the other case a farm of 100 acres in the township of Ops was sold for \$6,900. The price asked in the latter case was \$7,000, but as the cash was paid down, the seller took off \$100. That does not look as if the people had no hope and as if the country was in an abyss of despair. People who can pay \$70 per acre for land are not in a very bad way, and when that price can be got for land I do not think the country is in such a bad state. But I must confess that poor lands have gone down tremendously. I speak very feelingly on that subject, because I know it to my own cost. You cannot sell poor land at any price, for men will not go on poor farms when they can go to the North-West and buy good land at \$4 an acre. Now, a good deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite about the mortgage debt of the farmers and the miserable state they are in. No doubt, there is a good deal of mortgage debt in the country, and the mortgage debt shows two things. It shows not only the indebtedness of a great many of the farmers but also the money that other farmers have made off their farms, because, as was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, there are a great many mortgages which the companies do not take. A great deal of private money—what is called private money in the country—is lent out, and the great bulk of that private

money is lent by men who made it in farming. I speak advisedly upon that subject. I know many farmers in the town of Lindsay who live upon the interest of their money, men who retired from their farms and rented them, and came to the town where they educated their families, and they are now living, in their old age, upon their earnings. There is one thing on which we may congratulate ourselves, and that is the great decrease in the rate of interest. From 1857 down to 1868, when I had to do with that kind of business, the rate of interest was from about 10 per cent. up to 25 or 30 per cent. I have known many mortgages to have been drawn at 25 per cent. and a great many at 10 to 15 per cent. Now interest runs from 6 to 7 per cent., which is a great change indeed, a change of which the farmers have the benefit. But why was it necessary the farmers in Ontario should be mortgaged to the extent they are? I think I know something about it. In the first place, owing, as I said before, to the very high price of produce caused by the Crimean and American wars and the expenditure in building railways, the farmer got an extravagant idea about the value of land. They, in fact, thought this thing was going to last forever. They bought lands, they paid a part of the purchase money, and gave a guarantee for the balance. Then the poor years came, poor crops sometimes came, low prices came, and they had to increase their mortgage debt, but I am happy to say a great many farmers have been paying off their mortgages. Some, of course, not so good farmers as the others, were unable to pay off their mortgages, and lost their farms, and have gone out of the country. I would like to give the House practical knowledge on this subject, because we have had so much information volunteered, and I will not read anything from any friends of my own, but I will give you the opinions expressed at a meeting of the West Victoria Farmers' Institute, where my opponent in the February elections and several strong Reformers who opposed me as hard as they could, spoke; and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will pay some respect to the opinions of these gentlemen. At a meeting held in Mariposa the other day Mr. Glendenning, from Manilla, who is a strong Reformer and a farmer, read the following paper upon the question: "Does farming pay?" Now, so much has been said in the House about the farmers being in a dreadful state of despondency, that it will not be out of place for me to read this paper, which is not very long:

"The question is often asked, 'Does farming pay?' and nearly always answered in the negative by those asking the same, and in proof of this assertion they point to the increasing indebtedness of the farmers. Permit me to state that that is not sufficient evidence to establish the case. Mercants might answer the question 'Does mercantile business pay?' in the same way by pointing to the large number of failures constantly occurring amongst their class, but the farmers would not accept that as conclusive evidence that the mercantile business was a failure, in general, and they would be wrong in doing so. Farming like other callings in life will pay just in proportion to the amount of knowledge, capital, skill, economy and labor put in the business. Many farmers sigh for the good old times they had and when they made money. Let us go back twenty-five or thirty years ago. What had the farmers to sell then? Wheat, pork, horses, cattle, sheep and wood. Except in the case of wheat can he not raise as much per acre as then? But even this point is questionable. On some farms the average has been higher within the last ten years than it was at that time. Pork can be sold for as much on the average now as then. Cattle can be sold for more. A better price and demand for horses. Wool will not bring as much, but lambs realize better prices. While on the other hand the farmer has many new avenues opened up to him to make money. Notably among them is barley, clover seed and potatoes. Also a better demand and prices can be obtained for poultry, butter and eggs. He also has the advantage of railways, enabling him to sell in the best markets when he is ready. He has larger clearings; his fields are free from stumps and stones, which permits him to work his lands more easily and to better advantage by using labor-saving machinery.

"He can buy his implements, groceries and wearing apparel for less money. Yet with all these advantages many farmers complain that they cannot make ends meet. For this there must be a cause, which I think can be accounted for largely by the following facts: For nearly twenty years, with only short intervals during that period, the farmers had large crops and high prices for most of their products. And with their increasing prosperity many of them undertook the purchase of land on

Mr. HUDSPETH.

credit at high prices either to enlarge their own domains or farms for their sons, which seriously crippled them when less prosperous years came. All, or nearly all, acquired more extravagant habits of living which they have not learned to curtail. In many cases too much farm machinery has been bought, simply because some machines comes out with high praises and flashy paint. After a time the purchaser finds out that he could have done nearly as good work with the old discarded machine that he gave to the agent or lies rotting in the fence corner. This brings us to another point. Many farmers have not provided sufficient house room for their increasing implements and vehicles, consequently some of them have to stand out in the weather to rust, warp, rot and break when hitched to, which operation tends to break their temper and break them financially. Farmers who have not contracted heavy debts and who live within their income will generally tell you that farming pays and be satisfied with their position in life, but it is sometimes very hard to make farmers believe that their present mode of living is different and more expensive than it was twenty-five or thirty years ago. Well, I will ask how many farmers at that time sported a carriage with fine harness, or they and their families wore as expensive clothes as they do now?

"I do not wish to deny farmers and their families the use and luxuries of these articles, for I think there is no class of people in the Dominion who should enjoy the good things of this life more than the farmer; but when we find a top buggy and trappings to match for himself and each boy that is grown up, and other things that are just as ridiculous, is it not time for him to stop and ask himself the question, Can I make farming pay at this rate? One drawback the farmer has to contend with now is the high price of labor; but that is in part offset by labor-saving machines, which enables him to do a greater amount of work with the number of hands employed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, those sentiments were approved of by my friend Mr. Lownsbrough, who was my opponent at the last election.

"Mr. Lownsbrough said he thought from an honest standpoint farming did pay. Mr. Glendenning thought the wages paid by farmers were too high. He could not agree with the assertion. The farm hands had only about half of the year to earn wages, or at best not more than eight months, and had to go idle the rest of the year. Mr. Glendenning called Mr. Lownsbrough's attention to his paper that he had not said farmers were not paying too much."

Mr. Fee, who was one of the bitterest opponents I had, who is a farmer, was asked to criticise Mr. Glendenning's paper—

"But found nothing to disagree with him. He fully agreed with him and more too. The farmers were to be greatly blamed for their extravagance in buying too much machinery and not taking proper care of it. A great many farmers bought farming machines they did not need."

There is the opinion of farmers who, I say, are second to no farmers in the Province of Ontario, and they say that they do not find any fault, and they give their reasons. Now, is the country in that dreadful state in which it has been depicted by hon. gentlemen opposite? Are we wallowing in the Slough of Despond? Are we vainly endeavoring to get assisted out of that Slough of Despond? Where is the evidence of it? Where are the people coming to this Parliament and asking to be assisted, and claiming that they are suffering in this way? I did hear some years ago that there was a great deal of destitution in this country, when petition after petition was sent in, and deputation after deputation was coming down and getting no assistance from the Government of that day. We heard of soup kitchens at that time, and we know that there was a great deal of destitution then. Can any one say that there has been any such destitution in the country of late years? There may have been some distress among people who have been borrowing money needlessly, but it is not of such a kind as to require the heroic remedy that the hon. gentleman proposes. The people of Canada are not in the Slough of Despond that the hon. gentleman has depicted. I have tried in my imperfect way to show what I think have been the causes of the depression, because we know that there is a depression in the price of wheat. I have tried to give my reasons for it, that it is principally because the supply exceeds the demand, and I cannot for the life of me see how this unrestricted reciprocity is going to remedy that, because we know that it is not the United States that settles the price of grain, but that it is the English market that settles it. It seems to me that there is no market for us in the States for wheat, and, as far as barley is concerned, I am inclined to take the statement

of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the Americans buy our barley simply because they must have it, because it is of a brighter color than the barley which is grown by themselves, in preference to the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who does not know anything about it except what he gets from blue-books and statistics, whereas the hon. member for South Leeds knows all about it as a practical man, and he stated, as I understood him, that the price in Canada is the same as the price in the United States, and, when they buy it here and take it ever there, they pay the duty. If we get a \$1 for our barley, and the price there is \$.10, of course we do not pay the duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Of course you may laugh. I notice that those who laugh are generally those who do not know anything about the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes, you may say "oh, oh." You are only making yourselves ridiculous, and more and more ridiculous, like the monkey climbing the pole. I do not think this is a laughing matter, it is a very serious matter, and we should try to find out the facts of the case. I hope I have not hurt any gentleman's feelings by any remarks I have made. I should be very sorry to do it. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) mentioned something about the benefits which would accrue to this country from unrestricted reciprocity, and he argued very neatly, what would be the good of reciprocity at all if we did not get the advantage of an exchange of our products with the United States? He said, very fairly, and very clearly, and very logically, that gentlemen on this side said that there was nothing to be got by the exchange because the United States had the same kind of products as we had, and therefore they did not require our products, and there was no necessity for any duty at all. Well, I do not go quite as far as that. I think that an exchange, even by one town with another, is often beneficial, and that if we could have a reciprocity treaty that would be fair both to Canada and the States, it certainly would be an advantage to us, and I think it would be an advantage to them. Now, I was speaking to a gentleman in Peterborough who manufactures sawn lumber—he is one of the largest manufacturers in the western part of the Province—about this question of the duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber. I asked him if he thought that the abolition of the duty of \$2 would give him that amount more for his lumber, and he said: "No, I don't think it would, but I think we would get a little more for it." I said: "How much do you think you would get more for it?" "Well," he said, "I think about \$1 a thousand. The supply and demand regulate this matter to a great extent, and I do not suppose if the duty upon lumber was abolished to-morrow, that we would get anything like \$2 a thousand more for our lumber than we get now." Well, I suppose the same thing might be said about horses. It has been said by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the farmers lose about \$25 upon every horse they sell to the United States. Now, there are two young men up in my county, Bisailon and Dundas, who are buying horses. I saw them the other day in Lindsay, and I enquired what amount of business they had done in 1887, and they said they had paid out \$30,000 in the town of Lindsay and in the outlying county of Victoria for horses during that year. I asked them what was the average price that they paid for horses in Lindsay, and they said that they paid on the average \$109 for each horse. They bought them for the Montreal market, but a great many of them found their way into the States. I asked them what they thought of the duty upon horses. Well, they said they thought that if the duty was abolished, they would get a little more

for horses in the States than they do now, but that the Americans wanted our horses, they were healthier than their own, and stronger. I suppose that the same rule applies to horses as to barley. The Americans must have our horses, or a certain number, and they must have our barley. Now, I cannot agree with the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) when he says he is prepared to pay the price for this unrestricted reciprocity. He is quite prepared to run the risk of our being isolated from the mother country in order to get the benefits which he imagines would be obtained by trading with the United States. He says they could sell their hay without the duty, they could sell their grain without the duty, and that they would be benefited in a great many respects. Well, I dare say from his standpoint he may be right, but that is a rule that works both ways. I suppose as far as the lumbermen in the States are concerned that if it was not a benefit to them to have this duty upon lumber continued, they would not be opposed to reciprocity, as they are now, and they would be perfectly satisfied to have the duty abolished; but it seems to me that they are very bitterly opposed to anything of the sort. They think that the duty enhances the price of the article, that by taking off the duty it might depreciate the price of the article. That is their opinion, at any rate, and I suppose the same rule will hold good with anything else. I am perfectly satisfied, and I believe that the great majority of the people of this country are satisfied, to have a very full measure of reciprocity with the United States, provided always that it does not interfere with our relations with England. That is the point, it is the crowning point, and that is the point hon. gentlemen will find when they go to the country. People will say yes, we want trade with our neighbors, we always want to trade with them, but do not ask us to trade with them at the expense of cutting us adrift from the mother country. They will not stand that one moment. Now, our country is not alone in suffering from the depression. One would think that our fair Canada was lying, amongst all the other countries of the world, a pitiable object, suffering from every possible political ill and the hon. gentlemen want to apply this heroic remedy, as it is called, to relieve her in her miserable condition. England is surely as much depressed as Canada. There is real destitution there, there is great shrinkage in the price of land, a depreciation in the price of all articles raised upon the farm. A bitter cry has come out from all of the agricultural districts of England. Hon. gentlemen say nothing about that. So far as I can learn, the farmers of the United States are in no better condition than the farmers of Canada, in any shape or way. I have read you the opinions of practical farmers in my own riding, showing you the causes which have lead up to any depression that may exist among them. They tell you truthfully what the reason is. They tell you that farming will pay if conducted skilfully by men who understand their business just the same, with the present prices, as any other business. Then I say there is no need of this heroic remedy, the country is not in a state to require it. But there is a depression, there is a shrinkage. What is the remedy? I do not think it is annexation, to the United States, I do not think it is commercial union—hon. gentlemen seem to have abandoned that name now—I do not think that it is unrestricted reciprocity. I must confess that I think there is some common sense if a man wants to break from the mother country and annex himself to the United States. There may be some common sense in commercial union, because people can understand it. I daresay that the United States would be perfectly willing to take us under their protecting arms and dole out to us our share of the duties, because there would be the same wall put all around both Canada and the United States. But I cannot understand unrestricted reciprocity. With your permission, Mr.

Speaker, I will read an article upon this point from the *Chicago Times*. After leading up to this point that paper says:

"It provides that whenever Canada desires free trade with the United States, and the same system of internal and tariff taxes, it can say so, and thereupon the President will appoint three commissioners to meet the same number appointed by the Canadian Government and prepare a plan for assimilating the internal taxes of the two countries, and the taxes on imports from all other countries, and dividing equitably the revenues derived from these sources.

"This, at least, shows some comprehension of what is necessary in order to effect the kind of commercial union about which there has been so much loose talk—the kind which goes to the extent of absolute free trade and the entire obliteration of the customs line between the two countries. Mr. Hitt and the committee evidently see that this involves not only an identical tariff but an identical internal revenue system for the two countries, which most of the advocates of commercial union have either not seen or affected not to see. As *The Times* has repeatedly pointed out, if there is absolute free trade between the two countries, and no custom houses, as between any two States of the Union, there must be the same tariff for both, for otherwise the lowest duties imposed by either would practically be the duties for both. To illustrate: If Canada should lay 30 per cent. and the United States 70 per cent. on woollen goods imported from other countries, all woollen goods imported would be entered at Canadian ports and pay the 30 per cent. duties and thence be sent free of duty into the United States. Thus the Canadians could force us to adopt whatever duties they might impose for themselves or else lose the import trade of our seaboard cities. So, too, if they put a tax of 10 cents a gallon on whiskey we would have to do the same, or all our distilling business would go to Canada. Mr. Hitt and the committee see this, and propose a mode of agreeing upon an identical tax system for the two countries, because without it the sort of commercial union contemplated is wholly impracticable."

That is just my own idea, but I thought it better to give you the opinion of some one living in the United States. The American Government would never consent to it. Do not hon. gentlemen opposite know that? What is this thing brought into this House at the present time? In the opening of my speech I stated that it was not foreshadowed in any way at the last election, it was not a matter brought before the people, but it is sprung upon the House at the present time, it has not been discussed by the country or by the press, it has changed its name like the chameleon changes its hue and it is presented to the House in the most beautiful form possible by hon. gentlemen opposite. But it is the same thing, only it will not take with our neighbors over the border—they say they will have none of it. Can it be possible that the hon. gentlemen leading the Opposition in this House have so little respect for the opinion of this House, have so little respect for the opinion of Canada that they will merely for the sake of making a point against the Government of the day, bring down a scheme which they know in their hearts will never be accepted by the people of the United States, even if the people of Canada were to go upon their knees and ask them to take it. If they were to catch the ears of the people of Canada and catch their votes, so as to be placed on this side of the House, they would then offer this scheme to the United States, which would be repudiated and refused at once, and then those hon. gentlemen would turn around to the people and say: We have done all we could, we found the country in a destitute state and we applied an heroic remedy, but when we went to the United States they would have nothing to say to us, we can do no more for you, we are in office now, the scheme has acted admirably, like a perfect charm. Is that the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite? Do they think they can so befooled the people with this scheme, do they propose to act like the ostrich, hide their intelligence in the sand, that the people might fall down and worship it not knowing what it is? What is this thing? Is it not one thing or another? They say it is not annexation, that it is not commercial union, and the Americans say: We will have none of it; yet the hon. gentlemen opposite have night after night risen and stated that this thing, which would not be accepted by the United States, was the only thing that would save this country from ruin. What is the remedy? If our country is not progressing satisfactorily, as I think it is progressing, what

Mr. HUDSPETH.

remedy should be applied? In my opening remarks I showed what the country was in 1840 and in 1850, that in 1840 it was comparatively a wilderness and in 1850 was without a single railway or telegraph line. From 1854 to 1888 it made enormous strides, railways being carried into every portion of the Dominion, telegraph lines into every part of the country, the whole Dominion being rapidly developed. If this country can be benefited, if it is suffering in any way, if its trade is languishing, what must we do to improve it? Can we on this side of the House find no better remedy than the heroic remedy prescribed by the doctors on the Opposition side? I think we can. I think it is the duty of the Government to do everything in its power to open up and develop the North-West and encourage the immigration of a proper class of immigrants, not the rakings and scrapings of the towns and cities, but farmers and agricultural immigrants generally, not only from England, Scotland and Ireland, but from Germany, Norway, France, Sweden and other continental countries; to let our country be known, not according to the extract I have read you as a perfect Siberia, a land of frost and snow, of great frozen lakes, mountains and avalanches, but as the smiling, peaceful, happy land it is. Let the world know Canada as it really is, and let its fertility be known. The Dominion is better known in England from the exhibition there two years ago than it was half a century before. Then we should strive to fill up our country, to protect our manufacturing interests, to protect them to a moderate extent, not to such an extent as will make a monopoly of any one single manufacture, to protect them to a moderate and fair extent, and whenever protection goes beyond that it is injurious to the country. Then we should develop our mines. There is no country in the world, as we have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the advocates of commercial union, that possesses greater riches in the shape of mineral wealth than our own country. I think everything should be done to develop those mines. There is another question that has been raised, and it will do no harm to mention it, as it has been brought to my notice by some of our farmers, and that is this: They tell me that a great part of the swamp lands in Scotland have been reclaimed by loans of money made by the Government at low rates. The Ontario Government have been doing something in this direction, but of course they cannot do everything. If the Dominion Government can see their way to loaning money for improving swamp lands, it might be a step in the right direction. A large area of such lands has already been reclaimed in Ontario, and these lands have turned out the very best on account of the depth of the alluvial deposits. Then we should seek to develop our trade with foreign countries. An hon. gentleman who created a great deal of amusement, a member from Prince Edward Island, said the National Policy had ruined the shipping interests in the Maritime Provinces. He was evidently a strong advocate of annexing Canada to the United States, at all events commercially, forgetting all the time that the United States is a much more highly protected country than Canada, and that protection was said to have ruined the shipbuilding interests of the United States. So in order to cure a burat finger he puts it in the fire. We should endeavor not to decrease but to increase our shipping, and to do that by opening up new avenues of trade with other countries of the world. I have not the slightest doubt but that if our resources were known to people in other countries, trade could be established in a great many articles that we produce, and they do not. It is the duty of the Government to see that everything within reason that can be done should be done in order to spread and develop a foreign trade with not only our own colonies all over the world, but with foreign countries. Then there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is if we are going to become a great peo-

ple we must develop a nationality. It must not be Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, or Quebec, it must be Canadian. People who come to this country should be taught just as in the United States that they come to a country where the people are a united people. The sooner that the different Provinces give over looking from a provincial point of view and take the broad ground of being Canadian the better it will be for the country at large. It seems to me that from the smallest institution that we have in the country, like a municipal council in a town or village or township, up to the Dominion Parliament that our people are very much imbued with one idea and that is a selfish one. They want something for their own particular locality and they will move heaven and earth to get it. No matter what Government is in power I suppose the same influence will be brought to bear. I think the sooner that every province makes up its mind that it has got to bear and forbear, and to give and take, the better it will be for the whole Dominion. We never will have a united people unless they sink their provincialisms and become Canadians at heart. I am a Canadian by birth, but I never thought I was less a British subject. My parents, when they came to this country did not think they were leaving their own country but that they were simply going to a greater Britain. I wish to carry out those principles, and to be as good an Englishman as my father, and to be as good a Scotchman as my mother—I suppose that would be considered an “Irishism”—and Mr. Speaker, I shall never consent by my vote to do anything that will in any way hazard our connection with the mother country. If the people of my constituency differ from me then I shall be very happy to retire and let them send another representative here. I shall not represent any constituency that will approve of shaking off our connection with the mother land. I am as much a lover of Canada as the hon. gentleman who preceded me, but there is just this difference, I am a British subject and I hope always to be a British subject.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. So is he.

Mr. HUDSPETH. He says he is a Canadian before being a British subject, and if the interests would conflict he would do what he thought the better for Canada. I am not prepared to go that far, although I do not think it is necessary. I have told you why I did not consider the country was in such a position that any such risk should be run. If there are moneys spent by our Government extravagantly let us control it, if there are things that can be pruned down with a pruning knife let them be pruned down if that is an heroic remedy, but above all, do not humiliate my country, do not ask our people to go on their knees and ask for something we have been willing to accept from the United States for years back.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They know in their hearts we are just as willing to trade with the United States as they are, but we are not prepared to go the same length and risk so much as they want us to risk.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How far will you go?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will go as far as I possible can without discriminating against the mother country. I will go just as far as we can go without that, and that is the length the Conservative party will go. Just as far as the United States will meet us we are prepared to meet them half way, but we will not discriminate against English goods in favor of the goods of a foreign country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are doing it now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No, we are not doing it now, and that is not a fair argument. We are putting a duty on the

United States goods and the English goods for the purpose of revenue. They know that perfectly well and I am not going to allow that language to be put in the *Hansard* without it being contradicted; because we are not discriminating against England. We are quite willing, for if the United States Government will send commissioners, I am sure our Government would send commissioners too, to make a treaty just as wide as it can be made, provided it can be done in such a way that we do not tax the goods of England and admit goods of the United States free. In other points I agree with my friend the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and if I were an American citizen I would agree with every word that gentleman stated. It is one of the best speeches I have listened to in this House, a calm, dispassionate, argumentative speech, but, unfortunately, I am not an American citizen and I hope I never will be. I have said all I have to say on this subject. I am neither a poet nor a orator, and I cannot treat you to anything very extraordinary, but I have simply stated from my own standpoint and perfect knowledge of the country I was born and brought up in, the facts as I learned them from farmers and others. I have tried to give you those facts instead of quoting a lot of figures I knew nothing about. I am much obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the patient hearing you have given my humble and imperfect remarks. I do not think that I often trouble the House, for I am better pleased to listen to those from whom I can learn wisdom than to give any ideas of my own. This was an important question, and one which I could not sit and silently vote for on account of the reasons I have given. I have tried to put my reasons fairly and squarely before the House, and they will go before my country and constituents, and, as I said before, I am perfectly prepared to stand and fall by them. If every man in my constituency was of a different opinion I should never come to any other conclusion than that I shall do everything in my power to strengthen the bonds that bind us to the mother land, and I shall do nothing to weaken, or lessen, or in any respect whatever loosen those ties of affection for our mother country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not, of course, rise to say anything more on this subject but I rise to make a personal explanation with reference to some statements made by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) yesterday. I have notified him that I intended to do so, and of course if there is any objection to be taken to my making a personal explanation I can be placed in order if you object to my doing so. That gentleman, in the course of his speech, made statements in reference to myself which were not founded. In fact the statements made by him in one part of his speech are contradicted by him in other parts of his speech. I do not intend to trouble the House with any explanation in reference to that for I can afford to let it pass. But, Sir, he introduced into the discussion the names of some men who are deemed respectable and trustworthy men and he made a statement that those gentlemen of respectability whose words would be taken, and stated that what I said with reference to them was not accurate. The language of the hon. gentleman was this:

“Now, let me take the hon. gentleman again into my confidence for a few minutes. It is just as well that I should deal with him now. The hon. gentleman took up the Depression Committee report in 1876, and he says, ‘Why, Mr. Gurney is against the National Policy—he is in favor of unrestricted free trade,’ and all that sort of thing. He took Mr. Massey, Mr. Goldie, Mr. Rosamond, and all those gentlemen. Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I took the trouble of telegraphing to all these gentlemen to know if what was said of them was correct. I have all their answers, and they are in the negative.”

He made this statement that he telegraphed those gentlemen what I had said in reference to that, and that he had telegrams to say that what I had said was not true, or as he puts it “in the negative.” Now, Sir, there are two points in this. I think the first point is to be found in the

telegrams themselves, and that the hon. gentleman was mistaken when he said that he telegraphed what I had said. I think that is very evident, because I see that in the telegram he received from Mr. Goldie, one of the parties mentioned, Mr. Goldie telegraphed this :

"I am not in favor of commercial union ; I consider the country is prosperous under the present policy."

Now, I will read all I said with reference to Mr. Goldie, and you will observe that I made no statements that Mr. Goldie was in favor of commercial union, or that he did not consider the country prosperous under the present policy. We are at a disadvantage in not having the telegram which the hon. gentleman sent to these gentlemen. He was asked to say what he had sent, but he did not say it, and I can only imagine what the telegram was from what he received. This is what I said with reference to Mr. Goldie :

"Now, then, I propose to give you the testimony of James Goldie, one of the largest flour manufacturers we have in the country, a gentleman who became a supporter of the National Policy, and who opposed my hon. friend from South Wellington, I think, on three different occasions ; but nevertheless he is one of the largest flour manufacturers in this country, and he was examined in reference to it ; and what is his statement when he is asked whether he, as a manufacturer, would be afraid of reciprocal free trade with the United States and of holding his own with them ?" He was asked :

"If you had free trade with the United States, would you not be able to get wheat in this country from which you could make as good flour as the United States ?"

"He says :

"I would undertake to compete with all the world if we had the United States market to send it to."

"Then he was asked :

"Q. What effect would reciprocity in wheat and flour with the United States have ? A. I would not like to say."

"Q. You think that would be the best thing which could be had ? A. Of course we would not ask any favors."

"Q. At the time you had reciprocity did you not manufacture very largely for the United States ? A. Yes, very largely. And since that, even since paying the duty, I had a large trade—10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year."

"It is absurd to state that a manufacturer like James Goldie, who sold 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year in spite of the duty, could not hold his own under free trade with the United States, with their bars down as well as ours."

Now, Sir, I have read you all I said with reference to Mr. James Goldie. I was reading from the report of the Committee on the trade depression, as the hon. gentleman knows, because he mentioned that in his speech. Now, I will just read what I said in leading up to that :

"Now, I do not wish to read a great deal from the books, but I wish to read something which I think is rather valuable. If you remember, we had a committee on trade depression in the year 1876, when trade was very bad in Canada. There was a committee appointed by the House which took evidence to ascertain what was the cause of the depression in trade and whether any remedy could be applied. Some of the first men of the country were summoned before that committee and examined with reference to the condition of business, and the difficulties in its way. I have not time to read all the evidence ; but there was one question put to all these gentlemen, as to whether reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States would remove the difficulties they were laboring under, the answers to which will be found interesting. Many of those gentlemen were advocates of the National Policy, and were seeking to impress upon the committee the necessity of imposing higher duties, which the right hon. the leader of the Government proceeded to do as soon as he obtained power in 1878."

Those were the remarks I made preliminary to what I read. There could be no mistaking what I read. Everyone observed it ; the hon. member for Lincoln himself observed it, because he stated that I was reading from that report. He then telegraphed to those different men to ask them whether it was correct, and he said he had their answers, and they were in the negative. Now, the public documents are here ; they are parts of the public property of the country ; and it is not a question of veracity between Mr. Goldie, Mr. Massey, Mr. Rosamond and others and myself ; it is a question of veracity between these gentlemen and the public documents of this country, which hon. gentlemen have in their hands ; and the position the hon. gentleman has got those gentlemen in is this, that he has —

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not argue. It is quite within his right to make a statement, but I think to argue it is going a little too far.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, if I should be hampered too much, I shall have to ask some one to move an adjournment, but I do not wish to detain the House ; but when the hon. gentleman says he has telegrams from gentlemen of standing in the country stating that what I said with reference to them is not true, I cannot afford to let that pass.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not propose to check the hon. gentleman in making his explanation at all. It is quite within his right.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says he telegraphed to Mr. Massey, among others, and that he has a telegram from Mr. Massey saying that what I stated was not correct. The hon. gentleman says in reference to that telegram :

"I also telegraphed Mr. Massey of Toronto. The reply I got was : I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy."

Well, what did I say with reference to Mr. Massey ?

"The Massey Manufacturing Company were not able to come here before the committee, but they sent a letter. They are known to be one of the largest firms we have in Canada, and they sent the following letter :—

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a communication received this day from the Clerk of Commons, would say : We are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery. Our average trade is about \$100,000 per annum, and this season we are increasing the business about 20 per cent., and with very fair prospects. During the past season we did a foreign trade in Germany to the extent of some \$3,000 or \$10,000, and we anticipate a continuation of that trade. We may also add that the existing tariff is satisfactory to us, and is sufficient protection ; perhaps even a little less would also be. A still further advance in the tariff would certainly prove adverse to our interests."

That is all I said with reference to the Massey firm. I simply read their letter. The hon. gentleman says he telegraphed to them among others to ask if what I said was correct, and that he had their answer, and it was in the negative. Their answer is :

"I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy." Who said they did ? Certainly it was not I. The hon. gentleman tells us that he telegraphed to those gentlemen stating what I had said, and asking for an answer, and that they had virtually stated that what I said was not true. Then he said he telegraphed to Mr. Gurney, and he read a letter from Mr. Gurney :

"This is an important letter coming from one's own town. I have here a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, who has sent it to me unsolicited. It reads as follows :—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I would give a most unequivocal denial. Were I called upon to say whether my individual business could compete with United States manufacturers, I should probably declare my belief that it could, but that is not the question, but would it be wise to readjust my whole business, involving the sacrifice of two-thirds of my plant, on the basis of a treaty with such neighbors as we have on our southern border, to which I reply it would be the greatest blunder ever advocated by a business man, and what applies to the individual is equally applicable to the whole manufacturing and mercantile community. I write this with some haste, as I leave immediately."

"That is the letter sent to me by Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, without his being solicited for it or even spoken to."

There Mr. Gurney states that he had been informed that I had stated certain things. The hon. gentleman referred to that after recess, when he said :

"I read a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, a gentleman whom I have never met, but who, having listened to the hon. member for South Brant in this House, for he had occupied a seat in the gallery during a part of the hon. gentleman's speech, voluntarily wrote me this letter in which he says that the statement of the hon. member for South Brant with reference to him was not correct."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that in his letter.

Mr. RYKERT. You heard the letter read.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that I made a statement that was not correct.

"Mr. RYKERT. He said he understood you had said so, and it was not correct."

Now, I have read the letter Mr. Gurney wrote, and I think you will admit that he does not there state that what I had said with reference to him was not correct. Mr. Gurney could not do it, none of those gentlemen could do it, because I read from the public documents; and it would not be a question of veracity as between me and those gentlemen, but it would be a question of veracity as between those gentlemen themselves and the public documents. The hon. gentleman quoted Mr. Rosamond as one to whom he had telegraphed in reference to this matter. He said:

"I have also a telegram from Mr. Rosamond, of Almonte, another gentleman quoted by the hon. member:

"Paterson's statement altogether incorrect. Am as much in favor of National Policy as I ever was. Totally opposed to any agreement with the United States that would interfere with Canada's right to regulate her own tariff."

I would like to know what telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond so as to bring a reply such as that. The hon. gentleman is bound in honor to produce that telegram in order to verify to the House this statement that he had telegraphed this gentleman what I said and that he replied my statement was not correct. I will here read what I said in reference to Mr. Rosamond.

"B. Rosamond, woollen cloth factory, representing the tweed industry, the strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their candidate in the election—let me read what Mr. Rosamond says with reference to our woollen cloth industry, on page 208:

"Q. Is the present rate of duty satisfactory to you? A. Yes, under ordinary circumstances it would be. We are in an exceptional position, being alongside of a country which has a high tariff against us; but, under ordinary circumstances it would be satisfactory. The duty is certainly high enough; if we had a country alongside of us which was reasonable, as our people are disposed to be, we would have no difficulty."

"Q. You would be content to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, I believe it would be for the benefit of everybody."

"That is the testimony of Mr. Rosamond, of the woollen mills. I am afraid I have wearied the House with these quotations, but I thought it would be worth while to place the views of this gentleman upon record in order to show that he and others, who were contending against the Americans when gold was 112 and when there was only a 17½ cents tariff here, were willing and able, under those circumstances, before they had acquired the strength they have now after many years' prosperity, they were willing then and anxious, 'they were ready to hold up both hands,' as some of them expressed it, for reciprocal free trade with the United States."

Those were my closing remarks. I state that those gentlemen, at that time, declared they were ready to have reciprocal free trade with the United States; and evidently the hon. member for Lincoln, judging by the telegrams which he received from these gentlemen, telegraphed them—he can set himself right by producing the messages he sent—not what I said, but that I said these gentlemen were in favor of commercial reciprocity or commercial union, or something of that kind, and in this way got the answers from them which he read. He placed those replies before the House, thinking he would thus weaken the statement I had just made. I was called to order when I interrupted the hon. gentleman, but when a direct misstatement, a positive misstatement, was made, when a statement which, it seems to me, the hon. gentleman must have known was a misstatement, was made by him, I conceived it to be my duty to do as I did, to nail the misstatement at the time, so that when the hon. gentleman's speech went to the country, the denial would go with it. The hon. gentleman did not mend matters after dinner for Mr. Rosamond, because evidently he had taken a little alarm at the questions put to him in the afternoon, and during recess sent another telegram:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's object is to put himself right; he has no right to put anybody else wrong.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) This is what the hon. gentleman said after recess:

"Since my observations, this afternoon, I caused a telegram to be sent to Mr. Rosamond, to which the hon. gentleman will probably not take any exception. Why did the hon. gentleman quote Mr. Rosamond and Mr. Gurney and all those manufacturers, if not to show that they were in favor of the resolution; if not to show that they were opposed to ordinary reciprocity, but were in favor of this resolution. This telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond:"

"When you stated, in 1876, before the Depression Committee that reciprocity would be of benefit to everybody, did you mean unrestricted reciprocity or a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty?"

"The answer is:

"The old reciprocity treaty, certainly."

That, we are told, is the telegram the hon. gentleman received. Of course it is not signed here, and I have to take the hon. member's word that he received that telegram. Let us see if what it contains is what Mr. Rosamond did really say. I have read already the question put to him:

"Q. You will be content to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, I believe it would be for the benefit of everybody."

But there were further questions put to Mr. Rosamond bearing upon this last question which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) put to him by telegram:

"Q. In what way would reciprocity prevent the competition from English goods of which you complain? A. It would not prevent it. That has always been a difficulty, but so long as the country was prosperous we did not feel very much inconvenienced by it."

If that was the old reciprocity treaty, what had it to do with English goods?

"Mr. Platt asked: You would have a larger field if you had reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes."

And this is the gentleman whom the hon. member gets to telegraph here that when he gave that evidence it was the old Reciprocity Treaty he meant, although the answers I have read show that he was questioned with reference to the effect it would have on his own business. The hon. member has brought these gentlemen to disprove statements which I have made, but they have utterly failed, and all he succeeded in doing was to show that he must have sent telegrams to them which did not give, with accuracy, the purport of my remarks. He has endeavored to get these gentlemen to make a public denial of their own statements, which are set down in the public records of the country, but they are not so much to blame, as they have evidently been misled by the telegrams sent them by the hon. member. I desired to say this much, and I repeat I would not have taken the trouble that I have, had it been a simple question of veracity between the hon. gentleman and myself, but when he assumes to bring forward gentlemen like Mr. Massey, Mr. Rosamond, Mr. Gurney and others, to say that what I stated was not correct, I thought it due to myself to make the explanations I have made.

Mr. RYKERT. I claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments, while I reply to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has said that I refused to produce the telegrams that I sent. But I did not refuse to do so. I had not the telegrams that I sent, and therefore could not produce them, but I told the hon. gentleman the contents of the telegrams, namely, that the hon. gentleman had argued that these people were in favor of commercial union or commercial reciprocity. That was the purport and the contents of the telegrams which I sent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then you said what was not correct.

Mr. RYKERT. I was induced to send those telegrams in consequence of a letter which I had received from Mr. Gurney, a gentleman whom I never knew, and who sent me this letter unsolicited. I read the letter to this House, and it was as follows:—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I give the most emphatic and unequivocal denial."

In consequence of the receipt of that letter, I thought I would telegraph to the other gentlemen. I was also told

that Mr. Gurney had been in the gallery. Whether he was there the whole time or not I cannot possibly say. But I pointed that out in my speech last night, and also that the hon. member for South Brant had argued that those gentlemen were in favor of reciprocity still. Otherwise why did he quote them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I did not argue that.

Mr. RYKERT. Then why did the hon. gentleman quote them?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have read you why.

Mr. RYKERT. And that was the very reason why I referred to the matter. If the hon. gentleman did not argue that these gentlemen were in favor of reciprocity now, what object had he in quoting them? His quotations had no meaning whatever. The hon. gentleman read the report of depression. What is the evidence he brings? A testimony for what purpose? They were in favor of the resolutions which are now before the House. If it was not for that purpose, for what reason was it? In consequence of that, I telegraphed to those gentlemen and I got the answer. The hon. gentleman says I suppressed the telegram, I will give him the authority to get the telegrams if he likes?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You said you telegraphed what I said.

Mr. RYKERT. There was no use in his using these at all, unless it was to show that they were in favor of this resolution. He calls my veracity in question. I have told the House what I said. I put the worst possible feature upon it. I told them that Mr. Paterson had led the House to believe that they were in favor of this resolution, and I asked, are you in favor of it or are you not? Was I right or was I wrong?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has introduced this resolution. It is only a continuation of the policy of the Liberal party for many many years. The Liberal party has always advocated the greatest freedom that can be obtained for trade and commerce. This is only a continuance of the doctrines that have been proclaimed by them ever since the formation of the Liberal party, and, as one who believes in Liberal principles and in freedom of trade and commerce, I naturally hail this resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford with a great deal of pleasure. The amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is quite antagonistic, as I would expect it would be, to the resolution of the member for South Oxford. It proposes a very different basis from that which is laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford, and now we have before the country two distinct issues. We have the old and liberal platform of the Liberal party as enunciated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and we have the contracted trade resolution contained in the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There are two distinct issues before the people. We appeal to the people on these issues, and we ask the people to say whether they are prepared to have greater freedom of trade, to open up negotiations for a larger market for their produce, or whether they are not. Since this discussion commenced, since the discussion of the principle and the details of the resolution have been discussed, we have lost a valued member of this House. The late member for Missisquoi has passed away. He was a man who stood high in the feelings of the members of this House, who stood high in the opinions of his friends, and who was not very much opposed by those on the other side. He has passed away, but, I think, before his death the hon. member for South Oxford had introduced this resolution. He died, the writ was issued by the Speaker, and an election was held in the constituency of Missis-

Mr. RYKERT.

quo, where it was said that this distinguished man, this able man, Mr. Claves, by his personal popularity, had been able to wrest a constituency which has been almost always during its history a Tory constituency. At that time there were three candidates in the field, two of them on the Tory side, while Mr. Claves was the candidate of the Liberal party. Now, an election has been held in the constituency to-day, and the candidate favoring unrestricted reciprocity has been returned by a majority of 216. The people, on the first occasion on which they have had the opportunity, have pronounced in no uncertain way in regard to the measure that we now have before the House. I understand that, during the campaign, this was the only measure discussed before the people in that constituency, that it was the question upon which Mr. Meigs, the candidate of the Liberal party, took issue with Mr. Baker, who opposed this measure, who favored the shutting up and closing of our markets, and allowing no exist to the producers of this country, and who was opposed to greater freedom of trade such as it proposed by the resolution now before the House. I will now, for a few moments, allude to some of the speeches delivered on the other side of the House, and I wish to do so in such a manner as not to give offence to any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I know they are a very thin-skinned set of individuals, and I want to conduct this discussion in a proper manner, in a business-like manner, in a spirit of fair play. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) told us that, during the time that Mr. Mackenzie was in power, there was scarcely an industry in Montreal existing except the soup kitchen, that the country was being ruined and going to the dogs, that there were no manufactures, that all the furnaces were closed and all the blasts had gone out. Is it not rather singular that, when that hon. gentleman made that statement in this House as a responsible representative of the people, we find that, in the year 1878, there was an export of manufactured goods of something like \$2,000,000 more than there was in 1887? He speaks of this great policy that was initiated after the defeat of Mr. Mackenzie, and he says that laborers were idle, that people were unemployed, notwithstanding that they were enabled to export to foreign countries \$5,730,000, whereas last year we only exported a little over \$3,000,000. What can be thought, in a deliberative assembly such as this of an hon. gentleman rising in this House, and making such a statement, when all the facts and all the history are against him? At that time the country was flourishing, the exports and the imports were large, and the price paid for grain in this country is an indication that we were then flourishing. The only industry that was struggling at that time was that of the Tory politicians who were then sitting on this side of the House, and they never lost an opportunity to decry the prosperity of this country at that time. Born as I was in Canada, and professing to be loyal to Canada and to the mother country, I have sat here many a time and hung my head to think that there could be men found in this country, representing the people of Canada, and giving utterances to sentiments so unworthy of them, and so much at variance with the truth at that time. The hon. gentleman spoke about Ireland and said that free trade had been the ruin of Ireland. Does he not know, has he not studied the history of Ireland sufficiently to know, that that history proclaims that it was the condition of Ireland that converted Sir Robert Peel from the doctrine of protection to the doctrine of free trade, and induced him to open the ports of Ireland and to give to the struggling people of that country relief by getting in foreign grain? The hon. gentleman must know, if he had given any attention to the history of Ireland, that this was the condition of affairs, and that this was the reason why this measure of relief was afforded to the Irish people. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) state to-day that the hon. member

for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) occupies such a high place in the affections of the people he represents. Until I heard that statement, I really thought that, politically speaking, the sands of that hon. gentleman's hour-glass were giving out; but I am glad to have it on the authority of the hon. member for Welland, that that gentleman enjoys the confidence of his people, and that, by means of a Franchise Act, and by means of a Gerrymander Act he is able to boast in this House of his majority in his constituency. The hon. member for Lincoln did something which I consider he should not have done.

Mr. RYKERT. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me as being gerrymandered?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Certainly I do.

Mr. RYKERT. How?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will explain it to you.

Mr. RYKERT. You had better. I had a majority of 500.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, that is but a detail. Now, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Fergusson) objected to Canada having her middlemen in New York instead of Montreal, Quebec and Toronto. Why, that sentiment finds an echo in the bosom of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. That is what we contend for, and it is the policy of this Government that has driven our exportation to New York instead of to England; it is the discriminating tendency of the policy of this Government that has driven our trade from England to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hon. gentlemen laugh, but they have not studied the Trade and Navigation Returns, because if they had they would set to work and endeavor to devise something that would show to this country in louder terms than their words, the genuineness of their allegiance to Britain, by not submitting a policy that was discriminating against the mother country and in favor of the United States. In 1878 we exported of farm produce to the United States \$25,244,893; in 1887 we exported to the United States \$37,660,199, an increase to the United States in that period of \$12,415,301. Now, look at the difference between the exports of the United States and those to Britain, the mother land, the land that we boast of, from which we are proud of having descended, on this side of the House, at least—and we show our loyalty by protesting whenever an injustice is done to the mother land, and we endeavor to secure an amendment to their policy so that the mother country may not be discriminated against. Now, in 1878, we exported to the mother country \$45,941,539; in 1878, under the policy of the hon. gentlemen, under the policy of these loyal gentlemen, we exported to Great Britain, \$44,571,846, a decrease of exports in that period, of \$1,329,692. Now, Sir, I gladly welcome the hon. member for Welland to this side of the House in that sentiment. I gladly take him by the hand in wishing that this policy may be changed so that our middlemen may not go to New York, driven there by a policy which discriminates against the mother country. I am sorry the hon. member for Welland is not in his seat. He could hardly go with us in every policy of our party, but he goes with us that far. But then he had to have a fling at gentlemen on this side of the House, about having, at some period of their public career, said something in favor of Dakota. Well, now, that hon. gentleman comes here and boasts of his loyalty, and he deprecates anything being said indicating that the prosperity of Dakota is greater than the prosperity of Canada. Now, I do not wish to do the hon. gentleman any injustice, nor would I do any hon. gentleman in this House an injustice

if I knew it. I will, therefore, quote what he said in the matter in a speech which he delivered in this House in 1884. The hon. gentleman at that time was speaking in reference to a loan for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and here is what he said:

"We find, Sir, in the State of Kansas—with its miasmatic fevers and the pestilence that follows, without a solitary drop of water that is fit to drink, without a solitary bit of material for the construction of buildings, in that State, which has, I am told, been lauded highly by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in days gone by—in that State, where people have to live in dug-outs, the population has increased from 417,659 in 1870, to 1,080,000 in 1880."

That is the hon. gentleman who would not say a word in favor of Dakota, and that is the hon. gentleman who lectures us on this side of the House for having said, at any time, that the settlement of those new States was more rapid than that of our own country. There is a reason for this. The land regulations in those new States were much more liberal than the regulations made by hon. gentlemen opposite; there is no doubt about that. Our country is a better country than theirs, our land is better and more fertile than theirs, and if it were not for the stupidity—I use the word in a political sense—of our Government, there would not be very much difference between those States and our own country, indeed I believe we would have had the larger settlement. I can speak from personal knowledge. I can give the names of a number of people who went to our own Canadian North-West to buy land, where they might make homes for themselves, and I know that by the land regulations of this Government they were deprived of that privilege, as I will show later on. Now, the hon. member for Welland on the same occasion said:

"Yet with all these drawbacks, the population of Dakota has increased from 14,181 in 1870, to no less than 135,137 in 1880. Why, it has almost multiplied its population by ten in the short period of ten years."

Now, I think that is all I will read from the speech of the hon. member for Welland. He boasted of the success of the Government policy in the last election. Well, I declare that if I were sitting on that side of the House, that is the very last thing I would boast of. When the Government went to the people, did they go on the same basis or appeal to the same electorate that they did before? No. They carried an Act through this House that was unjust in almost every provision of it. They did that, I fully believe, with the purpose of strengthening themselves in power. They did not take a bold British course on that occasion. I do not know what course you might choose to term it, but I say it was a course unworthy of a great party, unworthy of the Conservative party; for the Conservative party is a great party, there are many great and good men in that party, and I am surprised that there are so many of these good men who would lend themselves to such an infamous measure as the Franchise Act. Now, I will give a little attention to the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth). He made a very calm and moderate speech, and I consider, for a Tory, he made a pretty truthful speech. I do not know but that that speech does him a great deal of credit. To those of us who have sat on this side of the House for some time, it is somewhat refreshing to see an hon. gentleman get up and speak plainly and honestly as the hon. member for South Victoria has done. He says—I do not like the sentiment, but it is the Tory sentiment, nevertheless—that education and accomplishments are not appreciated in this country, and the people who possess them go to the United States. The hon. gentleman gave instances from his own riding, and he tells us that he would not do anything that would weaken the bond that binds us to the mother country, and yet, he makes that utterance which I believe is as severe a stab against the people of Canada as can possibly be pronounced. He tells us that Scotchmen go to London and Canadians go to the United States. There is the difference. He says that Scotchmen only continue in the

mother country while our people go and live under a hostile flag and in a foreign land. If our people leave Toronto and go to reside in Montreal, Halifax, Quebec, Winnipeg, the North-West Territories or Victoria, then we should be glad of it, but the hon. gentleman was honest enough to admit that there is an exodus going on and that the prices of farm lands and other lands have not improved as they should have improved. I have here a statement in regard to the assessed value of the town of Lindsay down to 1886, prepared by the treasurer. While hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the success of the National Policy, we have only to take the assessed value of property to find out how hollow are the claims put forward on behalf of that policy. The people know it, and hon. members in this House, if they would honestly admit it, know that the National Policy has proved a failure as a means of relieving our depression, that it has no power to build up industries, and if we are going to become great, this policy must be changed or otherwise the country must continue to suffer. I will now take the assessed value of the town of Lindsay: it is a beautiful town, it is a lively town, it has been a progressive town, but its prosperity has diminished within the past few years. In 1873, at the time hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power, the assessed value of the town was \$362,971. In 1878 what was the assessed value? This was the time when soup kitchens were abroad in the land, when all the people had gone to the States, when there was no one at home, according to the loyal utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. The assessed value of the town in that year was \$1,403,217. Since then we have had five years of the National Policy. In 1881 the average value was \$1,397,731; 1883, \$1,379,119; 1886, \$1,435,462. During the five years when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, when there were soup kitchens in the land according to hon. gentlemen opposite, the increase in the assessment of Lindsay was 65 per cent. while during the last five years, when we have had the full fruition of the National Policy, the increase has only been three per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this policy has done a great deal to build up the country, but the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) was honest enough to tell us that the progress of the town in which he lived, although it is a beautiful town, is not what he would like to see it, and it is not what I would like to see also. From 1873 to 1878 Lindsay sprang up with remarkable rapidity. It appeared to receive a stimulus from the change of Government in 1873 which appears to have been taken away since 1878. The town has stood almost still during the last few years, the increase during the last five years of the National Policy being only 3 per cent. while during the five years of the Mackenzie régime the increase was 65 per cent. It was the hon. member for South Victoria who told us about the soup kitchens. I think when we remember the remarkable progress made by this town while the Mackenzie Government was in power, it comes with bad grace from the mouth of the hon. gentleman, who otherwise spoke so honestly, but he allowed his partisan feelings to carry him away in this matter. He said we must expect an exodus, and we have had an exodus. I will occupy the time of the House for a few moments in discussing the exodus. We were told that so soon as we had completed the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people would flow into Manitoba and the North-West and that country would soon become the home of millions of people. Well, we on this side of the House, sincerely desiring to see that state of things brought about, were willing to do everything in our power to promote such a desirable end. Last year the Government took a census of Manitoba, and what do we find? In Manitoba there are about 108,640 people, in the North-West Territories 48,362, deducting 20,117 Indians leaves the white population of the North-West Territories 28,192. Ten years of Tory administration of North-West affairs has brought about this result. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that, when we consider the fertility of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the desirable climate there, that there has not been bungling in our North-West policy, that we have not adopted a suicidal policy, a policy that has tended to retard settlement, and at present population is not going in there as we would like to see it. As to the exodus, we know, everybody knows; we do not need to be told that we are disloyal because we know that people are leaving that country. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) may possibly be branded as disloyal because he says people have left this country. If everybody is to be branded for saying that people have left this country, what will be thought of the Premier in 1878? I will read what he said. Speaking of the United States, he says:

"Yet with all their depression, with all their bad trade, and with all their strikes, the people of that country are successfully competing in the English markets, and not only so, but in all the markets to which England has access, beating England out of the field despite those disasters."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who said that?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Sir John Macdonald in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Impossible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, he is the gentleman who would not decry the country, he is the gentleman that would not talk of blue ruin, yet he says again:

"True they have suffered as this country has suffered. But there is this difference. We have no manufactures here. We have no work people, our work people have gone off to the United States. They are to be found employed in the Western States, in Pittsburg and in fact in every place where manufactures are going on. These Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of adding to ours. Our work people in this country on the other hand are suffering for want of employment. Have not their cries risen to Heaven?"

He was pious then.

"Has not the hon. the Premier been surrounded and besieged even in his own department and on his way to his daily duties by suffering artisans who keep crying out: We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families."

That is the language of the Premier of this country. He complains that we had no manufacturers in this country while that year we exported two million dollars worth more of manufactured goods than we did last year. It is a well known fact that there has been a great deal of money spent in trying to encourage emigration to this country and it is also a very well known fact that that money might as well, for all practical purposes, have been thrown away. The only object it served was to keep camp followers of the Government in situations and to keep languishing industries of that character from starvation. It is told us on the highest authority of fiscal matters in this country, and by the highest authority on fiscal matters in this House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that of every four emigrants they have being brought into this country, three have left it again and only stayed here for a short time, and having got the advantage of the trip across the ocean they cleared out of the country. This policy gave employment to, I do not know how many cormorants, and it enabled the Government to subsidise a great many journalists. But it did good in that respect, because those journalists told how great and how good and how honest the Government was which brought emigrants across the ocean, who came and stayed in Canada over night and then skipped to the United States. The American consul at Toronto a short time ago reports that he gave certificates to 517 families in the district of Toronto last year who went to the States, and he further reports that those people took capital out of the country to the extent of \$1,500,000. The American consul at Ottawa reports that during last year 600 families have left the Ottawa district and settled in the States, probably taking

Mr. LANDERKIN.

ritories 28,192. Ten years of Tory administration of North-West affairs has brought about this result. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that, when we consider the fertility of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the desirable climate there, that there has not been bungling in our North-West policy, that we have not adopted a suicidal policy, a policy that has tended to retard settlement, and at present population is not going in there as we would like to see it. As to the exodus, we know, everybody knows; we do not need to be told that we are disloyal because we know that people are leaving that country. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) may possibly be branded as disloyal because he says people have left this country. If everybody is to be branded for saying that people have left this country, what will be thought of the Premier in 1878? I will read what he said. Speaking of the United States, he says:

"Yet with all their depression, with all their bad trade, and with all their strikes, the people of that country are successfully competing in the English markets, and not only so, but in all the markets to which England has access, beating England out of the field despite those disasters."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who said that?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Sir John Macdonald in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Impossible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, he is the gentleman who would not decry the country, he is the gentleman that would not talk of blue ruin, yet he says again:

"True they have suffered as this country has suffered. But there is this difference. We have no manufactures here. We have no work people, our work people have gone off to the United States. They are to be found employed in the Western States, in Pittsburg and in fact in every place where manufactures are going on. These Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of adding to ours. Our work people in this country on the other hand are suffering for want of employment. Have not their cries risen to Heaven?"

He was pious then.

"Has not the hon. the Premier been surrounded and besieged even in his own department and on his way to his daily duties by suffering artisans who keep crying out: We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families."

That is the language of the Premier of this country. He complains that we had no manufacturers in this country while that year we exported two million dollars worth more of manufactured goods than we did last year. It is a well known fact that there has been a great deal of money spent in trying to encourage emigration to this country and it is also a very well known fact that that money might as well, for all practical purposes, have been thrown away. The only object it served was to keep camp followers of the Government in situations and to keep languishing industries of that character from starvation. It is told us on the highest authority of fiscal matters in this country, and by the highest authority on fiscal matters in this House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that of every four emigrants they have being brought into this country, three have left it again and only stayed here for a short time, and having got the advantage of the trip across the ocean they cleared out of the country. This policy gave employment to, I do not know how many cormorants, and it enabled the Government to subsidise a great many journalists. But it did good in that respect, because those journalists told how great and how good and how honest the Government was which brought emigrants across the ocean, who came and stayed in Canada over night and then skipped to the United States. The American consul at Toronto a short time ago reports that he gave certificates to 517 families in the district of Toronto last year who went to the States, and he further reports that those people took capital out of the country to the extent of \$1,500,000. The American consul at Ottawa reports that during last year 600 families have left the Ottawa district and settled in the States, probably taking

another \$1,570,000 capital with them. I made somewhat of an investigation of the exodus and of the number of people going from the country I have the honor to represent some years ago. I made this enquiry from public men and I received the following replies; on 9th April, 1886.

"*Markdale*—Exodus to United States in past six years from this section—80 families, 220 persons.

" W. M. BROWN."

"*Flesherton*—Exodus from this section—55 families, 200 persons.

" JOHN GORDON,
" THORPE WRIGHT,
" J. HERD,
" W. M. STRAIN."

" 200 have gone from Glenelg and settled in the States since 1879.

" J. H. HUNTER."

Mr. Hunter is a gentleman who has lived long in that riding.

" Over 30 families have left Normanby and settled in the States since 1879.

" W. H. RYAN."

Mr. Ryan is township treasurer and has been a public officer for a great many years.

" 72 families have left Bentinck and settled in the States since 1879.

" D. McNICHOL."

Mr. McNichol has been reeve of the township and warden of the county for a number of years, and is a worthy and reliable authority.

" Over 40 families have left Egremont and settled in the States since 1879.

" J. MURDOCK."

Mr. Murdoch was reeve of the township and warden of the county. Those, Sir, are reliable figures as far as my own personal knowledge goes and they are to be depended upon. I shall mention to you some cases which came under my own notice as to why our people did not settle in the North-West. I shall mention the case of Mr. Adams. He was an old settler down there and had a flour mill and a saw mill; he had an idea that he would settle in the North-West and he went there and he spent nearly a month there, but when he found land that would please him to settle upon, and when he went to the office to take up that land he found it was owned by some corporation, some colonisation company, some railway company, or some other speculator and he could not get it to settle on. After staying there a month he went across the line and settled in Dakota. I know the case of Mr. Hillis, a large farmer who lived in Normanby and who told me exactly the same story. He went there and he found the influence of monopoly so strong, he found those charges against the land regulations so true, that he had to go across and settle in Dakota. Mr. Fussey told me last year the very same thing. He went to Manitoba but he found it was so much under the power of monopolies, and of corporations, and colonisation companies, that he also went over. Mr. Grant, of Bentinck, also told me the same story, and he left and went to the States. In those four families there are about 40 persons, with a large amount of capital, who were induced to leave our own country of Canada and settle in Dakota. I shall now speak for a few minutes on the resolution before the House, and I would call the attention of the House to a resolution placed before Parliament when the fiscal policy was changed in 1878. There was a resolution introduced into this House at that time, and it is known as the "National Policy resolution." I will read it for the benefit of the House. It was introduced by Sir John Macdonald, the present Premier, and reads:

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate

themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

Now, gentlemen, you have none of this "blue ruin" in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford that you have in this resolution. From one end of the country it was a wail to the other, and do you know that the Conservative party in this House at that time took up this wail? They were willing to vote for this resolution, and they formally declared from their seats in Parliament that there was distress, and that people were leaving the country, when there was not one out of every twenty-five as many going to the States as there are going now. The Conservative members were prepared to vote for that which they knew to be almost if not entirely untrue, and this they did with a view of finally getting reciprocity of trade. If there are any of these gentlemen in the House now, to be honest they would have to support the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, because in the resolution they submitted at that time they indicated that that was the object. It was a sharp remedy, they stated, to compel the Americans to give us reciprocity, and that was one of the reasons they held out to those who doubted the wisdom of the course they were taking in order to get a larger support for it than they would otherwise have got. They did not state that they were going to increase the taxation of the people thirteen or fourteen million dollars. When asked by a prominent supporter in St. John if they intended to increase the taxes, the Premier replied that they did not, that they only intended to readjust them. They have not fulfilled the pledges they made in this resolution; but instead of readjusting, they have added to the burdens of the people of this country something like \$14,000,000 on the annual expenditure. The Liberal party in this House at that time stood up for the people, as they always stand up for the people. They were not prepared to see the people burdened with any more taxes than they could bear. The Liberal party took the stand then that they are taking now, that the people had enough burdens to bear, and it would not be consistent with the policy of the Liberal party to put any more burdens upon them. Mr. Mackenzie fell while he was fighting for the people of this country, and many of his supporters fell with him. But the day has come, and it would have come before this if it had not been for the Gerrymander and the Franchise Acts. The people would have supported the men who then stood by them, and we would have had a large majority in this House. These gentlemen at that time professed great loyalty; they were ready almost to die for their country; they were sorry to see the struggling industries of this country sinking to ruin and the country going to the dogs. Although Mr. Mackenzie had not added to the burdens of the people, he had two or three Provinces to govern more than his opponents had, and he governed them better than they did; he stilled the tumults that went on in British Columbia, and Quebec and Manitoba; he extinguished the Indian titles in the North-West, and while he stood fighting for the people in the tumult raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, in a moment of forgetfulness the people turned him out of power. Then the other party came in, and the famine in the old country increased the prices of grain, and they said: "We go for a Government that gives us better prices." In a couple of years prices fell, and they said: "What has the Government to do with the prices of grain?" In Mr. Mackenzie's time, when hon. gentlemen told us that the people were leaving the country, the farmers never got less than a dollar a bushel for their wheat. What are they getting to-day? Let the farmers in the House and the country answer. Well, that resolution was defeated

in this House, and it ought to be defeated in any British assembly; because the tone of that resolution was not of a character to elevate Canada in the eyes of the world. Imagine the hon. member for South Oxford putting a resolution of that kind on the journals of this House. Why, the hon. member for South Oxford is too loyal to do any thing of that kind; he would not submit to it, and if he did he would find that those who sit behind him would not support him. There were 77 members in this House, however, who voted for it. I say it to the shame of Canada; I say it to the lasting disgrace of the 77 members who voted for the resolution; and it was an infamous resolution to introduce into this House. Now I will show you the patriotism of those who voted for it. They were men who complained that the country was going to ruin, that the hum of industry was not heard in the land, and that we had nothing but soup-kitchens then. We will see how these patriots fared afterwards. Out of the 77, 11 of them have since become Cabinet Ministers, 9 have become senators, 8 have become judges, 22 have got public offices, and 8 are private members of the House. I do not know what offices they have got; but I notice some of them have offices. Among private members there is Mr. Haggart, of North Lanark, who has got an office of prominence and great value; I believe it was the only office the Premier had to give him; that is he made a director of the *Empire* newspaper. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick), was one of those who became Speaker in this House, but he has had to retire since, and he is now a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I believe, is standing counsel for the Government in all their losses. There are three or four others. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson), made a very interesting speech on one occasion on silica and white clay after he had come from a trip through the North-West, where he had been driving over the country on a buckboard. There is no doubt that he has not served the country so well without being rewarded. There are only 12 of those 77 that have been unprovided for; I believe they are all farmers, and I hope in the interest of the farming community the hon. the Minister of Public Works will see that some position is found for them in the Department of Agriculture. I am glad the Minister of Agriculture is here, and I call on him to see that these patriots who voted for this resolution shall be rewarded before they die.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps they have got their timber limits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, yes. Well, he knows. Mr. Baby was made a Minister of the Crown with a salary of \$7,000 a year. Mr. Bowell, the member for North Hastings, became a Cabinet Minister; I believe it was necessary to get a good many deputations down here before he succeeded. Mr. Caron became a Cabinet Minister, and he was awarded knighthood also by Her Majesty on account of his distinguished services in the North-West or somewhere else.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has that to do with reciprocity?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will explain that further on, when I take up that barley question with you. Mr. Costigan became a Cabinet Minister. Sir Hector Langevin also became a Cabinet Minister; Sir John A. Macdonald became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Masson became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Mousseau became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Pope became a Cabinet Minister; another Pope became a Cabinet Minister; Sir Charles Tupper became a Cabinet Minister and High Commissioner; Mr. Bolduc became a Senator; Mr. Gibbs was defeated by the people and became a Senator; Mr. Macdonald became a Senator; Mr. MacKay gave up his seat to the present Postmaster General and became a Senator; Mr. McCallum

became a Senator; Mr. Masson was defeated and became a Senator; Mr. Plumb was defeated and afterwards became a Senator; Mr. Robitaille was made Lieutenant Governor and afterward Senator; Mr. Schultz was defeated and he became a Senator—more of these patriots. Mr. Baby became a judge; Mr. Brooks became a judge; Mr. Cimon was made a judge; Mr. Gill was made a judge; Mr. McDougall became a judge;—he gave up his seat to Sir Hector Langevin. Mr. Mousseau was made a judge; Mr. Palmer was made a judge; Mr. Ryan was made a judge. Then let us see who were appointed to public offices. Mr. Blanchet received a public office; Mr. Colby received a public office; Mr. Dewdney received a public office; Mr. Currier received a public office; Mr. Farrow received a public office; Mr. Fraser received a public office; Mr. Méthot received a public office; Mr. Orton received a public office; Mr. Robinson was made Lieutenant Governor of Ontario; Mr. Rouleau was made Deputy Clerk in the House; Mr. Stephenson was made Inspector of Colonisation Companies; Mr. Ouimet was made Speaker. Yes, Ouimet, the Riellite, was made Speaker; he who voted like myself, regretting the execution of Riel, and who, like myself, was branded as a renegade, and a coward, and a traitor, and a knave, and a fool, was made Speaker, I suppose, because of the persecution he had suffered. There were altogether 20 of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have permitted a very long digression, and the hon. gentleman has diverged sufficiently far from the subject matter before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very glad you stopped me, Sir, for I have finished on that point. We will look and see what the National Policy has done. We will take up the exports and imports of the Dominion for the last two years, and see what the National Policy has done. I have examined the blue books very carefully, and, as one born in Canada, I must say they do not give me as much encouragement as I would like to derive from them. The hon. member for East Huron quoted from the blue books of the Customs Department, and I was astonished to see the spectacled gentleman from Hamilton getting up and declaring that the blue books of the Department of Customs were not reliable, but that he will quote from a report which was reliable—the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States. These are the loyal people who will not take their own blue books; these are the honest representatives of the people who deny their own blue books. Take the summary statement of our exports for the year 1877, the year when everything was going to the dogs. Our exports then were as follows:—

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Products of the mine..... | \$ 3,787,802 |
| Fisheries..... | 5,501,221 |
| Forests..... | 20,542,635 |
| Animals..... | 14,645,168 |
| Agriculture..... | 26,308,689 |
| Manufactures..... | 5,767,747 |
| Miscellaneous..... | 543,548 |
| Total..... | \$77,096,810 |

Now, in 1887, when we had the National Policy in full vigor, what do the returns show? They show our exports as follows:—

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Products of the mine..... | \$ 3,805,959 |
| Fisheries..... | 6,875,810 |
| Forests..... | 20,484,746 |
| Animals..... | 24,246,937 |
| Agriculture..... | 18,826,235 |
| Manufactures..... | 3,079,972 |
| Miscellaneous..... | 644,361 |
| Total .. | \$77,964,020 |

So that our exports of manufactures in the year of grace 1887, tell it not aloud, ye boasters of the success of your vaunted National Policy, were actually less than in 1877. Of these exports, we sent to Great Britain \$4,457,312 and to the United States \$34,658,275. Hon. gentlemen will see

that in 1877, when we had no manufacturing industries at all, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, we exported of manufactured goods to the old country and to the United States \$5,767,747, while in 1887, we only exported \$3,079,972 worth, or a falling off of a little over \$2,000,000. But these hon. gentlemen will say there is more used at home, and that the farmers are better off and can buy more now. They can get 70 cents for their wheat now, but they got \$1.50 then. What is the use of talking nonsense like that to the farmers or to other people? But then hon. gentlemen opposite will say that we are importing more raw material which enter into manufactures and that we have large manufacturing industries? Let us see if that is the case. Take the imports of wool for 1875 and 1878 and for 1884 and 1885. We find that in 1875 we imported of raw wool, 7,947,870 lbs. and in 1878 6,230,084 lbs. or a total of 14,170,693. In 1884, on the other hand, we imported 6,182,421 lbs. and in 1885, 7,759,554, or a total of 13,941,975 lbs., showing a falling off in 1884 and 1885 of 1,000,000 lbs. as compared with 1875 and 1878, when, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, they had nothing in Montreal but soup kitchens. I want to show you how the balance of trade has been against England. I want to show you how all those loyal people who say we are rebels and annexationists sit quietly in the House and allow this thing to continue without raising their loyal voices on behalf of old England, although they say they are prepared to shed every drop of their blood sooner than weaken the bonds that bind them to the mother land. Of goods in 1875 we imported as follows:—

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| From Great Britain, dutiable.. .. . | \$14,239,519 |
| From United States do | 22,023,665 |
| Free goods from Great Britain..... | 11,167,963 |
| Free goods from United States..... | 28,779,234 |

Or a total from Great Britain of \$60,000,000, and from the United States of \$50,000,000. In 1885 how did it stand? We imported from Great Britain \$41,000,000, and from the United States \$47,000,000. In 1886, we imported \$41,407,777 from Great Britain, and \$47,151,201 from the United States. In 1887, we imported \$40,601,199 from Great Britain and \$44,858,039 from the United States. I want hon. gentlemen to pay attention to this. In 1886, we imported from Great Britain over \$41,000,000, on which we collected a duty amounting to \$7,616,249, and on the larger amount which we imported from the United States of \$47,000,000, we only charged a duty of \$6,624,100. In 1887, we imported from Great Britain \$40,601,199, on which we charged a duty of \$7,817,357, and we imported from the United States \$44,858,039, on which we only charged a duty of \$6,769,384. The United States is the only market for a great deal of the products of the farmers. There is no interest in this country which is equal to the farming interest for its vast proportions, which gives employment to a greater number of people, which gives a home to a greater number of people, and, if the farming industry is not prosperous, if the farmers of Canada are not doing well, no other branch of industry is doing well; but, if the farmers are doing well, every other industry must do well; the manufacturing industry must thrive if the farming interest thrives, and that, I suppose, is the reason why we imported such a comparatively small quantity of manufacturing goods last year, because the farming interest was not prospering as we would like to see it. Now, take the exports of our farming products and what do we find? Last year we exported to Great Britain 329 horses, and to the United States 18,225 horses. Of horned cattle, we exported to Great Britain 63,622, and to the United States 45,765. We exported to Great Britain 68,543 sheep and to the United States 363,046. We exported cheese to Great Britain amounting to 73,185,717 lbs., and to the United States 304,318 lbs. I may say for the benefit of hon. members on the other side, that this is one industry which is not affected by the

National Policy, and it has therefore grown to be a great industry in this country; and probably if they had left other industries alone, as they have the cheese industry, they would probably have flourished in the same way. Last year we exported butter to Great Britain to the amount of 4,076,365 lbs., and to the United States to the amount of 100,895 lbs. The United States is the best market for our eggs. Last year we exported to the United States 12,907,956 dozen of eggs, of the value of \$1,821,364. I see that, under the National Policy, there was a provision made, which was considered to be a very wise provision by the promoters of the National Policy, in regard to some of the articles which were the produce of the farm, that, as soon as the United States remitted the duty on those articles, the Government here took the power to remit the duty on them when they were imported into this country. I see that the United States have removed the duty on several of these articles, and that this Government have failed to carry out the understanding which they agreed to by this Act of Parliament, and have refused to do it unless every article which is enumerated in that Act is put on the free list by the United States; and, by what I see in the *Free Press* of the city, it is rumoured in Washington that they are going to retaliate, and that, if this Government do not keep faith according to the provisions of the Act of Parliament which was passed here, retaliation will be adopted against the people of Canada. If the United States retaliate, and put a duty on eggs, what would become of our egg business? And the same may be said of other articles which are the produce of the farm. It is to be hoped that the Government will look into this matter, and see that the faith to which they are pledged by an Act of Parliament is kept with the United States and with this Parliament. I see that there is one industry which has grown amazingly under the National Policy. It was very insignificant when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, but it has grown wonderfully since,—I refer to the importation of rags. I find that in 1877, we only imported \$92,179 worth of rags, but, under the benign influence of the National Policy and the development of the country and of manufactures which has taken place, last year we imported \$193,029 worth of rags. That I suppose is an indication of the revival of the industries of the country. You would almost imagine that, since the National Policy was brought about, nothing was brought into this country, because they promoted it under a promise that nothing should be brought into competition either with our farmers or with our manufacturers. While they told our farmers that they were going to protect them, and particularly in the article of wool, still they have allowed wool to come into the country to as great an extent as ever, and, although they have taxed many things which our farmers bring into the country from the other side, they have not prevented the importation of wool. For these and other reasons, I favor the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. I believe it will be in the best interests of this country if that resolution passes this House and becomes effective with the United States, if we can get a larger market for our farmers, for our manufacturers, and for every other class of people. I do not believe that it is going to injure any of the industries of this country, but I do believe that it will make our farmers so much richer, and that they will therefore consume so much more of the manufactured articles of the country than they do now. I do not believe that it is in the interest of this country to keep up manufacturing industries at a high tariff for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of the manufacturers, by enabling them to charge higher prices than the consumer ought to pay. I am in favor of the manufacturers, I would like to see them prosper, but I believe there are many in this country which if they do not get more protection, must evidently go to the wall. Now, about the slaughter market. They used to

tell us how the manufactured goods of this country had to enter into competition with the American goods that were sold here at slaughter prices, and they told us that this would be all done away with under the National Policy. Well, now, last year we bought of manufactured goods from abroad \$9,914,824, and in the year 1887, the total importation of manufactured goods reached \$15,606,944, or a slaughter market established to the tune of \$4,000,000 more than we had then. Our imports do not indicate that we are improving, or that the country is growing as rapidly as it should. The total imports in 1877 were \$99,000,000; in 1878, \$93,000,000; in 1885, \$23,000,000; in 1887, \$112,000,000. So that our importations are not as great now as they were 10 years ago. That is not a satisfactory state of things for this country. Now, Sir, I am very glad that we have a clear and distinct issue before the people. The Liberal party takes its stand upon this question, as it did at its organisation, for greater liberty and greater freedom of every description so long as it conduces to the well-being of the country. We believe in giving a larger market to our farmers, and to our manufacturers, and to all other classes of the people, and we do not believe in under-rating the power, and the ability, and the worth of the Canadian people. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite telling us that they are afraid of the United States people, that our own people are powerless to keep pace in the race of progress with the United States. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, sitting here as a native Canadian, that I believe, as a true Briton, and I feel that I am a British subject in every sense of the word, and I hurl back to the hon. gentlemen their epithet and the insult that they apply to the native-born Canadians in this country, when they tell us that man for man, in a fair field and without any favor, the people of Canada are not the peers of any people on the face of God's footstool. I have listened with a considerable amount of indignation at the statement, at the disloyal utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, towards the people of Canada, to see them stand up in this House and tell us that the Canadians, the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the Germans, and the French, who have settled in this country, are not able to compete with the Americans in a fair field. Why, I do not think that anything more disloyal can be said by hon. gentleman on the other side, and I hope that they will have sufficient respect for my feelings, if not for themselves, not to repeat it again in this House. Well, what are we going to do if this resolution should carry and unrestricted reciprocity become a fact between the United States and Canada? What would happen? We would lose revenue, but that can be easily made up. We have statesmen on this side of the House who can grapple with that question.

Mr. HESSON. How?

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will show you when we get a chance. It is a very simple problem, but it would be a very difficult problem for the hon. gentlemen in power, because they do not understand the principles of economy, they never practise economy, it is foreign to their nature. They have accumulated such a debt, and the expenditure of this country has advanced so rapidly, that it would be almost impossible for this country to retrieve itself unless a check is put on. Well, you might save nearly half a million by knocking out that cruel and unjust Franchise Act. You might strike off the Superannuation Fund.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We heard all this before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, but you must have line upon line, and precept upon precept. You don't like to hear it, because I believe there is a little honesty about you if you only had courage enough to assert it, and I believe you would, but the party will not allow you. I think, perhaps, we could dispense with the Senate; I think that there might be more life infused into those dry bones at a less

Mr. LANDERKIN.

price than we have to pay. Now, there was another matter which cost this country good deal, and I told the Government at the time that it was an improper expense. I refer to the expense for the Liquor License Act. It was brought in by the Premier himself, and I think that the Premier after he introduced it, very soon began to see that there was something shaky about it, and he did not like to injure his reputation by continuing to father the measure, and so he transferred it to his standing counsel, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and it became known as the McCarthy Act. It passed this House, and it cost this country over \$300,000. What for? So that they could get their heels on the neck of the liquor interest in this country, so that they could make them turn in and vote for the Government. Well, there are many things just like that, that we all know could be done away with, and yet the public interest of this country would not suffer at all, and the service of the country would be just as efficiently performed. Now, there is another matter I would like to refer to before I sit down. I think it was the Minister of Marine who stated that this country pronounced unmistakably in favor of the Government at the last election. You would imagine, when you heard that statement, that the people almost unanimously pronounced in favor of the Government, and you would think that the representation in the House would bear some comparison with the vote that was polled. Now, I took the trouble the other day to compute the number of votes that were polled in those elections, 1898, and I just want to show the Minister of Marine, when he makes that statement in future, that he should consider how it has been brought about, and how it is that the Government in this House have so large a majority. The total Tory vote polled at the last election was 332,481, the total Liberal vote was 326,967, the total majority in the 1898 elections being 5,518. A change of 2,700 votes would give the Liberal party a majority, and while hon. gentlemen talk of British fair play and British loyalty and denounce us as being disloyal, they are willing to sit in this House in proportion of about 130 or 137 to 75 members, when they have polled scarcely any more votes than the Liberal party in this country. The Liberal party to-day with a fair field would wipe out this Government, so that it would never recover, and it would be the best thing that ever happened to Canada. A change of 15 votes in each of those constituencies would humble hon. gentlemen who now boast of their strength and would place the Liberals in power, if the representation was just. The representation is not just, it is far from being fair, manly and British, and this country has a right to expect that there should be fair play between parties. If there is not fair play between political parties, where should we expect fair play to be found? It is the duty of the Government and the Opposition to show an example of fair play and manly square dealing. I should think hon. gentlemen opposite would blush for shame when they came here with only a very small majority, and yet possessed such a large proportionate number of members, and that at the same time boast that the country has pronounced so strongly in their favor. I do not believe the country is much in their favor, and I am quite sure if we could get a fair and unbiased expression of their opinion with the ridings unchanged we would carry the country. When Mr. Mackenzie went out to the country he did not carve up the constituencies, but he went to the constituencies on the same bases as he had been elected on—he was manly enough to do that; and if we are going to make of Canada a nation of which we and our children should feel proud we should do nothing to bring the blush of shame to the face of any Canadian or British subject, or allow any blot to remain that was unfair, ungenerous and un-British in any particular. I have reason to expect that this resolution

will carry. I expect that fifteen of those patriots who voted for the National Policy will every one vote for reciprocity, and I expect those few hon. members who are not in the Ministry will vote for the resolution. I expect that the Minister of Finance will vote for it. The Minister of Finance was in favor of reciprocity then, and he said:

"We believe that reciprocity, which has been advocated by all parties and classes in the country, is clearly identified with the policy we have pursued and that we propose to pursue."

Again he said:

"When capital is driven away, the people of Canada go after that capital, and where employment is furnished them; and this is what the hon. gentleman's policy has resulted in."

The exodus is now going on; I have shown that to be the case. The hon. gentleman said further:

"Now I say if you want to knit this whole country together from end to end, you must knit it together commercially."

He further said:

"Now, there is another reason why we should have a different tariff with the United States. I have said before that, as far as England is concerned, while we are most anxious to preserve her institutions and adopt her policy, as far as they are adapted to our own country, we feel as Canadians that we must look at the position in which we stand in relation to the fiscal policy of the great nation alongside of us."

The hon. gentleman could not be content unless he had a little wail. The hon. gentleman spoke of good crops, but he complained that prices were very low, only \$1.50 a bushel for wheat. The hon. gentleman also said:

"Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to propose in the present disastrous state of affairs? What has he to propose in view of the suffering industries of this country? What has the hon. gentleman to propose by which the present depressed state of things in this country may be changed or the people inspired with the slightest hope for the better. He has nothing. If I were Bengough, if I had the power to caricature as he has, I would portray the hon. gentleman as General Distress giving to the people the word of command 'starve.'"

That was said by the present Finance Minister in this House, by the hon. gentleman who now has charge to a very large extent of the destinies of this country, and who pretends to be loyal, and who will come before us in this House and try and make us out annexationists because we tell the country the exact position of affairs. There is not an hon. member in this House or a man outside of it supporting the Liberal party who has not always promoted everything calculated to promote the welfare of Canada. In everything we have said we have been actuated by a sincere desire to remedy the trouble that exists and point out if possible where the remedy is to be found, and we believe that the remedy we propose will go largely to bring about that prosperity which we all desire to see prevailing in this country, and we believe that a policy of greater freedom of trade introduced in this resolution will bring about that very much desired result. I hope that Canada may become great. She has great resources, she has illimitable mines, she has vast agricultural resources, she has great fishing industries, she has all those sources of wealth, and if she only had an enlightened liberal policy controlling the trade of the country we might expect to see Canada flourish to a very much greater degree than she is doing at the present time.

Mr. HICKEY. I cannot allow this debate to close without making a few remarks giving my opinions regarding the motives which I think have inspired this resolution and the consequences which I think are involved in it. I have been much pleased with the gentleman from the South Riding of Grey (Mr. Landerkin) who has just taken his seat, for the pleasant way in which he has addressed the House and especially the way in which he has closed hedging himself by the statement that he is a loyal man as he would wish also to hedge his party with the cloak of loyalty towards our land. That must be gratifying to every person in this country. This resolution has, I think, one sin-

gle virtue and that virtue is this, that it seems to be the camping ground of the Grit party. It is the camping ground in which they say they will follow their leader and in which they have planted their stakes just now. But it will soon be like many other camping grounds which they have occupied. It will soon be deserted like the camping ground of commercial union which was vacated lately by the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and that they will take down their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away. Now the gentlemen opposite must be perfectly well aware that the success of this agitation, and that the result of the full development of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity will be annexation. It is just as sure as that the child is father of the man, that annexation must be the development of this "fad" which they are agitating throughout the country to-day. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this debate assumed that "commercial union" was "unrestricted reciprocity," and when he was corrected by his leader he was willing to adopt either term. We can show I think from the literature expounded and put forth in the country on this subject that "commercial union" and "unrestricted reciprocity" are one and the same thing. Why they want to deny that is a queer thing to me. I think I will be able to show that the people outside of this House, whether they be the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite or not, look upon this movement as commercial union. Commercial union is undoubtedly the essence of this matter, and hon. gentlemen will find that it will be so interpreted in the country. While I felt pleasure in complimenting my old friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) at the close of this debate, I believe that there are possibly members in this House, and I believe there are a respectable few, at least, of the Reform party in the country who will not be found following those gentlemen in this uncalled for agitation. I think they can justly calculate upon the great majority of the Grit people of this country following them; but they will find, at least, that there are a few people who will not follow the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the gloomy wail he sent up about this country. He and his party have played the doggish game of grasping at the shadow for the bone. We expected that after ten years of the National Policy those gentlemen would have learned from experience, at least, that the people of this country were not disposed to be led away by any such side issue. They should have, at least, learned that the Canadian people were determined to keep this country as their inheritance, and as they have inherited it from their loyal ancestors so they are determined to hand it down untarnished.

"A heritage it seems to me,
Worthy being loyal—
To hold in fee."

Their policy reminds me of one of Victor Hugo's characters who was constantly mistaking a weather-cock for the flag of his country; and that is the fact with those gentlemen. That this is an important main question no one will deny, because it involves the life, welfare and end of this country, and it has been said that the end of any nation is its perfection; but how in the world can it be perfection if we take a step by which we lose our identity in the first place, and merely give our future to add to the great country that those gentlemen propose to annex us to. They have counted without their host, because the people of this country have no sympathy with the movement they are engaged in. If this policy were carried out to its legitimate end anyone who exercises a little logic in this matter will see that Canadian nationality by this reciprocal union proposal would be wiped out altogether. That would undoubtedly be the case although gentlemen on the opposite side pretend to say

that it will not. I am led to believe that those gentlemen can scarcely be sincere in their professions of abiding loyalty to Canada. They have merely sugar coated the pill of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union; but, Sir, the "sugar coating" is too thin, and within it is the nauseate drug which will not be acceptable to the people of Canada. I think, Sir, we must admit that it is the resignation of our hope and faith in Canada, that it is an acknowledgment of our inability to look after our own country, when we go as is proposed in this resolution to seek help from a foreign country. Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that we owe respect at least to the leader of this "fad." Mr. Wiman, unlike hon. gentlemen opposite, does not seek to detract from this country, but, on the contrary, Mr. Wiman has endeavored at all times to speak in glowing terms of our wealth, progress, prosperity and hopes. He has represented Canada as something worth annexing to the States, while those gentlemen opposite have represented Canada as being too poor almost to give away. They must not wonder if we in this House have to tax them for speaking lightly of Canada, and that we speak of them as being disloyal, because we can only judge them by their language, and their language sounds traitorous and is disloyal in tone. We must suppose, therefore, that it comes from the heart as it does from the tongue. They tell us that this close union with the United States would not injure our relations with Great Britain, and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us that it would be a great blessing if we could unite ourselves with the States and make a great Anglo-Saxon union in this western world, where Great Britain would find a resting place in her old age and a place of safeguard. Bah! upon such a sickly wail. I can tell the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that while his spirit and soul may be hovering over the State of Michigan, it is not meet that his body and breeches are the part reserved for this Chamber. This may not sound very pleasant to the hon. gentleman, but I want to declare that Great Britain does not ask any wails from men whose patriotism is of the same kind as his. I would remind him in the words of Henry Ward Beecher:

"That England is the finest country in the world and take her up one side and down the other she has more generosity, more liberty and more freedom than any country in the world."

If the hon. gentleman does not like to hear this I like to say it. Now, Sir, free trade with the United States means of necessity that we must separate our existence from Great Britain with whom we have gone hand in hand in the steady march of prosperity and strength, and if hon. gentlemen opposite think that our union with a foreign country would be taken in a quiet way by the people of Great Britain they at least do not know what the sentiment between the two countries is. If there is anything in this union at all the essence of it is that money again is the consideration, that the thirty pieces of silver is to be considered and that if we are to sell this country it is for a money consideration only. If that is ever done one result of it will be to separate the sentiment and feeling which exists between this country and Great Britain, and at the end leave us to be swallowed up by the United States. A great deal has been said about the progress of Canada and it has been stated that we have not progressed as well as we ought. We need only look and scan the scenes around us to be satisfied that our march to prosperity has been onward and upward and that our achievements in the past will be a sufficient index for our prosperity in the future. Our population we have been told has been leaving us on account of the National Policy, but the gentleman who undertook to explain this exodus goes back to years before the National Policy and tells us that 2,000,000 of people have left Canada. If he prosecuted his enquiries further he would find at least that 7,500,000 people have left the United States, and he had better hunt

Mr. Hickey.

them up and find where they are. It is true we have had an exodus from this country, some have left us and some more could very well go for the good of the country. Some are remaining here to sow the seeds of discord and foment, the spirit of discontent among our people, and if they left too, I think Canada would be happier and better, because no human mind can comprehend the destructive results that must follow an agitation of this kind at this period of our country's growth. It tells the world that the Canadian people are still adrift, that they are not satisfied with their country, that they know not whether they are drifting, and are willing to take up any fad and leave their loyal homes to go to a country that has been inimical in every way it could in its trade relations with Canada. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House have said that the annexation sentiment has been increasing in this country. If it has, who have been the fathers of that sentiment? These very gentlemen are the preachers of annexation. We do not find any annexation sentiment being taught in the Conservative ranks of this country; but these gentlemen get up here, with all the audacity that is peculiar to their politics, and tell us that this sentiment is increasing. They are the authors of it, and they must feel the opprobrium that is attached to it. They tell us in as many words that our country is poor. When they wish to hurl a dart at the Government they say the country is going to the dogs, and that it is poor; but if they once lose sight of the Government, they can dilate on Canada's wealth and on the great future it is likely to have. I say this is just the time when Canadian hearts ought to be strong and cheerful, because the sinews of this country have just become developed; the foundations of this nation have just become solidified; we have expended our wealth, we have sown the seeds of prosperity, and are just about to reap the results, and built up a nation that will be second to none in this world. For these reasons, I think that if these gentlemen would sound a word or two that would be consistent with the real position of the country, instead of decrying it, they would do much better. But they say our policy has ruined this country. Well, if the National Policy has ruined this country, what in the name of common sense do they expect to give us when they get us connected with a nation where a National Policy exists in its perfection? If there is one fault that I have found with the National Policy, it has been that it was too limited; it did not go far enough, the protection was not great enough. So you see the utterly nonsensical position these gentlemen occupy, with not a bit of regard to logic or the interests of this country. If there is any evil in this country, it must be in their own bosoms. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) had a good deal to say against the Government for the evil way in which they are conducting the affairs of this country and bribing one Province after another. Hon. gentlemen who have read the newspapers must be sure of this fact that that hon. gentleman with his silvery tongue and his insincerity, or I should say, his big hopes in himself and his party, bribed the people of Prince Edward Island by telling them that his party were going into power and the Tories were going out, and that they would then get all they would ask for. Instead of our party being the bribers, that gentleman with all his smooth ways was the arch briber. But before I forget it, I want to give some outside opinions as to what these gentlemen are fighting for, and to show them that the people of the United States regard it in the light of commercial union and annexation. In the first place, what does Mr. Wiman say in reply to Mr. Edgar about unrestricted reciprocity? He says:

"Almost everything that commercial union in its fullest sense could accomplish would be achieved by this plan."

That is Mr. Wiman's view of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. In opening this debate the hon.

member for South Oxford was very irritable over the idea that commercial union could be tacked on to his resolution of unrestricted reciprocity. That resolution contains a very nice word, reciprocity in trade. We all believe in reciprocity in trade with the United States so far as it is consistent with the interests of Canada, and no further. Here is what the *Boston Advertiser* says on this subject :

"The members of the Opposition party in Canada have come out without reservation in favor of free trade between Canada and the United States. Sir Richard Cartwright, who is the recognised leader of the minority in Parliament, has made a set speech, in which he has declared expressly, with the unanimous approval of his party, in favor of a commercial union with the United States. He goes to the extent of saying that if it is necessary, in order to accomplish this result, Canada must adopt the tariff which the United States imposes upon English goods or shut out English manufactures from Canadian markets in preference to allowing the existing condition of things to go on, which impoverishes Canada and makes it a political tributary of Great Britain, while it should naturally be a commercial ally of the United States. The *Montreal Herald*, the leading Liberal paper in that city, declares in favor of breaking down all tariff barriers along our border, and defiantly declares its independence of the complaints of British manufacturers. * * As Sir Richard Cartwright pointed out, the right to enter our markets free is the only commercial privilege which can make Canada prosperous, and without it she can never be so."

Do hon. gentlemen wonder now why we think they are disloyal in the sentiments they are propounding from day to day in this House? Senator Frye, who has been a warm friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, gives his opinion on the subject :—

"Senator Frye, who has given this subject more careful study than any other member of our Congress, has expressed it as his opinion that it is simply a question of time when at least the Maritime Provinces of Canada will be forced to ally themselves to the United States on whatever basis they can obtain, with this provision of a free market thrown in. He believes Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at least, will be forced by the necessities of the case to demand of Great Britain a peaceful separation from Canada on condition that they may be annexed to this country. It may be that this result may not happen directly, but the whole tendency of public discussion in those Provinces looks in that direction, and while it would be a severe blow at English Imperial pride to give up these Provinces to this country, and to sacrifice the splendid harbor of Halifax, which for more than a century has been the headquarters of the British naval force in this hemisphere, yet we believe that the necessities of the case are so great that a large party in Canada prefers free trade with us to any consideration of national pride."

That is the opinion of an outside critic, who stands in the position of the party with whom these people wish to unite. He looks upon the agitation as one for annexation, and these gentlemen must know that that would be the natural end of such a union. The paper goes on to say :

"It will then become a serious problem for our statesmen to consider on what basis reciprocity with Canada can be entertained. So long as we maintain our present tariff, the first preliminary must undoubtedly be the same tariff for imports into Canada as we raise on our own borders, thus throwing Canadian markets open to our manufactures, we in turn buying at will all the products of Canada in the form of grains, potatoes, fish and coal. It is easily seen that it would be impossible to maintain a political union with Great Britain under these circumstances and a commercial unity with this country."

"The unrest in Canada on these lines is sufficient reason for the anxiety which England has shown to bring out of this fishery dispute some method of opening our markets to Canadian productions. It also explains why England countenanced the unjustifiable conduct of Canadian cruisers to our fishermen. But as the United States has refused to be forced out of its proper policy thus far, the two countries are brought face to face with the more interesting problem of what step Canada will next take to meet her increasing debts, the growing discontent of her people and the unavailing statesmanship of her leaders, bringing into striking prominence the dependence of Canada upon closer relations with us for her future prosperity."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anything could be wanting to criticism in a proper spirit, without any bias of partisanship, it could be found in the mouths of their own friends in the United States whom hon. gentlemen opposite wish to join this country. A great deal has been said about the great markets of the United States. The hon. Minister of the Interior and other hon. gentlemen on this side have abundantly shown that the markets in Canada are as good as those in the United States, and in many cases better, because they are at our own doors and subject to our own control. In this connection we have heard a good deal

24—1888—5

about horses. Now, what are the facts? Take the American trade reports and we find that the average price for horses in the United States is \$73.70, while in Canada it is \$113. In many of the States the average price of horses is \$60, \$70 and \$80, much less than the average price in our Canadian market. This was in 1876. From 1876 to 1885 the exports of cattle to Great Britain amounted to \$28,150,000, and the exports to the United States to \$7,934,000, or three and a half times greater export to Great Britain than to the United States, and the average price of every animal exported to Great Britain was \$77, while the average price of the exports to the United States was \$36, so that the average price of cattle for those years was \$35.97, a little less than the average price of the Canadian cattle exported to that country during these ten years. We must also bear in consideration the fact mentioned by the hon. member for South Leeds, that if we were united to the United States, we would lose the English market, because our cattle would be scheduled and could not be shipped to Great Britain at all. Besides that, we know that the market in the United States is a fickle market, while that of Great Britain is a steady market, with a constant and increasing demand for our cattle. This is shown in a striking manner by the fact that in the aggregate value of farm animals, in the United States, comparing the year 1885 to 1884, we find a decrease of over \$100,000,000, while the number of animals shows an increase with the exception of sheep; yet in Canada during the same years, we find both the number and value have increased, except as regards the number, in sheep and pigs, the value having increased to the amount of \$8,250,000, or about \$2 per head of the population, while the decrease in the price of animals in the United States was \$1.60 per head of the population. You see, therefore, that the market of Great Britain is of paramount importance to us, while that of the United States is more flickering and changeable than our own, and, therefore, not as desirable. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his strictures of the people of Canada, said that money was much cheaper in the United States than here; he said you could get money at from 6 to 7 per cent. in Michigan. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that you can borrow money anywhere in this country at 6, 6½ and 7 per cent. The hon. gentleman will have us believe that the people were laboring under a heavy mortgaged debt from which they could not possibly get any relief. But what do you find, Sir? You find that in that great country, where that hon. gentleman loves to dwell, where his souls is at peace and where his spirit seems to have its fullness—especially in that part of it known as Michigan—you find in that country, to repeat the figures given by the hon. member who moved the reply to the Speech from the Throne, and which are very pertinent to this debate, that the mortgages on farms in the United States are as follows :—

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| In Ohio..... | \$ 701,000,000 |
| Indiana..... | 398,000,000 |
| Illinois..... | 620,000,000 |
| Wisconsin..... | 250,000,000 |
| Michigan..... | 350,000,000 |
| Minnesota..... | 175,000,000 |
| Iowa..... | 351,000,000 |
| Nebraska..... | 140,000,000 |
| Kansas..... | 200,000,000 |
| Missouri..... | 257,000,000 |

Total farm mortgages..... \$3,422,000,000

And the actual value of all farms in these ten States is about \$13,931,000,000. Now the *New York Times* sent out a commissioner to investigate the matter, and he reports as follows :—

"The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving farms, because the larger portion of the farms were equipped with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live."

Of Michigan, the commissioner says :

"In Michigan the number of mortgaged farms has recently been closely ascertained. Practically one-half of the farms of that great State which is justly famous for the production of wheat, oats, barley, corn, fruit, vegetables, lumber, iron ore and copper are mortgaged. In 1880 the assessed value of Michigan farms was \$499,000,000. Their assessed value to-day is about \$700,000,000, which shows an actual value of \$1,400,000,000. One-half of them are mortgaged, and the older the community and the more valuable the land the more numerous are the mortgages—(so the recent investigation shows.)"

Thus \$700,000,000 worth of Michigan farming land, or one-half the whole value is incumbered. Farm mortgages are always negotiated on the real value of the land. Thus the total amount of money represented by the faces of Michigan farm mortgages, is at least \$350,000,000. As it is in Michigan, so it is in the ten great agricultural States which lie in the Mississippi valley. In Dakota, there is a population of 600,000, and the mortgages are \$45,000,000, for which interest is paid at the rate of 10 per cent. The commissioner further says:

"I here wish to say to investors, that all talk relative to this vast sum of money ever being paid, is utter folly.

"The profit derived from American agriculture is now so small as to be unworthy of the slightest consideration. To illustrate this fact, the interest money drawn annually from the ten States listed, if they pay 7 per cent, only amounts to \$239,000,000. The total value of the agricultural products of these ten States was, in 1879, \$839,000,000. In 1885, the total value of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco and cotton, was \$754,600,000. Allowing \$250,000,000 for other products of the farm, we have a total annual value of \$1,000,000,000. Half the farms being mortgaged, the produce they yield is \$500,000,000, \$239,000,000 of this goes to pay interest, leaving \$261,000,000 of produce to support 886,000 farmers and their families, or \$294 to each farmer."

"Out of this sum," says the Commissioner,

"They must pay labor, taxes, supply seed, buy tools, &c. The sum is entirely inadequate. It is not possible for these mortgaged farmers as a class, ever to lift their mortgages."

And this is the country to which these hon. gentlemen point with such ecstasy, when they are chagrined over their own country and lament her miserable condition. Would they wish to reduce Canadian farmers to that low level of prosperity, to that hopeless condition of inability to extricate themselves from the burden of debt which is upon them. I think not. If they were sincere they would show up all the facts to the public. This is not Canadian literature that I have quoted or literature gathered from Canadian books, but it is a report of the views of the people themselves who have invested in lands in these States. Take this same comparison and what will we find? We find that in Canada, that is, in Ontario and Quebec, the total mortgage debt does not exceed \$200,000,000, on an estimated value of \$800,000,000. Mr. Blue gives it as \$600,000,000, but we may add 25 per cent. to that. The crop of Ontario is valued at \$121,000,000. Taking \$14,000,000 for interest, we have left \$108,000,000 to be divided among 182,000 farmers holding more than ten acres each, or \$600 a piece from agricultural products. This is 100 per cent. more than in the ten States to which the commissioner directed his attention. And yet, the hon. gentleman would cajole these farmers of Ontario to unite their fortunes with those of the depressed farmers of the United States. In 1874, we find that the default on mortgages was equal to 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. In 1879, it was 5 per cent. In 1886, it was 4 per cent. Notwithstanding the blue ruin they have been stating has overtaken the farmers, though certainly the defaults are more in 1886 than they were in 1874, still they are only 4 per cent., and, when the hon. gentleman left power, they were 7 per cent. This is a very valuable showing when you compare it with the statements which they made. Here is another report. In the course of a recent discussion in the Congress of the United States, Mr. Weaver, of Iowa, said that:

"During the summer he had traversed the country from western New York through Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska, and the best testimony he could procure showed that two-

Mr. HICKEY.

thirds of all the farm land of the United States was under mortgage. In Iowa it would be an accident if a man travelling through the State got upon a farm that was not mortgaged."

That is the testimony of the people of the United States in reference to the condition of their farmers, and these are the farmers who are held out to the people of Canada as occupying the green fields of prosperity in order to induce them to unite themselves to the people of the United States. It is well known that far off fields are green, and so these would be found if we were ever so thoughtless as to betray our trust and unite our existence with the United States instead of remaining in our present prosperous condition, a condition of which I think any man might be proud as a citizen of Canada, and which I hope will continue. We have a great country, and, if the United States were removed to the antipodes to-morrow, we could go on and flourish in spite of it. In their 4th of July orations the people of the United States are proud to say that their country is God's country; and so is this country God's country. We have all the materials of wealth, we have all the means of maintaining a prosperous nationality here, and we can as well live without the United States as they could live without us in proportion to our numbers. The products of our fields, of our mines, of our forests, and of everything we have are abundant and are handy to the industrious Canadian, who, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was very strong in stating was worth any six immigrants to this country. With all the wealth of Canada, I say we ought to look upon Canada as God's country. It is full of everything calculated to make men happy and prosperous, and I say that an unworthy compromise such as this would be—and an unworthy compromise is always looked upon as a certain avenue to national destruction—ought not to be made, because our position with Great Britain has been one of honor, faithfulness and strength, and that was never exhibited to the world more than it was during the fishery negotiations that have taken place recently in the United States. The United States Congress a short time ago passed a non-intercourse Bill, but they found that they could not put it in force against Canada without putting it in force against Great Britain and all her colonies, and they at once commenced to estimate the cost of that course. What would Canada be in such a case without such a friend, at a time of weakness such as we had in regard to this question. Investigate this matter as much as you like, and the firmer you will find our position in this matter. Let us keep our fidelity and remember that what is right is safe. If it is right to look after our interest, then the preservation of our present position is the best and the safest thing for us to do. We have the desire to promote our own prosperity. I see Canada drifting down the stream of time, with all its interests growing greater and grander as the times go by, and I believe that she will inscribe upon her banner in the future as she has in the past the motto "*Dieu et mon droit.*"

Mr. McINTYRE. I understand that there is a general desire for the adjournment of the debate, as the hour is growing late, and, if the Government are of that opinion, I will move the adjournment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Go on.

Mr. McINTYRE. Before this debate comes to a close, I desire to say a few words in reference to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question of unrestricted reciprocity, or of reciprocity of some kind, is one that overshadows all other considerations of that kind, with us down by the sea, and this is especially the case in the Province from which I come. We have been lectured by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in regard to the manner in which we treat this question. They say we should treat it from a national standpoint. That is all very well for hon. gentle-

men from Ontario who make use of us down by the sea as their footstool. In fact, there is a gentleman in this House—I think it was the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson)—who stated that, if we obtained unrestricted reciprocity, we would be made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the people of the United States. Well, we had reciprocity with the United States before, and I do not think we were made hewers of wood and drawers of water at that time. In fact, with us down by the sea, we were not inclined to be made hewers of wood and drawers of water under the old Reciprocity Treaty. Our people in Prince Edward Island and in the Maritime Provinces generally, but more especially in the island from which I come, have had ample experience of the immense advantages and benefits which accrued to them under the old Reciprocity Treaty, and for that reason they have always been looking forward to the renewal of that treaty or to something even better. While that treaty was in force, our merchants, our farmers, and our fishermen were in the highest degree of prosperity. It was a time when the American vessels came down to our ports and into our rivers and took away from us all our surplus produce—in fact they took away everything we had to spare, and paid for it in cash. It was a time when all our people enjoyed the highest degree of prosperity, and consequently of contentment, because people are generally content when their pockets are lined with the needful, and not otherwise. In order to show that what I have said is true, and that I am not drawing upon my imagination, I will just illustrate by two small rows of figures. In 1854, which was the year the Reciprocity Treaty was inaugurated, but it was not a full year, our exports to the United States only amounted to \$81,782; in 1865, which was the last full year of the Reciprocity Treaty, they amounted to \$604,642; in other words, an increase of \$523,960 in the space of twelve years, or something over 400 per cent. The contrast between that time and now is certainly very marked, so far as the Island is concerned. To-day we are hemmed in by two Chinese walls. If we send our produce to the American side we are met by an enormous tariff, but in spite of this, we have to force our products in there and take whatever we can get for them, and bring back the money in order to pay for goods imported from Ontario and Quebec; and if we bring back American goods we are met by our own Government with another Chinese wall, in the shape of an enormous protective duty. Now, Sir, it is the general feeling down in that section of the country that so far as tariffs are concerned, it is utterly impossible for us to be ever a prosperous people. Under the existing state of affairs we are forced to buy from Ontario and Quebec, which do not require any of the articles which the Island produces; therefore we are forced to go into a hostile market to obtain money in order to pay the goods we buy from Ontario and Quebec. You might just as well expect water to run up hill as to expect that there ever can be any community of sympathy or sentiment between the Western Provinces and the Eastern, so long as this condition of affairs exists. The Americans, of course, are our neighbors, they are nearest to us, they are the people with whom we have always dealt more or less, they are the people amongst whom our friends live because a large number of our friends go to the United States, and we are at all times anxious to see them besides trading with them. Again, our rates of freight to the United States are much cheaper, because they are water rates as against railway rates with the Western Provinces. In order to show the difference which exists between the old Reciprocity period and the present, I will quote some more figures. In 1887, our exports to the United States only amounted to \$668,627; and as I said before, in 1865, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, our exports amounted to \$604,642; so that in the space of 22 years, they only in-

creased by \$63,975; whereas, in the 12 years of the Reciprocity Treaty, they increased by \$123,960. I think these figures speak for themselves, and more eloquently than anything I can say, or any person else. As I said before, in the last full year of the treaty, our exports amounted to \$604,642, and the first year after the abrogation of the treaty they fell to \$108,166. This is an enormous fall in a very short space of time, and goes to show what an advantage it would be to us to have a reciprocal trade with the United States in preference to the existing state of affairs. Whilst I am on this point, I wish to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Marine in reference to the savings bank argument that he used. He said it was an indication of our wealth that we had so much money in the savings bank at Charlottetown. Well, Sir, I thought we had heard the last of that during the late campaign, but I find it is made to do service over and over again. Now, if that is an argument that we are wealthy, it shows that we are even more wealthy than the great commercial city of the west, Toronto, because we have, in proportion to the population, double the amount of money in the savings bank at Charlottetown than they have in the city of Toronto. I think this fact proves the very reverse; it proves that if we had any remunerative business in which this money could be invested it would be placed there, for any person who receives 5 or 6 per cent. for his money would never leave it lying in the savings bank at 4 per cent. We are expected to be happy down by the sea, but when we consider the inducements which are supposed to make us happy they are really extraordinary. Take the present price of produce for example. We find people starting for market before daylight, in the fall of the year, and with mud up to the hubs of their waggon, to bring oats to market with which to purchase goods, and they receive twenty-five or twenty-six cents a bushel. They bring their potatoes to market for sixteen cents a bushel, which is the ordinary price in the fall of the year in Prince Edward Island. They were a little higher last fall on account of the American demand, and it is only when there is an American demand, or when there has been a short crop in the United States, that there is any demand at all, scarcely, for potatoes in Prince Edward Island. Then, again, so far as real estate is concerned, it is falling in value every year in consequence of the low prices of produce—in fact it is almost impossible for a man who wants to leave for the United States now, to sell his farm, except at a ruinous rate. This was not so in former years; because I remember myself that during the terrible years of the Mackenzie Administration of which we have heard so much, real estate was booming in that Province. As a natural consequence of all these things, our people are leaving the country. I do not deny that there is always a certain amount of emigration, as there always will be from a country like the Maritime Provinces, but within the three, or four, or five years, emigration has assumed alarming proportions. It is not only our young men who are leaving us, but also our young women. In every section of the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, people from Prince Edward Island are to be found. I know myself that from nearly every house which I can recall to memory, one, two, three and sometimes four, persons have left and gone to the United States. They have not gone there to come back again but to stay. Our young men go into the fishing business or the mercantile business or whatever they can get to do; and it is the same with our young women, then marry and settle down in the United States. I am very sorry that I have to make such a statement as this, because if it were in my power to do otherwise I would be very willing to do it, no matter who would be the gainers thereby, even if it was the Government. Then again in Prince Edward Island in former years we

had a magnificent industry in the shape of shipbuilding. The industry of shipbuilding has entirely disappeared from the Island. In former years it gave employment to our mechanics, it assisted our farmers so far that they could sell the timber off their land, and in fact it saved many a bushel of grain when they could bring a few sticks of timber to the shipyard and obtain the necessities, while to-day they have to give away their timber altogether. In order to show the great depression that has taken place in this industry, I will read a few statistics to the House. In 1875 we built 26,041 tons of shipping, of the value of \$7,621,194. In 1878 we built only 16,486 tons. As I said before, those were the years of which we have heard so much with respect to the Mackenzie Administration; but to us they were not disastrous years but years of prosperity, a return of which we anxiously look for. Then we come down to succeeding years. In 1886 shipbuilding had declined to 1,244 tons, and 1,686 tons in 1887. In 1873, the year in which we entered the Confederacy, we owned 280 vessels, equal to a tonnage of 38,918; in 1886 we owned only 225 vessels, with a tonnage of 30,658, or a decrease in fifteen years of 55 vessels and 8,260 tons. I think those figures speak for themselves. They show that ever since we entered Confederation the shipbuilding industry has been declining steadily every day. It has been stated that the reason of the decline in shipbuilding is due to the fact of the place of ships being taken by steamers; but if that were true the tonnage ought to show it, but it does not. I believe that every person conversant with the old state of affairs under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 will believe that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, which would prove much more advantageous to us than the old Reciprocity Treaty, the value of our farms would nearly double in a year or two. Then again it would give a chance to capitalists of the United States to come down and establish fisheries amongst us as they did under the old Reciprocity Treaty. This gave encouragement to our young men to stay at home and they did so during those years. If a reciprocal treaty was in operation, which we earnestly hope will be the case, there is no doubt in my mind and no doubt in the minds of nine-tenths of the people of Prince Edward Island, but that there will be a renewal of the good old times that prevailed under the old Reciprocity Treaty, and even better times. Our farmers would find some encouragement for continuing in the business of agriculture. We have in the Island some of the finest farms to be found in the whole Dominion of Canada, and our farms are famed all over the Maritime Provinces and the Eastern States. Then again we raise large numbers of sheep, and it is a fact that the mutton of the Island is regarded as of first class quality, and a large number of sheep even under present circumstances are sent yearly to the States. Of course, I need scarcely say that we produce large quantities of potatoes, butter and eggs. We sent in 1877 to the United States horses to the value of \$61,524; sheep to the value of \$16,279; potatoes, 792,426 bushels, to the value of \$168,366; eggs to the number of 1,668,539 dozen, to the value of \$202,737. Then by the Trade and Navigation Returns I find that we are the largest exporters of eggs of any Province in the Dominion with the exception of Ontario. We also sent of mackerel 14,764 barrels, to the value of \$93,936; canned mackerel, 501,320 pounds, to the value of \$32,421, or a total of \$126,360. All this produce has been sent to the United States and the money brought back goes to pay for goods from Ontario. If we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States I have no doubt but that these exports would be quadrupled in a very short time. Some of the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite against unrestricted reciprocity appear to me to be very frivolous, one of which is that it is going to impair our loyalty. It appears to me that this is the most silly objection that could

Mr. McINTYRE.

possibly be raised. We had reciprocity before, and I do not think it impaired our loyalty to the slightest degree. I think myself that when the people are prosperous they are content, and when they are contented there is no room for disloyalty. There is no disloyalty without a cause, and in this case there would be no cause. Then, again, we are told that unrestricted reciprocity would involve direct taxation. It did not involve direct taxation before and it would not involve it now. We are told that it would cut off \$7,000,000 from our revenue. It is very easy to make up that deficiency if proper methods were adopted, and there are several means which might be adopted. There has been an enormous and useless expenditure going on in this Dominion for many years, a large number of which might be cut away with benefit to the Provinces and benefit to the Dominion. If we would stop purchasing constituencies by railway subsidies there would be an immense saving effected. Of course I do not object to railway subsidies where they are really required, but when they are spent merely for the purpose of purchasing constituencies they are objectionable. Then, again, there is another enormous item of expenditure and that is with reference to newspapers. Newspaper support is purchased by means of the emigration funds. That is an enormous leakage year after year which might very easily be stopped. Then, again, if the Government would accord to us universal suffrage we might easily dispense with that expensive Franchise Act. Another objection raised by supporters of the Government is that we cannot obtain reciprocity with the United States and that it is useless to be looking for it. I think that since the abrogation of the old Reciprocity Treaty there never was a brighter prospect than there is to-day—there never was such a disposition manifested by public men in the United States for reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada. Within the last two years we have had the Butterworth Bill which goes in for a large measure of reciprocal trade, then again we have the Hitt Bill, which not long ago was recommended from the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously, and more recently still, we have the expression of Mr. Secretary Bayard, in which he says in his letter to Sir Charles Tupper of 31st May, 1887:

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement, and there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations between the two countries."

I think, Sir, since the abrogation of the old treaty we have never had such a universal expression from the people of the United States in favor of reciprocal trade as we have had within the last year or two, and that not only by the statement of the United States, but by the large meetings which have been convened for the purpose of discussing this question, and which were nearly all unanimous in favor of more extended relations. It has been quoted in the Government papers that during the Fishery Commission certain propositions were made by the British Commissioners in the direction of reciprocal trade with the United States, and those papers say they were rejected immediately by the United States Commissioners. This is not putting the matter in a fair light, because the United States Fishery Commissioners rejected those proposals for the reasons that they were not authorised to treat in regard to trade. All they were authorised to do was to settle the matter in reference to the fisheries. I am glad, Sir, that this question has been brought so prominently to the attention of the people of this Dominion, and I trust that at no distant date we will see a triumph not so much in the interests of party as in the interests of the whole country.

Mr. FREEMAN moved the adjournment of the debate to Tuesday evening next at eight o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman means to meet to-morrow, I suppose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does he propose to take up or to do?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With the consent of the House our intention is to go on with the question put by members, and take the Private Bills. We will have five

Private Bills to consider from Ontario and if we can get through those Bills they would be sent to the Senate. Then we can take the Notices of Motion, selecting the unopposed motions. This, I think, will take us up to six o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:30 a.m. (Wednesday.)

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER, & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, March 28, 1888.

No. 25.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 28th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved:

That the second report of the Select Committee to supervise the publication of the Debates of the House be adopted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough not to insist on that motion to-day, as it will take some time to discuss it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I would then ask to let it stand as a notice of motion for Wednesday next. The report has been several days on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let it stand until the present debate is concluded.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is only a recommendation for some increases of salaries.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique, Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Burns)

Bill (No. 80) to wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 86) to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie for railway and passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)

25—1888—1

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter that I consider of very considerable importance to this country. It will be recollected that in 1878, when the Government was changed from that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to that of the right hon. gentleman opposite, some very eloquent speeches were delivered throughout this country in favor of what was claimed then to be a National Policy—not a protective policy, but a National Policy—and to which I had the honor, in all good faith, of giving what little support I could. The right hon. gentleman, at the head of the Government, carrying out in good faith what he proposed, placed on the Statute-book of 1879 the following clause in the Customs Act:—

"Any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal and flour and meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked) and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

I see in the *Free Press* some very important communications from Washington upon that subject, which, with the permission of the House, I will read:

"Washington, March 27.—Much feeling has been aroused against Canada in congressional circles here owing to the neglect of the Dominion Government to place on the free list those articles of natural produce which are now admitted free into the United States. Some years ago the Canadian Parliament passed an Act authorising or directing the Dominion Executive to place on the free list certain articles of natural produce, including trees and shrubs, green fruit, coal and coke, fish, &c., whenever the United States Government agreed to admit such articles free. It was expected that by this means complete reciprocity of trade in the natural produce of the two countries would gradually be brought about. In 1883 Congress placed on the free list a number of the articles mentioned in the Canadian Act, but up to the present the Canadian authorities have refused to reciprocate or to take any steps towards bringing about a free exchange in the natural products. After the new parcel post system came in operation the nurserymen of this country were placed at a great disadvantage as compared with their Canadian competitors, as all trees and shrubs exported from Canada to this country came in duty free, while American nursery stock is dutiable when sent into Canada. Steps were lately taken to ascertain what the policy of the Canadian Government was in regard to the free exchange of natural products, and the information received is to the effect that the Dominion Government has decided that they are not called upon to put their standing offer of reciprocity in natural products into operation until each and all the articles referred to in the statute are admitted free by the United States. The course of the Canadian Government in refusing to adhere by their own engagement to place on their free list articles of natural produce now admitted free by this country, is likely to strengthen the hands of the opponents of the fisheries treaty and to lead to retaliation. A congressman from New York State announces that it is his intention to present at once in the House of Representatives a bill removing from the free to the dutiable list, for customs purposes, all articles of Canadian growth now admitted free. The bill will not include only trees, shrubs and green fruits, but oysters, fresh fish and eggs, of which immense quantities are imported into this country every year from Canada. The proposed duty on eggs, he says, will be about 4 cents per dozen and on other articles the same rates of duty now levied and collected by the Canadian Government."

"Washington, March 27.—A New York representative has prepared a bill for early presentation in the House of Representatives which places all articles now in the free list of the United States and not

embraced in the free list of Canada, into the duty list at the same rates of duty now imposed by the Canadian tariff.

"These articles are principally green and dried fruits, nursery stock and seeds of all kinds, fresh fish, &c.

"Other articles which have long been on the free list will also be included for duty, such as eggs, 4 cents per dozen, fresh fish, &c.

"Great indignation exists here at the total indifference and bad faith of the Canadian Government in their disregard of Secs. 3 and 9 of the Canadian Customs Act, and the spirit and principle embodied in Sec. 10."

There is a good deal more upon the same subject here with reference to the determination on the part of the United States to propose retaliation, and I am certainly not very much surprised at it. We have heard various rumors about this matter. It is stated in these despatches that the Canadian Government have received communications from the American Government on this subject with the view of getting reciprocity in those articles in which, by the statute, this Government have declared their readiness to reciprocate. What I would like to know is this, whether any, and if so, what correspondence has passed between the two Governments in relation to this subject, and whether the Canadian Government have taken any action with the view of meeting the American Government in their endeavor to meet the statutory statements of our Government regarding reciprocity in natural products. This is a matter of the greatest importance. To my constituents it is especially of great importance. Hundreds of tons of fresh fish, during certain weeks of the winter, leave one single station, Shediac, in my county, for the markets of the United States; and if this retaliatory policy of the United States should be carried out, if there is any just ground for its being carried out, the people of this country will have good reason to find fault with the right hon. gentleman and the gentlemen behind him. They will have good ground of complaint if the Government have taken no steps to try and meet the advances of the American Government and prevent a system of retaliation growing up between the two countries. This is a matter of vital importance, not only to the constituency I represent, but to the whole of Canada. It affects almost all agricultural products, it affects flour and meal and corn and everything of that kind, and, if the American people are met at the outset of this reciprocity question by a refusal to admit these things which they have made free, I think it is a breach of faith in regard to the inducements which were held out by the hon. gentleman in 1879. I know that the policy of the Government has changed since 1879. The National Policy was adopted then as a means to an end, as a means to bring about reciprocity. That was the argument used by which myself and others were induced to support it, but now it is a policy of protection. I want to find out whether the people of this country—my constituents, for instance, in the matter of fresh fish—are to be driven into a position where they will have the tax placed upon them when they go into the United States. This is a matter of vital importance to the people of this country. I think the right hon. gentleman ought to inform the House whether negotiations had been going on in reference to it, and whether the Government have refused to meet the just claims of the United States in regard to reciprocity in those articles which they have put upon the free list. I am told that the matter has been under discussion in the Cabinet. We cannot tell, of course, what takes place there. It is one of the secret places, unless the *Herald* happens to get at them now and then, but generally they keep their secrets to themselves. We ought to know whether the articles which have been named, of fish, coal, fruit, eggs, and so on, which the Americans have made free, are to be made free on our side. There is a little error in the statement which has come from Washington, and that is in regard to coal. Anthracite coal has been made free in the interests of Ontario, which the right hon. gentleman represents, but the coal of our country

Mr. MITCHELL.

has not been made free and the people I represent have still to submit to a tax of 60 cents a ton on all soft coal, and that is the coal which is generally used in the eastern Provinces. Now, I want the hon. gentleman to give a positive answer to my enquiry, whether advances have been made by the United States, complaining of the breach of faith which has occurred, or whether negotiations have taken place in which they have offered to extend the system of reciprocity, and whether or not any answer has been returned to them, and what the attitude of the Government is upon the question to-day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no applications have been made by the American Government upon the subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to go a little further, and I want to see why the Government have not carried out the pledge which they made in section 16 of the Act of 1879, and have not put these articles on the free list which the Americans have made free?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, when the question comes up in such a form as it can be discussed, and not in the form of an enquiry, the hon. gentleman will get a full and satisfactory answer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may get a full answer, but I do not think I will get a satisfactory one. I want to ask another question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to ask whether the United States Consul has not made representations as to the breach of faith of this Government in relation to section 16 of the Act of 1879?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, I repudiate altogether, on behalf of the Government, the insinuation that we have been guilty of any breach of faith.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, of course; you will repudiate anything if it suits your purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no right to use that insolent and unparliamentary language.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can tell the hon. gentleman—
Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall have to call for the protection of this House against such an unparliamentary course as the hon. gentleman is pursuing, and I have no doubt that this House will give me protection, as it would give any other member protection, against such coarse and unparliamentary language. I repudiate the statement that there has been any breach of faith on the part of the Canadian Government, and further, Mr. Speaker, I say that there have been reports made on behalf of the American seedsmen desiring that this provision should be carried out, but we have seedsmen on the Canadian side of the border also, and we have to consider their interest as well as the American interest. However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interests of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government, but there has been no official statement even from the Consul.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Sir,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will some hon. gentleman move the adjournment?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I ought to say that the hon. gentleman knows that he came to me and asked permission to put these questions. I asked him not to make a speech and not to be too long, and it was understood that the adjournment of the debate would not be moved, and I think the House will sustain me in saying that the hon. gentleman ought to relinquish this subject now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. You may "haw" as much as you like. I wish to correct His Honor the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not go to the Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me. Hear what I have to say first. I did not go to the Speaker to ask permission to make these statements, but to tell him that I was going to do it, and it was in the interests of my constituents—

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the hon. gentleman asked me if he might be allowed to ask these questions in order that he might not be obliged to move the adjournment of the debate. I said, That is all right so long as you do not go too far in the way of a speech. I am sorry now that I did not enforce the rule of the House at once and stop the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Sir,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely rise to put myself right in regard to what the Speaker has said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a perfect right to set myself right, even when the Speaker himself is concerned. I went to the Speaker to state, as a matter of courtesy, that I was going to bring up this question. When the hon. gentleman says he can appeal to the House, I tell him that he can do it as soon as he likes. I am not afraid of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the language of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was such as to warrant the remarks which have been made by the right hon. the Premier. If the Premier had answered the question at first as he did afterwards, my hon. friend would have been satisfied. All he wanted to know was what communications had been made to the Government in relation to this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had none, and I said so.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer which the hon. gentleman gave afterwards was not that which he gave at first.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did give it.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think he gave the answer at first in such a fair manner as he did just now. I only desire to make one remark. This is not a case which requires any communications between the two Governments, as we have a standing offer upon our Statute-book that, as soon as such a thing is done by the United States, we will reciprocate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. If it is not so, I can only say that it ought to be so, and, further, that it was understood that it was so in the first instance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Looking at the wording of the section—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear anyone do so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I was going to say was that the hon. gentleman has induced Parliament to put upon the Statute-book a certain Act. By that Act, he declares that the Parliament of Canada are ready at any time to permit articles to come from the United States into Canada free of duty, in so far as the Americans do the same thing with regard to articles going from Canada to the United States. The words used are "any or all." Now, all the articles which are named in that Act have not been admitted free into the United States by Act of Congress, but a considerable number of them have been. I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman, in not proposing to take those articles off the dutiable list and put them on the free list, is setting at defiance an Act of Parliament that he himself asked the House to put upon the Statute-book. That is the position of things. It is not a matter of discretion with the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman has parted with his discretion; he has asked Parliament to tie up the Government to a certain proposition, and that proposition is that the moment the Americans put upon the free list certain articles, those same articles shall be put upon the free list by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. No such a thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has no discretion. The hon. gentleman cannot put his opinions and his views as to public policy at this moment, above the law, and that is what the hon. gentleman has just declared to the House, that it is his intention to do. Now, I say that these words are clear and distinct, that there is no discretion left to the Government, and their duty is to put those articles upon the free list that have been put upon the free list by the Congress of the United States; and if the hon. gentleman thinks that is not good policy, then he should propose to amend the law that is at this moment upon the Statute-book.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that the hon. gentleman has not read the clause, else he would not make that statement. It is permissive altogether, it is not obligatory. The language is explicit: "Any or all of the following things," &c.—reciting them—"may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided for by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council." It is perfectly in the discretion of the Government. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he did not read the clause, or he would not have made that statement. It is perfectly permissive.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will point it out, although this irregular discussion is really interrupting the business of this House. I say to this House that if the hon. gentleman will look over our free list and the United States free list, he will find that there is an infinitely greater number of articles allowed to come into Canada on the free list of the United States than are allowed on the American free list from Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. That has nothing to do with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An infinitely greater number. But I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we have got the interests of our own people to look

after as well as the interest of the people of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, if time permits, and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list, while they refuse to take any of the others in which there could be anything like reciprocity or interchange between Canada and the United States; I say they take out some articles the manufacture of which they think they can crush in Canada, and keep up their tariff on all other articles, except one particular article, when they think that they have got the advantage. That is not the way which we, as a Canadian Government, think best to carry on the affairs of this country, and I have no doubt that the majority of this House, and the majority of the people of Canada, will think with us.

Mr. DAVIES. I submit that the argument that the hon. gentleman has just used is altogether wide of the mark. He stated just now that the Government, in their discretion, looking to the interest of certain seedsmen, did not see fit to comply with the plain words of an Act of Parliament. The hon. member for Bothwell pointed out to him that he had no discretion at present, that the proper construction of the Act demanded that when all or any other of these articles should be admitted free of duty by the United States, then, by Order in Council, the same article should be admitted into this country free of duty.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says the question is one of the construction of an Act of Parliament, and no one knows better than the First Minister, and the Minister of Justice who interrupts me, that the word "may" is the proper word to use in respect to actions to be taken by the Crown. Parliament does not use the imperative "shall,"—the Crown "shall" do this or "shall" do that. Parliament always uses the word "may," but the intention and spirit of that section is perfectly plain and perfectly clear. It was not so understood when it was passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows well that not once, but twenty times, since that statute was passed, it has been declared in this House by responsible Ministers of the Crown, and by their supporters, that we have a statutory offer which, if the United States acted upon it, would enable their products to be admitted into this country, and ours to be admitted into theirs, just to the extent to which they acted upon our offer.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, the United States have expressed not only their desire but their determination that certain of those articles which we have specified shall be admitted free into their country, on the assumption that we would act in good faith in the offer that we put on our Statute-book. I say that while, technically, if that section was used with reference to private companies, the hon. gentleman's construction might be correct, when those words are used with reference to the Crown, and looking at the spirit of the offer, the hon. gentleman is flying directly in the face of Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to my interruption, I may explain to him and to the House in what sense my interruption was made. It was not made with reference to any construction which the hon. gentleman chooses to argue should be put on the statute at all, but it was made with reference to a statement made by him that the language of the Act was that the proclamation shall

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

issue as soon as these articles are declared free from duty in the United States, and in that respect I am correct. My interruption was not intended to be at all offensive, but to call the hon. gentleman's attention to what I say was strictly correct:

"Any or all of the following, that is to say"—

Mentioning the things enumerated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell):

"—may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty."

Then the hon. member, with the view of giving this Act a certain construction, says that "may" is always the word used in reference to the Crown. Precisely so; never is the word "shall" used at all, but never is the discretion of the Crown taken away by Parliament, and it is only when the matter is left discretionary and subject to the action of the Executive, that the Crown is vested with the right of bringing the Act into force, and therefore —

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? Does he mean to put that construction upon an offer made by one great nation to another, and to say that if the other nation accepts the offer, it is contended in a case like this, this Government can turn round and say, We will not do it, we were only fooling?

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean to say that there is no offer in the question at all. The hon. gentleman has addressed the House upon the question of the interpretation of one of our own statutes. My view of the matter is that whenever a matter is left open to the Crown to do it is left to the discretion of the Crown, and on the advice of the responsible Ministers of the Crown, and that is the reason why the word "may" is always used instead of "shall," to imply that the discretion rests in the Crown, and is never taken away by Parliament at all. It was in that sense that I made the interruption of which the hon. gentleman complains. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of this as being a statutory offer, an offer on the part of this Parliament which involves a breach of faith if this Government should fail to carry it out to the full extent. Does the hon. gentleman mean to contend—because his argument goes that far—that this statutory offer—not only including the clause which has been brought to the notice of the House, because what is called the statutory offer embraces half-a-dozen other offers, and looks to the admission of free fish, coal and various other products into the United States—does the hon. gentleman mean to contend that it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Canada, even for that part of the statutory offer, to decline to allow the United States to say: "You have made that offer; we will take portions of it, and enact those which please us, and which appear favorable to our people, and we will shut the door in the faces of your people in respect to all the other articles"? I can only say that, in my humble judgment, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, they would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be very true, it no doubt is true, that the discretion of the Governor cannot be interfered with by statute and that the word "may" is permissive and not mandatory; but it certainly is an unfortunate thing that there should be standing on our Statute-book now, and it has been there for the last nine years, a clause like this, which seems to provide that any or all of a certain number of articles named may be admitted to this country free of duty on the United States taking steps to admit similar articles there free of duty. It was understood by all, beyond question, that on the United States admitting free any of those articles named there would be

corresponding action on the part of the Canadian Government, and if this was not the intention of the clause, then it has been left on the Statute-book to work mischief, as it is doing on this occasion. It invites retaliation, and if it does not mean what it absolutely says it ought not to be there, it ought not to have been put on the Statute-book in 1879 and continued there, and if the Government do not intend to comply with the obvious language of the clause they had better expunge it from the Statute-book with all possible haste. Of course, the view that will be taken by the American Government is that Canada has been acting in bad faith. They find this language on our Statute-book, and they believed evidently, and they will believe, that if they took this step we would be prepared to do what we explicitly promised to do. We have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite that we have a standing offer of reciprocity to the United States, according to the language of this clause, in any or all of the articles named. It is thus the Americans understood this offer. Now, if understanding this offer, as they obviously did, as one to admit free certain articles which they have placed upon their free list, necessary action is not taken on our part, and they resort to retaliation, as is threatened, they will do a great injury to this country. Take the single article of eggs. It is true they were on the free list of the United States before this clause was put on our Statute-book, but if we take the article of eggs and if the Americans were to impose a duty of four cents per dozen on them, it would involve a loss to this country of between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 on that one article alone. Take the article of fish; if a duty was imposed on our fresh fish entering the United States it would involve a loss of great magnitude to Canada. Now, the matter involved is not one of very great importance. It is true, I am willing to concede, that Americans have selected certain articles and placed them on the free list, the whole of which are mainly in one direction, but we are placed in this unfortunate position that here is plain language on our Statute-book, and we are not complying with that language, and it will be urged in the United States that we are simply shirking what they believe to be a promise, because it is not advantageous to us to fulfil our promise. That is the view they will take. We are not, of course, placed in a better position than if we were granting something that would be advantageous to us. I believe, however, in view of the circumstances of the case, in view of the language of the clause on the Statute-book,—although I admit there is great force in the statement of the First Minister, although it is a permissive clause and not a mandatory one, and one in regard to which the Government may or may not act,—notwithstanding this is true, I believe under the circumstances it will be better to act in accordance with the implied promise embodied in this clause respecting those articles being placed on the free list, because we are inviting retaliation, and retaliation in a line that would prove very injurious to the interests of this country. If we were acting as the American Government believe it would have a severe effect on the relations of the two Governments, and might weaken our present friendly relations; and, in my opinion, when the interests involved in the present case are not of great magnitude, we should consider whether we could not with advantage, and especially in view of the small cost involved, admit those articles to the free list.

Mr. CASEY. I am not a lawyer and I do not pretend to argue this question from a legal point of view, but it is quite as necessary that those who are not lawyers should understand what the laws on the Statute-book mean, at least in general terms, as that lawyers should understand them. I desire to obtain a correct understanding of the interpretation of this statute given by the Minister of

Justice. I understood him to say that the word "may" is always introduced when directions are to be given in regard to the exercise of the executive power of the Governor General, that when proclamations are directed to be issued in certain cases the word "may" is always used instead of the imperative word "shall," because, in theory at least, the discretion of the Crown cannot be limited. If that be so, —I do not know whether that is so in all cases—if the Minister's statement be exactly correct, it follows that, for instance, in the case of the Scott Act, or any other Act under which the Governor General is directed to issue a proclamation under certain circumstances, the word "may" is the word used, and therefore the Governor, advised by his responsible advisers, is at liberty to issue that proclamation or not. That is the only meaning I find in the Minister's words. Am I mistaken in that? If not, I suppose I have given a correct interpretation, and it is important that the country should know it. We always were under the impression that a statutory enactment is binding, that whatever the Legislature used, the words "may" or "shall," the statute had to be carried out when the circumstances arose. Certainly in regard to this particular statute, that impression prevailed and does prevail, not only here, but in the United States. The United States, being a nation of honorable people, believe that when we pass a statute declaring that a certain proclamation should be issued under certain circumstances, that the statute meant that it should be issued under those certain circumstances, and not merely that the Government were at liberty to advise the issue of that proclamation if they saw fit. Again, the Minister said that the prerogative of the Crown in regard to the issue of a proclamation can be exercised only on the advice of the responsible Ministers, and it is by their advice His Excellency has not issued a proclamation under present circumstances. Why is it the Ministers did not so advise him? The Minister of Justice says it is because the United States have chosen to put only a portion of the articles on the free list. Well, what is the wording of the statute? The statute says: "Any or all of the following articles." Why did the Government, and remember it was this present Government, this present set of advisers, place the words "any or all" on the Statute-book if they did not mean to accept reciprocity in regard to some of them, but would only agree to reciprocity in regard to the whole number? If they did not mean at that time to offer reciprocity in regard to some of those articles, but would require the whole number to be placed on the free list, they have changed their minds, and they have to explain to the House and the country the reason of this change of policy. Remember that those hon. gentlemen are the same advisers now, with few exceptions, the Minister of Justice being among the exceptions, and, at all events, there is the same Premier at the head of the Government, who is responsible for the advice given by any of his colleagues, as were the Government who placed on the Statute-book the words "any or all of the following articles." The hon. the Minister of Justice at least has given no explanation whatever as to why they have gone back upon the distinct wording of the statute. Now, Sir, this is a distinct change of policy, no doubt. In 1879 I am quite satisfied the Government did intend to make this offer of partial or full reciprocity in natural products, as we learn from the discussion at the time and from the use made since in the country of this portion of the statute. The reason of the change of policy is this. The hon. gentleman sees that if he allowed, even that there was reciprocity of natural products he would be giving up his whole case in favor of the National Policy, and he would be admitting that the National Policy did not protect and prosper all those articles in Canada. In order to save his beloved National Policy and his beloved friends—the few of them

who make money on the National Policy—he insists upon violating the offer which was formerly made by his own advice to the United States when the National Policy was introduced. That is the reason of this change of policy, and that is the only reason the country can put upon it. It would be clear to everybody if he agreed that there should be reciprocity in those articles, that the whole pretence of the National Policy having benefitted the country in the past was a humbug. The hon. gentleman does not like to acknowledge that he has been a humbug in the past—he does not like to acknowledge it, at all events, and for that reason a change of policy has taken place. The possibly serious consequences that may follow from this breach of faith—for it is nothing else—on the part of the Government would take too long to discuss here. We may probably hear something about that before the end of the Session. If the United States have that respect for themselves which they have always shown, it is highly probable that the consequences will be very serious to our trade, and the right hon. gentleman will then feel the responsibility of what he has done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has invited us to look at the statements that were made at the time that the National Policy, so called, was introduced, and when this resolution upon which that clause in the statute was before the House. I find that Sir Leonard Tilley, in introducing that measure, made these remarks:—

“I have this to say to our American friends: In 1865 they abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty and from that day to the present a large portion of the imports from that country into the Dominion have been admitted free. We have hoped, but hoped in vain, that by the adoption of that policy we would lead our American friends to treat us in a more liberal spirit with regard to the same articles. Well, after having waited twelve years for the consideration of this subject, the Government, requiring more revenue, have determined to ask this House to impose upon the products of the United States that have been free, such a duty as may seem consistent with our position. But the Government couple with the proposal, in order to show that we approach this question with no unfriendly spirit, a resolution that will be laid on the Table containing a proposition to this effect: that as to articles named, which are the natural products of the country, including lumber, if the United States take off the duties in part or in whole we are prepared to meet them with equal concessions.”

That was the proposition, and that has been crystallised into an Act of Parliament. The words of the Act being “any or all” of those articles.

Motion for adjournment withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that when the Speaker leaves the chair at six o'clock this day, that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next, at eight o'clock p.m., in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

THE WRIT FOR KENT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the Orders of the Day, I wish to question the Government as a matter of privilege. A day or two ago this House passed a motion ordering the issue of a writ for the County of Kent, in Ontario. I understand that up to this time no writ has been received. I would like to know whether the Government have appointed a returning officer and whether the writ has issued from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the officer so appointed. In this matter, Sir, the Crown has no discretion whatever. The officer is the servant of the House and his duty is to obey the order of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two or three days ago information was conveyed to the Clerk of the Crown in Mr. CASEY.

Chancery that Mr. Speaker had issued his warrant. The Government will in a day or two select a returning officer for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Up to this time the Government have not appointed any returning officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have not appointed one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And so the order of the House is disobeyed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has not been disobeyed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The word “may” is not there in that case.

COST OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What has been the cost of the Railway Commission to the present date, and what amount is estimated will be the whole cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$26,415.71. There may be a few outstanding accounts, but they will certainly not exceed \$1,000 additional, and may not reach that amount.

COST OF LABOR COMMISSION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What has been the cost of the Labor Commission to the present date, and what is the estimate of the whole cost of the commission?

Mr. BOWELL. The cost of the Labor Commission to the 19th March, the date on which the accounts were last made up, as they are sent in every month, was \$24,137.05. The whole cost will depend upon the length of time that the commission will occupy, and consequently it would be impossible to state it now.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) asked, Whether, under the terms of the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, all lands paid them on said contract are not liable to be taxed so soon as the Company sells the hay of said land, or in any other way receives a rental for said land?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question involves a question of law which the Government cannot well answer about. The hon. gentleman can take the best legal advice to get an answer to that question.

MR. HENRY SMYTH.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Has Henry Smyth, at any time during the past year, been in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary? How much has he been paid? Is he still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity? If not, when were his services dispensed with?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to Henry Smyth, ex-member of this House?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Smyth was employed last year in the immigration service in the North-West and also in Dakota and Minnesota. He was paid at the rate of \$100 a month, with an allowance for actual travelling expenses. The total amount paid to him was \$1,850.50. His employment by the Department ceased on November 15th last at the termination of the specific duties for which he was appointed.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, How many persons are now employed by the Government of Canada in every branch of the public service, and receive public money in consideration of said service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman would do better to put that in the shape of a motion for a return. It is impossible to answer it in reply to a question.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John), for Mr. EDGAR, asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce an Insolvent Act during the present Session, or any legislation in that direction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. WATSON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to establish, and bring into active operation, experimental farms in the Province of Manitoba during the coming season?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

PAYMENTS TO IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have any sums of money been expended by the Government, in payments of any sort, to persons in Dakota, to induce them to remove to Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. No money has been paid whatever.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF OTTAWA COUNTY.

Mr. WRIGHT asked, Whether the Government intend to cause such a geological survey to be made in the County of Ottawa as will afford all necessary information with regard to the mineral and phosphate interests of that section of country?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The work of the Geological Survey in Ottawa County was commenced last year, and it will be continued this year with special reference to the subject the hon. gentleman refers to.

HARBOR OF PAPINEAUVILLE.

Mr. WRIGHT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to send a dredge, at the opening of navigation, to Papineauville, to remove all obstructions from that harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention to send dredge to work in that direction.

SURVEY OF CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON asked, 1. Whether the survey of the Indian Reserve of Caughnawaga, entrusted to Mr. Lea Walbank, has been completed? 2. If so, whether it is the intention of the Government to lay his report before the House, and when? 3. What is the total amount paid to Mr. Walbank, to date, and what amount remains due to him?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The field work connected with the survey has been completed. The returns of the survey have not yet been received, but they are promised in the course of a few days. As to whether the report will be laid on the Table if Parliament asks for it, I presume it will be brought down, as I see no objection to that being done. The total amount paid to Mr. Walbank and his staff up to

date, on account of the survey of the Caughnawaga reserve, is \$18,000. The cost of this survey has been very heavy, but it has been occasioned by the intricacies connected with the work, owing to the Indians having taken up and cultivated irregular pieces of land within the reserve, and their respective rights having to be clearly defined by survey of the boundaries of these pieces of land, with a view to determine what those rights were, and making a valuation of the land individually improved by them.

GRAZING LEASES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. WELDON (St. John), for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, asked, How many acres of land in the district of Alberta, North-West Territories, are held under lease for grazing purposes, and on which no settler is allowed a homestead entry without first obtaining the permission of the leaseholder?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The number of acres of land leased for grazing purposes in the district of Alberta altogether is 4,466,844. Of this 1,718,640 acres are held under old leases, and the land is not open for homestead and pre-emption. I may say, however, that we are doing our best to get that particular provision released, and in the Calgary and McLeod districts we have succeeded very largely. Several of the old leases have been cancelled for non-fulfilment of the conditions. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will answer a question put to me the other day by Sir Richard Cartwright, which I was then unable to answer in full. He asked what amount of money had been received from the sale of lands in the North-West, from the 1st January to the 1st March. I have ascertained that the amount is \$100,068.04.

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Mr. REID, for Mr. PRIOR, asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a Commission to accurately define the boundary between British Columbia and Alaska, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Diplomatic correspondence is now going on between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States, in which the Canadian Government is consulted, with reference to a survey either jointly or separately by the two Governments.

SECTION "A," WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. WELDON (St. John), for Mr. EDGAR, asked, 1. To whom was the work of deepening section "A" of the Welland Canal originally awarded? 2. Were new tenders called for when the work was taken off the hands of the first contractors? 3. If not, then, to whom was the work awarded?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work was awarded to R. P. Cooke and Chilton Jones for \$145,299, they being the lowest tenderers. The work later on having been taken off the hands of this firm, new tenders were called for, and the lowest tender was accepted, namely, that of Murray & Cleveland, for \$173,945.

PAMPHLET ON SCIENTIFIC DAIRY PRACTICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to publish in the German language Mr. Lynch's pamphlet on scientific dairy practice?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention.

SALES OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John), for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, asked, 1. Whether the Government have obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a statement of the lands sold by them to private individuals or corporations? 2. Whether, if they have not obtained such statement, the Government intend to take any steps to secure such statement?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That return was laid on the Table about a fortnight ago.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

BILL CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved second reading of Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Mr. HAGGART. Before that Bill obtains its second reading, I would call the attention of the Government to the peculiar nature of the Bill. It virtually gives to this company the control of the navigation of the river from the Des Joachims rapids up to the Quinze. They have at present the control of the Ottawa as far as towage is concerned and the passage of logs from the Des Joachims down to Ottawa River, and this gives them the further control from the rapids up to the Quinze. Perhaps it is not objectionable that the control should be given to them, so far as regards the present members of the company, who are principally the owners of the mills around Ottawa and the principal persons interested in it, but I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that at some time or other it is contemplated that the canal system may be extended up the Ottawa river to the Georgian Bay, and the control of this company might pass into other hands by the sale of stock or otherwise, and might not be worked so much in the interests of the people if it were in other hands. Besides, I think that, in regard to a large river like the Ottawa, it is objectionable that the slides and other improvements in connection with navigation should be in the hands of a private company at all. Many of the improvements on the different large streams as well as on the Ottawa river are in the hands of the Government, and they pay well, in fact they pay a handsome dividend. I think it is objectionable for a company as at present constituted to have control of the river from Des Joachims to Ottawa. It may be very objectionable, and it may, at some future time, cost the Government a large sum of money when they may be compelled to assume these works again. I believe that this company is composed, principally, of the same persons who are interested in this work, and are desirous of obtaining the Government works—I do not know whether there are any between the Des Joachims and Quinze, but there are on the Madawaska River. I enter my protest on behalf of the parties interested in that section of the river in lumbering and driving logs down that stream. I say these improvements ought not to pass into the hands of any company. We believe that there is

Mr. CARLING,

at present a control by the Government, and that it is in the best interest of the country and the best interest of the trade, that it should remain so. I simply state these objections for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to the enormous scope of this Bill, in which Parliament is asked to give control of the navigation from the city of Ottawa to the Quinze Rapids. It is simply objectionable that any company should have the power which this company propose to assume under this Bill.

Mr. BRYSON. In rising to protest against the passing of this Bill, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do it with a great deal of reluctance, as I feel that the promoters of this Bill, being Chaudière lumbermen, are entitled to fair consideration in making improvements. They have operated on the Ottawa River for a distance of 140 miles, as their charter of 1875 gives them power to do. But they are now asking for further powers beside driving powers, and on a river which has been declared by this Legislature to be a navigable stream. I believe the Ottawa River improvements should be controlled entirely by the Government. They not only ask control of the river for 350 miles, but they virtually ask control of the entire towage of logs and timber as well, which, to my mind, as a practical lumberman, would prove very detrimental to the private interests of the minor proprietors on the Ottawa River, which I do not believe is the intention of this Government. I proposed at one time to discuss this Bill clause by clause, as it is to my mind exceedingly objectionable, but as the time of the House is very limited to-day, I will not go into the details, but will merely say that I protest against any company acquiring such right as they ask for in this Bill. It is true that the company are willing to adopt certain amendments in this Bill. I have met them and have discussed the Bill clause by clause. It is now before the House, and the company are willing to make certain concessions in order to get the Bill through, but I believe that even with the concessions which they are willing to make, it is not in the public interest that the Government should allow this Bill to pass. I ask the Government, during recess, to give it their serious consideration, and after the reassembling of Parliament, I think, the Government should take over the improvements now held by the Ottawa River Improvement Company, instead of giving these men further power to control the river for 350 miles.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am quite sure the two hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill are doing it with proper intentions. Let me say, however, that the question is not a new one. The gentlemen who are now asking for an extension of rights and powers that they already possess in regard to a portion of the Ottawa River have possessed and enjoyed those rights over a certain portion of the Ottawa River since 1875. It is not correct, as stated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that these gentlemen, the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, have any rights as regards the navigation of the Ottawa, or that they control the navigation of the Ottawa in any respect. They have a right to locate and construct certain improvements to facilitate the descent of timber down the Ottawa River. When they obtained their Act of incorporation in 1875, it was believed by them that the point to which they then proposed to go, Des Joachims, was sufficiently distant and northerly upon the Ottawa to suit all their purposes. As the timber has become cut away along the Ottawa, and as it is necessary for the lumbermen to go further into the interior, it is found necessary for them to construct certain works and to have driving powers over a further extent of river, and that is the reason they are here to-day asking for the powers mentioned in this Bill. I say they have no powers for controlling the navigation of the river. The whole object of this company, first, in getting incorporated in 1875, and

getting certain powers as far as Des Joachims, and now asking to have these powers to Lake Temiscamingue, is for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber to the mills at Ottawa, and for cheapening the cost of its transport. They are asking for no new powers, as I have already said, and the powers that they have possessed under the Act of 1875 were carefully guarded by the House at that time, as I propose the House shall carefully guard the powers granted under this Bill, if they allow it to pass. Let me say, Sir, that the gentlemen who are asking for this Bill, and who obtained the Act of incorporation in 1875, were not particularly desirous of constructing these improvements. It required a considerable outlay of capital at their hands, which they would very much rather not have undertaken, and if the Government had been willing then, or if they were willing now, to undertake the construction of these improvements for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber, I am quite sure that the gentlemen interested in this Company would be quite willing to withdraw this Bill and to transfer their works to the Government, as the hon. member for South Lanark has said, for the acknowledged cost of the work as constructed by them. Let me point out this further circumstance in regard to what has fallen from the hon. member for South Lanark respecting the canalling of the Ottawa River. In the Act of incorporation of 1875, it was specially provided, and I have no doubt that provision will be incorporated in this Act also, that the company should remove any of these works at any time that the Government might require them to be removed to facilitate navigation. Now, as regards the objections offered by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), he says that it is proposed by this Bill to give to this company control of all the towing upon the Ottawa River. I think this House will agree with me that that would be utterly impossible. You cannot take away the river, you cannot grant any franchise upon the river that will prevent anybody else from putting a steamer there for the purpose of towing or doing any other work. All this company asks with regard to towing is this, that if they are unable to make a contract with a towing company, or with any steamboat company, or if they are unable to secure the towing of their logs at reasonable rates, they should have power to construct and run steamboats themselves. It is not necessary to come to this Parliament to get that power. They already have it. That company organised in 1875 under the Joint Stock Companies Act, and obtained letters patent to enable them to do what this Act will enable them to do in respect to towing logs down the Ottawa. I repeat again that all that is asked by this Bill is to enable these people to construct improvements under the strict supervision of the Government, and to locate them where the Government may determine for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber down the Ottawa. And let me say this further, if I thought a single public interest or the right of a single private individual would be interfered with by this Bill, I would not have brought it before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill has already received the attention of certain members of the Government, and especially of myself, as chairman of the Railway Committee, to which this Bill will most likely be referred, and I must say that after reading the Bill I found that it certainly required considerable amendment before it should be allowed to pass, provided the principle of the Bill was admitted. Therefore, in allowing now—so far as the Government are concerned—the Bill to be sent to the Committee, we do not pledge ourselves to the principle of the Bill, but we wish it to be well considered by the Committee to which, of course, these measures must be referred. When the Bill comes back from the Committee it will, I have no doubt, be in such a form that it will receive the best consideration of this House. There were a number of omissions from the

Bill which its promoters promised to remedy. There were certain sections, one or two referred to by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), which, of course, must disappear, or be very much modified. Under these circumstances, and as these modifications and amendments cannot be made in this House but must be made in the Committee, I think the best course to follow is to allow this Bill to receive the second reading and be referred to the Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. With the permission of the House I desire to reply to an observation made by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) in which he stated that I said the Bill gave exclusive control of the river to this company in regard to navigation. I said it virtually does so. If a party has a railway round the rapids on a stream, which is navigable above and below, and has sole control of that railway, or has slides for the passage of logs, that party can make their tolls and towage so excessive over that particular portion of it as to compel parties coming down the stream to use their towage above and below that railway or improvement. This Bill virtually gives control of navigation so far as regards the passage of logs and timber down that stream.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The best answer to that remark is the fact that you cannot give the control of the navigation of a stream to anybody. No company can possess any franchise giving right to navigate any stream.

Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the Report made by Professor Saunders on the question of location of the Experimental Farm in the North-West, with all letters, documents and papers referring to the several proposed locations and his recommendations in connection therewith.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the number of Colonisation Companies now in existence in Manitoba and the North-West, the number of settlers they have put on their lands during the years 1885-86-87, the amount of money paid by the several companies on account of lands purchased from the Crown during the same period, the amount of money paid to the Crown on account of purchase of land from the Crown by all other parties during the same years.—(Mr. McMullen.)

A copy of Mr. Parmelee's report to the Honorable Minister of Customs regarding the desirability of making Kamloops an Outport of Entry.—(Mr. Mara.)

Return of the proceedings of the inquest held at Ste. Flavie, on 23rd September, 1887, on the body of William L. Duncan, killed on the Intercolonial Railway on the previous day, with the evidence taken at such inquest; also, any report of any investigation of the accident made by the railway authorities, or any report in connection with such accident made to the Department of Railways and Canals; and also any correspondence had with said Department relating to this matter, —(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing the total amount of money disbursed by the Government in consequence of the North-West rebellion.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return showing the total amount of money paid out by the Government in connection with the Liquor License Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return of all reports, correspondence, petitions or documents relating to the proposed permanent building of a post office and custom house at Strathroy, including any recommendations made regarding its location, character, cost, &c.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return giving:—1. The names of all the leaseholders in the District of Alberta, North-West Territories. The number of cattle each have on their lease. The date of each latest return, showing the number. 2. Showing whether any are in arrears for rent. 3. Whether the land under the lease is good agricultural land. 4. What, if any, return has been made of the loss and suffering of cattle during the winter of 1886-87 in this district.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return of all correspondence, petitions and reports respecting the Chippawa and Ottawa Nation Indians' claim to certain islands in Lake Erie and the Detroit River.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROSS & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, April 3, 1888.

No. 26.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 8 p.m.

PRAYERS.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 87) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of increasing the remuneration allowed to the Auditor General and for an amendment to the Act. When it becomes my duty to move the resolutions, I will explain more fully what reasons the Government have for introducing this Bill.

Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite, if they would think well of it, to send some business up to the Upper House, by taking up the private Bills, of which there are seven in a position to be sent there.

Mr. EDGAR. Only unopposed Bills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting the River St Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 35) to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

26--1888--1

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting bonds on branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 80) to wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That the salary of the Auditor General of Canada shall be four thousand dollars per annum, and that he shall be subject to the provisions of the "Civil Service Superannuation Act."

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, and to provide that the expression "value" as respects any penalty or forfeiture shall mean the duty paid value of the goods or articles at the time the offence was committed; that in cases of under-valuation of ten per cent. or more an additional duty proportionate to the percentage of under-valuation shall be collected; that no allowance shall be made for damage to sugar or other saccharine product, when the duty is computed by the polariscopic test, except that an allowance in respect of damage by salt water may be made; that when no reliable means exist by which the value of goods for duty can be ascertained, the Minister may determine the value for duty; that the system of taking bonds for the payment of duty on goods warehoused or entered for exportation, transportation or removal, or transferred from one owner to another without payment of duty, shall be abolished, and that in lieu thereof the owner of any such goods in respect whereof any infraction of the Customs laws is committed, shall, in addition to any other penalty, be liable to a penalty equal to double the duty chargeable on such goods.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police for the year 1887.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

WRITS FOR ELECTIONS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to enquire if the writ for the election in the County of Russell has been issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it has not.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it to be issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be issued immediately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I do not like to say to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the writ for the Kent election has been issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe it has been.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To whom has it been addressed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, to the last returning officer, the sheriff.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade there-with.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. FREEMAN. I am quite aware that before the adjournment of the House there was a feeling of impatience among the members for the conclusion of this debate. I do not know what effect the recess has had, but I am very much disposed to believe that it has not changed that feeling very much; and as I am quite in sympathy with it, I will endeavor to-night to make the few remarks I intend to make in as short a time as it is possible for me to make them. The proposition before the House I understand to be something like this, that it is not only desirable but necessary, in order to save this country from ruin, that there should be a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity made with the United States, and that the extravagant expenses of the Government should be stayed; and inasmuch as these extravagant expenses are a part of the National Policy, in order to get rid of that and the other burdens that rest upon the people, it is not merely important, but absolutely necessary, if any good is to be accomplished, that the gentle-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

men on the other side of the House should be put in power and the present Government displaced. While the resolution does not set this out fully, the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed it very boldly, very clearly and very distinctly. The National Policy has been the stone of stumbling, the rock of offence to hon. gentlemen on the other side. Against it they have hurled their artillery of misrepresentation, their artillery of ridicule, their artillery of every description. Indeed, no language was lacking on their part to bring that policy into discredit and now, Sir, when seeming failure is at hand, when all the predictions of the hon. member for South Oxford seem to have failed, when all their hope is gone, they find an ally; they strike hands with a gentleman who represents himself as a Canadian. Well, Sir, he may be a Canadian born, but my experience, and it is not a very short one, leads me to this conclusion, that of all Americans, the one that this country should keep clear of is an Americanised Canadian. There are no greater enemies to this country than the men who settle down in the United States, and make, as they express it over there, their "pile," and who then come over here and treat us as if we were a poor, ignorant set of men who were unable to find our own way through the world, and who need assistance, not to make our "pile" like themselves, but to be tools by which they can accomplish their purposes. I need not remind this House of the condition of this country between the years 1873 and 1878. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power they found a full treasury, they found the country prosperous, as they themselves acknowledge, and they found everything in gratifying condition. What was the condition of the country in 1878? Every source of national life was obstructed, the sinews of trade and all avenues from which flows the life of the nation were obstructed or cut off, and the captain of the ship,—and I desire to remind hon. gentlemen that I come from near the salt water, where I was born and brought up, and if I use nautical expressions I hope they will pardon me—the captain of a ship, as the storm clouds gathered, indicating a storm, stood with his hands behind him helpless, with nothing to offer the people of the country but—hope. Hope is, doubtless, a very excellent thing, but my experience would lead me to this conclusion, that when you see a storm coming you must have something besides hope, for with that alone the storm will burst on the ship and captain and crew will find themselves in a terrible predicament. It was a dark day, the year 1878, for this Dominion. I have said something in regard to it, but there was one sign that perhaps more than anything else showed the condition of the country in 1878, and that was the number of bankruptcies. No less than \$29,000,000 was, I think, the amount for which people were bankrupt at that time, and during the subsequent years bankruptcies continued, and there was the same tale of bankruptcies, bankruptcies! Yes, the nation was bankrupt, she was congested at the heart, and relief had to come from somewhere. In that dark cloud, as it hung over the horizon, came a rift; and sailors are delighted when they see a rift in the cloud, for they have hope then, and there is something upon which they can found hope. That rift gave promise of a bright sky beneath. To the front came the leader of the Opposition, the old, tried friend of this country. He, with his wise statesmanship, saw that the changed circumstances on the other side of the border necessitated a change of policy and change of action here, and he said to the crew of the ship, I am ready to take charge if you are satisfied with the mode I intend to adopt to bring the vessel out of the storm safely. And the heart of the people turned to the old chieftain and they were ready to grasp his hand, and they put him at the head of the Government in 1878, and adopted the National Policy as the policy of this country. What did the National

Policy do for this country? It first filled the treasury, and that is a most important thing in any country. The outlook is always dark when the purse is empty, and one of the signs of a good time coming is that the treasury becomes filled. The National Policy filled the treasury. It did very much more. It restored confidence; and what is a country without confidence, what is a man without confidence in himself, what is a community or a family or a nation without confidence? The National Policy restored confidence to the people of this country, and with confidence came prosperity. Factories started up, work was provided for the working classes, trade revived and the congestion of the heart of the nation was removed, and we stepped out with renewed prosperity—I say the heart of the nation, because I believe in the future we shall have a great nation on this side of the boundary line, a nation that will vie with the nation to the south, a nation built up on British institutions, with British principles, with British men. I say that this young nation has gone on from step to step in her prosperous career; and how do we stand to-day, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite have said? How does this Dominion stand to-day so far as regards wealth, prosperity and advancement? She stands better to-day than ever before, there is more prosperity in this country to-day than ever before, and it has been steadily advancing and gaining since the National Policy was introduced. Try this Dominion by every test which men experienced in banking, commerce and finance would apply, by those tests by which communities or individuals and great commercial corporations are tried, apply every test by which nations are tried by the men who hold the purse-strings of Europe, and under those tests this country stands to-day in a prosperous condition. We have the proof of it everywhere. There is something more the National Policy has done for us; I need not speak of the magnitude and importance of that great highway, that iron road which connects the Atlantic with the Pacific. Why, it is only a few years since the advocacy of a road across this continent would have exposed a man to the ridicule of the more sober, solid-going people of the country. I need not speak, I say, of the magnitude of this great highway or its importance not only to this country, but to the Empire; I need not speak of the herculean task which this country took upon itself when it determined to build that railway; I need not do more than quote one of the leaders of the party opposite, who said it would require the whole resources of the British Empire to build this road in ten years. Nothing more than that statement is necessary to show the resources of this country and what it is able to do, when in less than ten years it has been able to carry out that great work, and to-day the credit of the Dominion is far higher than it was the day we determined to build the road. But hon. gentlemen opposite object to all this reasoning. They say that this is not a serious test to apply. One hon. gentleman had the fortitude—I say fortitude, because I hardly know by what name to characterise it—to tell us that it was no sign of wealth when a man had money in the savings bank. I call that an extraordinary assertion and one of the most extraordinary that I have ever heard. It, Sir, is an extraordinary thing to tell men in this House that it was no sign of riches, wealth, or prosperity when a man had money in the savings bank. I contend, Sir, that it is one of the indications that this country is growing in wealth when the deposits of our people in the savings banks are larger than ever they were before, and when they have multiplied wonderfully during the last ten years. What is the wealth of a country but the savings of every individual in that country, and what are the savings of a man but what he has left after all his expenses are paid, and when he has his family supplied and everything provided for? Is it not a sign of prosperity, is it not a proof of some measure of wealth when a man can deposit

a balance in the savings bank? I consider it is, Sir. We are some of us traders in this House, we understand the rules of commerce, and it is an extraordinary thing that any one should rise and tell us that we should not trust a man sooner when we knew he had money in the savings bank. Why, Sir, the idea of such a statement is preposterous. I maintain that from this the wealth of the country is manifest, but when we, on our side, boast of the wealth of the country, they tell us in opposition to that statement that we have not kept our people in the country. They say we are losing our people by emigration, that the National Policy has not put a stop to this, and that it has not brought back the million of Canadians who are in the United States. Well, Sir, the National Policy has not brought back that million of people, nor has it kept that portion of the people in the country who left since the National Policy was introduced. What did one hon. gentleman representing Prince Edward Island tell us here the other night, and in telling it, whether intentionally or not, he touched the very marrow of the question? He told us that the people were always going from Prince Edward Island to the United States, and that they would always continue to go. In that, Sir, lies the whole of the matter. People have always been going. In the memory of the oldest man in this House it is well known that the people have been going from this country to the United States. I remember forty years ago seeing in my own town, people boarding the sailing packets and going to Boston. They have been going steadily ever since, and I believe that they will continue to go, and that neither the National Policy nor any other policy will prevent them. We have been asked why they are going there. Well, Sir, they have a broader field there; but it is no reason why we should decry our country, or why we should have a poorer opinion of ourselves because there is a broader field in the United States. As well might a young man starting in business say that he could do nothing, or that he could not succeed because some person had been extensively in the business before him, or had probably been born in the business and had everything prospering around him. But that is not the stuff our young Canadians are made of. Our young men are plucky enough to say: "We will go in and we will take our share of what is going, and we will compete and contend with the older and richer men." The National Policy, while it has a tendency to restrain and keep back the people from going abroad, cannot be expected to accomplish very much in that line. The National Policy, I say, is calculated to keep the people at home, because it provides labor for the people, and will continue more and more to give our people opportunities and advantages such as they possess abroad. In this way it will tend to keep our people at home. Now, Sir, we have also been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have not built up an inter-provincial trade. I suppose the object—or at least one object—which it was expected would be accomplished by the union of those Provinces was that there would be an inter-provincial trade built up between them. Statistics, Sir, are not wanting to prove that contention in this House, and I have not thought it necessary to provide myself with them, for we have had statistics here in great abundance to show just what provincial trade there is between the Provinces. I say, Sir, that if the inter-provincial trade between the Lower Provinces and these Upper Provinces is not so much as it might have been, we have to blame hon. gentlemen opposite for that. What is it that interferes most largely with inter-provincial trade, and the communication between the people of the Upper Provinces and the people of the Lower Provinces? Why, Sir, it is the continual efforts of the Liberal party to create ill-feeling between the people of the Provinces below and the Provinces up here. They seem to regard it as a part of their duty, and as a part of their mission, that they shall, in as much as they pos-

sibly can, keep up a feeling of distrust and dislike between the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Ontario. They began this policy immediately after Confederation, they have been doing it ever since, they are doing it to-day and they will continue to do it as long as this Dominion continues under the National Policy. I say again that it is to the gentlemen opposite and to the party opposite that we owe it, if there is not more inter-provincial trade and if there is not a better feeling of amity and friendship between the Province of Nova Scotia and the Upper Provinces than there is to-day. I will pass from that to what hon. gentlemen opposite have said with respect to the farmers of Ontario. They have told us that this National Policy has not prospered the farmers of Ontario. Well, Sir, I was very much surprised last Session when I sat in this House and listened to the doleful stories of hon. members opposite with regard to the poverty of the farmers of Ontario. Down in the Lower Provinces we were made to believe by those gentlemen who opposed the National Policy, and many did believe it, that the people up here were very rich, that they were fattening on the good things of the land and that we in Nova Scotia had to pay tribute to the farmers of Ontario for every barrel of flour that came from that Province. We were told, Sir, that the people of Ontario lived at the expense of the people of Nova Scotia. That is what they told us then, and I must say that their stories had some effect on my mind because I thought the people up here were all very wealthy, I thought they were rich and that we were poor, and when I listened to what hon. gentlemen told us about the poverty of the farmers of Ontario I was struck with amazement. I tried to call to mind some statements that I had read with regard to the prosperity of the people up here. I examined an author—or authors, as you may wish to call them, of considerable eminence and who are highly esteemed and regarded, I believe, by gentlemen opposite. I took the *Toronto Globe* of 1886 and I read in the *Globe* something that I will read to you now. It may have been read before, but it is so good that I will read it again. The following is from the *Toronto Globe* of December 18th, 1886:—

"There are many among ourselves who do not fully realise how broad is the domain they occupy, how advantageous its situation, how bountiful its resources, how fertile its fields, how favorable its climate, how substantial its progress, and how hopeful its future. * * * In extent Ontario extends over ten degrees of latitude and twenty degrees of longitude. From Lake Erie on the south to Hudson's Bay on the north, it has a breadth of seven hundred miles, and from the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence Rivers on the east to the English and Winnipeg on the west, it has a length of one thousand miles. Exclusive of its vast waters, which are nature's highways of commerce, it has an area of 200,000 square miles. It is larger than the six New England States, with New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, by 25,000 square miles, and larger than Great Britain and Ireland by 78,000 square miles. The portion of it south of Lake Nipissing, which is the best settled and best known, has a soil and climate not equalled by any other portion of the same area on this continent. * * * But we can allow for these and still possess a country large enough and rich enough in resources on which to develop and sustain a nation. In Upper and Lower Ontario we have room enough for a Great Britain. Its farm land, its forests, its mines, its fisheries, its navigable waters, its innumerable water-powers,—all these furnish conditions under which steady and substantial expansion is not only possible, but under which it is only to be escaped by the blunders, the crimes, or the stupidity of the people. It may be said that little progress can be hoped for in the settlement of our northern districts until communication is opened up—until highways and railways are built, over which traffic may pass, and settlers and traders come and go. That is true, but with the wealth and resources of this Province there is nothing formidable in the building of roads and railways. We have only to look back at what has been done during the past fourteen years, to be satisfied that the Government and the people of Ontario are equal to any such enterprise, and to be satisfied also that they could not make a more desirable investment of the public funds. To-day there is hardly one important section in the older districts of the Province without its railway line; the total length in operation, exclusive of the Canadian Pacific main line, from Pembroke westward, is about 4,600 miles; and towns and villages, with their local markets, have sprung into existence or have been nurtured into importance all over the country. In 1872 we had in Ontario 122 incorporated villages, towns and cities, with a population, as enumerated by the assessors, of

Mr. FREEMAN.

374,854; in the present year we have 206, with a population of 675,499. The number of townships with municipal organizations in 1872 was 406, and the population as taken by assessors was 1,049,931; in the present year we have 445, with a population of 1,143,187.

"We should like to refer to the encouragement given to the great agricultural industry of the Province, by grants of public moneys given to Agricultural Societies, to Dairymen's Societies, to Fruit-growers' Societies, &c. We might show, for instance, how the number of cheese factories in the Province increased by 223 in ten years, and the value of their annual product by \$3,213,000, and how in four years following the decade, the number of factories increased by 200 and the value of their annual product by \$2,330,000. It is enough to say that its one Chamber system, with wise and able men at the head of its affairs, with a vigilant but grateful people industriously developing its resources, Ontario to-day is the wealthiest, the soundest, the most progressive, and the best-governed commonwealth in America."

Now, Sir, that is the record given by the *Toronto Globe*, and we know how the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite contrast with this record. I put this question to the House, and I put it to myself at the time, who tells the truth? Does the *Globe*, in this statement which it sends not only throughout America but over all Europe, tell the people the truth, does it tell the Government the truth, when it says that no better investment can be made than in the railways of Ontario? Does it tell the people the truth when it says that there is no wealthier or more prosperous commonwealth in America than the Province of Ontario? Does this paper tell the truth, or do hon. gentlemen opposite tell the truth? Both statements cannot be true. There is falsehood somewhere, and I leave you, Mr. Speaker, I leave this House to judge where it is. Now, while I am reading about Ontario, I will read something about Prince Edward Island, for I am speaking now rather of the Dominion than of a single Province. We remember what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), said the other day about Prince Edward Island. He told us that the farmers were living without hope. I think those are just his words—I could refer to them, but I will not occupy the time of the House by doing so. I do not know whether he referred to only one class of the community, but he said that if it were not for the money sent home by their sons from the other side of the line, the people would really suffer want. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a hard description of a country. I trust it is not true. At all events, it is not fully correct, and it is contrary to my ideas of Prince Edward Island. Some of our people visit Prince Edward Island every year, and the reports that they bring back of the wealth of that Province are cheering and charming. We supposed it was a garden, a second paradise, where the people could live without much labor. I will read you what the *Prince Edward Island Agriculturist* says of that Province. This paper is the organ of the farmers, and if it told what was not true the farmers would detect it immediately, and would not suffer its statements to go uncontradicted. This is what the *Prince Edward Island Agriculturist* says:

"Prominent among the many evidences of the rapidly increasing prosperity of our farmers that we have met in the course of our ramblings during the past summer, are the numerous buildings being erected in almost every section of the Province. It is safe to say that for a number of years past there has not been such activity in building, and never in one season, in the history of the Province, have so many buildings of a superior class—much in advance of those of former times—been put up by farmers. Many of the houses built during the summer would, in size, architecture, finish and general appearance, do credit to any city in the Maritime Provinces. We are glad to note that many farmers have had to enlarge their barns, or build new ones, and that in these improvements the majority of them have kept in view the great advance made in agriculture and stock raising, and modelled their farm buildings accordingly. Thus they are evidences not only of increasing prosperity, but of a fuller knowledge of the great science of farming. The people are not only making great strides in agriculture, but they are doing so as a result of getting out of the old ruts, and moving alone with the spirit of the age. Farming to-day is not such as it was fifteen or twenty years ago, for the old methods have been completely revolutionised. The people are better off, their farms are in better heart, their buildings are more adapted to their intended purposes, improved stock graze in their broad fields, they till the soil in a very intelligent manner, and with a higher conception of the important position they occupy in life. In short, the farmers of to-day are more comfortable, better educated, and more contented and happy, than were those who preceded them in the march of life. All over the island are thrifty,

intelligent, hardy communities of steady-going farmers, whose families are contented, and whose homes are models of neatness, order and comfort. The men are 'strong of arm and stout of heart,' and the women are 'pious and sensible, good mothers, helpful daughters and honest folks.' The wail of 'hard times' is seldom heard among the farmers of Prince Edward Island."

Now, Sir, I ask which of these stories is the true one? Are we to take the wail of hon. gentlemen opposite as well founded? Or are we to accept the statement of this paper, which is largely circulated among the farmers, that there is no such thing as the wail described by the hon. gentleman opposite heard in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELSH. What is the date of that?

Mr. FREEMAN. I read the speech of the hon. gentleman for Queen's, Prince Edward Island. He told us that the condition of the farmers of Nova Scotia was about the same as that which he described of the farmers in Prince Edward Island. Let me tell the hon. gentleman this, that if he means to say there is a wail of discontent from, and that a want of hope exists among, our farmers in Nova Scotia, he is wholly incorrect. Let me tell him that such a statement lacks every element of proof. Our farmers, it is true, are not rich; we do not expect to see very rich farmers, especially in those portions of Nova Scotia where farming is not the chief industry, but if our farmers are not rich, they are fairly prosperous, they are hopeful, and they are in a large measure, contented. At all events, they are certainly not discontented in the manner in which the hon. gentleman would endeavour to persuade us they are. Speaking of mortgages on farms, I may say that, so far as the farmers in my own part of the country are concerned—and that is the section in which there are a great many farmers—there is hardly such a thing known as a mortgage on a farm. Except in the case where a young man has bought a farm and has effected a mortgage on it, which he hopes by his industry to pay off, there has not been a mortgage taken on any farm in my section of country during the last ten years; and our farmers there are prosperous and happy. I will say this also, that not only are our farmers honest and industrious, not only are their homes orderly, not only are their daughters the models of all the virtues and accomplishments that adorn society, but our farmers are a sober community. In the northern district of the country I have the honor to represent, the district in which the farmers are most numerous, there has not been a single licensed dram shop known for many years. Our farmers are industrious and sober, and whatever side of politics they may take, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives, they are sensible, honest, progressive men, of whom any country might well be proud. I might make here some comparisons between our farming community and that of the United States, which hon. gentlemen opposite hold up to us as a model in everything. They want us, not only to model our tariff on theirs and our trade operations, but, I suppose, to model ourselves in every respect on the fashions set by the United States. I am sure we will hesitate before doing anything of the kind. I might give you quotations from different papers in the United States, which publish most doleful accounts of the condition of the farmers in the Northern States, and these would show conclusively that when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us the farmers of this country are to prosper and succeed by allying themselves with our neighbors on the other side of the border, and when they point to the farmers of the northern portions of the United States as a sample of the success that is to be expected from a union with that country, they are merely trifling with us; they are not dealing honestly or fairly by the farmers of this country. Another charge which hon. gentlemen opposite make is that we have increased the debt of the country. Well, our debt is a pretty large one and some of our friends in the Lower Province, when they see

the figures, say: Well, I wish we had a little of it; I would like very well to have a year's interest on it. It is a very heavy debt, no doubt, and I remember last Session our Ministers having a pretty hard time of it at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, because, in some of the counties in our Province, they did not represent the debt at its full value but were some few millions below what these hon. gentlemen said it was, and what I believe it was. Hon. gentlemen opposite held up the Ministers as being unworthy of confidence, as having committed a great blunder, as having been guilty of a great sin, and it struck me they were going it a little too strong. It struck me they were forgetting their own conduct with regard to the debt. I have heard in my own county my opponents loudly talking, but what has their party done? They charge this Government with saddling this country with \$220,000,000 debt, and they held that the people must get rid of this Government which was so improvident. But how does this matter of the debt stand. Looking into it a little I find that it was not all incurred by the present Government. I find that, during the administration of these hon. gentlemen opposite—I examined the figures, and at first I could not believe it; I turned the book first one way and then the other way, and I said, is it possible that these gentlemen ever saddled the country with any debt; it was something that bothered me, but I found that it was actually true they actually brought this country \$10,000,000.00 in debt during their administration of five years. Why did they not tell this to the people? Why did they not tell the people of Nova Scotia, We involved you in debt to the extent of \$10,000,000; we expended \$40,000,000 during our term of office? Why did they not tell the people that, out of the whole debt, \$109,000 were incurred as the result of Confederation and of the transference of the debts of the Provinces to the Dominion? If they desired to be honest and straightforward, why did they not let the people understand this, why did they not tell the people the true amount for which the present Government should be blamed or condemned? Before charging dishonesty as against members on this side of the House, those hon. gentlemen should first get their own skirts clean, and should see that they themselves are doing the honest and honorable thing. Now, there is a consideration in regard to this debt. As we hear it spoken of from platform and on the hustings, we imagine that it is something that might have been got rid of and that was not at all necessary. That is the idea which the people have in regard to it; but let me ask, what bearing does the debt of the country have upon the prosperity of the country? I say that the debt of the country is intimately connected with the prosperity of the country, and, if the hon. gentlemen opposite object to this statement, I would ask them to point out or to put their fingers upon the public work which has been undertaken with the money for which this debt has been incurred, to tell us what public work they would not have engaged in, what railway they would not have built, what canal they would not have deepened, what public building they would not have erected? Let us know where they would have saved this money they speak of. But they tell us nothing about this. I suppose they would not have built the Pacific Railway. I suppose, if they were in power, they would not have built that road which has given us the position we have to-day of having this railway, bringing the products of Asia across the continent of America and shipping them to Europe; bringing the people of Asia in competition with those of Northern Europe. Would they have built that railway, or would they have ceased to continue the railway which was already commenced, or what would they have done in this matter? I venture to say, when they make a full explanation in regard to this matter, it will not be satisfactory to the country. Now, there is a statistician, who I believe has some weight

in Europe and in America, in this country and in Britain. I think he is a man who is relied upon by most people, I refer to Mr. Mulhall. He says:

"The expenditure in our colonies for railways, canals, harbors, drainage and other productive works has been most beneficial, the colonists borrowing at 4 and 5 per cent. and increasing the public wealth in a far greater degree."

Mr. Mundella, member of the British Parliament, an eminent political economist, said in 1886:

"A debt incurred for the purpose of constructing reproductive works was a very different thing from a debt incurred for aggressive wars. There was no doubt it was as immense advantage to a new country to have an abundant means of transport. There was a tendency in England to undervalue the importance of railways in the colonies and to overestimate the colonial debts. He believed the money lent to our colonies was perfectly secure and well laid out. Every effort ought to be made to encourage the colonies to develop their magnificent resources."

That is what this gentleman says about the expenditure on railways, and there is much more to the same effect. I say that the debt for which this country is responsible is a debt which has been well incurred, a debt which has been incurred for works which are highly productive, and which have contributed highly to the welfare and prosperity of this country. These are some, and only a very few, of the objections that hon. gentlemen make to the National Policy, and the grounds upon which they condemn the National Policy. As a remedy, as they say, for the ills which afflict this country, they will have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Well, there seems to be a good deal of difference in what these hon. gentlemen understand by unrestricted reciprocity. Sometimes it is called commercial union and sometimes it is called unrestricted reciprocity, and, if the speeches of these hon. gentlemen are taken up and examined, you will find that they differ very widely in their understanding in regard to the matter. It is, however, the breaking down of the tariff wall between the two countries, according to whichever view you take, and they say that great wealth and great prosperity is to come to this country in consequence of our having the privilege of selling our products in the United States markets. As they contend, it is simply to obtain the benefit of selling our raw products to the United States, and it is from this that the great benefit is to accrue to us. A country that produces everything which this country produces, which has produced, as we have, sufficient to sell a large quantity to foreign customers, is to obtain a wonderful advantage and wealth in the way these hon. gentlemen suggest. They say that when this tariff wall is broken down the farmers are to save two millions of money, which they pay into the United States treasury for the goods they now send in there, and, at the same time, they dwell upon the statement that we are to get dollar for dollar for all we get from the United States—that, while we are to get great results, great riches and great wealth in consequence of this union, the United States are to get equally wealthy with us, dollar for dollar. They have not told us whether this is to be *per capita*, whether the 5,000,000 of people on this side are to receive one dollar and the 60,000,000 of people on the other side are to get one dollar profit, or whether it is to be a profit *per capita*, but, if it is in the way I have suggested, I do not see where the money is to come from. I thought I could see this shrewd, clever Mr. Wiman, who has gone about Wall street, where money is made in some way, and generally out of some other people's losses,—I thought I saw this shrewd Americanised Canadian reading the speech of the hon. gentleman, especially the part in which he says: We are not beholden to them; we are going to give dollar for dollar. I imagine Mr. Wiman chuckling, and saying to himself: "Did you ever know an American to give a dollar for anything less than a hundred cents?" Let me tell you, that in any treaty you make with the Americans they will

Mr. FREEMAN,

take care to get a dollar and a half out of you for a dollar, instead of a hundred cents. Why did they abrogate the treaty of 1854? Because they said they did not get the lion's share. This country contended at the time—at any rate, it was the feeling of the Maritime Provinces—that they were getting rather the better of that treaty, and I thought that was the universal opinion until I heard the contrary here. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been telling us how gravely the American people were wronged by that treaty, how much money we were making out of it, and what great fools the Americans would be if they would have anything to do with us on the same terms again. I believe they had the best of that treaty, and we have had it from their own mouths that the reason they refused to continue it was that they hoped to drive us into asking for political union with the United States. Now, let us suppose that this union is effected, and that we got this \$2,000,000 from the Americans for the benefit of the farmers of Ontario, how are we going to give that amount back? Remember, hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have to send our manufactures into their country, that for every dollar they displace in manufactured goods here we are to displace a dollar on the other side; and one hon. gentleman grew eloquent over the idea that Canadians could hold their own in that part of the world. As to that I dissent from that hon. gentleman. Just as he was getting up into the clouds with this grand idea of what Canadians were doing and could do abroad, he seemed to get paralysed, and he came down like some lofty bird under whose wing the marksman has shot a bullet, and said: "But when I come to my own business, I do not know whether I can hold my own or not." I think he might well say that. In manufactures this country can never hold its own with the Americans; it is ridiculous to suggest that we can. They would flood this country with manufactures, and if the people of this country, for the sake of getting their raw products into the United States, are willing to let the Americans come here and overwhelm and destroy our manufacturing industries, let us know it; but I believe they will never listen to any such suggestion. But some hon. gentlemen have spoken of the great wealth that lies under our soil, in our great mines. When one hon. gentleman was describing that wealth, I was reminded of a story I heard of a young man who had left his home in the country, and went abroad and saw great and marvellous things. When he returned home he was telling his brethren what he had seen. He found them very careless listeners, and he soared higher and higher, and at last said: "Why, in the interior of one island I was on, there were mountains of silver and rivers of gold, and all you had to do was to go in and help yourself." When the hon. gentleman was describing this country, I thought that he would come to the mountains of silver and rivers of gold; and it is this wealth, I presume that we are to give the Yankees. Let us suppose that it is, how are we to get the wealth? Is there any process by which either Canadians or Americans can take our mines and our lands, and remove them across to the other side of the line? I trow not. If the mines are to be worked, if the lands are to be cultivated, and if we are not developing our own resources, I suppose the Americans will have to come across and dig our mines and tickle our soil. If we have lost an immense sum of money, as we have been told, by the one million of people who have gone from us to the United States, what will the Americans lose if they send five millions of the people of the United States into this country in twenty-five years, as Mr. Wiman says they will? Why, Sir, the debit is all the other way. We debit them with everything, and give them no credit for anything. How are they to reap any advantage? Simply by taking our minerals and produce to the United States and getting a commission by shipping them to foreign countries. Why, Sir, if we Canadians know our privileges, as intelligent, in-

dustrious and far-seeing people, as I think we are, we will develop our own mines and tickle our own lands and ship our produce to foreign lands ourselves. We will not ask these American to come in and be our factors and agents in this matter; we will let them stay and develop their own mines and tickle their own lands. There is something else involved in this question—there is a loss of revenue; and Mr. Wiman in his pamphlet says there is no question but that the manufactures of the United States will displace a very large quantity of manufactures that come here from England; and as he is the man who has originated all this wisdom, I suppose we should take his word. If that is the case, in addition to the \$7,000,000 that we have to provide for, there will be three or four or perhaps seven millions more, and how is this deficiency to be made up? Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored in a way of their own to show how this can be done, but they have dealt with it in generalities; they have not attempted to come down to hard pan, and as they attempted to grapple with it, I thought of a man with St. Vitus' dance among sharp-edged tools—he stood away off for fear of getting touched. In that way they were dealing with the manner in which this \$7,000,000 was to be made up,—we say it will be nearer \$14,000,000. Only one hon. gentleman opposite really attempted to deal with this matter. When, however, he came to touch upon direct taxation he was reminded by an hon. gentleman opposite that they would have none of that in their Province, and he dropped it just as he had dropped commercial union for unrestricted reciprocity on a hint given him by one of his friends. I say hon. gentlemen opposite have dealt with the question in generalities, and have not shown how they are going to provide the \$7,000,000 of deficit in the revenue. We have been told that increased trade will do it. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that we would spring into a better position in a day, and that our wealth would be increased. That reminds me of the old tale of Sinbad the Sailor. It will not do, however, to give us nothing but generalities in dealing with an important question of this kind, one affecting the very vitals of the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) after he was driven off the direct taxation remedy, jumped at the expenditure and said that by retrenching the expenditure they would be able to save millions. The hon. gentleman, also, told us how he was going to save. He was going to stop further public works. Here is very significant language used by the hon. gentleman:

"If we admit it is not possible to readjust our tariff, and that it is not possible to supplement that loss by increased revenue from other sources which undoubtedly it is possible to do, if we admit that for the sake of argument, we are still warranted in saying that it is possible to go back to the expenditure of 1881 and that we would have revenue enough without any change in the tariff even with unrestricted reciprocity."

Then we are told very distinctly by the hon. member for South Oxford that this Government could not retrench. He believed the Government were in a position that it was impossible for them to retrench, they had run so far with extravagant expenditures, and the consequence was this: if the revenue was to be obtained there must be retrenchment, and if retrenchment was necessary it must be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, who must therefore come into power. That is just what those hon. gentlemen want,—there is the whole thing. They think Mr. Wiman will help them to that position; but Mr. Wiman, a keen Americanised Canadian will have them in a place where they will not have to say much about the matter, for he will be master of the situation. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says:

"Now, would it be possible for us to effect retrenchments? We who have run up our expenditure from \$13,486,000 in 1868 to \$36,000,000 in 1887; we who have increased our expenditure four times as fast every year as the population has increased, is it possible to retrench in this country? Well, Sir, if it is not possible to retrench, it is not possible

to avert ruin; if it is not possible to retrench, the country has got to go to the dogs; if it is not possible to retrench in this country, we may as well give up the case—the whole case. Now, I hold that it is possible. I will tell you where you might effect some retrenchment. You might abolish that sum of all political villainies, the Franchise Act, and you would save \$400,000 at one stroke, and you would also save your character, and your consciences would be clearer."

The hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if we had no consciences. The party of purity has the conscience; they remind us of the old Scotch saying, "ma conscience." The hon. gentleman continued:

"You might get along with a little less expenditure on public works and buildings. I believe that in the United States, with all its wealth, there are about 60 cities only where they have public post offices. They only give post offices to large commercial cities such as New York and Buffalo."

So we are better off than the United States. The hon. gentleman will no doubt say it is all very well to build a post office in Toronto, but no post office buildings are required down by the sea, because they can be placed in the corner of a house. He goes on to say:

"They do not go into the business of building little \$6,000 post offices as bribes to the people; they have not got so low in the scale of humanity as that."

Every public work in the Lower Provinces is called a bribe.

"Well, we might save very largely in the expenditure on public works and buildings; we might cut it all off, the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel."

The hon. gentleman was getting religious—and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not pick fun any longer at me on this account. He was thinking about the other world, this is another-world matter to him. He had better change his course a little, I think. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite this: members in the western part of the Dominion have got the Canadian Pacific Railway built, the canals enlarged, and a network of railways over the country, and they are not going to put us in Nova Scotia off by telling us that they are not going to allow any more subsidies to railways or other public works. What do they mean by telling us that they are going to save \$7,000,000 of revenue in order to give the farmers of Ontario two millions for their horses and barley? No, our Nova Scotian people will never listen to such a demand; and I think hon. gentlemen opposite have themselves forgotten a little, for they do not always speak so plainly as to what they intend to do when they get into power. I have no doubt they will talk differently afterwards, they have been talking differently in fact. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has told us that this sad, this union question, is going to help us in Nova Scotia, and is particularly going to help the fishermen. I do not wish to be considered disrespectful, and I listened to the hon. gentleman's speech with a good deal of interest. I knew his long and successful experience in mercantile life, his long connection with the political party with which he is associated, the fact that he had held a seat in the Government and his long experience in all matters connected with this country, and I therefore expected to gain a great deal of information from the hon. gentleman's speech, and that I would be ready to say "amen" to his speech. But I was astounded as I listened to his speech, I was astonished that the hon. gentleman expressed great sympathy for the fishermen. I believe, Sir, that the fishermen are deserving of his sympathy, I believe, Sir, that there is no class of men in Nova Scotia who have brought more grist to his mill than have the fishermen and I believe he owes them a very large share of sympathy. I am glad to see that he feels sympathy with the fishermen, and I hope, Sir, that all that sympathy has not some other object besides that of helping the fishermen. He told us, among other things, that the fishermen had but one market for their fish, while he said that we had no other place to ship our fat mackerel to. That was very true. I have no complaint to make about that, for

any man who knows anything about the fish trade in the Provinces, will admit it. But he went further than that. He said it was the only market we had for our fish, that the fisherman would be vastly benefited if they had this free market, that consequently the fishermen were suffering from the lack of this market, and that they were un able to build any vessels and that there was no encouragement for them to build vessels to fish in when they had no market for their fish. He described the fishing business in Nova Scotia as in something the same condition that the farming interest was represented to be in by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward, Island (Mr. Davies.) Now, Sir, I had thought when I heard the hon. gentleman's speech that I had heard something different from him or "of him." I did not hear it "from him" but I heard something "of him," with regard to his views, gathered from his experience as a statesman, and I remember that I thought his views as a statesman then were different from what he enunciated in this House recently. They were made at a time when he hoped—I will not say "hoped," but expected—to occupy the position of Minister in this Dominion, and when upon him would devolve to a very large extent the mapping out of the policy of the Dominion with regard to the fisheries of Nova Scotia. I did expect that his opinions as they were expressed here would be different to what I found them to be. What was the hon. gentleman's opinion in 1872? Let us hear what Mr. Jones of Halifax said as his utterances are reported here in this book which contains the parliamentary debates of this Dominion for 1872. Mr. Jones said among other things:

"The last speaker had referred to the remarks of his colleague from Halifax respecting the advantage the treaty would have conferred upon the fishing trade of Nova Scotia had it been in operation last year. He stated that in that case Nova Scotia would have saved between \$500,000 and \$600,000 on the duties on herrings and mackerel which had been sent to the United States. He (Mr. Jones) held in his hand the Trade and Navigation Returns for the past year, which he presumed were tolerably accurate. He found from this document that the total amount of pickled fish, herring and mackerel and alewives—sent to the United States last year was 47,000 barrels, which at \$2 a barrel would be \$94,000 instead of \$600,000 as claimed by the hon. gentleman opposite."

Now, Sir, anyone will know that small quantity of fish did not to any extent whatever represent the quantity of fish that was shipped from Nova Scotia, and therefore it overthrows the idea that the United States at that time or any other time was the only market that we had for fish. The hon. gentleman also said:

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. FREEMAN. The hon. gentleman if he cannot hear had better come over on this side. We will not mark you too much if you come over. I think you want to be here. But to continue, the hon. gentleman for Halifax said:

"The hon. member for West Durham, the other night speaking on the point had hit the nail on the head. He stated that the reason why American fishermen opposed the treaty was that Gen. Butler had gone to Gloucester and harangued them, telling them that now was their time to wrest from Congress what they had long wanted, namely a system of bounties and the bonding of their supplies. That was the sole cause of their outcry against the treaty and the Minister of Justice knew it very well and he (Mr. Jones) had grave apprehensions that such a policy would be adopted by Congress."

That was, that as soon as the Washington Treaty came into effect the Congress of the United States would give a bounty to the American fishermen in order to keep our fish out of the market and which would be a direct disadvantage to the fishermen of Nova Scotia.

"Of course, they would not do so while the treaty was pending, but when this Parliament accepted the treaty then would be their time to grant bounties to their fishermen and to allow the bonding of their supplies. And they were right enough from their point of view, because they argued if you give those people the water they will soon own the land."

"If we give the Americans the water they will soon own the land." I beg the House to remember that, as the sentiment of the hon. gentleman, and if it was true in 1872 so it is true to-day.

Mr. FREEMAN.

is true to-day. When they ask us to throw down the customs barriers between this country and the United States, when they ask us to throw down everything we have in this country at the feet of the Americans, and when the Americans have the trade of this country, as would be the case if they had the waters of Nova Scotia, they will very soon have the land, and they will very soon have the country as their own. But the hon. gentleman says more than that:

"Under those circumstances he felt as a representative of Nova Scotia that however anxious he might be for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the States on fair terms, he was not willing to give the United States everything that we had to offer as an inducement for reciprocity. If we gave them permission to fish in our waters we put them in competition with our own fishermen and reduce the value of their fish. He stood here not to represent one country or one province, but the whole interests of the Dominion (hear, hear), and in that capacity he would feel it his duty to vote against the ratification of the treaty."

I might quote further remarks of the hon. gentleman all tending to the same thing. In one place he says:

"We will lose more by the competition of those American fishermen in our waters than we would gain by the reduction of the duty."

And to show the feeling of the party of which the hon. gentleman was a leader and in which he was a recognised authority, I will read to you what the *Chronicle* said on this subject. The *Chronicle*, as you will remember, is the leading organ of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, and I claim that no one has any right to separate the principles of this party. There are only two parties in the Dominion, the Conservative and the Liberal party, and the Liberal party is the same thing in Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and all over the Dominion, and what is said by it in one place should be said by it in other parts of the Dominion. This paper says:

"Sir John has peculiar claims upon England's gratitude. He has helped the Home Government to complete the national degradation by the Washington Treaty."

The Washington Treaty that gave us free markets for our fish was the degradation of the country, according to this paper. Then it says:

"It is the duty of the press to speak out boldly on the question, to separate itself from being a party organ, and to look at the Washington Treaty in its relation to the well-fare of the country. The treaty, if carried out, will prove most disastrous to Canada, and will necessarily lead to annexation."

They feared annexation very much at that particular time.

"There is nothing left for them (the Americans) to ask for except the cession of Canada. It is no wonder that under these circumstances the proclamation of the treaty by President Grant should have been made part of the national celebration of the 4th of July. A traditional triumph of the United States over her old enemy, has added to it this year a substantial victory which gives her more advantages than she was able to secure by the war of 1812."

Now, Sir, there is a great deal more of just that kind of reading. It says:

"We are safe in saying that no measure has ever done so much to weaken the already frail tie of allegiance to the mother country on the part of the colonies, as the consummation of the Washington Treaty. We have been called upon before to-day, either through the selfishness of Downing street or the stupidity of former commissioners, to make unnecessary and unjustifiable concessions to the Americans. . . . We should be unworthy of the name of British colonists and of the traditions of liberty which Britons are supposed to carry with them wherever they may pitch their tent, if the disregard shown to our constitutional rights and trade interests, had failed to arouse a spirit of resentment and indignation within our breast."

This is what that paper says about the Washington Treaty, because the Americans had the privilege of fishing in our waters. Now, under this treaty, we are to get great wealth, our fishermen are to prosper by letting the Americans come into our waters again. I contend that this is a change of base which I did not expect from the hon. gentleman, and I feel exceedingly sorry that he should have deemed it necessary, in the exigencies of

his party, so to stultify himself, and so completely to renounce the opinions that he held at that time and to adopt principles exactly opposite. Now, I hold that the commercial union that is now proposed, this breaking down of tariff walls, would be most disastrous to Nova Scotia. I hold just as the senior member for Halifax held, that we are going to lose far more than we could gain by having a free market in the United States, and allowing the American fishermen to come into our waters—we would lose double as much by that transaction as we could gain. The hon. gentleman knows well that instead of the American market being the only market for our fish, the West Indies are the market for our codfish. The fishermen of Nova Scotia are not all employed in catching mackerel and herring, very much the larger portion are employed in catching codfish, and they send codfish to the United States only when the catch falls short there. I remember seasons when the Americans sent us fish to Nova Scotia to be shipped to the West Indies, but the West Indies have been our market ever since the hon. gentleman and myself were young men, and Halifax is to-day the rich city that it is because of her fishery trade with that country. Now, with regard to the United States fish market, let me say that during the Reciprocity Treaty the average price of fish that we sold to the United States was lower than it has been since. The hon. gentleman told us of a schooner that went to the United States with a cargo, I think, of 800 barrels of mackerel, and he lead us to suppose that in consequence of the duty, the fishermen got scarcely anything for their year's work; he told us that they got \$30 a-piece out of that cargo. Well, he does not tell us how many fishermen there were to share the money, and therefore you can make but a little estimate of what the fish really sold for. The prices taken from the Boston Fish Bureau at the time, probably, when that vessel was there, do not warrant any such statement as that, and we can only come to the conclusion that the fish he refers to was spoiled fish, certainly it was not No. 1 mackerel. Now, I find that the average price of mackerel from 1854 to 1866 was from \$12.84 to \$18.90—those were the years of the Reciprocity Treaty when our fish went into the Boston market free of duty. I find that from 1867 to 1873, when we had to pay duty, the price of No. 1 mackerel was from \$13.31 to \$23. You will see that a larger price was obtained between the Reciprocity Treaty and the Washington Treaty, notwithstanding that we paid the duty, than was obtained during reciprocity, or during the time of the Washington Treaty. The price of mackerel as given by this Bureau of Statistics, from 1874 to 1885, was from \$9.29 to \$19.21, still lower than the years in which we paid a duty. I contend, therefore, that if the prices of past years are to be the criterion of what prices will be in the future, and they have been taken as the criterion throughout this discussion, then I hold that we gained in our prices for fish by having to pay a duty on it, and the last year carries out that idea. Last year the prices of mackerel in the United States were higher than they had been for a number of years. Now, Sir, I say that these facts led me to believe that under unrestricted reciprocity the interests of our fishermen will be injured. Hon. gentlemen opposite must get into power in order to carry out this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, now, the people have a voice in that; the people have had something to say all along. In 1872 the Government appealed to the people to endorse their National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite prophesied during 4 years that the country would come to ruin under the National Policy. But when they come before the people with their prophecies, the people said to them: We think you would better stay where you were relegated in 1878, and let the present Government still carry out the National Policy. Again in 1887, the people told them: While we commend your

aspirations and ambitions, you had better remain on the Opposition benches a little while longer. And before these hon. gentlemen will be able to carry out their schemes of retrenchment, before they will be able to cut off our subsidies to railways and other public works, they must again go to the people. They told us that they had every reason to expect to be returned to power in 1887; and considering that there was no effort possible to obtain power, which they did not make, considering there was no scheme they did not work, considering they left nothing undone, which people who disregard their honor could possibly do, it is somewhat astonishing that they did not succeed. What did these hon. gentlemen do in Nova Scotia? What they did there must be ascribed to the whole party. They cannot escape responsibility by throwing the whole onus on the Nova Scotians, because the party, as a whole, is bound by its programme in each Province. In Nova Scotia they threw aside every principle that we suppose they formerly held as a Liberal party, for I pretend they had principles. I say it to the credit of the Liberals of my own Province that I believe they had principles, and that a large number of the people there who supported the Liberal party did so in the belief that the Liberal party had principles to which they vowed allegiance. But the Liberal party in 1887 cast aside their principles and adopted in each Province a different platform. In Nova Scotia they were repealers. There they said that the people of the Maritime Provinces were oppressed by the Ontario farmers. There they said that on every barrel of flour imported into those Provinces, the people had to pay a tax of 75 cents a barrel, or 15 cents a bushel on wheat, five bushels of which make up a barrel of flour. In that Province every word they uttered was in abuse of the fathers of Confederation. Not even the late Hon. George Brown escaped. On the contrary that hon. gentleman was held up as a man to be despised in company with every other man who had anything to do with establishing Confederation. In Ontario they told a different tale, and upheld Confederation. They trimmed their sails to every political breeze in the hope that in each Province they would catch a favoring wind. In Nova Scotia they said that Ontario was sucking the life blood out of that Province, while up here they said that Nova Scotia was living out of Ontario, and that all the breakwaters, all these public works built in the Maritime Provinces, were paid by Ontario. What did they do in Quebec? There they erect their platform on a scaffold, and the leaders of this great Liberal party bowed low at the shrine of Riel. I have nothing to say against the sympathy that French Canadians might have for that unfortunate and misguided man, but when the leaders of the party bowed down before him in order to traffic on race prejudices, they forfeited all claim to public respect and confidence. I was extremely sorry to hear an observation made respecting my Province and my countrymen. I was extremely sorry to hear it said that Nova Scotia offered herself to Mr. Blake, and that he would not buy her. I regretted exceedingly that that hon. gentleman, whom I have been taught for years to respect, whom I highly esteem—and I take the declarations of his party in reference to him and the statements of their papers, and I believe he is an honorable man—I was sorry that he was not in his place to tell us something about that offer, to tell us who offered Nova Scotia to him, to tell us how Nova Scotia was offered, and to give us some information more than the statement that Nova Scotia was offered to him. I do not know where that statement originated, I do not know at whose suggestion that insult was thrown upon us the other night, but I do not hesitate to say that I know what it was meant for. If I read what went before it, and if I read what followed after that statement, it was distinctly stated that Nova Scotia was got by corruption, by bribes from the Government, and it was meant that, if Mr. Blake had been a corruptionist,

if he had been as corrupt as Nova Scotia, he would have bought Nova Scotia, and the members who now represent Nova Scotia here would not have been here. I think that is what was intended by the statement, and if that was meant, I say in behalf of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia and in behalf of the Liberal party also, that there is not one scintilla of truth in it; and, if I were not in the House of Parliament, I would describe it by some other word. I say that Nova Scotia never offered herself and that no authorised agent of Nova Scotia offered that Province to Mr. Blake or to any other party, and the statement is an insult to Nova Scotia, and an insult that Nova Scotia will not forget, an insult that Nova Scotians, the descendants of honorable men, will a long time remember. Now, this fad would never suit this country. Germany had at one time a customs union. All the smaller States of Germany united with Prussia in a customs union, and before many years passed over the natural result came from that, and all the German States confederated with Prussia. Prussia swallowed them all up, and, instead of the smaller States being benefited by their commercial union with the larger State, the larger State absorbed the smaller. All the smaller States were absorbed, and had to succumb to the power of Prussia. I might give other instances, and they all go to show that in cases of this kind the smaller States are absorbed in the larger. There is no doubt that this is just what the Americans contemplate. Let us see what has been said by the Americans themselves in other days when this question of reciprocal trade came up between the American and the British Governments. When the British North American commissioners went in 1866 to Washington to endeavor to secure the continuation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, Mr. Morrell, of Vermont, who was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, said:

"You want these commercial privileges that you talk about. Then take your seats here by the side of us and vote for them."

The Hon. Jos. Howe, at the Detroit convention, said:

"I know that it has been asserted by some and I have heard it since I came into the convention that if the Reciprocity Treaty is annulled, the British Provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States."

These are the statements of these men, and we know perfectly well what the United States wants. It wants a market for its productions. Its warehouses are overflowing with manufactured goods, and it wants the Canadian market in which to dispose of them, and under no other consideration than the opening of our market to American manufactured goods will the United States enter into a commercial treaty with us. What did one of the leading newspapers of the United States say the other day in regard to Cuba? Discussing very fully the question of Cuba, it wound up by saying, Cuba is commercially ours now, and we are a nation of cowards or it would be wholly ours. That is the way in which they will talk about this country if this idea of commercial union is carried out. If there is a commercial union between Canada and the United States, they will say that they will be a nation of cowards, if Canada, being theirs commercially, is not theirs politically. Another feature is the fact that Mr. Wiman, who plans this whole thing, says that in twenty or twenty-five years he is going to put five millions of American people into this country. No one who has travelled over this country and has met the American propagandists can fail to know how they represent the beauties of the country on the other side of the line, the mountains of silver and rivers of gold which lie within their borders, and the great wealth which that country offers to immigrants and to anyone who will make that country his home. We know how they work upon the imaginations of the people. But, if so small a number of people can do so much, five millions of Americans in this

Mr. FREEMAN.

country, who of course would have the right to vote—for that would be a part of the scheme—would have a much greater opportunity of influencing Canadians, and where then would be the loyal men of this country, where would they stand beside the five million of Canadianised foreigners, agents of the American people, who could easily carry the day against us? And this would be particularly the case if Canadians manifested the same feeling which hon. gentlemen have manifested on the other side of the House. I have been astonished to hear those hon. gentlemen, in presenting this unrestricted union question to the House, talk about Great Britain and the United States in the way they have done. I have been astonished to hear them plead the cause of the United States against that of Great Britain. Mr. Wiman is a little ahead of these hon. gentlemen because he writes pamphlets, but, instead of being loyal subjects of the Queen, as I presume they are, as they say they are, and as I have no reason to suppose they are not, except what I have heard them say in this House, if, instead of representing loyal Canadian constituencies, they were paid agents of the Americans, with American gold lining their pockets, those hon. gentlemen could not have represented American interests more strongly than they have done in this debate. More than that, the manner in which they sneer at our loyalty, calling us sycophants and every other name of that kind they could hurl at us. If they have not done it in this House, they have had it done for them outside. They have represented us as everything that is mean and base, because we are loyal to our country, because we are loyal to Britain. Love, Sir, is one of the largest elements, if I understand loyalty; and would you condemn a man because he loved the knees on which he was dandled in infancy? Would you condemn a man because he loved the father who protected and shielded him in his growing days? If you would, then you may ask us not to love Britain. But, Sir, after Britain has nursed us in our infancy as a colony, and has stood with her fleets behind her and has said to this great spread-eagle nation: "Hands off the little boy," are we to be twitted to-day because we love Britain? It is a new thing, Sir, that men should be twitted in this House of Commons of this loyal colony of Canada for professing their loyalty and their love for their country. It is a thing that will be marvelled at in other countries, and will be gloated over by the Americans who are seeking to annex this country to themselves. I am glad that this question has come up, and that the future of this country is to be decided. I hold, Sir, that when responsible government was granted to these colonies, we put off our childhood as colonies; when Confederation was framed, the nucleus of a great nation was formed, and when this country adopted the National Policy, it was a formal declaration to the world that we had taken the great and important step of nationhood, to protect our own industries and our own labor. We have now gone on for nine years in the same direction, and if we are now to turn back, and go on our bellies, as one of the papers said the other day, and cringe to the United States, and tell them we shall go to ruin if they do not give us this treaty,—I say if we are to do that, it is time that this question was put fairly before the people and settled. I am glad the question has come up, and I only hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not forget it as they did the National Policy which they espoused in 1887, when they told the manufacturers they had nothing to fear. When the hon. Minister of Finance declared that he was pleased to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition had been converted to the National Policy, hon. gentlemen opposite accepted that declaration, but they forgot it very quickly. I hope they will not forget this so quickly, and let us have the issue before the people, for I believe that in this Dominion there is an overwhelming majority of the people who will

never consent to be absorbed into the United States. I believe there is an overwhelming majority of loyal people in this Dominion. I believe there is an overwhelming majority who will say with me: Let this right hand forget her cunning, let this tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I forget thee, Oh, Britain, the home of my ancestors, under the temptation of this spread-eagle country!

Mr. BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has expressed his desire that this question should be submitted to the people, for their judgment upon it, as soon as possible. If we can judge the future by the present, I think the Liberal party will have nothing to fear. I have an announcement to make, which I know this House will hear with pleasure, that the election in L'Assomption has resulted in the return of Mr. Gauthier with an increased, or I might say, a quadrupled majority. He was elected last year by a majority of twenty-one, and this year by a majority of ninety-four. I would now ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few observations on the question under discussion. I feel as if it was my duty to congratulate hon. members who have preceded me upon the excellency of their speeches, which have been interesting and in many cases full of information. The resolution at present before the House is, I think, the most important that has ever been discussed since Confederation; it is so comprehensive in its character, so far-reaching in its effects, and involves so many questions that have puzzled the minds of the greatest financiers and statesmen, that I rise to speak upon it with some diffidence. It was not my intention, when the resolution was first proposed, to take any part in this debate, because I felt that the resolution was of such a character that would meet with the acceptance of both sides of the House. It had been said on the introduction of the National Policy that it was a means to an end, that its purpose was to obtain reciprocity, and in discussing the National Policy upon public platforms, we were always met by our opponents with the remark: "We are free traders whenever we can get anybody to free trade with us." In listening to the hon. member who has just taken his seat, if I were a spiritualist, I would have almost thought that George Washington had returned in some sort of an angelic form; but when we come to examine the hon. gentleman's speech, we find that he was accusing members on this side of the House with sometimes suppressing truth, and who would have thought that this essence of purity would ever have forgotten and neglected the same duty himself? Why, Sir, in referring to the Provincial debts which were assumed by the Dominion Government, he did not tell us anything about the assets which came along with the debts. He spoke of an increase of \$40,000,000 in the debt during the Mackenzie Administration. He also claims great effects from the National Policy, that it has done wonders for the country, and he intimates that public men and Governments should not make any promises they are not able to fulfil. When we come to examine the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the National Policy and their fulfilment, we find they are very wide of the mark. One of their promises was that the National Policy would check the exodus, which our opponents admitted to be going on; and, moreover, that it would be the means of bringing back those who had left the country. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), in speaking upon this question, intimated that had the National Policy been introduced ten years earlier, there would have been no exodus from Canada. I have taken the trouble to examine as to the true state of affairs in this connection. In 1870 there were in the United States 493,000 Canadians; in 1880, 717,157, or an annual increase of 22,000. In 1886 the number was

1,040,038 or an increase of 55,000 annually, being an increase of 150 per cent. as compared with the previous years under a revenue tariff. I notice that if hon. gentlemen opposite seek some good authority as to the resources of Canada they generally consult some commercial unionists. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to and read part of a speech delivered by Mr. Ritchie, of Ohio. Had the hon. member completed the reading of that speech he would have found Mr. Ritchie's opinion with respect to this matter. Mr. Ritchie says:

"In 1854 a treaty of reciprocity was made between the United States and Canada, which, by its terms, was to run for a period of ten years or longer, unless terminated by either party upon a year's notice being given. The articles embraced in the schedule attached to this treaty were the products of the farm, forest, mine, and the sea. The operation of this treaty greatly stimulated the trade of both countries, whose present volume is largely due to the impetus given at that time or during that period."

The hon. gentleman also referred in somewhat complimentary terms to my esteemed opponent Mr. Wigle, in terms from which I do not dissent. He dwelt also on the loss the House had sustained by the absence of Mr. Wigle; but I think we may well say that what the House has lost the country has gained. The hon. gentleman was guilty of great ingratitude in resurrecting that old hackneyed speech and asking for a second judgment after its burial by the people of South Essex. I think at the same time he did Mr. Wigle an injustice from the fact that, if I do not mistake the resolution of which he was the seconder, Mr. Wigle has since repudiated the principles involved in that speech. At a meeting of the Conservative Association on the 12th September he was the seconder of the following resolution:

"This association is of the opinion that at the present time all channels of trade and commerce should be as free and unrestricted as possible, having due regard to the necessary revenues of the Government and the best interests of the Dominion, and that the freest possible commercial intercourse with all parts of the Empire, the United States and other nations would promote the best interests of the Dominion."

An hon. MEMBER. Who seconded the resolution?

Mr. BRIEN. Mr. Wigle. I thought I would refer to this matter as the hon. gentleman might have left a wrong impression on the minds of hon. members that Mr. Wigle was not in accord with advanced public opinion. The hon. gentleman also referred to the egg argument in somewhat amusing terms. I am sorry that he did not have that egg, for I am sure that if he was as apt with cracked eggs as with disjointed arguments he would be tolerably skilful. As representative of the people an hon. member of this House occupies, as it were, a dual character, especially when a new question comes before the House. He has to consider, first, its probable effect on his own locality, on the constituency he represents; and I will now briefly deal with that aspect of the question. I need not tell the people that in the section of the country I represent, South Essex, of the benefit that would accrue to them from the market of a city like Detroit, with a population of 150,000 people, being freely thrown open to them. Many of them have, no doubt, fresh in their memories the advantages that flowed to them from the old reciprocity treaty. It is no question whatever with the people in that section as to who pays the duty. Each man is well aware that if he has a horse to sell or any cattle, barley or any other produce he has to pay the duty, and instead of receiving \$100 for his horse he will receive only \$80. We have an opportunity of becoming conversant with those facts from having a personal knowledge of them. I have prepared an estimate, which I think is a very moderate one, as to the effect of unrestricted reciprocity on my locality, and the estimate will apply to the country generally. Take a farmer having a farm of 100 acres. Suppose he sold one span of horses worth \$200 he would save \$40; if he sold two head of cattle worth \$100 he would save \$10; five tons of hay, save \$10; 150 bushels of barley, save \$10; 100

pounds of wool, save \$10, or an increase of profits amounting on the whole of the products of a hundred acre farm to the extent of \$150. There is in the county, a portion of which I represent, 430,000 acres of assessed farm land, which would give 4,300 farms of 100 acres each. Assuming that we had free trade with the United States, that would give for this county an increased profit of \$645,000. In the Province generally there are 208,000 farms, and taking the increased profit it would reach \$31,200,000, which capitalised would amount to \$780,000,000. That is one class of farmers. I need not say anything of the fishermen and of the lumbermen, for they will be satisfied. As to the manufacturers in our section, I have a communication from a manufacturer in the town in which I live, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. He writes:—

"ESSEX CENTRE, ONT., 24th March, 1898.

"DEAR SIR,—I am just in receipt of your telegram, 'How would reciprocity affect my business.' I have watched the debates on this question with a great deal of interest. Unrestricted reciprocity would be a boon to the manufacturing company here. We would then have the American States for our market. In fact, we have sold some as it is, because they considered the ploughs superior to their own make. If it were not for this duty line we could ship large quantities there and easily compete with the American manufacturers. We have to buy our steel in the States, because there is only one firm that make plough steel plates, and they do not make an article to compare with the Pittsburgh make. The Nova Scotia plates are very inferior, and they charge just about as much as the Pittsburgh men, that is they add nearly as much as the duty, so that as far as they are concerned they make a harvest out of the duty business. Having to buy a good article to make good goods in Pittsburgh we have to pay the duty. Last year the Government committed the outrage of raising the duty from 12½ per cent. to 35 per cent. on plough steel plates. This was done after we had made the greater part of our contracts for the season and, therefore, could get no more for our ploughs sold. This difference ruined the business for the year. True the Government, finding their mistake, reduced the duty to the old thing, 12 per cent., but they would not make any rebate for the money wrongfully taken from us during the year. Another point. There are about three ploughs made in Canada to one in the States, in proportion to the population of the two countries. Therefore, the competition has become so keen that the prices are cut very low, and in order to affect sales resort is had to giving long terms of credit, thus making the risks of bad debts much more. For our line of business, I would consider our institution worth 50 cents on the \$1 more than it is now if the Chinese wall was thrown down. Stand firm as a rock. The cause is right and in time must win. We are all well.

"MILNE."

I have a telegram from the lumber firm of James Taylor & Son in my section of the country. They say:

"We think unrestricted reciprocity would be a great benefit to our business."

I have now dealt with the farmer, the lumberman and the manufacturer as far as our section of the country is concerned and, I believe, so far as my judgment goes, and from what I have been able to find out, that it would be of great benefit to the fisherman as well. Now, as to its general effects upon the country, we all know that under the old reciprocity treaty that we had prosperity in this country such as we had not experienced before that treaty nor since. We know that our import and export trade increased from \$30,000,000 in 1853 to \$84,000,000 in the last year of the treaty. This is sufficient guarantee that it was a great benefit and that it was a success as far as the country was concerned. I do not wish to delay the House by going into a long list of figures in this matter as so many who have preceded me have given uncontrovertible facts with regard to those things. We have had figures enough and if we were only able to remember them I presume we would be all "figured-heads." With your permission, Sir, I will read a report as to the progress of the country during the years between 1850 and 1860. It is written by Mr. Ward, an American, who made this report in 1862 in accordance with the desire of the United States Congress. He thoroughly investigated the resources and the progress that Canada had made and was making. In his report he says:

Mr. BRIEN.

"During the interval between the last census and the preceding one (1850-1860), the decennial rate of increase of population in Canada exceeded that in the United States by nearly 5½ per cent.—Canada adding 40·87 per cent. to her population in 10 years while the United States added only 35·58 per cent. to theirs. She brought her wild land into cultivation at a rate in nine years, exceeding the rate of increase of cultivated lands in the United States in ten years by nearly 6 per cent.—Canada in 1860 having added 56 acres of cultivated land to every 100 acres under cultivation in 1851, while the United States in 1860 had only added 14 acres to every 100 acres under cultivation in 1850. The value per cultivated acre of the farming lands in Canada in 1860 exceeded the value per cultivated acre of the farming lands of the United States—the average value per cultivated acre in Canada being \$20·87 and in the United States \$16·32. In Canada a larger capital was invested in agricultural implements, in proportion to the amount of land cultivated than in the United States—the average value of agricultural implements used on a farm having 100 cultivated acres being in Canada \$182 and in the United States \$150. In proportion to population, Canada in 1860 raised twice as much wheat as the United States—Canada in that year raising 11·2 bushels for each inhabitant while the United States raised only 5·50 bushels for each inhabitant. Bulking together eight leading staples of agriculture—wheat, corn, rye, barley, oats, buckwheat, peas and beans and potatoes.—Canada, between 1851 and 1860 increased her production of these articles from 57,000,000 to 123,000,000 of bushels—an increase of 113 per cent.; while the United States in ten years, from 1850 to 1860, increased their productions of the same articles only 45 per cent. In 1860, Canada raised of these articles 49·12 bushels for each inhabitant, against a production in the United States of 43·42 bushels for each inhabitant. Excluding Indian corn from the list, Canada raised of the remaining articles 48·07 bushels for each inhabitant, almost three times the rate of production in the United States, which was 16·74 bushels for each inhabitant. And as regards live stock and their products, Canada in 1860 in proportion to her population owned more horses and more cows, made more butter, kept more sheep, and had a greater yield of wool than the United States."

Referring to this report the author, Sir Edward Watkin, the former president of the Grand Trunk Railway, a gentleman well known to hon. gentlemen in this House, says:

"Our British Government having thus allowed the treaty to expire, and having thereby damped the energies of the colonies, and excited the hopes of the protectionist and annexationist parties in the States, what are we to do?"

"In the first place Parliament should express its condemnation of the failure of the executive; in the second, its desire for peace and fraternity with the United States; and in the third, its determination to stand by the Queen's Dominions on the other side of the Atlantic."

"What ought we to seek now to secure, in the interests of peace and civilization?"

"1. A neutralisation of the 3,000 miles of frontier, rendering fortifications needless.

"2. A continuance of the neutrality of the lakes and rivers bordering on the two countries.

"3. Common navigation of the lakes and the outlets of the sea.

"4. An enlargement of canals and locks to enable the food of the west to flow unimpeded and at the smallest cost direct in the same bottom to Europe or any other part of the world.

"5. Neutrality of telegraphs and post routes between the Atlantic and Pacific, no matter on which territory they may traverse.

"6. A free interchange of untaxed and an exchange, at internal revenue duty rate only, of taxed commodities.

"7. The passage of goods in bonds through the respective territories as heretofore.

"8. A common use of ports on both sides of the continent."

That statement was made nearly 20 years ago, and it is almost in accordance with the present resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), so that we find that all Englishmen do not consider it disloyal to enter into any reciprocity treaty with the United States. It refers to the amendment of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and it also applies to the section of country which I have the honor to represent. At the present time there are residents in the towns along the lake shore, many brave sailors, captains and mates of vessels, second in courage to no men in the Dominion of Canada, who might be useful citizens if they were retained in Canada, but in consequence of not being able to obtain situations, owing to the destruction, almost, of our shipping, they have to seek work in the United States, although it does not have the effect, as hon. gentlemen opposite would seem to think, of making them disloyal, because they still live under the British flag and are loyal subjects of the Queen. Now, I will not contrast the condition of Canada at different periods, as that has been so frequently done by hon. gentlemen from this side of the House, but I will refer to one or to points. With regard to population, I think I

have made a fair and moderate estimate. I have taken, as a basis our population in 1861, and the natural increase of births over deaths. In the Australian colonies that increase is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or at least 25 per thousand, and in order to maintain the position under all circumstances, I have placed our increase at 20 per cent., which will be at the rate of 2 per cent. The population of the old Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, in 1861, was 300,000. Then our population in those Provinces should have been, in 1871, 3,708,000. Adding to the population of the old Provinces that of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-West Territories, 200,000, which is, I think, a little under the mark, we should have, in 1871, a population of 3,908,000. Add to this from the same standpoint the natural increase, and we should have, in 1886, a population of 5,080,000; whereas, according to the statistics furnished by the Government, our population in 1886 did not exceed 4,725,000. Then we have lost of our natural increase, 355,000. Add to this sum the immigrants we have received, according to the Government figures, 824,000, and we have, under these circumstances, 1,179,000 to account for, and the question is, where have they gone, and what is the cause of their departure? Sir, if a remedy can be found which will retain these people at home, and, if possible, bring back those that have gone away, I think it should be adopted, and I believe that unrestricted reciprocity would have that effect. We all remember the great promises that were made of a home market under the National Policy. Well, this home market has not been found for the farmers. In some cases, I believe, there is a slight increase in the population of the towns and cities, but it has been at the expense of the country, so that there is really no home market whatever. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that under unrestricted reciprocity our cattle trade with England would be destroyed. I will not presume to give you an opinion on that point myself, but I will give you the statement of a gentleman whom all will admit to be fully competent to speak upon it, and that is Mr. Valancy Fuller, a stock dealer. I will not detain the House by reading a long letter of his upon this point, but in substance he says that this new arrangement will not affect the sale of cattle in England if our quarantine regulations remain the same. Now, it has always been claimed by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me on the opposite side of the House, that the National Policy has benefited the laboring men. Instead of using any argument of my own, I will mention a circumstance that occurred to my personal knowledge, which shows the effect it has upon laboring men near the border who are in frequent communication with the people across the line. A young man who was employed as a painter in the village of Leamington, went to Detroit and bought an article which cost him \$1. Coming back over the river, he had to pay a duty of 30 or 35 cents. He went to his home, and a few days afterwards a painter came from the city of Detroit and offered to work for the same employer at a much less rate of wages than this young man could obtain himself, so that the young man had to come down to the standard of the American labor or else lose his situation. That was the effect upon this laboring man. It not only reduced the purchasing power of what he earned, but it gave him no protection. Indeed, public money has been spent in the past in bringing laborers over from Europe to compete with our own laborers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Times are much better in Canada than in the States, then?

Mr. BRIEN. That only shows the principle. It is a special case, it shows what they can do. Now, the question of interprovincial trade has been frequently referred to; the Minister of Marine has referred to it at great length,

and I am glad to say that I think we can produce evidence of the benefit of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, by taking the result of interprovincial trade. What has been the principal cause of the increase of interprovincial trade? Why, Sir, simply throwing down the barriers between the various Provinces which formerly had a tariff of their own. It had the effect of increasing the interprovincial trade, and I am sure that trade will not stop on account of the flag. Our climate varies over a narrow strip of country over 4,000 miles in length, and our natural productions are varied according to the climate. Well, we must have variety of products in order to secure an exchange of trade, because two nations having the same classes of goods to export are not likely to trade so freely with each other as those having dissimilar classes. Variety is the basis of exchange and exchange is the basis of commerce, and I know of no means to meet the case except that set forth in the resolution now before the House. The Government may tunnel mountains, they may bridge rivers, and annihilate space, but they will find it impossible to overcome the difficulties of climate. The hon. gentleman of Marine referred to the natural market. With regard to that question, there are many things to be taken into consideration. A natural market is one in which we can sell at profitable prices, and from which we can obtain in exchange return cargoes. The hon. gentleman also referred to the West Indies and to the increase in provincial trade as compensating advantages to the Maritime Provinces for being debarred from their natural market. On this point, I will read what the late Mr. Howe has said, and Mr. Howe, I think, is an authority whom no one would be likely to question. Mr. Howe, according to a report in the *Halifax Chronicle*, said:

Our neighbors may have their faults and their misfortunes, but there they are 34,000,000 of them divided from us by the Bay of Fundy as by a street—they on the one side and we on the other. Where will be our market for coal for ever? In the United States. Where will be the market for our grindstones? In the United States. Where will be our market for plaster, and fish, and our potatoes? In the United States. Here are five great staples, and there is our market."

That ought to be accepted as good authority. He goes on to state:

"The man with a shallop of coal goes to the United States; he wants a freight to return with, and you say to him: 'You shall bring back flour from the United States, but you must turn your shallop up the St. Lawrence and make a twenty-five or thirty days voyage to Quebec.'"

Hon. members also differ, as did the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter), with regard to what the result of the policy embodied in this resolution would be. The hon. member for Perth intimates that we would likely become hewers of wood and drawers of water, while the hon. member for Huron claims that we produced in Canada as fine a type of men as exist on the face of the earth. There is a contradiction somewhere. I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Huron that Canada does produce the highest type of man to be found in the world, just as I believe it is not the country which presents the greatest facilities for man's livelihood that develops the highest type. The highest type, on the contrary, is found in those countries where pluck, energy and skill are required to overcome adverse influences and consecrate nature to men's own use. If Canada produces a superior type of man, how is it that Canadians will not be able to compete with their American neighbors when they will have just as cheap labor and all the raw material at hand? It seems to me somewhat strange that while hon. gentlemen opposite are willing, if we can judge by their past utterances, to let the farmer seek his market where he will, they will not allow him to buy where he will, but insist on giving control of the whole market of this country to the manufacturers. That the interests of the farmers, the lumbermen and the fishermen should be

sacrificed to protect the interests of the manufacturers does not appear on its face to be just. With regard to our manufactures, our exports have within the last few years been on the decrease, instead of the increase. A great deal has been said about this cry of disloyalty. It does seem to me that in this case, that cry is quite uncalled for; and I would not insult the constituents of hon. gentlemen opposite by insinuating that they are disloyal when there is no cause for disloyalty. When this question is being discussed, I have always in my mind what the historian Hallam says. I hope it does not apply in this case. He says: "Patriotism and loyalty are too frequently the pretense of the hypocrite, and the plea of the designing politician." The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) gave us quite a lecture on this question, but I think if he were reminded of the past, he might take a little of the lecture for himself. He did not know how to manifest his loyalty sufficiently, but the hon. gentleman occupies here a unique position; and if we are to judge from the past, all he need do would be to visit his returning officer and with equal justice, that functionary might appoint the hon. gentleman to any position he chose and thus give him an opportunity to sacrifice his life or the British Empire. Let us turn back to 1869, and we will find some interesting reading. In the speech of the late Hon. George Brown, that hon. gentleman when speaking about the demand made in 1869 to negotiate a treaty on a basis somewhat similar to that laid down in the resolution before us, said:

"More than one effort was made by the late Government (Macdonald-Cartier) for the renewal of the old treaty between 1866 and 1869. In 1869 formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government and the *projet* of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. The *projet* included the cession for a term of years of our fisheries to the United States; the enlargement and enjoyment of our canals; the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence River, the assimilation of our customs and excise duties; the concession of an import duty equal to the internal revenue taxes of the United States; and the free admission into either country of certain manufactures of the other."

To make this stronger I will read the comments of the *Times* on Mr. Dorion's speech. The *Times* said:

"A single circumstance may show to what extent the freedom of action of our colonies may go. It is at this very moment a matter of discussion in Canada whether a treaty of reciprocity should not be concluded with the United States; and the result of the deliberations may very possibly be the admission of the manufactures of New England into the Dominion under lighter duties than the manufactures of Great Britain. If the Canadian Ministry come to the conclusion that such an arrangement is for the benefit of their country, will the Colonial Office advise the Crown to disallow the negotiations? Assuredly not."

With regard to this discrimination against England, I took some trouble to ascertain what was the effect of the old reciprocity treaty of 1864 on the trade of England. From 1844 to 1850, our aggregate trade with England was \$160,000,000, or an average of \$14,500,000 a year. From 1854 to 1866, \$332,000,000, or an average of \$25,500,000 a year. This is an increase of about 80 per cent. I think that will be a full answer to the question of discrimination. Instead of decreasing our trade with the United Kingdom, I am confident that this would have a tendency to increase our trade with Great Britain, as it would induce such an era of prosperity in this country as would enable us to purchase more than we do now. Further, I believe it will also have the effect of consolidating the various Provinces, and creating a feeling of satisfaction which I think no man will doubt is required at the present time. I think any person, looking at the situation calmly, will find that there is a feeling of dissatisfaction with Confederation itself, and I think it is a duty on the part of all those who have at heart the interests and the stability of Confederation to support this resolution, if it is going to have the effect, as we believe, of consolidating and cementing together the various Provinces of this Dominion. There can be no doubt that it would have that effect, that it would give greater satisfaction to the Maritime Provinces, that it

Mr. BRIEN.

would afford a more convenient market to the people of the North-West, and that it would also largely add to the prosperity of the farmer and the manufacturer in the Province of Ontario. We believe that such an era of prosperity would set in if this were carried out that it would have the effect not only of doubling our trade with the United States but also that with England. It certainly would have that effect if we are to judge from the past. It is time that this question should be faced and should be looked at from a serious standpoint. We aspire at some future time to become a nation, and there is no doubt that we have a good foundation on which to build a great nation if we now pursue a proper course, and I believe this is the first step to consolidate the Provinces together.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox.) I have been somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pressing this debate after the observations which were made by Sir Charles Tupper. Has the hon. gentleman got any more information from the United States Government leading him to believe that this is a more opportune time to present this matter to that Government than the time when it was presented at Washington? Does not the hon. gentleman know that the great political parties in the United States are now engaged in getting ready for the presidential election, and that the party in power is not likely to do anything to lessen its chances of success at the poll? The hon. gentleman will remember the efforts which were made by the Government of which he was a member, I refer to the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, when they sent the Hon. George Brown to Washington and made a desperate effort to get a reciprocity treaty passed. They were accused on that occasion of offering more than they were justified in offering, but, notwithstanding the liberal offers which they made to the people of the United States, the United States refused to make such a treaty. Is this agitation in the interests of the country, or is it because hon. gentlemen opposite have failed in their prophecies in relation to the Fishery Treaty and are now seeking to raise a cry in order to injure the Government and to embarrass the Government, and in that way, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said, get a platform with which to go to the people? The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) drew a very doleful picture of the position of the farmers of this country. He seemed to think that, if we could get commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, it would be a boon for all our ills; our land would go up in value, we would have general prosperity, and we would be altogether much better off. I would like to compare our exports in breadstuffs from 1875 to 1879 with those from 1880 to 1884. We exported of breadstuffs from 1875 to 1879, \$31,954,797; but we imported to the value of \$61,362,580, or we exported over our imports in those five years, \$20,592,217, or a yearly average of \$4,118,443. Our exports of breadstuffs from 1880 to 1884, under the National Policy period, were \$90,201,639, and our imports \$16,623,986, or the total exports over imports amounted to \$73,577,653, or a yearly average of \$14,715,530, as compared with a yearly average under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite of \$4,118,443, or about three and a-half times as much. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that this must have been of some benefit to the farmers of the country, that, if the people of this country raised so much more produce, they must have had more money, and times must of necessity have been better. Now, the hon. gentlemen suppose that they have made a strong case showing the depression of the farmers of this country. I would like to give them a quotation from an hon. gentleman who stands high in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who was at one time a member of the Mowat Administration, and who was before that a member of this House. I think

he has taken a great deal of pains to get the necessary information on which he bases the statement which I will read, which is a short extract from one of the five letters written by the Hon. James Young to the *Globe* in 1887. He says :

"How absurd it is, not to say unpatriotic, to speak of Canadians, especially our farmers, as being poverty stricken and suffering serious disadvantages as compared with our American neighbors. Let them go into the country districts of the various States; let them compare northern Maine and New Hampshire with our Maritime Provinces, or Michigan, Ohio, or any other State, with Ontario; let them contrast the territories of the Great North-West, and it will be found that our general prosperity does not compare unfavorably with theirs. So far as Ontario is concerned, I know no part of the United States in which the masses of the people are healthier, wealthier, or happier."

That is a statement made by a leading member of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also took great exception to the home market. He wanted to know where our home market was. He had a great deal to say about the tall chimneys which had been promised to us under the National Policy. I have another short extract here from the same hon. gentleman whom I have quoted before, and I think it ought to be good authority to hon. gentlemen opposite. In speaking of the markets in which we dispose of our farm produce, he classifies them as three markets—the American, the British, and the home market; and he says :

"It is the very marrow of the question to determine the relative value of these three markets to our farmers, and we are fortunately now in possession of some reliable data which may guide us in doing so. The able head of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, Mr. Archibald Blue, in a carefully prepared statement now in my possession, makes the value of everything produced on Ontario farms in 1886 to have been close upon \$160,000,000. Adding \$140,000,000 for all the other Provinces, which must be a moderate estimate, we reach a total production for the Dominion of \$300,000,000. Assuming that one-half of these products were consumed by the farming community themselves. These various statistics will, I trust, furnish our farmers some reliable data upon which to estimate the relative value of their three chief markets. The surplus farm production of the Dominion (only one-half the total amount) for 1886, as we saw above, was about \$150,000,000, and of this our own market absorbed (to use round numbers), \$110,000,000, or 73 per cent.; Great Britain, \$22,500,000, or 15 per cent.; and the United States \$15,500,000, or 10 per cent. It is quite evident from these facts that it must be absurd to represent our farmers as dependent on a market which for twenty years has only taken 10 per cent. of their surplus and only 5 per cent. of their total annual production."

Now, if the hon. gentleman will just consider this a little, I think he will find where the home market is. I think a home market that consumes 73 per cent. of our surplus products is a very good home market. England takes 15 per cent. of our surplus, while the United States takes only 10 per cent., so that we have not much to gain from commercial union. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down said that if we got unrestricted reciprocity with the United States it would be a great boon to the farmers of his district, and that it would bring back to this country many of the Canadian people who have gone to the United States. But he failed to tell us how we could bring them back. If he would only tell us that, it would be a good thing for this country, and we might make the effort. But the hon. gentleman forgets that if we have a market of 60,000,000 people to deal with, the moment we have unrestricted reciprocity with them, we shall have 60,000,000 competitors in our own market, and a people who export \$500,000,000 worth of farm products annually are not likely to want much of our farm products. The hon. member for North Norfolk in a very ably and carefully prepared speech, tried to make out that the farmers of this country pay the duty on all they export, and he was not satisfied with that, but he said they also pay duty on what they import. It is a new doctrine to me that we pay the duties both ways, and it may be true, but I do not believe it. On that subject I would like to give another short quotation from the Hon. Mr. Young, to show what the view of the Reform party has been in the past :

"Equally fallacious is it to assume that the Canadian farmer pays all the duties on the horses, cattle, barley, &c., which are exported across the lines. For forty years the Liberal party has been taught differently, and the demonstrations of Adam Smith, confirmed by all great living political economists, as well as by practical experience, clearly prove the contrary."

That has been the doctrine of the Reform party in the past, and I believe it is the common sense view of all parties of the present time, that although there may be exceptions, as a rule the consumer pays the duty. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said in his speech that we raise a particular kind of barley, and that the Americans must have that barley, and still he insisted that the Canadian farmer, in order to get it into the American market, must pay the duty. That seems to be a very strange kind of logic, and, if it is correct, I think it was very kind of the American Government, in 1883, to take 5 cents a bushel of duty off, just to benefit the Canadian farmer. With reference to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 in natural products, which has been so much talked about, some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have said that there were casual advantages which made times better for Canada than they would otherwise have been during the existence of that Treaty. The hon. member for East Huron said the Grand Trunk had been commenced five years before the Reciprocity Treaty went into effect. I do not wish to dispute that, because preliminary surveys may have been made, and some work may have been done; but one thing we do know, the Grand Trunk Railway was not opened for traffic until 1856, and consequently between 1854 and 1856 there must have been a large amount of money spent in this country in building that railroad, which must have added materially to the prosperity of the people. The hon. gentleman also said that the Russian war was nearly over before the treaty of 1854 came into effect. We all know that the Russian war commenced in 1854 and the treaty of peace was not signed until 1856; and no matter whether the war was nearly over or not, I do not think any member of this House will venture to say that wheat went up to \$3 a bushel in consequence of the reciprocity treaty, but I think every hon. gentleman knows that the Russian war was the cause of that rise. The hon. gentleman also said the American war from 1861 to 1865 was of no advantage to us, as it cut off 10,000,000 Southerners from dealing with us. I think that war was a very great advantage to us, because it drew more than 2,000,000 of the American people from industrial pursuits for fighting purposes; consequently these men were not able to provide their own necessities, and were at the same time kept from competition with us in our market. I have taken the trouble to look up some statistics on this subject, and I find that our total exports to the United States from 1855 to 1859, before the war, amounted to \$78,000,000, or a yearly average of \$15,610,000, while our exports to the United States from 1861 to 1865, after the war, amounted to \$93,866,600, or a yearly average for the five years of \$18,773,000. It does seem to me that these figures show that that war was of some advantage to the people of this country. The yearly average surplus exported to the United States during the war period exceeded that exported before the war by over \$3,000,000. It seems to me that was quite an advantage. There is just one other matter with respect to this treaty of 1854; it is part of the statement made by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and I agree with him. He said :

"Hon. members on this side of the House are willing to accept the same kind of treaty as the one of 1854."

I am willing to accept that kind of treaty too, and I believe hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are willing to accept such a treaty; but they are not willing to go the length to which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be willing to go, that is so far as unrestricted reciprocity in

order to secure trade with the United States. As a reason why we are not prepared to do that, I am in a position to prove out of the mouth of the same gentleman to whom I have referred, that we have been more prosperous since the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty even than we were during that time. If that can be shown to be the case we ought to be able to dictate to the United States, or at least we ought to be prepared to say that we are prepared to accept a treaty on fair terms, and except on a fair terms we are not prepared to accept any treaty. The gentleman to whom I refer is Hon. James Young, a gentleman belonging to the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He says:

"There exists almost universally throughout Canada not only the most friendly feelings towards the United States, but an ardent desire for freer commercial relations between the two countries. Not that we cannot prosper otherwise. On the contrary, notwithstanding some grievous misgovernment, Canada never developed or prospered more than during the twenty years since the reciprocity treaty expired."

It seems to me that it is a very good reason why we should be prepared to accept a reasonable and fair reciprocity treaty, and not be willing to give the Americans any advantage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would that not be a reason for having no treaty at all?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I would simply say, in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, that we can do without a treaty. I think we can do better with one, and I am prepared to go any reasonable length to secure it, but I am not willing to go the length of annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I do not like to be personal, for to be personal is to be unparliamentary, and I would not like to be unparliamentary. We will, however, soon find out what unrestricted reciprocity means. It is pretty hard to tell what it does mean, if it does not mean annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did it not mean that before?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). We never had unrestricted reciprocity before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was proffered by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. BOWELL. No, never.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Unrestricted reciprocity with the United States means free trade with the United States and the same kind of tariff against the rest of the world as the United States has in force. I think that is unrestricted reciprocity; I may be wrong, and if so, hon. gentlemen who follow me will put me right. I should like to give another quotation from the same gentleman to whom I have referred, because I rather like his views, and I think he is a sensible man and a good Reformer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. All Reformers are that.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, all Reformers are, but they do not always show themselves to be so. That gentleman says:

"It may be presented in the pleasing guise of 'complete reciprocity,' but every intelligent person must see that what is proposed is simply a Zollverein, which is not only irreconcilable with our continued connection with Great Britain, but a sort of half way house on the road to annexation. Political union has followed commercial union in Germany, and he must be very blind who thinks it would be different on this Continent."

That is a statement made by Hon. James Young, who is a man that I think hon. gentlemen opposite will say is worthy of credence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That statement is an historical mistake.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). It may be, we do not know. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may know, for

Mr. WILSON (Lennox).

he is said to be a philosopher. I have a statement here, taken from a newspaper, made by ex-city Attorney J. N. Cross, of Minneapolis. He says:

"The time has come to be generous to Canada, and to at once form with her a Commercial Union, a 'Zollverein' for tariffs, a perfect union for trade, traffic and commerce in their every aspect, to be followed by a political union."

I think if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to investigate as to the men who are in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity on the other side of the line, they will find they are only in favor of it as they hope it will be a stepping stone to annexation. I desire to give the House an illustration of the effect which unrestricted reciprocity would have in this country in regard to direct taxation. Our revenue, as a matter of course, is raised now from customs duties. We raised last year \$22,500,000, \$7,300,000 of which was on goods imported from the United States. We imported a little over 40 per cent. of our total imports from the United States last year, and although I have talked with many people, some favoring unrestricted reciprocity and others opposing it, I never met a man who said our imports from the United States under the system proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite would be less than 75 per cent. of the whole importation. My own impression is that it would be more, that if we had free trade with the United States, we would buy in that market everything we could, and only go outside that country for such articles as we could not procure there. In that way we would lose from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000, which sum would have to be made up by direct taxation. I desire to give the House an illustration of how this proposition, if carried out would affect the counties of Lennox and Addington, because hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be anxious to benefit the farmers, and they never tire of talking about the wrongs of the farmers under the present Administration. The assessment of the county is \$8,166,000. Of that amount only \$438,000 is for personal property and taxable income, while \$7,728,000 odd is for real property. Hon. members, especially those who have had anything to do with municipal matters, can easily understand how this happens. The assessor can see the real estate and the improvements, and consequently he cannot be deceived to any great degree as to the value. If he is not satisfied, he can make enquiries of the neighbors and find the value, whereas when he comes to assess personal property or taxable income the people are interested in not telling him the whole truth, and people hold the opinion that there is not much harm in doing it. In my county we have one town of nearly 4,000 inhabitants, from fifteen to twenty villages with from 50 to 500 inhabitants, and in all those places there is a good deal of personal property; but my impression is, that three-fourths of the personal property in the county is not taxed, and the result of that for municipal purposes real property pays more than seventeen times as much as personal property and taxable income. If we have to raise direct taxation in order to conduct the affairs of the country the same thing will happen. There is another serious aspect to this question which I think hon. gentlemen have forgotten. They are never tired talking about the wickedness of the revising barrister and his clerks, and the hon. gentlemen must know that if we have to resort to direct taxation that we will have to get in all probability valuers for every municipality, but certainly we will have to get tax collectors. Those people going around those different municipalities will have an opportunity of doing political work and that sort of thing, and I am afraid that if hon. gentlemen succeed in getting this resolution through and a treaty made with the United States they will be kept out of power for the next twenty years, not alone the next five years, which would be very bad.

Mr. BOWELL. Bad for them?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, bad for them.

Mr. BOWELL. Good for the country.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, as my hon. friend says, it would be good for the country. There were some sweeping assertions made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In his speech to this House, which was very carefully prepared, he said that all public works should be stopped, as well as all subsidies to railways. He would reduce the grant to the militia by a million dollars, or, in other words, wipe it out altogether; he would stop superannuations, reduce the civil service 65 per cent., reduce the House of Commons one-half and virtually wipe out the Senate. I would like to know if the party which the hon. gentleman follows ever comes into power, will he say to them: "I will not give that party my support unless they make these reforms," or is it that he wants annexation pure and simple. Gentlemen, I do not know which view of the matter he takes. I suppose it makes very little difference to me personally, but I am satisfied that Canada wants to maintain her independence. I am satisfied the Government of this country is doing the best thing for the country.

26-1888-3

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Hon. gentlemen opposite may differ, but I say "yes." Notwithstanding the wail of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the laudations of the United States by the hon. member for North Norfolk (M. Charlton) and his supporters I have faith in the future of Canada, and I am willing to support the Government lead on by the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, who has brought this country to be a great Dominion from being a few scattered Provinces.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 4, 1888.

No. 27.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANSTEAD ELECTION TRIAL.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Brooks the certificate of judgment in the matter of the election petition for the Electoral District of Stanstead, by which the said petition was dismissed.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That, as the time for the reception of reports of Committees on Private Bills will expire to-morrow, the same be extended until Friday, the 27th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, in their fifth report.

Mr. LAURIER. Is not that a very unusually long period to extend the time to? If I understood aright, it was up to the 27th instant that the hon. gentleman proposed to extend the time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it is not an unusual thing. On the contrary, we have to do it from time to time on account of the work of the committees. I think our committee, which has, I suppose, three-fourths of the Bills presented to the House this year, cannot sit oftener than we are sitting. We sit twice, and sometimes three times a week, and we will require all this time to pass the Bills which have been presented.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time do you propose to get through?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as you let us get through.

FORFEITURES FOR TREASON AND FELONY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 88) to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, and to otherwise amend the law relating thereto. He said: It is proposed by this Bill to adopt the provisions of the law of England in reference to forfeitures for treason and felony; practically to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, but to provide a means by which the property of persons con-

victed shall, during their incarceration, be administered, subject to an account to them at the conclusion of their term. Power is also to be given to the court which has jurisdiction to try these offences, to award compensation for the injuries the convict may have inflicted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—BILL.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to amend chapter eight of the Revised Statutes: An Act respecting the Election of Members to the House of Commons. He said: I will make a few brief explanations as to the purport of the Bill. In the first place, it contains the principal provisions which were embodied in the Bill which was under discussion during last Session of this House, which seemed to meet with a good deal of favor on both sides of the House. In addition it is proposed to adopt the section of the English Act which allows to a member whose agents have, without his knowledge or connivance, committed acts in relation to the offences of treating and undue influence, and which would forfeit his seat—in such circumstances, the member has a right to excuse himself by showing affirmatively to the court the following circumstances: that no corrupt or illegal practice was committed at such election by the candidate or his regular election agent; that the offences mentioned in the Bill were committed contrary to the orders or without the connivance of such candidate or his agent; that such candidate or his agent took all reasonable means to prevent the commission of corrupt or illegal practices; the offences mentioned in the Bill were of a trivial and unimportant character; that in all other respects the election was free from any corrupt or illegal practice on the part of such candidate or his agent; in such case the candidate is not to be subject to the incapacity provided by the Act. It is proposed, likewise, by this Bill, to make uniform the dates for holding elections in British Columbia and in the other electoral districts for which special provisions had been made as to the time for nomination, and the interval between nomination and polling day, in consequence of the difficulties of communication. Then it is proposed that special disqualifications, as in the mother country, shall be established in relation to persons who are convicted upon the indictment of any corrupt practice. It is proposed, in addition to the penalties prescribed by the existing law, that these persons shall be, for seven years from the date of their conviction, incapable of being registered as persons entitled to vote, or of holding any public office within the gift of the Crown or the Parliament of Canada; vacating any such office if they hold any when convicted of such offence; they are made incapable of being elected to this House, or of holding a seat in the House, they must vacate it. There are various other provisions inserted with a view of increasing the safeguards as to secrecy, as to tampering with ballot boxes, providing for greater conveniences for the taking of statements which are required to be taken at the close of the poll, and the authentication of the state-

ments which are usually enclosed in the ballot boxes. The Bill likewise deals with the cases mentioned last Session, of the boxes being lost, and the statements not being forthcoming.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As to the gazetting of members?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no special provision.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice as to whether there is any provision regulating, within certain limits, the issue of the writ to the returning officer, or perhaps I should say more correctly, taking care that a returning officer be appointed within some reasonable period after the writ has been issued by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no provision on that subject.

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask from the Minister an explanation of the first section of his Bill. He said that the subject had been fully discussed last Session, and favorably received by this House, yet he omitted to explain the nature of the amendments.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The sections which I referred to particularly were those providing that the ballot paper should be sufficiently substantial to prevent marking and puncturing it in such a way as that it would be possible to discern the way in which a person votes, and providing for a hard surface to be furnished by the returning officer or his deputy, in order that the ballot may be marked without showing through on the other side, and various other details of that kind.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUNISHMENTS, PARDONS AND COMMUTATIONS

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 90) to amend chapter 181 of the Revised Statutes, respecting punishments, pardons and commutations of sentences. He said: It is merely to remove a defect in the existing law as applicable to the North-West Territories. There are provisions in the Speedy Trials Act with reference to sentences carrying with them hard labor, and the Speedy Trials Act does not extend to the North-West Territories; this Bill will remedy that defect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRAUDULENT MARKS ON MERCHANDISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to consolidate and amend the law respecting fraudulent marks on merchandise. He said: This Bill will be found to be an adaptation of the English Fraudulent Marks Act of 1887, and which all Her Majesty's colonies have been asked to adopt. I may explain that the provisions of the existing laws with reference to the fraudulent marking of merchandise were found to be almost entirely inadequate, and in 1883 a convention was held at which the following powers were directly or indirectly represented: Belgium, Brazil, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Domingo, Servia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunis and the United States. These States adopted the provisions which are contained in this Act and in the Imperial Act of 1887. A subsequent convention was held in 1886 in which the provisions of the preceding convention were confirmed, and extending as regards some matters of detail. I will say that the new provisions, in the first place, provide a protection by criminal proceedings in relation to fraudulent marking of merchandise. The protection by criminal process is confined by this Bill to the registered trade marks. The system of registration has been in force for ten or

Mr. THOMPSON.

eleven years, and it has been held both in the mother country and, I think, in the colonies that sufficient time has elapsed to enable the registration system to be perfected, and it is, therefore, proper to take criminal action for fraud in relation to registered trade marks. In the second place, the burden of proof has been changed in relation to goods fraudulently marked with fraudulent trade marks. Persons having such goods in their possession are required to prove affirmatively that they came by them in good faith and had no intention of fraud. Then it is provided that all offences against the Trade Marks Act shall be punished by summary conviction, instead of being left to be dealt with by indictment under the old system. It has been found that the practice of resorting to indictment is one of great practical inconvenience to the mercantile community, and that procedure by summary conviction was more appropriate and suitable in dealing with offences of this kind. There is an enlarged provision as to false trade mark descriptions. There are provisions for searching premises in which it is supposed that goods fraudulently taken out are to be found, and a provision likewise for the seizure of goods of that description, and the prevention of their passage through the Customs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it the intention of the Government to drop entirely the Bill respecting the Controverted Elections Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

THE WRIT FOR RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to ask the Government whether they can inform the House to-day if the order of the House for the issue for a new election in the County of Russell has been complied with? We were promised it would be issued immediately.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman repeat the question when the First Minister is in his place?

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask of the Minister of Finance, whom I am glad to see in his place, whether the attention of the Government has been called to a certain Bill recently introduced into Congress, called a Retaliatory Bill, which may have important effects on the commerce of this country, and whether the Government are prepared to take any action with regard to it? Numerous communications have reached me, and I dare say have reached the hon. gentleman, showing there is great uneasiness in many parts of the country as to a possible disturbance of trade; and if the Government have come to any conclusion it is highly in the public interest that it should be announced at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in regard to the enquiry made by the hon. member that the Government have not had their attention drawn in any especial manner to the Bill which has been introduced and to which he has referred; but I am led to suppose that that Bill was introduced under an impression that the Government of Canada were unwilling to carry out the arrangement which the Government of the United States had expected would follow upon the reduction of duty, and I may say that if that Bill has been inspired by any such impression, I think the action that the Government have taken will entirely remove that impression, and I do not anticipate that any such Bill will be proceeded with or any such action taken by the Congress of the United States. I may be permitted to say,

as I was not in the House on a former occasion when this question attracted attention, although I do not wish to refer to a past debate, [that the policy of both sides of this House and of both parties in this country has been steadily directed to obtaining a free interchange of the natural products of the two countries; that from the date of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty both sides in this House, whether in Government or in Opposition, have always been prepared to do everything that it was possible to do to obtain, if we could not obtain a reciprocity treaty, a reciprocity tariff, and, as far and as fast as we could, to obtain the free interchange of the various natural products of the two countries that were indicated in the Treaty of 1854. I can only say that is the policy of the Government to-day, and that any measure we can take to carry that forward will be taken, and that, as hon. gentlemen are aware, the moment the attention of the Government was called by a communication from Sir Lionel Sackville West, covering a memorandum of the Department of State of the United States, to the fact that certain duties had been removed from articles that were contained in the Act of 1879, especially pointed to as inviting reciprocity, an Order in Council was passed placing those articles on the free list, and the proclamation will be issued in the next *Gazette*.

Mr. MITCHELL. Score one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That communication was made to Sir Sackville West, and I have no doubt it has been communicated to the Government and to the Committee of Ways and Means and to all of those who were under any impression that we would receive from the policy that, as I say, has not been the property of one party or the other in this country, but which all parties believe should be steadily carried forward.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can only say that I think it is a great pity the hon. gentleman was not in his place a week ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may add my congratulations to those of my hon. friend on my right in regard to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. You want order, do you? I think I am giving order. I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will permit me to say that we all have one object in view, and I am gratified to know that the course taken by the Government is one that meets with his approval; and I am satisfied he would not wish to make an observation that would tend to lessen the force of that action in any way. I hope, if the hon. gentleman has risen to compliment me at the expense of my colleagues, he will postpone doing so.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one object I have in view, and that is, if the Secretary of State desires to call "order" to prevent me from stating what I think it is my duty and right to state, he has made a little mistake in his man. That is what I want to say. I want to compliment the Minister of Finance for the frank and manly manner in which he has acted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I rise to a question of order. This is not in order.

Mr. GILLMOR. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have already moved the adjournment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is not in order so long as the motion has not been put.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have moved the adjournment, and I have a right to speak on this matter. I am not going to

be put down by the Secretary of State nor by anyone else when I am in the right. I rose for the purpose of paying a proper compliment to the Government, that when they found they made a mistake they took back water at once. I will simply say that I entirely approve of the remarks the hon. the Finance Minister has made, and I believe that no remarks should be made, nor no utterances given expression to by this House that would in any way detract from the frank manner in which the hon. gentleman has stated the policy of the Administration. But I wish to say this, that the attempt to snub me the other day by the Premier, and the statement he made, shows that the policy of the Government on Wednesday last was entirely different from what it is to-day. I simply wish to vindicate myself from the impertinent and insolent remarks that were applied to me on Wednesday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that the House and the country has reason to congratulate the Government on the presence of the Finance Minister here to-day. The views expressed by the Finance Minister are very different from the views expressed by his leader in this House not very long ago. Sir, there has been a change in the views and opinions of the Government and there has been a change which the country will receive with pleasure. Not very long ago when it was proposed to put certain articles on the dutiable list that had been on the free list and that were on the free list of the United States, we remember that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—perhaps not all the hon. gentlemen who are there, because it was not formally before Parliament—that the colleagues of the Finance Minister on that occasion adopted views and expressed sentiments altogether different from what the hon. gentleman has expressed here to-day. The hon. gentleman has stated to the House, that on both sides of the House we are one upon this question, and that we are in favor of a free interchange of the natural products of Canada and the United States. Sir, I am glad to find out that the Government are now of that view. It is true that many years ago they did express sentiments of that sort, but a very considerable period has elapsed since we have heard those sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen sitting on the front benches of the Treasury. The hon. the Minister of Customs shakes his head, but has the hon. gentleman forgotten the altercation which took place on this subject between himself and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), who supports the Administration? Does the hon. gentleman forget the discussion which took place about fruit trees and grape vines and with reference to the other matters which were put upon the dutiable list and the duties upon which were from time to time increased? Sir, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are like Captain Scott's coon, they have come down. The hon. the Finance Minister has taken great pains to explain to the House that they do not know what is going on in Congress, but the hon. gentleman, I suppose, will bring down to the House the communication received from Sir Lionel West. We will find out from that, and be able to judge, whether the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have recently done as the organ of the Minister of the Interior says they have done, namely, that they have passed an Order in Council putting upon the free list articles which the First Minister but a short time ago declared would be ruinous to Canada to put on the free list. Then, Sir, that hon. gentleman said that we had scores of articles on the free list already that the United States had not put on their free list, and that he was not going to put upon the free list articles which would promote the interests of the United States and which would enable the people of the United States to crush the interests of the people of Canada. Well, Sir, the hon. gentlemen have had new light, and I have no doubt whatever that that light has shone in

the Congress of the United States. Sir, we find in the Montreal organ of the hon. gentleman the following communication :—

"Since the discussion in the House last Wednesday relative to Canada placing on the free list certain natural products specified in clause nine of the Tariff Act, the equivalents of which have been placed by Congress on the American free list, the attention of the Government has been officially called to the matter by the Washington authorities through Sir Lionel West."

Remark, gentlemen, "By the Washington authorities through Sir Lionel West." Now, Sir, I have no doubt that the production of that communication from the English ambassador at Washington would prove to be an excellent commentary on the speech of the Finance Minister here to-day; it would greatly add to the clearness of that speech and would enable us to understand how it was that this Government that has allowed those articles to be on the dutiable list since 1854, have had new light since the discussion which took place here on Wednesday last, and have discovered that it was for the interest of the people of this country that those articles should now be transferred from the dutiable to the free list. Sir, we are making progress. We supposed that the Government here was as fixed as Atlas with the world upon his shoulders and almost as free from anything like a correct idea upon the subject of the trade and commerce of the people of this country. Sir, I think that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has done an excellent service to the people of this country in bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament. He has forced the gentlemen upon the Treasury benches from that position which they have so long occupied, and when they intrenched themselves behind an Act of Parliament which they had no intention of putting into force, which they declared they would not put into force, which they declared it was not for the interest of the people of this country that they should put in force, and which the hon. the First Minister not long ago informed Parliament that the people of this country would sustain them in refusing to put it into force. Those gentlemen have had new light. They have an Order in Council carried on the subject. The hon. the First Minister not long ago told us—what? Why, he told us that if we would allow him to determine the fiscal policy of this country that within two years he would force the Americans from their exclusive position and secure to the people of this country free trade. Well, Sir, we find out how this enforcement has gone on. We find that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been forced from their position. It has not been Congress which has been driven from its exclusive position by the Government of Canada, but it has been the Government of Canada that is driven from its exclusive position by the action of Congress. The British Minister told the hon. gentleman what the consequences would be if they persisted in the particular policy they had adopted, and which the First Minister declared the Government was prepared to stand by. But we find, Sir, that they have paid deference to the opinions expressed in Congress which they have refused to pay to the opinions of the people of this country. Sir, we congratulate the hon. gentlemen on the respect they have shown for the public opinion of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I understood the other day that I would be permitted to allude to this matter when the subject came up for discussion. The First Minister took the position that we were not compelled at all to add to our free list such articles as the United States might choose to pick out from the number that was mentioned in what is termed our statutory offer to the United States. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what articles they have placed upon the free list by this proposal, and whether it includes all the articles that are

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

mentioned in that clause of the statute which is generally spoken of as our statutory offer to the United States, or whether we have just placed on the free list such articles selected from among those as the United States have placed upon their free list?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to say in reply to the hon. gentleman that it was never proposed by us that we would place any of those articles upon the free list or reduce the duties imposed upon them by our law, except with similar action on the part of Congress. It was only as the duties on these articles were reduced or abolished, and satisfactory evidence that such changes had been made was given to the Governor in Council, that it was proposed that we should take corresponding action. I am very sorry to find that the hon. member for Bothwell does not seem disposed to adopt the course that I believe would commend itself to the great majority of the gentlemen on that side of the House, and that is, not to use language here, in dealing with this question, for a miserable, unworthy party object, calculated to prejudice the interests of the very people he proposes to serve. I say, Sir, if these gentlemen were sincere in desiring that Canadians should have the benefit of this reciprocal free interchange of commodities, they would not take the line the hon. member for Bothwell has taken just now. They would adopt the line I have taken, not in claiming credit to the Government or the party to which I belong, but declaring, as I do declare in my place in this House, that no person can read the past history of this country in relation to this question without finding that it has been the avowed policy of both the great parties in this country to obtain as far and as fast as they could, the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. In 1854 a treaty was made which met with the approval of both parties, and when it was abrogated both parties in this country united in every effort they could possibly use to prevent that abrogation going into effect. Subsequently, at the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party in this country, pressed on the Government of the United States, and induced the British high commissioners associated with him to press on the Government of the United States, the desirability of returning to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, under which the natural products of the two countries were freely interchanged. That proposition was rejected. Subsequently, the Hon. George Brown, representing hon. gentlemen opposite, who then held the Government of this country, went down to Washington and represented it as the desire of the Government of the day, and of the Liberal party in this country, that there should be a return to the principles of reciprocity established by the Treaty of 1854. That offer was refused by the Government of the United States. I say, therefore, that the credit does not belong to one party or the other, but it belongs to both the great parties in this country, of having steadily endeavored as far as possible, to obtain a free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. Subsequently, when Sir Leonard Tilley, my distinguished predecessor, brought down the policy of the Government in 1879, he placed on the Statute-book an Act which invited reciprocal action on the part of the United States, and took power for the Governor in Council to make free either any or all of the articles that were named. It was discretionary power, as has been stated, and discretionary for the reason that when you are dealing with the action of the Crown you must necessarily use a language that is discretionary. But it was, in my humble judgment, none the less an invitation to the Congress and Government of the United States to make these articles free, and a holding out of an expectation that this Government would take similar action in such an event. Now, this question is not quite so plain as it would appear to be, and I am very

sorry that in the discussion which took place here a few days ago the House did not rest on the statement made by the hon. First Minister, as I understand it to have been made, that this subject was engaging the attention of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, no, that is not the statement he made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say he would have been warranted in making that statement, for it was engaging the attention of the Government before a question was raised in this House. I may say that no member of this Government is so much to blame in this matter as I am, and I will explain to the House why. I confess I had overlooked the action that had been taken by Congress; it is fair and right that I should say so. My colleagues had a perfect right to expect that in a question of this kind, which appertained to my department, I would bring to their notice any required action to be taken. But there are difficulties in this matter which hon. gentlemen do not seem to appreciate. I will give an illustration. In this application from the Government of the United States, through Sir Lionel Sackville West, reference was made to the admission of seeds free of duty by the United States. Now, the clause in our Act does not pledge us to make free whatever seeds they choose to make free; it specifies "seeds of all kinds." The broadest interpretation you can give to that Act will not make it cover a partial action in regard to any one of the articles named. We say that when they make seeds of all kinds free, the Governor in Council has power to make them free here. But the United States Congress have not made seeds of all kinds free, and therefore, it would have been perfectly competent for us to say to them: "Until you make seeds of all kinds free, there is no moral obligation upon us to admit any of that class free." But we have not stood on that technicality, and it should be remembered that the nomenclature used by Congress differs in a wide degree from that used by us. We have included in the Order in Council all the seeds which have been made free by the tariff of the United States, and they will be free hereafter; so that we have not only complied with the Act of 1879, but have even gone further in the desire to remove the possibility of any ill-feeling or any prejudicial action to Canada being taken through any misrepresentation or prejudice that could be excited on this question. Then, barley is one of the articles with regard to which we have taken power, whenever the United States removes or reduces the duty, to take corresponding action. But a very nice question arose in regard to barley. True, the United States Congress reduced the duty from 15 cents to 10 cents per bushel, but at the same time they greatly increased the duty on malt, thus acting in the interests of the United States, not simply by the reduction of the duty, but by taking a line that was inimical to the interests of the people interested in barley on this side. I mention these matters to show that in this matter there is not quite as plain sailing as hon. gentlemen seem to think. But I may say that the moment the Mills' Bill was introduced into the Congress of the United States, long before the discussion arose in this House, I had the Deputy Minister and the staff of the office engaged in making a comprehensive statement in reference to this question, in order that I might bring it to the notice of my colleagues, as I was bound to do, because I found that by an oversight on my part, caused no doubt by the various duties imposed upon me, the action of the United States Congress had been lost sight of.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a pity you did not coach the Premier.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must know that the Premier had a right to expect that the Finance Minister would bring the subject under his notice. As I

say, I am sorry, desiring as we all do to place the relations between the United States and this country on the most friendly footing, desiring as we all do to have the freest interchange of natural products between the two countries, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not take the course that the rest of his friends on that side did, of not raising the question; and I think the course he took was unworthy of the hon. gentleman, in view of the great interests that are at stake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking in a qualified sense and not in any personal manner. I think it was unworthy of the high position which the hon. member for Bothwell occupies in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The insinuation is unworthy of you.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was unworthy of the hon. gentleman's position in this House and of his former position as a member of a former Administration, to adopt a tone or take a means calculated in any way to weaken the action the Government have taken. I will say, in answer to my hon. friend who asked me the question, that we have reciprocated with the United States in the articles they have dealt with, and I have in my hand a message which I sent to Sir Lionel Sackville West for communication to the Government of the United States, which I intend to read to the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish just to know what are the articles that will be placed on our free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall place on our free list every article to which our attention has been drawn by the Government of the United States as having been made free by them, and which is mentioned in our statute.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is the barley dealt with?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement made by the First Minister was quite correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You had better, perhaps, hear what I have to say before you take exception to it. The statement of the First Minister, which was quite correct, was that the subject was receiving the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; he did not say that at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He stated that the subject was receiving the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. He subsequently stated that, but that was not his first statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The right hon. the First Minister said:

"However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interest of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government."

Mr. MITCHELL. Read what he said before that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to go back to a discussion which I regret should have taken place, but I desire to say that what we have done was to make everything free that the Government of United States have called our attention to as having received the action of Congress, under that clause and our relation to that clause in the enactment, and we have stated that we are prepared to go further.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How did you deal with the barley?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That remains untouched for the reason I have given—that and straw, which is another article that has been made free by the United States. Barley has only been reduced in duty, and that reduction is accompanied by an increase in the duty on malt against the interests of the maltsters of Canada. An additional reason is this. A Bill is now before Congress of which I shall have occasion to say more hereafter. That Bill has been introduced there by the gentleman who virtually represents the Finance Minister here, the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who is the mouthpiece of the American Administration. He has introduced a Bill in which Canada is greatly interested, making a number of articles free which it is very important to us should be made free, and we think it better to defer taking additional action until we see the result of that measure. I may say that I believe, notwithstanding the action of the present opposition in the United States, that the measure dealing with the tariff will, in a modified form, at all events, become law; and if so I shall take the opportunity of inviting the attention of the House to measures which, I think, will be calculated to go further in the way of freeing the natural products of both countries and having a larger measure of reciprocity on both sides.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The speech of the hon. Minister of Finance will be received with no small satisfaction by the people, and to a large part of his remarks no exception can be taken, either as regards the tone or the matter. As regards, however, some of the references to my hon. friend from Mr. Mills (Bothwell), it is plain to every hon. gentleman that the hon. the Minister could not have been in his place on Wednesday last, when the conversation on this subject took place, or he would never have made the remarks he has regarding the discussion which was then had. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that it has been the avowed policy of both parties in this country to move in the direction of reciprocity regarding the natural products of each. Certain action had been taken by the United States with reference to the admission of certain natural products of this country into theirs, and the question arose, on the interpellation by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as to whether the policy of the Government, as laid down in our statute, would be carried out, or whether they had a secret policy which was opposed to that avowed one. The First Minister replied with a good deal of warmth, and stated that the matter was receiving the consent of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot discuss a matter which has been already the subject of debate.

Mr. DAVIES. The Finance Minister has just given us his view of that discussion. He has made statements as to what was said before, and only to the extent of answering those statements do I wish to refer to a previous debate. The First Minister said at that time that there had been no official communication in reference to the matter, and the question arose whether the Government of the Dominion, without reference to any communication from the United States, were prepared to carry out in good faith the terms of our statutory offer. A discussion arose to the meaning of the offer, and the First Minister declared it was merely a permissive clause which left the Government very full discretion as to whether they should act or not; and the point which the First Minister omitted to refer to entirely was the point on which my hon. friend for Bothwell made his remarks. The First Minister said that, in the exercise of that discretion, it would be in the highest degree impolitic on the part of the Government to reciprocate in those articles. That was the statement of the First Minister, and as evidence that it was not a mere haphazard statement, we have the fact that the Minister of Justice, who followed him, agreed in the con-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

struction put upon the statutory clause, laying stress on the word "may," and wound up by saying there was a large discretion left in the Government, and that if the Government would use that discretion in the way the hon. member for Northumberland said they should, they would use it to obstruct the interests of the people of Canada. We had then the declaration of the policy of the Government, expressed in clear, terse, and undisguised language, that we were not to carry out the statutory offer in the sense in which hon. gentlemen on this side understood its terms. It was argued on this side that you must not place the same strict narrow meaning on a great international offer of this kind as you would on a simple contract between man and man. It would have been in the highest degree advisable, and in the best interests of this country, as is proved by the statement the hon. the Minister of Finance has made to-day, had the Government at once declared their intention of abiding by the spirit of that offer. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that, in view of the change of front upon this very important matter, he desired to know what was the motive of that change, and what was the despatch that the Government had received from the Secretary of State. Let us hear the whole of it. There was not a word said by my hon. friend but what his duty called upon him to say as one of the leading men in this House. Therefore he was quite within his right in demanding what he did, the House having been put in possession of the very important fact that the Government have made a complete change in their policy, a change upon which we congratulate them thoroughly, a change which I think is in the interests of the country. I think that the motive which has induced them to make that change will induce them to go a little further, and I have some hope, in view of the change which they have already made, that they may withdraw the resolution which the Minister of Marine has moved, in which they have, as it were, nailed their colors to the mast, and declared for the National Policy every time and the National Policy only. I am still in hope that they will withdraw that in favor of the motion proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) for a broad, free and generous interchange of commodities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, for a broad, free and generous interchange not only of natural products but of other articles as well. It will not be contended now that it is treason or disloyalty to admit into this country some of the natural products of the United States, and the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, or some of his very clever supporters, will have to state to the people of this country exactly where they draw the line, and what are the articles in regard to which it becomes treason to admit them reciprocally, and when in regard to what it is not treason. My hon. friend the Finance Minister has eased the way for them a great deal, he has smoothed it down. He says it is the natural policy to remove all the barriers which exist.

Mr. MITCHELL. But he differs from the Premier.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He not only differs from the Premier, but he lays down a line of policy which the Premier declared to be in the highest degree improvident, and which the Minister of Justice said would amount to a betrayal of the interests of the people of Canada. We have heard that sort of language used for the last fortnight in this House, that our policy was a betrayal of the interests of the people of Canada, but that has all been taken back—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me finish my sentence—that has all been taken back so far as the natural

products of the country are concerned, and now those gentlemen will have to confine their argument to this, that free trade with the States means treason and disloyalty to the Crown in regard to manufactured articles, and to those alone. I have not lost entire confidence in the Government in this trade question. I believe that the Finance Minister in his heart and soul is with us on this point, and I believe he will yet reorganise the First Minister upon it, and will perhaps give him a little more light. I hope, before this Session breaks up, to hear the announcement made, in a frank, honorable and manly way, by the First Minister that he has misconceived the position and is prepared to accept, if not in whole, at least in a great part, the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It would be a great advantage for Canada, and I think that, if the Finance Minister proceeds in his educating policy a little further, he will succeed in achieving this end.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find that I have been able to lay my hand upon the despatch which I said I would submit to the House if I had it:

"April 3rd, 1888."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the date? Is it to-day?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, yesterday, April the 3rd.

"To the Hon. Sir LIONEL SACKVILLE WEST:

"Immediately on receipt of copy of your despatch to Lord Salisbury, enclosing memorandum from Department of State of the United States, calling attention to certain articles made free of duty by United States, an Order in Council was passed admitting all the articles mentioned, when imported into Canada, free of duty. Proclamation will issue next *Gazette*. Canadian Government awaits further legislation by Congress in same direction."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have got one progressive Minister on that side, anyway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am reminded of the very eloquent reference that my hon. friend from one of the North-West constituencies made on another occasion, when he referred to the perilous attention which certain hon. gentlemen paid him.

Mr. MITCHELL. You do not seem displeased with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may add that it will give me great pleasure to lay the despatch and the papers in connection with it on the Table of the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I hope the House will pardon me for a moment, while I refer to the subject under discussion. I listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion on this subject which took place last week. If hon. gentlemen desire to deal fairly with this discussion which has now been resumed, they will find in the first remarks of the First Minister, in answer to the hon. member for Northumberland, the very reply which, condensed, was made by the Finance Minister this afternoon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Allow me to continue. I have not interrupted hon. gentlemen on the other side, and the fact that they try to interrupt me shows that they do not want to hear what is coming. In answer to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on that occasion, the First Minister said:

"I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no applications have been made by the American Government upon the subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of."

Did the Minister of Finance this afternoon make any other explanation?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Wait—Did he make any other explanation than the expression of a sincere regret that hon. gentlemen should bring this forward at this time, or did he say anything inconsistent with what seems to be so objectionable to the hon. gentleman opposite in the remarks of the First Minister, which I now propose to read?

Mr. MITCHELL. Read the whole of them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will read the whole.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I tried to read them, but I was not allowed.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). After many interruptions from the other side of the House, the First Minister declared in effect that it would not be the policy of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I shall read afterwards. He stated that it would not be the policy of this Government or of any Government in this country to respond to the action of the United States who might select some one particular article which would perhaps be injurious to the manufactures of this country, and might ask us to reciprocate on that alone and to be bound by any such partial arrangement as that. I say that by no mode of reasoning which can be placed upon the clause in the Act of 1879 could the Government of this country be bound to place such a construction upon it which has been suggested, and, if the Government in this particular instance have responded to the advance made by the Government of the United States in regard to the natural products of this country, if they have responded to it fairly, generously, and liberally, perhaps more so than that section in the Act of 1879 would warrant, does it follow that we were wrong, or that the First Minister was wrong in his opinion the other day as to the interpretation of the Act? No candid or reasonable man, no man who has a pretension to the possession of fair, sound reason can say otherwise, and all the crowing of the Opposition to-day amounts to nothing, and the position of the Minister of Finance as he has expressed himself to-day is exactly consistent with the position taken by the First Minister the other day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but an effort has been made to place certain hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in a false position. When the discussion took place here a week ago to-day, the attention of the Government was called by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), to the fact that the United States Government had placed certain articles upon the free list; that the 6th clause of the Customs Act of 1879 provided that any or all the articles named in that list should be placed upon the free list, or the duties upon those articles reduced upon corresponding action being taken by the American Government; that the Government of Canada had failed to respond to the action of the United States Government; that that failure had elicited bad feelings in the United States, and that retaliation was threatened. The hon. gentleman pointed out that this was a matter of very grave importance, and he desired to enquire whether the Government proposed to be governed by the stipulations in that clause of the Customs Act, and he set forth his belief that we were bound by the conditions of that Act to place upon the free list any such articles as the United States Government had placed there. Now, Sir, the First Minister on that occasion distinctly denied that proposition; he distinctly asserted that that provision of the Customs Act was not mandatory but was permissive, and that it rested with the Government in Council to do or not to do this thing, as they pleased. I may read, if permitted to do so, the words in which the First Minister presented that opinion to the House;

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that the hon. gentleman has not read the clause, else he would not make that statement. It is permissive altogether, it is not obligatory. The language is explicit: 'Any or all of the following things,' &c.—reciting them—'may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided for by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council.' It is perfectly in the discretion of the Government. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he did not read the clause, or he would not have made that statement. It is perfectly permissive.

"Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will point it out, although this irregular discussion is really interrupting the business of this House. I say to this House that if the hon. gentleman will look over our free list and the United States free list, he will find that there is an infinitely greater number of articles allowed to come into Canada on the free list of the United States than are allowed on the American free list from Canada.

"Mr. MITCHELL. That has nothing to do with it.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An infinitely greater number. But I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we have got the interests of our own people to look after as well as the interest of the people of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, if time permits, and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list, while they refuse to take any of the others in which there could be anything like reciprocity or interchange between Canada and the United States; I say they take out some articles the manufacture of which they think they can crush in Canada, and keep up their tariff on all other articles, except one particular article, when they think that they have got the advantage. That is not the way which we, as a Canadian Government, think best to carry on the affairs of this country, and I have no doubt that the majority of this House, and the majority of the people of Canada, will think with us."

The Minister of Justice, in speaking to the question, said:

"Does the hon. gentleman mean to contend—because his argument goes that far—that this statutory offer—not only including the clause which has been brought to the notice of the House, because what is called the statutory offer embraces half-a-dozen other offers, and looks to the admission of free fish, coal and various other products into the United States—does the hon. gentleman mean to contend that it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Canada, even for that part of the statutory offer, to decline to allow the United States to say: 'You have made that offer; we will take portions of it, and enact those which please us, and which appear favorable to our people, and we will shut the door in the faces of your people in respect to all the other articles'? I can only say that, in my humble judgment, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, they would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada."

Well, now, Sir, the Crown has used its discretion in that way. The Crown has taken a different position to-day from what it did a week ago, and has placed upon the free list the whole of the articles which the First Minister distinctly informed us should not be placed upon the free list, one week ago to-day. I do not know that in discussing this question I am doing anything that would prejudice the interests of Canada. It was pointed out by the Opposition, a week ago to-day, that the interests of this country were being threatened by the failure on the part of the Government to comply with the stipulations made by them in the Act of 1879; it was said that if we were not to live up to the letter of that clause, it would be better to expunge it from the Statute-book. Now, it is possible that in this matter we have not taken a step that will redound very much to our advantage, but we have taken a wise step, in my opinion; and if we do not wish to take any more steps of that kind, if we do not wish to act upon the statutory offer, we had better repeal it with all possible haste. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that the country deserves well at the hands of the Opposition for having brought this matter to the attention of the Government, for having pressed this matter home, and in consequence of the action of the Opposition, a grave danger has been averted. I believe that if this matter had been allowed to drift along, the result would have been retaliation on the part of the United States, and retaliation of a character that would most seriously have injured the interests of this country. I hope that the utmost care will be taken in future to carry out any offers that we may make by statute or otherwise. We are dealing with a country that is naturally jealous, dealing with a country that, per-

Mr. CHARLTON.

haps, is not very scrupulous as to whether they give up the advantage, or whether they take it themselves. But that country certainly has a right to exact from this Government the fulfilment of its promises. It is an act of folly to put a promise upon the Statute-book without the intention of redeeming that promise.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is advocating reciprocity in a partial or a whole number of articles that may be offered to us by the United States, if we have upon our Statute-book a law which says we may do so-and-so? Is that what I understand?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Customs may understand me to say that if we place upon our Statute-book an offer such as that of 1879—

Mr. BOWELL. Partial or wholly?

Mr. CHARLTON—although that offer may be permissive, yet it is an offer calculated to mislead our neighbors if it is viewed as a permissive offer; and if they accept that offer as *bona fide* and mandatory, it is better, as I said before and as I say to-day, to carry out the provisions of that offer, than not to do so, and if we do not do so we had better repeal the clause. I do not dispute that the clause was permissive, yet I do say that in the position of matters it had better be treated as mandatory, or we had better abolish it if we do not intend to live up to it in respect to those articles which the Americans put upon the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. Then we will expect the hon. gentleman to support the Bill before the House brought forward by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), because that makes a special provision in matters of wrecking.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will discuss that question later on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry I was not in the House at the time the debate arose. I was engaged otherwise in public business, and therefore lost the advantage of hearing the statements which have been made. But I gather from what I have heard since I have come in, that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to make a little capital out of this question. The hon. gentleman who just sat down said that the country owes the Opposition credit for bringing this question up. Well, I am very willing they should have all the credit that can accrue to them in this matter; but it is very odd that it is only just now that they have thought of it. I think that on some of these articles, seeds and fruit, the duties were taken off in 1883, and yet, watchful as the Opposition are, they never thought of bringing it up until the hon. gentleman did so the other day. Well, I did not hear the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but I am satisfied that he has not stated anything inconsistent with what I state to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, he did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a rude interruption that, a very rude interruption, a very rude interruption.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, very.

Mr. HESSON. He don't know any better.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asks a question. I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no application has been made by the American Government upon this subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of. That is true. There was no application of any kind, and there had not been any. Not only that, but until the other day no application was made in behalf of any person that I ever heard of, who had paid duties on seeds, trees, or vines, that similar duties were not exacted on the other side of the line. But I went on, and I stated that the subject had been brought before the Government, though not officially, by some seedsmen, and I said:

"However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interests of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government, but there has been no official statement even from the Consul."

That is precisely the fact. There was an unofficial statement made to the Minister of Customs, and thereupon he was called upon to make a report showing exactly the articles included in the clause referred to made free by the American tariff and not made free by the Canadian tariff; and at the very time we were discussing this question my hon. friend was engaged in preparing that statement for Council, for the purpose of considering whether that statement would show the articles admitted free by the United States and dutiable in Canada were those respecting which we might properly exercise the discretion given us by the statute and admit them free. My hon. friend who has just spoken says he supposes the clause is permissive; the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said it was not permissive, but I do not think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will say that the statute is not permissive. I am quite satisfied, if he were a judge, and I hope to live to see him one,—he will make a very good judge and we will have a less formidable opponent in this House—I say if he were called upon to decide the question he would decide that the clause was permissive, and he could not decide any other way as a judge. But the matter was before the Council in the manner that I speak of; it was of sufficient importance to call for a special report from the Customs Department, for the purpose of seeing what articles—they are not very important any of them—were admitted free by the United States and were dutiable in Canada. It so happened that, the day after this discussion, a despatch of the State Department, to which allusion has been made in the debate, was received, calling attention in a very informal and unofficial manner to those articles, seeds and trees. That was the first occasion on which it had come before the Government. So far as regards my remark, which has been quoted, that:

"If time permits and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list."

I say that now, and I can give a hypothetical case to prove it. Take this instance, and it is one worthy of the attention of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Suppose the Americans should ask us to admit oranges free, because that would suit them, and they declined to admit potatoes, I think the hon. member for Queen's would say that was a very unfair bargain, that we ought not to allow American oranges to come in from the Southern States unless the United States allowed Canada to send blue-nose and other potatoes from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia duty free. That is a case I give just as an instance. I say that the statute is discretionary, that it was meant to be discretionary, and that the Government did no more than carry out the principle of the statute. When the matter was brought before our attention by the United States Government, the Government took it up at once, and I hope that in consequence of the active and energetic exertions made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the great zeal and anxiety shown by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, we shall have more agricultural products introduced on both sides, duty free, than has previously prevailed.

Mr. IVES. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) congratulated himself rather prematurely, I think, when he assumed to think that by the action of the Government in this matter the House and the country were about to accept the policy enunciated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It seems to me that although the people as a whole do now,

as they have always approved of the interchange of natural productions between the two countries, it does not follow that they are prepared to go the length of sacrificing our interests here, of dropping eighteen or twenty million dollars of revenue, of resorting to direct taxation, subsequently or gradually falling into the arms of the United States by way of annexation or otherwise. It strikes me there is a difference between admitting potatoes and oranges and a few other natural productions of the United States into Canada free of duty, and adopting a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, including, as it does, loss of revenue, direct taxation and annexation to the United States. The hon. gentleman said there were no cries of treason now. The cry of treason does not come in that way. We do not say it is treason to propose to trade with our neighbors; we say, it is treason to frame a policy which must wipe out Canada's nationality and which necessarily leads to annexation. I rose not to speak on the resolution before the House, but simply for the purpose of disclaiming so far as I am personally concerned, and I trust the Government and the House will also disclaim it, that the action of the Government in this matter has been in any way brought about or hastened by the legislation which it is said has been introduced into Congress. I do not think there could be anything more mischievous to Canada than to have the impression go abroad, especially among our neighbors, that all they have to do to bring us to book is to threaten us with the passage of legislation like that said to have been introduced into Congress. Why, only a Session or two ago they adopted the celebrated Retaliatory Bill. That measure was passed through Congress with an object similar to that with which the proposed Retaliatory Bill was now introduced. The retaliatory measure, fortunately, was not put into effect by the President of the United States—he had too much good sense; but we were not frightened by that Bill, although it was of very much more importance and would have proved more serious in its effects, than the Retaliatory Bill of the present Session. Our country, our Government and our people were not struck with alarm by the proposed putting into force of that Retaliatory Bill. I repeat that I make these remarks simply to disclaim for myself the idea that the Government have taken this action because of, or on account of that proposed measure, or that their action has been hastened by it. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has told us—and he ought to know—that our neighbors are unscrupulous. He has made that statement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think, Sir, it is advantageous to allow that expression to go to the House in the sense that the hon. gentleman has placed upon it,—that is, the statement which he alleges to have been made by me, "that the Americans were unscrupulous." What I said was that perhaps they were not exactly scrupulous in matters where their own interests are concerned. I think the bald statement that I said "they were unscrupulous" would not do justice to the sense in which I used the words.

Mr. IVES. I am quite prepared to accept the correction. I do not think it would be right to deprive the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) of the esteem and friendship of his friends on the other side, which he has earned during the present and past Sessions of this House. I think it would be a pity, indeed, if there would be a feeling of difference between him and his good friends, the gentlemen who represent the people of the United States in the Parliament of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman imputes motives to me and insinuates relations with regard to me that he is not warranted in doing. When I rose to make the remark which I did, it was clearly with the intention that nothing said in

this House should be of a character to prejudice the interests of this country. It was in that sense that I used the expression. The gentleman is entirely unwarranted in making such insinuations with regard to me or any other member of this House, and I call for the protection of the Speaker.

Mr. IVES. I made no insinuation of that kind and I wish to say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, chair.

Mr. IVES. I have a right to say what I meant and I claim that no point of order can be taken. I merely said the hon. gentleman was a friend of the United States and was a friend of the men who advanced the interests of the States. That is all I said. If the hon. gentleman wishes to repudiate that, I think it would be useless for him to withdraw the statement he made that they are unscrupulous.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman imputed a desire to me to stand well with them and that I did not wish to do anything that would effect my friendly or business relations with them. I repudiate having relations of the character and manner he refers to. The imputation is an unworthy one and I desire your ruling that it may not be permitted to go on the journals of the House without being retracted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. IVES. I have not given up the floor yet. A point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPEAKER. I really fail to notice in the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) anything that could be objectionable from a parliamentary point of view. I fail to see that any of those remarks went as far as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) thought they did. I see nothing unparliamentary in the language.

Mr. IVES. I have only to say one thing and that is this, that I am happy that the Government have taken this action. I think the section of the country from which I come will approve of that action. I believe they would be delighted to see the free list in natural products very largely increased, as largely increased, or even more so than is proposed in the Bill now before the Congress of the United States. In view of that measure now before Congress I think it would be extremely prejudicial to our interests if it were to go abroad in the United States that we have been driven into this action by a threat of retaliation from the United States. There are no doubt many people in the United States who are working upon that very idea and who are endeavoring to make the people of the United States as a body believe, that if they can only coerce us or "freeze us out" as they term it, they will accomplish the object they have in view, namely, the annexation of this country. Those men are found to be against Mr. Mills' Bill or any other measure for improved or enlarged trade relations between this country and the United States, and nothing could be more injurious to the prospect of the passage of the Mills Bill than for it to be supposed that our Government was forced into this action by the threat of a retaliatory Bill in Congress.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to protract the discussion with regard to this matter. I think that, with the members of the House who have spoken on this side, I should be permitted to congratulate the Government on the step forward they have taken. I would not have said anything with regard to the matter had it not been for the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who seems to have embodied in him a very great deal of loyalty. This seems to be the cry

Mr. CHARLTON.

that comes from that side of the House on every occasion. They declare that we are a disloyal people, and that this matter may result in annexation. I think it does not come well from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) to talk about any such question as that, and I would just read an extract which I happen to have in my desk. It is a special telegram from Sherbrooke, dated March 12th, and I will read it to show the way in which the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) professes his loyalty to the British Government, and to the institution which he professes to think so much about. This special was sent from Sherbrooke on the 12th of March. It is in reference to a matter in which the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is very much interested. He is not only interested in the welfare of Canada, but it appears he is interested in the welfare of the States, and particularly interested in the welfare of Texas, and I would just read the extract:

"Sherbrooke, March 12th.—(Special).—The bankrupt Dominion cattle enterprise was before the court here a few days ago. It appeared that Senator Cochrane, President, and Mr. W. B. Ives, M.P., Managing Director of the defunct company, undertook, some two years ago, without proper authority from the directors or shareholders, to give the Eastern Townships Bank a chattle mortgage upon the whole of the assets of the company to secure an overdue indebtedness to the bank. This deception upon the —"

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman what has this to do with the present debate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I want to show the loyalty of the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. IVES. I rise to a point of order. I would like the House to permit the hon. gentleman to continue if they will afterwards allow me a moment to answer. I am aware of that passage in the *Free Press*, but I could not take any notice of it there. If the hon. gentleman brings it before this House I shall take an opportunity to answer it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to refrain from reading that, because we have no debate on this question. It is clearly out of order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) desires to make an explanation it would be a good place for him to explain his position with regard to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the rules of the House to be broken even for the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have no desire to transgress the rules of the House at all—I supposed I was perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish just to say to those gentlemen who profess so much loyalty that when a search is made into their past history it will be discovered they are not quite so loyal as they profess to be. Dr. Johnson says: "That loyalty as professed by some is the last refuge of a scoundrel." I think, Mr. Speaker, that the loyalty manifested by some gentlemen on the other side of the House is somewhat of this species.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist on what he has said, but will withdraw it and apologise to the House for having said it. Characterising the loyalty of a large number of the members of this House in the way he has done, I think, is derogatory to the dignity of the House, and he ought to withdraw what he has said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I merely referred to what Dr. Johnson has said. The species may be very varied, but I did not say it was positively of that character at all.

Therefore, I do not think I have transgressed the rules of the House in any way whatever. I think it is very much out of place for those gentlemen to throw out the insinuations they have.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must submit to the ruling or else appeal. I decided that the words were unparliamentary and very ungentlemanly and he ought to withdraw them and apologise to the House. If he cannot do that I will have to take another proceeding.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How did I transgress?

Mr. SPEAKER. In what you have just said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Tell me the words I made use of that were unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. The words were that a certain number of members of this House—"that loyalty was the last refuge of scoundrels."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member said something to that effect and I understood it so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was not what I said in the precise words; but if you and the House understood that I did say so, I am quite willing to withdraw it.

Mr. IVES. I shall not occupy but a moment. Your decision, although I bow to it, is rather unfortunate to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. IVES. The House allowed him to proceed with the reading of that document, and I can only say there is no truth in it whatever; and if permitted by the House and you to refer to it, I would be very happy to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Apologise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is much use in pressing for that. If there is any lesson to be learned from this at all, it is the extreme and excessive folly of gentlemen who live in glass houses casting stones, and in particular the extreme and excessive folly of men whose record for loyalty will not bear investigation for one second, either in their own persons or in the persons of their colleagues, presuming, as many have done from the beginning to the end of the late debate, to cast imputations on the loyalty of better men than themselves. However, I do not propose to go into a discussion as to whether my hon. friend here or the hon. gentleman who spoke last is the more loyal or better citizen of Canada. They can settle that matter between themselves at their leisure, and I have no doubt my hon. friend has nothing to dread from the encounter. What I rose to call attention to is this: In the first place, Sir, I do not know whether you entirely comprehended, if I may be allowed to say so, not being as familiar as we are with the intricacies of the English language, the very dangerous attempt made by the First Minister to seduce from his allegiance to our side our estimable friend from Charlottetown, when he got up and intimated that a chief justiceship was at his disposal. I think you ought to call attention to the danger to the morals of our hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is on a par with the accusation that Nova Scotia was going to be bribed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir, the public records and the public accounts show that I had very excellent ground for anything I said in that respect. However, I want to call attention to the fact that the First Minister has been endeavoring to corrupt the morals of my hon. friend by telling him that the chief justiceship was waiting for him when he was ready to take it. But I am bound to say this, that I have known a very much higher

price to be paid for infinitely inferior men to my hon. friend; and knowing that, I cannot but feel that the matter ought to be more or less taken notice of. But I wish to call the attention of the First Minister and of his colleagues to the fact that the First Minister was not correct in saying that attention had not been frequently called from this side of the House to the action of the American Government in freeing certain articles. If my memory does not fail me, in the debate in which the present Postmaster General proposed certain changes in the duties on fruit, that point was taken, and taken strongly. He was told that he was likely to destroy a valuable trade which was growing up, and that it was expedient that we should act at once under this identical clause now under discussion, for the purpose of showing the Americans that we were disposed to meet them half way in order to obtain reciprocity in the articles named in that clause. The hon. First Minister will find on reference to the *Hansard* that he is not at all correct in supposing that we on this side of the House did not over and over again call attention to the fact that the American Government had placed on the free list certain articles referred to in the Act of 1879, and that it was eminently desirable that we should meet them in the same spirit.

Motion withdrawn.

THE WRIT FOR RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. Now that the First Minister is in his place, I would like to inquire if he can inform us whether the Order of the House for the issue of the writ for the election in Russell has at last been complied with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not. I was looking into the matter this morning and I had not time to consider who the returning officer ought to be.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated yesterday that it would be issued immediately. I will renew the question to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, in desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sure the House must have been pleased that an incident should have occurred which even for a few moments cast a gleam of hilarity over

those usually very gloomy countenances on the other side of the House; and I think we may be sure of one thing that whatever credit they may take to themselves from that circumstance, those representing the majority of the people of this country will never permit that any reciprocal advantage, no matter how great it may be, with reference to any class of commodities, will divert the people of this country from pursuing their own interests in the way best calculated to promote those interests and in the manner indicated by the National Policy. Now, Sir, this debate has already been so protracted that any hon. gentleman who undertakes to intervene in it can hardly expect to obtain the attention of hon. members unless he avoids as far as possible going over ground which has been already occupied, and avoid reading those extracts which swell the pages of *Hansard* without really affecting the issue of the debate. The contention of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I take to be this, that the agricultural interests of this country are in such a distressed condition that they require a remedy, and that this depression is largely due to the burdens laid upon them by the National Policy. To remedy this depression he proposes the remedy, the only one, he claims, that can be found, of widely extended commercial relations with the United States. I deny the premises, and I say that, even admitting the premises to be well founded, the remedy suggested is neither the only one nor the best one. When we come to examine the grounds upon which this alleged depression is based we are confronted with the remarkable fact that at the time of the last general elections, a little over twelve months ago, we heard nothing about this depression; we heard nothing of the farmers being in such a bad condition that it was necessary to resort to the heroic remedy—an ignoble remedy would be the more fit term—of subverting the policy which the people adopted in 1878, a policy in which they renewed their confidence in 1882, and which they finally sanctioned in 1887. When we come to examine the question, that remarkable fact stares us in the face, and we must draw the inference, either that the hon. gentlemen opposite were then ignorant that such a thing as depression existed and therefore did not think any remedy necessary, or that they did not dare to face the evil and propose a remedy. The first inference would be an insult to their intelligence, and the second would be an insult to their courage and statesmanship. The only other inference is that since the general election some terrible calamity has overtaken this country, which has brought about the state of depression that now exists. If we examine the history of the country, we will find that we have had causes for depression, but they are causes which are beyond Government control. We have had dry seasons and short crops. Our cattle have suffered from want of water, and many of our grains were light. But are we to blame the Administration for those evils? Is it the fault of the Government that there has been rust in the wheat and that we have had short crops? And is it contended that reciprocity with the United States would prevent the recurrence of these evils? I would venture to suggest another hypothesis for the course adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I feel rather loath to make it, because it is not very creditable to hon. gentlemen opposite for whose statesmanship and knowledge of the affairs of this country I have much respect. That hypothesis is this: At the last elections they had no policy, and they found it impossible to obtain the support of the majority of the people for want of a policy. Not having the wit, or ingenuity, or sense, to devise a policy for themselves, they took up one which they found out and dried, and which was devised by a renegade Canadian Englishman and a Yankee politician. Every political ground which they had taken formerly was worn threadbare, and they had nothing with which to cover their own political nakedness; so they adopted this garment

Mr. O'BRIEN.

of commercial union, and having put it on, they strutted about like jack-daws in borrowed shoes. But there is one hon. gentleman among them who is above wearing ready made clothing and second hand garments, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, by virtue of the magic letters which gives him the title he wears so gracefully, could not think of putting on a second hand garment, even that of Wiman, Smith and Butterworth. He needs must have a coat made to fit himself, so he took his garment, brought it to a tailor, had it made up anew, and called it unrestricted reciprocity. That is the best explanation that can be given of the course pursued by the hon. gentleman. When we come to consider again the grounds of the policy of the Opposition, we find the only tangible statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite is that the mortgages on the farm lands of this country have become so heavy that it is absolutely necessary some relief should be furnished. As a matter of fact, the farm lands of this country have always been mortgaged, and in the existing state of things must always be mortgaged, and I deny the proposition that the mortgages represent a debt. Except to a very limited extent do they represent the debt. They represent the capital invested. They represent the money invested in improving farm lands and promoting the agricultural interests of the country. Not one farmer in one hundred has capital of his own beyond that which he evolves out of the labor of his own hands, and it is good economy for him to borrow money for the purpose of making improvements. At any rate, he thought it was good economy, and the great majority of the people think it is; and I am justified in my contention that that money does not represent a debt, but represents capital invested for the purpose of improving and carrying on the agricultural interests of the country. Even if it were a debt, it is one to which we are no more subject to-day than we were in times past. How, I ask you, can the burden be more heavily felt to-day, when money is obtainable at 6 per cent. and $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., than it was years ago, when the farmer had to pay 10 to 12 per cent. So much for the depression among the farmers, which, I think, I have shown to exist largely in the imagination of hon. gentlemen opposite. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that that depression does exist, let us see what the remedy that is proposed amounts to. We are told the remedy lies in more widely extended commercial relations with the United States. With regard to the burdens said to be laid on the farmers by the operation of the National Policy, I say that ever since 1878, hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavoring to persuade the farmers that the duty levied on articles imported necessarily adds to the price of similar articles made in this country. The farmers, however, have refused to be deluded by that fallacy, as shown by the fact that they have elected as their representatives men who take the opposite view. I am not going to weary the House with figures, but I wish to point out, by reference to a few of our leading articles of production, how little our agricultural interests would be benefited by this new policy. My contention is, that the American market is not our only and best market, and it does seem to me an argument which no one in his senses would raise, unless driven to it by the necessity of advancing some kind of an argument, that the best market for an agricultural country is a country which produces a large surplus of similar products. If the hon. member for Bothwell were called on to advise the people where they should seek their best market, he would say go to that country which requires the things you have to sell. Do not go to a country which competes with you in the same market. Let us see what the actual state of things is, taking a few of the leading articles. I do not pretend to say that this is a full statement. It is only a partial statement, but it is sufficient to illustrate my view of the case, and I think it is

very suggestive. England is the best market for the following Canadian products, and to this extent:—

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Cattle..... | \$ 5,300,000 |
| Butter..... | 750,000 |
| Cheese..... | 7,000,000 |
| Bacon..... | 870,000 |
| Hams..... | 370,000 |
| Apples..... | 648,000 |
| Oats..... | 509,000 |
| Peas..... | 2,000,000 |
| Wheat..... | 4,278,000 |
| Flour..... | 1,580,000 |
| Oatmeal..... | 176,000 |
| Total..... | \$23,482,000 |

The United States is our best market for the following:—

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Horses..... | \$ 2,200,000 |
| Sheep..... | 900,000 |
| Eggs..... | 1,800,000 |
| Wool..... | 288,000 |
| Barley..... | 5,245,000 |
| Beans..... | 206,000 |
| Hay..... | 670,000 |
| Potatoes..... | 328,000 |
| Total..... | \$11,637,000 |

Therefore, England is our best market for leading agricultural products to the extent of nearly twenty-three millions and a-half, while the Americans give us the best market for only a little over eleven millions and a-half. Of course, there are many other articles on both sides, but I am taking those on which the difference is very apparent on one side. Of our cattle, for example, the value of nearly five millions and a half goes to England and less than one million to the United States. The result is this. If we had a market for barley, if the Americans did not require our barley, and did not buy it almost at any price we choose to ask for it, the case would stand this, that we would sell to England twenty-eight millions and a half, and to the States only six millions. Where is our best market in that case? Clearly where we sell the largest quantities of our products and, in regard to this article of barley and in regard to the article of horses and in regard to most of the agricultural products that we sell to the States, there is this remarkable fact that everything we sell to them is better than they have themselves. I have been told, on what I believe to be very good authority, that in the New York market the life of our horses for the sort of work for which our horses are purchased is very much greater than that of horses bred in a southern climate; and it is well known that our barley is superior to theirs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman consider that that statement would hold good if there was a free admission of all these articles in the United States as there is into England?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think it would make a great difference, and if it made a difference, it would not be to our advantage. For instance, why should we sell flour to the Americans in order that they may export it and make the profit out of it? Why should we sell them wheat in order that they may grind it, and export it, and make the profit out of it, which is now made by our own mills? If we must have commercial union with any country, it should be with the country which affords us our best market, and that is not the United States. If we must have free trade in manufactures, let us have it with the country which enters least into the competition with our own manufacturers. The manufactures which we buy from the United States are precisely the same as we make ourselves; or, rather, those that we would buy from the United States if the resolution of the hon. gentleman opposite were adopted. But what we buy from England are goods which our manufacturers do not produce. So, if we could have free

trade with England, it would interfere to a far less extent with our trade than for us to have free trade with a country that manufactured the same class of goods that we do. If, therefore, we are to have a system of commercial union adopted, let us have it with the country which gives us our best market, and in which we meet with the least competition as regards agricultural products and manufactures. There is another subject which has not been touched upon to any extent in this debate, and it is one of which I have some knowledge in a general way, although I do not pretend to have a particular knowledge of it, and that is as to the effect that reciprocity in lumber would have upon our trade in this country. We have always dealt with this question as though the lumbermen were the only people in this country who had an interest in this trade. I say the people of this country as a whole have a much larger interest in this trade than the lumbermen themselves, and I confess that I look with great suspicion upon any measure which is said to tend to stimulate the lumber trade. When I see our lumber going out of the country to the extent to which it is now being sent out of the country, when I remember that in the part of the country in which I live there was a time when lumber was plentiful and that now a hemlock board is the best a farmer can get, and that that is the same all over the Province of Ontario, it is no wonder that I should regard with suspicion any measure which stimulates the export of lumber. When once a pine tree is gone, it is gone forever, for all practical purposes. We are doing nothing to replace the trees which are cut down, we are doing nothing to fill the gaps in our forest, even where there are facilities for doing so. Besides, I take it for granted that, if the American import duty is taken off, our export duty up on sawlogs must go too. The effect of that is easily understood. In my own constituency, before that export duty was put on, I have seen the representatives of Michigan firms who had taken elaborate precautions to prepare to take our logs across the lakes, who had built their scows and bought our limits, and I think the other day in Toronto, at the last sale, some of our most valuable limits were bought by those men. Their policy is clear, and I think we might take a lesson from them. They know that their supply of timber is limited, that pine trees are increasing in value every year, and so they are saving their pine forests in Minnesota and Michigan and purchasing our limits. If that goes on, instead of our timber being cut up and manufactured in this country, it will be transported to the mills in Michigan, and this country will not only lose the timber but the profit which it has hitherto made on the manufacture. One or two words in regard to this unrestricted reciprocity. I do not charge hon. gentlemen opposite, in the view they hold on this question, with desiring to change the political relations of this country, and I think they have carefully framed this resolution so as to avoid that imputation, but I may point out to them that the practical difficulties in the way of carrying out such a scheme as that which they present to the House would necessarily lead either to its being extended all the way to commercial union or would lead to disputes which would result in its abrogation by one party or the other. Without pretending to know much about importations and about the transaction of business, it does appear to me that, supposing such a treaty were made and there was a difference, as there probably would be, between the import duties of the two countries, a year would not elapse before we would find complaints made from the country which had the higher import duties that the other country was bringing in English or French or German manufactures and passing them through by some trick by which they evaded the letter of the law and so got them into the other country. I may be wrong, but I think there is good ground for that expectation, and I think we

could never stand still on the resolution which is now before the House. I think that either the whole thing would be abrogated in consequence of disputes in regard to the customs, or it would be extended to such a degree as necessarily to bring about the subservience of this country in a fiscal point of view to the neighboring country, and what the result of that would be hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves. I think there is no possibility of avoiding the conclusion that it would bring about a change in our political relations which would be most disastrous to what I conceive the best interests of this country. I believe that there is no such depression as would justify a revolution in our fiscal policy, no such depression as would cause us to depart from what has been our policy ever since Confederation; for, mark you, if this view is correct, we have been under a mistake ever since Confederation, and we must abandon all hope of realising the dreams we have held of ever becoming a great nation. We must admit that we have been the greatest fools in expending millions of dollars in railways that are practically useless. I say to propose a remedy like this, an ignoble remedy, would be to ask the people of this country to do something which nothing but the direst necessity would drive them to. Having failed to establish that point, the whole case of the hon. gentleman falls on the ground, and he has no right to ask this House, or to ask this country to revolutionise our commercial arrangements and to adopt a policy which, in the opinion of the great majority of the people, whether rightly or wrongly, will lead to political changes which are abhorrent to them. Therefore this House would be justified, in view of our highest and best interests which are not to be measured by mere dollars and cents, in rejecting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and if we are to have reciprocity confining it simply to those natural products which do not interfere with the policy adopted by this country, and which has so largely contributed to its welfare and prosperity.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not my intention to take up a great deal of the time of the House in discussing the question before us. When the question was before the people last summer, and there was a great deal of agitation throughout the country in favor of commercial union, I paid a good deal of attention to it; but it always seemed a great objection to me that the proposition had never been put upon such a financial basis that I could understand it becoming a serious question before the country. I can understand a commercial union between this country and the United States, but so far as the proposition of the hon. gentleman opposite is embodied in his resolution, I confess I am unable to understand it. Commercial union, as it was proposed, is something similar to the Zollverein which existed among the different principalities of Germany. We were to have similar tariff regulations in this country and the United States, and we were promised that the customs duties between the two countries would be abolished. We were told how the revenue was to be divided, and a basis was to be agreed upon between the two countries, either a *per capita* one, or one according to the interests involved in the two countries. I could understand that proposition. The difficulty that always occurred to me was this: if we receive only a *per capita* allowance of the duties on goods which came into this country, how were the engagements of the country to be met? We import into this country at present nearly double the amount per head that they import into the United States, and the revenue which we receive barely suffices for the wants of the country. In any arrangement between this country and the United States in the form of commercial union, the basis would be a *per capita* one, we would receive only one-half the customs duties which we receive at present. Hon. gentlemen say that we are not going to have commercial union, we are

Mr. O'BRIEN.

going to have unrestricted reciprocity, with the rights of fixing our own tariff; but I shall endeavor to show, in the remarks that I am about to make, the absurdity of any such proposition as that. Unrestricted reciprocity with the rights of fixing our own tariff—what does that mean? It means that we shall have the fixing of the tariff on any goods which come from any other country than the United States, into our own, and an unrestricted interchange of commodities, either manufactured or otherwise, between this country and the United States. That is a proposition which never enters into the heads of any one in the United States. They never make a proposition of that kind; you never see anything like it proposed by any statesman in the United States; you hear nothing of that kind in the press of the United States. They always ask, as a condition attached to unrestricted reciprocity, a similarity of tariffs. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gets up and says: The proposition which we propose for you is not one of commercial union, we intend to reserve to ourselves the right of fixing the tariff. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to show you the absurdity of such a proposition as that. What does it mean? Suppose the United States, on some articles, have a tariff of 25 per cent.; suppose we have a similar tariff to theirs on iron, which ranges from \$4 up to \$22 per ton. Suppose they leave to the people of Canada the right of fixing the tariff on articles coming into this country in any manner which they like. What is the object of unrestricted reciprocity? Is it not for the purpose of compelling us to interchange commodities, manufactured or otherwise, with the United States? I can show you how, if we are left to the fixing of our own tariff, we would not be at all obliged to take a single article of manufactured goods from the United States unless they can manufacture them cheaper than we could import them from any other part of the world. The simple reason is this: Iron, as we all know, is at a high price in the United States. That price is fixed by the import duty of from \$4 to \$22 per ton. Supposing we were left the right of fixing our own tariff, and we wanted to use, say, 100,000 tons, or 50,000 tons, of steel rails in this country; would we go to the United States and pay \$10 or \$12 a ton more for them if we had the right of fixing our own tariff? Would we not fix the tariff at such a rate that we could get these rails into the country \$5 or \$7 or \$8 cheaper than we could from the United States? I know the answer hon. gentlemen will make to a proposition of that kind. Their answer is that the liabilities of our country are such as would compel us to raise as large a revenue as possible on all articles coming into the country, and that fact would oblige us to prevent any such transaction as that occurring. But, no, Mr. Speaker, if we import these goods from the United States, we would have to pay no duty, and there would be nothing accruing to the revenue in that case. If we put on \$4 or \$5 a ton, or 10 per cent. duty, there would be a larger amount coming into the revenue of this country, and we would be getting the articles cheaper. You would think that no sane person, no politician or statesman in the United States, would make any such a bargain as that with us. They do not propose it, Mr. Speaker. The proposition is the simple and bald one, on their side, of unrestricted reciprocity in natural products and manufactures, with similar tariffs. What would be the result in this country if we had a similar tariff with that of the United States? What would be the amount we would receive from duties on goods coming into the country? As I said before, the Canadians import into this country double the amount *per capita* of what the Americans import. Supposing there was a pooling system between the two countries, Canada would only receive one-half in the shape of import duties of the amount it does at present. How are we to pay our liabilities in a case of that kind?

to Canada not in our interest

Mr. COOK. Reduce the expenses.

Mr. HAGGART. There are some fixed liabilities we are obliged to pay. We have to pay the annual subsidies to Provinces, the cost of legislation, interest on the Dominion indebtedness, expenses for the purpose of keeping the Indians from starving in the North-West, the cost of the constabulary there—all these sums we must pay some way or other, and it devolves upon hon. gentlemen opposite on submitting a proposition before the House, the adoption of which would completely change the fiscal arrangements of the country, to show some financial basis upon which the proposition can be supported. Not a single hon. gentleman who has addressed the House during this debate has attempted to solve the problem, except the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he made his statement on the supposition that the imports into this country would pay as much duty to the treasury with commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity between this country and the United States as they do at present. I can understand the benefit of commercial union between peoples similar to one another, peoples of similar ideas, of similar lineage, without different feelings and sentiments, peoples the same as the German people, having a fiscal arrangement by which there was commercial union and by which the customs duties between the two countries were abolished; but I cannot understand the proposition for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States which the hon. gentleman has introduced. I cannot understand it, because it means, if it means anything, commercial union *plus* the custom houses between the two countries. It has no other basis or foundation. What arguments do hon. gentlemen opposite advance in support of their proposal which involves an entire change in our fiscal policy? They speak of the benefit which would accrue to this country from the free exchange under unrestricted reciprocity of agricultural products, of fish and the products of the mine and other products. Their first effort is to show a depression in our agricultural industry. I deny that our agricultural interests are depressed. I make the statement, and I make it supported by the opinions of the best statisticians, that the agricultural population in Canada are in as good a position as any other agricultural population on the face of the globe. The amount of money invested in agricultural lands in this country is greater *per capita* than in the United States, the yield is within a percentage of being as great. The reason why it is greater in the United States is because the returns of California are included. We have larger receipts and returns for our agricultural population than any of the New England States; our return is greater than any of the Middle States. A farmer in any portion of Canada is better off than a farmer in New York or any of the Middle States. We are now, according to the opinion of statisticians who have made the subject a special study, in the same position as the Western States, and the only reason of the percentage of return being greater in the whole United States is because of the enormous return of California *per capita*. I am convinced that if we had the statistics down to the present day, giving the returns of our North-West, with its enormous crop this year, and the returns of British Columbia, the return *per capita* for the farming population of this country would be greater than in the United States, and the farming population *per man* is better off in this country than in any portion of the United States except California.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do our farmers leave in such numbers?

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard a great deal about farmers leaving this country. It has been natural, since 1820, for the surplus population of the country to leave here. The whole number of people, being Canadian born subjects, who

have left here from 1820 up to 1888 and gone to the United States, has been about 1,000,000. The present number in the United States according to last census, the only return we have, is 713,000. When I heard the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) the other day talking about the large number of people that were annually leaving Prince Edward Island, that it was almost depleted, that the country was naturally going over to the United States, I turned up the census of the United States out of curiosity to find out how many had left Prince Edward Island and gone there, and I find that of people born in the Island there were at present living in the United States, according to the last census, 7,313. That was the total number of people who had left Prince Edward Island and gone there. Hon. gentlemen may think I am wrong in my statistics, but I will take the American Almanac and show there is no mistake about them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that they do not distinguish between British North America and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HAGGART. They do; they distinguish in every particular. Nationalities of the foreign born population, from the official return of the tenth census, 1880, Canada 610,000, New Brunswick, 41,788, Newfoundland, 4789, Nova Scotia 51,150, Prince Edward Island, 7,537.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that; I also know, what I intimated, that they are not very particular about distinguishing between the small Provinces.

Mr. HAGGART. The only official statistics we have are those of the United States census, and I have quoted from that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What year?

Mr. HAGGART. Last census, 1880, and compiled in 1881. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of telling us of the immense advantage that would result from the interchange of agricultural commodities and minerals between the two countries. It is true there has been an immense traffic developed in the Lake Superior district and in Michigan from extracting ore from the mines there; but hon. gentlemen opposite always reject or refuse to state, or at least they do not tell us the reason. There would not be, I venture to say, a single ton of iron ore extracted out of United States mines or manufactured there if it were not for the protective duty which exists, ranging from \$4 to \$22. Are they going to offer to the people of this country markets so highly protected without receiving some corresponding advantage? Hon. gentlemen tell the House of the paltry 30,000 tons of iron ore exported from this country to the United States. The United States or rather the people of the United States tax the industries and the agricultural portion of the country in order that they may manufacture for themselves. They have ores in the country, but is it not a notorious fact that you can take better ore than is to be found anywhere in the United States from Bilbao in Spain and deliver it in the United States for a less price than it can be taken from the Michigan mines to Philadelphia? If it were not for the protective duties they have at present in the United States there would not be a single ton of United States ore smelted and worked there, because free trade England and Spain and those other countries could send them the products of their mines and undersell them in their own country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in Northern Alabama and in other portions of the United States iron is produced for less cost than in any other place in the world?

Mr. HAGGART. I am quite aware of it. I have the authority here for my statement, and the statistician on the subject says that there would not be a ton of ore manu-

factured in the United States if you could export iron ore into the country free of duty, and that the ore of a better quality from Bilbao could be delivered cheaper in Philadelphia than it could be extracted from the different mines of the United States and delivered there. What would be the use of the railroads in the United States, and where would their increased prosperity be if England should at one time or another alter her fiscal policy in reference to foreign nations? What is it that builds up Chicago and Milwaukee and those railroads which centre there? Is it not the carriage of the surplus cereal products of that country for the purpose of delivering them in England? What is it that gives a benefit to the agricultural population of our North-West and the Western States of America? It is the high market in England; it is the carriage of the surplus products of this country towards the Atlantic coast for export to that great country beyond the Atlantic which consumes so much of our produce. We have had a great deal of talk in this country about the glorious United States. Sir, we belong to an empire greater and more glorious. We belong to a people and we belong to a country which consists of 352,000,000 of inhabitants. We belong to an island which has increased in wealth during the last decade at the rate of £400,000 sterling a day. The wealth of that country has increased at that rate. The people of that country emigrate to every portion of the world, but you do not hear the cry that the country is becoming poor, nor do you hear her people running down their own country. If we are going to unite to any country let us have closer bonds with the country which can benefit us. What would be the use of all that great farming country in the Western States unless they had England as a market for their surplus products? And are we going to cut our connection with the best market in the world for the purpose of forming some absurd political policy proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite and which not one of them has attempted to put before us upon a financial basis. As I showed in my opening remarks not a single one of the gentlemen opposite except indeed the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has attempted to put their proposition on a financial basis. Are they going to ask the people of the country to support any such policy as this, or are they going to ask the people of this House to support it, without giving us the financial aspect? The pre-requisite, to advancing any proposition of that kind which will alter the fiscal arrangements of this country, is to show how it can be done. Has any one of them attempted to do that? Not a single one, but the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have endeavored to show how absurd his proposition is; I have endeavored to show that the amount paid in import duties by the inhabitants of this country is as two to one compared with the amount paid by the people of the United States, and that the requirements of this country need nearly the whole revenue. We may reduce our requirements to some extent, but even the hon. gentleman could not explain his case in any other way than by saying that the balance of what we require should be raised by direct taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I thought perhaps that I was listening to him the other evening, and I listened to him in order to hear how he proposed to raise the custom duty and excise, and how we should get the balance, which even, according to his own calculation, was required after that. I may have misunderstood him, but I think he said it was to be raised by direct taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will explain.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly. I do not wish to make any statement as to what any gentleman may have said, unless it is correct.

Mr. CHARLTON. I proceeded to point out in what way I deemed the necessary revenue could be raised. I asserted distinctly it would not be necessary to resort to direct taxation. I then said: "even admitting for the sake of argument" that which I would not admit, that it were necessary to resort to direct taxation, and I proceeded to show that in that eventuality the country would be a large gainer. I did not say that it would be necessary to resort to direct taxation, and I did not believe it.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it was from some remarks like those I drew the conclusion which I did. I was paying attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks, because he was the only one who endeavored to supply the information which the country and the House required from gentlemen opposite. When they demand a complete change of the system of government of the country they should show in some manner or other how they intended to carry out their project financially. I say they have never done this, and as I said before, it is required by the country that they should do so. The hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), described the glowing condition of the country which would follow from this change, and I trust I may be pardoned if I show how it would be entirely different from the glowing condition he represented. What would be the effect of this policy on this country? Would not the manufactories, or the majority of the manufactories, of this country be closed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is true. I admit the proposition that a Canadian is just as intelligent and as good as an American, and as good a man as any to be found in the United States, but, unfortunately on account of the smallness of the market the whole capital of the manufacturer in this country has been forced into the supplying of four or five articles while in the United States his energies are centered in the manufacture of one article. Any manufacturer in this country will tell you or any one who has inquired into the matter will tell you that the result of this policy now proposed would be almost a complete destruction of the capital at present invested if there were open competition between Canada and the United States. They are the judges of what would be best for themselves, and I venture to say that 99 out of 100 manufacturers in this country will tell you that it would be complete ruin to them if such an arrangement was made as they propose. And another thing. What would become of the commerce of this country? The hon. gentlemen themselves say: "Oh, we naturally go south, we naturally go to the United States for anything we can buy and importers going from New York or Boston to the old country buy wholesale and buy larger quantities than are required for the limited markets of Montreal and Quebec, and as a consequence they may be able to sell cheaper. His facilities for navigating between the ports of the old country and this on account of the immense export and import trade being nearly equal both ways, and as a natural result the people of this country would go to the markets, where perhaps they can buy a little cheaper, where perhaps they would have a larger stock to select from, and Montreal and Toronto and Halifax and St. John, instead of supplying the retail trade of the Dominion as at present, would become ports in which there would be hardly any commerce done whatever." Under this system we would have the whole trade and commerce of this country transferred to a foreign country. What benefit would that be to the agricultural portion of this country? No benefit at all except the interchange of two or three commodities, in the sale of horses,

the sale of chickens and the sale of barley over there. The great agricultural products of this country are sent to Great Britain where they have a market, and what benefit would it be to have a free interchange only for those articles? It would be of course to some extent a benefit to the country, and that, I suppose is the policy of this Government and of all parties in this country—to get as unrestricted a trade between this country and the United States as possible, having regard to our fiscal position and our manufacturing interests. It is in the interest of the people of Canada to have such an interchange as that. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us how much better off people on the other side are than people here. On the contrary, the people of this country *per capita* are nearly as wealthy as the people on the other side. Our commerce is nearly double *per capita* what the commerce of the United States is. Our shipping is greater by nearly two to one *per capita* than that of the United States, in everything that constitutes a nation, man for man, we are equal if not the superior of the people of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why cannot we hold our own, then?

Mr. HAGGART. We can hold our own. Now, what would be the result of such a proposition as that of hon. gentleman opposite, even supposing it had a financial or fiscal basis? It is not a proposition in the form of a treaty that would be continuous, say for thirty or forty years. It proposes to leave to each nation the framing of its own tariff. The time might come when there would be a change in the Government of the United States or a change in the Government of this country; a different set of people would come in who might change the tariff regulations altogether; and if our manufactures were wiped out and the present commerce transferred from Montreal, Quebec and all our other seaport towns to the United States, then how could we expect to revive trade if the arrangement came to an end? It would be impossible. The country would be put back, and it would take ten or fifteen years to restore it to its former position; and even then capitalists would lose confidence in the country, for they would say that although the Government and Parliament of this country had promised a certain policy to the manufacturers of this country, they had revoked that policy at the instance of the Opposition without providing for compensation. The consequence would be that promises of any kind from any party would not induce capital to re-engage in manufacturing. A more absurd proposition I never heard propounded in my lifetime by any great party in the country. The primary condition of such a proposition should be to put it on such a financial basis that it can be clearly understood by the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never endeavored to do so. The hon. member for Queen's described the wonderful wealth that would accrue to this country in a few years under the carrying out of this policy. He described the flag as drooping over his head, but the breeze of public opinion he said would soon come and open its folds. The breeze of public opinion will never blow in this country in favor of such a policy. It is to the interest of the people of this country to have an Opposition which will propound a policy that will be acceptable to the country. It is to the interest of the people of this country that there should be an independent spirit, perhaps not in the House, but in the country, to change the current of opinion from one party to another; but the party that propounds such a policy as this, mark my words, will never get into power.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

27-1888-3

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of Debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

ST. JOHN'S AND IBERVILLE HYDRAULIC COMPANY BILL.

Mr. BAIN (Soulanges), for Mr. VANASSE, moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to grant certain powers to the St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.

Mr. BECHARD. There is a strong opposition on the part of numerous people, who will be seriously affected by it, to this Bill. I would ask that the second reading be delayed so that I may have time to communicate with those people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The last time the Bill was up for a second reading, I asked that it be allowed to stand over, in order that the hon. gentleman and his friends might have an opportunity of presenting one or two petitions against it, which I knew were coming on. These have been presented, and I understand others are coming. This Bill will be before the committee for eight days, so that there will be plenty of time for the presentation of petitions, and I would advise the hon. gentleman not to object to the second reading, but to reserve his opposition until the Bill goes into committee.

Bill read the second time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed debate on proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, on amendment of Mr. Foster, and amendment to amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax).

Mr. HAGGART. I was about concluding my remarks before dinner, and those which I shall now make will be very short. I wish briefly to refer to some of the remarks I made before recess, and to which I defy contradiction from hon. gentlemen opposite. I stated that unrestricted reciprocity means parting with our right to fix our own tariff; I stated that it means parting with all our rights in respect of our fiscal policy. I stated that unrestricted reciprocity, as rightly understood between reasonable men and between countries, means that the tariff of each country should be the same. I referred to statements made by gentlemen who advocate that scheme in the United States, and I showed that, without exception, they require similar tariffs in the two countries. I may refer to an address to the American people, which was issued by Mr. Blaine, son of the gentleman who was supposed to be a candidate, in the Republican interest, for the presidency of the United States. He is supposed to mouth the opinions of the Republican party in the United States, and he said that there were only two ways of dealing with the Canadian people, either retaliation or unrestricted reciprocity with similar tariffs. I have shown that if unrestricted reciprocity means anything it means an agreement between the two countries to have a common tariff, and I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to prove the contrary. I stated that if we desired that our manufactured products should be admitted free into the United States,

and have the benefit of their highly protective tariff, we would have to prevent goods manufactured in other countries from coming into this at a nominal rate of duty and thus competing with United States manufactures in our markets. I showed the absurdity of an agreement such as that proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, by pointing out that if on the American side there was a tariff on foreign goods of 30 to 50 per cent, and we had a similar one here, and if the power was given to us to legislate in any manner we liked in regard to our own tariff, we might legislate to admit foreign goods which are manufactured cheaper than American goods, into this country at lower rates, and thus nullify the whole agreement. The United States will never agree to a proposition such as these gentlemen propose. A proposition to receive the support of this country and of the people of the United States, must be a reasonable one. We must, if we expect to enter into an agreement of this kind with the United States, be prepared to assimilate our tariff to theirs. That argument is incontrovertible. I have never heard it attempted to be answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. Another reason, which is advanced to the people of Canada, especially Ontario, for the purpose of inducing them of entering this commercial union,—for commercial union it is, notwithstanding the denial of the hon. member for South Oxford—is that between Ontario and the sea, our country is occupied by an alien population, a population of French origin, a population alien to us in religion, in tradition, and in sentiment, and we are asked how is it possible to build up a nationality with such a population between us and the sea. Well, we, the representatives of the Conservative party, have accepted the position. We entered into a union with our fellow countrymen of French descent, and we entered into that union, not with our mouths but with our hearts. We believe they are as great a nation and as great a people as we ourselves are, and we are willing to accept the responsibility of building up a nationality on the north shore of the St. Lawrence with them. We are told that through the influence of their priesthood, through the influence of early marriages and other causes they are increasing in population to such an extent that the time will come when they will rule this country. That time may come, and if through the teaching of morality and from other causes, they will succeed in building up a nation on the north side of the St. Lawrence, we are perfectly willing that they should do so. Those remarks were intended solely for the population of Ontario, with a view to induce us to enter into the scheme of commercial union. What does it mean? It means not only intimate relations with the people on the other side of the border commercially, but it means a union in every respect, it means that we are to cease this nationality which we are endeavoring to build up in connection with the British Empire on this side of the St. Lawrence. As for me and the party to which I belong, we are in favor of that union, we are in favor of building up an empire on the north side of the St. Lawrence in accordance with the sentiments of the British Empire. We believe that, if the day ever comes that we should separate from the Empire, we will have a nationality of our own on the north side of the St. Lawrence. We live in a climate which begets men, and we will at some time have an influence over the continent of America as great as that of any other empire that ever was on the face of the globe. That is the ambition of our people, and it is a laudable ambition. What is that empire that we are in accord with? Has it not done everything it possibly can for the advancement of this country? Has it not loaned us money, and protected us in every respect? Has it not opened to us its markets and done everything it possibly could do for a colony, which we are? I think it is to the interest of this part of the Empire that we should be in accord with

Mr. HAGGART.

the Empire? It is the greatest Empire on the face of the globe. It is the greatest Empire that ever was known. We have free intercommunication not only with the colonies of the British Empire but with the British Empire itself. We are part of an empire which, as I said before, contains 352,000,000 people under the dominion of the British Crown, and it is to our interest to have closer communication with that empire than we possibly can have with the people to the south of us. While we are willing to have as great an interchange of commodities and of manufactures with that people as we can, consistently with our position, still, as I said before, we are man for man equal to the people to the south of us. We have as great intelligence, as great industry, and we have, perhaps, as fine a climate—at least we have a climate that begets as good men as they have—and it is to our interest to build up our own nationality. I urge upon hon. gentlemen opposite to adopt a financial and a fiscal basis which is sensible, which people can understand, and until they do that, the proposition which they now put forward should be voted down. It has no basis. It is merely a statement of individuals. It is a sentiment without any basis which any reasonable person can be asked to support. It is my opinion that the position we occupy is one which we properly ought to occupy, in communication with the great Empire with which we are connected; and, if the time should come when we will be separated from that Empire, it is my opinion that it would be to our advantage to remain a separate nationality, which it would be impossible for us to do if the doctrines which are preached on the other side were carried out. I have shown that, if our manufactures and our commerce and everything that constitutes a nation are wiped out, we will be left at the mercy of the people to the south of us, and it is our duty to ourselves, to our children, and to our children's children, to build up a nationality on this side of the St. Lawrence in accord with the Empire; and I believe that these sentiments will be echoed by every elector throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

M. AMYOT: M. l'Orateur, je viens d'entendre de jolies paroles, dites avec beaucoup d'éloquence, au sujet du grand Empire britannique. Certes, pour ma part, je suis heureux d'appartenir pour le moment à ce grand empire. J'aurai occasion, dans le cours des remarques que je vais faire, de revenir sur cette question, mais l'honorable député qui m'a précédé (M. Haggart) aurait pu nous dire en passant si ce grand empire n'est pas attaqué au cœur même, si au centre même de ce grand empire, il n'y a pas des millions et des millions de personnes qui pleurent et qui souffrent la persécution malgré la gloire du drapeau britannique. Il aurait pu nous dire, avant de nous vanter ces trois cent cinquante millions d'âmes, pourquoi cette grande puissance ne réussit pas à protéger, même à ne pas persécuter ceux qui sont près d'elle, cette pauvre Irlande. Il veut nous annexer à ce territoire. Nous verrons tantôt le grand amour qu'a pour nous cette grande métropole qu'il appelle, lui, la mère-patrie. Nous verrons son brûlant amour pour ceux même qui forment partie de l'Empire britannique.

Je n'ai pas l'intention d'employer l'excuse ordinaire, et de dire qu'à cette phase de la discussion je ne devrais pas parler. Au contraire. La question a été présentée avec beaucoup d'habileté à deux points de vue par les libres-échangistes et par les protectionnistes. Mais il est une partie importante du pays qui n'a pas encore été entendue. Je regrette qu'une bouche plus éloquente que la mienne ne soit pas chargée de combler cette lacune. Il y a dans le pays des gens qui croient que la protection est nécessaire. Il y en a d'autres qui croient que le libre-échange est nécessaire, et il y en a d'autres qui croient que les circonstances doivent tout décider.

En 1878, les États-Unis avaient élevé une barrière contre nous. Nous ne pouvions pas envoyer chez eux nos effets

de culture ni nos effets de manufacture. Quand nous voulions pénétrer là, nous heurtions une barrière qui ne s'ouvrait pas; mais eux envoyaient chez nous tous les effets qu'ils voulaient, ils inondaient nos marchés des produits de leurs récoltes et des produits de leurs manufactures. Ce n'était pas juste, et l'on aura beau, de ce côté-ci de la Chambre, dire que c'était juste, moi, je dis que ce n'était pas juste. Je dis que cela appauvissait le pays et que tant que les Etats-Unis mettront une barrière contre nos produits, nous devons les empêcher de communiquer chez nous, nous devons nous protéger contre eux. Mais, M. l'Orateur, je dis aussi que quand les Etats-Unis seront prêts à nous ouvrir leur marché, quand ils seront prêts à nous dire : voici 60,000,000 d'âmes, venez commercer avec nous, ce jour-là, nous devons nous aussi ouvrir nos portes et dire : très-bien, nous sommes prêts, marchons ensemble sous le drapeau de l'Amérique.

Quelques honorables DÉPUTÉS. Oh ! oh !

M. AMYOT. J'entends dire Oh ! oh ! Le mot drapeau de l'Amérique les surprend. Ce sont des gens, je présume, qui auraient empêché les Etats-Unis d'obtenir leur indépendance et qui poussent la loyauté jusqu'à croire qu'il faut nécessairement, pendant des siècles et des siècles, faire l'affaire d'un autre pays pour être loyaux. Nous verrons tantôt ce que l'Angleterre a fait pour nous, jusqu'où doit s'étendre cette loyauté et le sens du mot drapeau de l'Amérique. Il ne faut pas craindre d'appeler les choses par leur nom.

En 1878 donc, suivant moi, la protection était nécessaire. Les Etats-Unis se protégeant contre nous, nous fermant leur marché, et le nôtre leur étant ouvert, leur excédant de récoltes et d'objets manufacturés s'en venaient dans nos villes et dans nos campagnes et faisaient mourir d'inanition nos propres manufactures. Nos cultivateurs n'avaient pas la chance de vendre leurs denrées puisque les cultivateurs américains pouvaient venir leur faire la lutte sur leur propre marché. Il fallait la protection contre cet état de chose, et tant que les Etats-Unis continueront leur politique de protection contre nous il nous faudra continuer la nôtre contre eux.

Mais que se passe-t-il aujourd'hui, M. l'Orateur ? Aujourd'hui, nous voyons un mouvement en faveur de la réciprocité. Depuis longtemps la question de l'union commerciale s'agitait. Depuis plusieurs mois des hommes de talent, un canadien dont nous devons être fiers, M. Erastus Wiman, a soulevé le mouvement de l'union commerciale. Naturellement, l'écho de ses discussions et de ces discours transmis par la presse s'est répandu jusqu'en Angleterre. Or, qu'a dit M. Chamberlain lorsqu'il a été envoyé par le gouvernement anglais aux Etats-Unis ? Je vais lire ce qu'il a dit en parlant au nom du peuple anglais et qui est rapporté dans une résolution unanime de la Chambre de Commerce de New-York le 3 de novembre dernier :

"Whereas the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the representative of the Government of Great Britain on the Fishery Commission, in a speech delivered before he left England, is reported to have said as follows: 'The arrangement between the Colonies and Great Britain, is essentially a temporary one. It cannot remain as it is. * * * Already you have in Canada—the greatest of all the Colonies—an agitation for what is called commercial union with the United States. Commercial union with the United States means free trade between America and the Dominion and a protective tariff against the mother country. If Canada desires that, Canada can have it;' and,

"Whereas, on a subsequent occasion, the right hon. gentleman further said, that 'Commercial union with the United States meant that Canada was to give preference to every article of manufacture from the United States over the manufactures of Great Britain. If the people of Canada desired an arrangement of that kind, he did not doubt that they would be able to secure it, and he did not think anybody in England would prevent such arrangement by force; but he remarked that in that case all the advantages of the slender tie that bound Canada to England would disappear, so far as England was concerned; and it was not likely that the people of Great Britain would continue much longer to sustain the obligations and responsibilities of a relationship, all the reciprocal benefits of which had been withdrawn;' and,

"Whereas, The foregoing expression of opinion by an eminent public man, in a high official position, is an important contribution to the knowledge of the members of this Chamber and as it is supplemented with information from Canada that a strong movement is in progress there favoring the closest possible commercial relations with the United States, it would seem to be the duty of this Chamber, without any regard whatever to political or territorial considerations, to investigate the possibility of a greatly enlarged extension of the commerce of this city and country with the northern half of this continent, and;

"Whereas, It is most desirable that the Canadian Fishery question, which for over 100 years has periodically threatened to disturb the peaceful relations existing between Great Britain and this country, should be settled on the broad and enduring basis of a mutual interest, resulting from an enlarged commercial relation between Canada and the United States; therefore, be it Resolved..."

Ces paroles de M. Chamberlain, prononcées en Angleterre, n'ont pas été désavouées encore que je sache, et pourtant il était l'envoyé de l'Angleterre.

D'un autre côté, aux Etats-Unis, nous voyons un grand mouvement; les chambres de commerce se réunissent partout; la presse discute, les orateurs encombrant les hustings, chacun d'un bout à l'autre des Etats-Unis, affirme désirer faire un commerce libre avec nous. Notre pays lui-même consulté a répondu dans de nombreuses assemblées publiques qu'il était prêt à commercer avec les Etats-Unis. Devons-nous accepter cette réciprocité ? Qu'est-ce qui nous a été dit en 1878, pour nous faire accepter la protection qui alors, suivant moi, était nécessaire ? Quelle était la motion de l'honorable premier lorsqu'il proposait d'adopter la protection ? Il terminait sa motion en disant :

Que cette politique gardera au Canada des milliers de nos compatriotes maintenant obligés de s'expatrier pour trouver du travail que le pays leur refuse, rendra la prospérité à nos industries qui luttent et souffrent si péniblement, empêchera le Canada d'être un marché à sacrifice, encouragera, développera et activera notre commerce interprovincial, et tendant à la réciprocité de tarif avec nos voisins dans la mesure requise par les intérêts variés du Canada, aura grandement pour effet de procurer éventuellement à ce pays une réciprocité commerciale.

Pourquoi cela était-il mis dans la motion, M. l'Orateur ? Nous avons fait les élections là-dessus. Nous disions aux électeurs : nous voulons la protection pour arriver à ce que vous désirez tant, vous, peuple du Canada, pour arriver à la réciprocité commerciale avec les Etats-Unis. On peut donc parler de réciprocité sans être rebelle, sans être traître à son pays, et sans être utopiste ni en politique ni en commerce.

M. l'Orateur, dès 1869, cela était déjà prévu. Je trouve dans un discours de sir Francis Hincks sur le budget, le 7 avril 1870, les paroles suivantes :

L'honorable préopinant a attiré l'attention de cette Chambre sur les mots "politique nationale." Eh bien ! mon opinion est que nous devrions jouir de la faculté de faire tout ce qui est bon et utile à nos intérêts; or, qu'on ne l'oublie pas, si plusieurs de ces articles ont été jusqu'ici maintenus sur la liste des exemptions, c'est uniquement en conséquence des négociations entamées à plusieurs reprises avec les Etats-Unis au sujet du renouvellement du traité de réciprocité.

A ce sujet, je ne saurais mieux faire que de citer ici l'opinion exprimée par mon prédécesseur dans le cours de l'exposé financier qu'il faisait à cette Chambre l'an dernier. S'adressant aux Américains, il leur disait : "Nous vous avons permis d'importer ici votre charbon en franchise, bien que vous imposiez un droit élevé sur le nôtre. Nous permettons l'importation en franchise de vos farines, de vos céréales, votre houblon, votre sel et autres articles, tandis que non-seulement vous ne voulez pas nous rendre le réciproque, mais qu'encore vous nuisez à nos propriétaires de moulins en imposant un droit plus élevé sur les farines que sur les grains. Cet état de chose," pourrions-nous fort bien ajouter, "existe depuis trois ou quatre ans, mais vous devez comprendre qu'il ne peut se perpétuer. Le temps viendra peut-être bientôt où nous devons avoir une politique nationale qui nous soit propre, que cette politique nationale pêche ou non contre une théorie ou une autre de l'économie politique. Car nous devons être guidés principalement, sinon exclusivement, par la considération de ce qui peut nous convenir à nous-mêmes, et nous pourrions avoir à consulter notre propre intérêt sans égard à celui des autres."

L'honorable premier ministre lui-même, dans un discours qu'il prononçait à Montréal le 7 juillet 1877, disait :—

Vous allez enterrer cette fausse politique, et vous allez adopter la politique du parti qui déclare qu'il conservera le Canada pour les Canadiens et qu'il aura une politique nationale. Vous adopterez la politique du parti qui veut que le Canada ne baise plus les pieds du frère Jonathan, qui exigera la réciprocité du commerce ou la réciprocité des impôts. Si les Américains veulent s'entourer d'une muraille de Chine, nous aiderons à l'érection de cette muraille. S'ils ne veulent pas

que nous allions chez eux, nous ne leur permettrons pas de venir chez nous. Nous ne souffrirons pas que le Canada devienne un marché pour le surplus des produits américains; nous ne permettrons pas que ce pays soit asservi aux manufacturiers et aux capitalistes de la république voisine.

Il y a eu, à la Chambre de Commerce de Montréal, en 1875, une assemblée à laquelle n'étaient pas étrangers certaines personnes qui sont maintenant en cette Chambre, et où la résolution suivante fut adoptée. Le rapport se lit comme suit :

" Acting upon the invitation from the St. John Board of Trade, formally accepted at Ottawa, your council, early in the summer, commenced preparations for the special session, which they decided should be held in St. John on the 16th day of July. At that meeting there were forty-eight delegates present, representing 20 different cities and towns,—while the following gentlemen attended from the National Board of Trade of the United States:—

Portland: T. O. Hersey, Esq., Chairman.
Cincinnati: W. W. Taylor, Esq.
New-York: John Austin Stevens, jr., Esq.
Boston: B. F. Nourse, Esq.
Milwaukee: W. E. Smith, Esq.
Detroit: R. Hawley, Esq.
Buffalo: E. P. Dorr, Esq.

A full report of this important gathering was published soon after adjournment, and extensively circulated, so that any statement of the business done there, seems needless in the present report.

That the draft reciprocity treaty formed the principal subject of discussion, is generally known,—and the following resolution was adopted as the result:—

1st. That this Board reiterates its frequently expressed opinion in favour of a Treaty of Reciprocity between the United States and Canada."

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, comme nous venons de le voir, dans ce temps-là nous prenions la protection à défaut de libre-échange complet. Nous concevions que si les Etats-Unis continuaient plus longtemps à inonder nos marchés et nos campagnes de leurs produits, notre population ne pouvait pas prospérer. Mais aujourd'hui, comme je viens de le démontrer, les Etats-Unis désirent faire le commerce avec nous. Devons-nous le leur refuser? La question qui se pose maintenant est celle-ci: Y a-t-il pour nous des avantages réels dans un traité de réciprocité? Nous avons d'abord pour nous guider l'opinion générale des auteurs sur la théorie du libre-échange. Je ne citerai que Adam Smith qui dit entr'autres choses :

To prohibit a great people from making all that they can of every part of their own produce, or from employing their stock and industry in the way that they judge most advantageous to themselves, is a manifest violation of the most sacred rights of mankind.

Nous avons en second lieu l'expérience du passé. Y a-t-il un seul homme, de bonne foi, qui dira que sous le traité de réciprocité de 1854 le Canada n'a pas marché à pas de géant dans le progrès et la prospérité? On peut faire dire aux chiffres tout ce qu'on veut, mais on alignera tous les chiffres que l'on voudra, qu'on ne réussira pas à prouver le contraire de la vérité. J'ai entendu cet après-midi un honorable député de la droite dire à la Chambre, que notre commerce avec les Etats-Unis était de \$5,000,000. Et bien! en regardant aux livres bleus, on verra qu'il s'élève au contraire à une somme variant entre \$36,000,000 à \$40,000,000 par année. Tels sont les faits. Quand même nous passerions des mois et des mois devant les électeurs à leur citer des chiffres, en seraient-ils plus avancés, et plus renseignés? Assurément non. Mais parlons-leur du traité de réciprocité et demandons-leur s'il a été profitable, et tous nous répondront dans l'affirmative. Tous nous diront que pendant sa durée les terres ont commencé à prendre de la valeur, et que leurs produits se vendaient mieux. Il est vrai que dans ce temps-là nos manufactures n'étaient pas encore bien considérables, et que nous ne pouvions pas lutter avec les manufactures américaines; mais quant à l'agriculture, quant aux cultivateurs, la période du traité de réciprocité a été éminemment favorable.

La position est bien simple: un traité de cette nature ouvrirait un marché immense, d'abord à nos produits agricoles, en deuxième lieu aux produits de nos mines, et en

M. AMYOT.

troisième lieu aux produits des forêts. C'est-à-dire que les céréales, les mines et les bois recevraient de suite un puissant développement au moyen de la réciprocité.

Une autre raison propre à nous engager à conclure ce traité, est notre situation spéciale sur ce continent. Nous sommes, par la Providence même, destinés à faire affaires avec ceux qui sont nos voisins. Nous n'avons qu'un pas à faire pour traverser cette ligne imaginaire qui nous sépare des Etats Unis.

Il nous faut des marchés, la force des choses l'exige. Il est vrai que la protection a fait surgir chez nous un grand nombre d'industries; mais qu'est-il arrivé? Au bout de cinq ou six ans de production, le marché local est devenu encombré des produits de ces manufactures, et il en est résulté de grandes faillites. Il en est résulté aussi de ces grandes coalitions commerciales appelées *combines*, dont l'objet et le résultat ont été de faire hausser, au détriment du consommateur, les prix des objets manufacturés. Et je ne crains pas de dire que les seules manufactures qui ont résisté, sont celles qui avaient des débouchés à l'étranger. Entr'autres, la fabrication des cuirs et des chaussures est prospère; mais pourquoi l'est-elle? Parce qu'elle a trouvé un marché aux Etats-Unis et ailleurs.

Nous cherchons partout des marchés, en Espagne, dans les Antilles, etc.; nous frappons à toutes les portes, et nous demandons qu'on veuille bien nous recevoir—excepté en France. Il paraît qu'il ne faut pas frapper là. Mais on nous dit: les manufactures vont être détruites. M. l'Orateur, il y a bien des manières de répondre à cela. J'ai entendu un honorable député de cette Chambre, qui passe généralement, et avec raison, pour un philosophe,—et un philosophe chrétien,—nous dire qu'il voulait bien protéger l'agriculture, mais pas au détriment des manufactures. Je me permettrai de lui demander ce qui fait le bonheur d'un peuple? Est-ce le manufacturier,—dont souvent l'éducation n'est pas tout à fait ce qu'elle devrait être,—ou bien le cultivateur, le vrai chef de famille? Et ceux qui passent pour philosophes et moralistes oseraient-ils venir dire devant le peuple, que les cultivateurs qui sont la véritable force du pays ne doivent pas être protégés, si cela doit être au détriment des manufacturiers?

La force et la vitalité du peuple français dont on parlait tantôt, ne sont pas dues à ceux qui vont s'étioier dans les villes, à ceux qui vont perdre leur morale et leur caractère dans les manufactures des villes, mais elles sont dues au peuple des campagnes qui a conservé cette virilité, cette force, ce caractère moral qui en font aujourd'hui un objet d'admiration dans le continent de l'Amérique du Nord. On en dira ce que l'on voudra ici et on en pensera ce que l'on voudra, mais parlant pour la province de Québec, et mon discours est destiné à la province, je ne crains pas de dire que si le peuple français a conservé de la vitalité, cela n'est pas dû aux employés des manufactures, mais c'est dû aux braves cultivateurs, aux braves colons; aussi ce sont ceux-là qu'il faut protéger d'abord.

On veut prétendre que les manufactures seraient ruinées si nous adoptions la réciprocité. Je ne le pense pas. Un grand nombre, dans tous les cas, ne le seraient pas. Je pourrais citer l'industrie du coton, des lainages, les manufactures de cigares, de cuir, de chaussures, de papier, de pianos, d'orgues, d'instruments aratoires, de meubles, de fromage, les moulins à farine, les raffineries de sucre, de caoutchouc, la confection des hardes, et d'un grand nombre d'autres articles qui sont aujourd'hui assez puissantes pour résister à la compétition des Etats-Unis.

Mais, M. l'Orateur, on nous dit: les manufactures canadiennes vont être ruinées, et vous allez voir cinq millions d'Américains venir ici s'emparer du pays. M. l'Orateur, cinq millions d'Américains, je les aime tout autant que les Métonites. Je les aime tout autant que ces races abruties que l'on nous amène quelquefois de l'autre côté de l'Atlantique. Qu'il en vienne cinq, dix, quinze millions même des

Etats-Unis ; qu'ils viennent prendre nos terres et nos manufactures et s'associer avec nous dans le travail de la prospérité, j'en serai fort aise ; cela donnera un marché pour les produits de notre agriculture et de nos manufactures. Je ne demande pas mieux que de voir venir vers nous ce peuple intelligent, ce peuple de génie qui prospère si rapidement qu'il en fait l'étonnement du monde entier. Il y a parmi nous de petites manufactures, ou même de grandes manufactures qui ne peuvent vivre qu'en donnant de petits salaires et qu'au moyen de "combines" et en pressurant pour ainsi dire l'acheteur, il vaut autant qu'elles disparaissent. Je voudrais qu'il s'établisse ici des manufactures de tout genre, correspondant aux besoins des localités, qui prospéreraient tout en faisant la richesse des diverses localités.

Du reste, les manufactures, c'est un peu comme l'eau de la rivière ; cela suit son cours. Quand il y en a besoin quelque part, il s'en établit. Quand nous serons en communication avec les Etats-Unis, nous serons sûrs d'avoir des capitalistes qui viendront aider le talent et le génie de nos jeunes gens pour établir des manufactures, les asseoir sur des bases solides, et répandre ça et là la richesse dans nos campagnes. Nous avons la matière première ; nous avons les pouvoirs d'eau ; nous avons tout ce qu'il faut pour cela. J'ai entendu avec plaisir les honorables députés des deux côtés de la Chambre dire fréquemment que l'homme pour l'homme nous ne craignons pas les Etats-Unis. Eh bien ! si vous ne craignez pas les Etats-Unis l'homme pour l'homme, ouvrez donc vos portes. Si l'homme pour l'homme nous sommes capables de lutter avec les Etats-Unis, laissez donc venir à nous leur argent. Vous avez la matière première, les pouvoirs d'eau, et l'énergie de vos enfants. Alors appelez en compétition les citoyens des Etats-Unis pour assurer le progrès et le succès de chacun.

On nous dit, M. l'Orateur, que le libre-échange, c'est bon quand un pays est devenu riche, énormément riche. A-t-on bien songé qu'il ne s'agit pas de libre-échange ici ? Les Etats-Unis ne sont pas libre-échangistes. Il s'agit de nous associer aux Etats-Unis pour nous protéger contre le reste du monde. Il s'agit de nous associer à soixante millions d'âmes et avec eux de nous protéger par un tarif commun contre les pays contre lesquels nous aurons intérêt à nous protéger. Le vrai principe qu'il y a à suivre dans cette circonstance, c'est le principe ordinaire, c'est de produire et de vendre à profit autant que possible et d'acheter à aussi bas prix que possible.

Il y a encore bien d'autres avantages qui peuvent être retirés d'un traité de réciprocité. Nous éviterions les querelles de douane, qui, à un moment donné peuvent prendre de grandes proportions. Nous éviterions le danger que nos chemins de fer soient boycottés et que le trafic leur soit refusé aux Etats-Unis. Où en serait le Grand Tronc si aujourd'hui les Etats-Unis disaient : vous ne passerez plus chez nous ; vous ne transporterez plus d'effets chez nous. Où en serait même le Pacifique ? Où en seraient nos autres voies ferrées ? Nous éviterions aussi de voir arrêter notre commerce de transit. Les Etats-Unis peuvent à un moment donné nous dire : vous ne passerez plus vos effets chez nous en transit, à moins de payer des droits de douane énormes. En outre, nos compagnies d'assurance pourraient probablement faire des affaires considérables aux Etats-Unis. Pourquoi plusieurs d'entre elles ont-elles succombé en entraînant dans leur chute la ruine d'un grand nombre de familles ? Pourquoi ? C'est parce que leur champ d'opération n'était pas assez large ? Eh bien ! ouvrons-leur le champ des Etats-Unis ; offrons-leur le commerce avec soixante millions d'âmes, et alors nous leur donnerons un champ immense où ils auront l'avantage de faire fructifier leur argent.

Nous donnerons encore une impulsion à notre commerce maritime. Si à un moment donné nous ne pouvons plus avoir accès au commerce maritime des Etats-Unis pour la simple gloriole de leur refuser le commerce maritime chez

nous, nous pouvons calculer les millions qui seraient perdus. Mais on est toujours à dire que le Canada est riche, qu'il est grand, qu'il est puissant ? Où est-elle donc cette richesse ? Parcourez un peu nos campagnes ; allez dans nos paroisses nouvelles, qu'est-ce que vous voyez ? Un nombre immense de maisons sur lesquelles il y a un écriteau : partis pour les Etats-Unis. Pourquoi vont-ils aux Etats-Unis ? C'est pour travailler pendant deux ou trois ans ou plus, pour gagner de l'argent, payer les terres et d'autres dettes et revenir vivre sur la terre que l'on a été obligé de laisser. On laisse le pays parce que la culture n'y paie pas ; et la culture n'y paie pas parce qu'il n'y a pas de débouché, parce qu'il n'y a pas de marché pour le cultivateur. Cette prospérité, elle peut être bien belle pour une centaine de manufacturiers qui se combinent ensemble pour exploiter le public ; elle peut être bien belle pour des magnats de chemins de fer, pour des entrepreneurs du gouvernement, mais je dis que pour le peuple elle n'existe pas ; pour le peuple qui travaille, pour le peuple qui se lève avec l'aurore, et qui se couche après le soleil et qui travaille toute la journée, cette prospérité n'existe pas.

Plusieurs honorables DÉPUTÉS : Oh ! oh !

M. AMYOT : Peut-être que ces messieurs n'aiment pas que l'on parle le français dans cette Chambre. Si c'est cela, on ferait aussi bien de le dire.

M. GAUDET : Au contraire, on aime ça.

M. AMYOT : If those gentlemen do not wish to hear one speak French, let them say so, and let them not be sneering at people who speak so. Let them remember that there is a province called the province of Quebec, where we speak French, and they have to pass through that province to communicate with England. We want to be respected here as we respect others. We have the patience to sit here months and months listening to English speeches and we do it with deference and pleasure and we expect others to do the same to us.

La première objection que l'on fait à la réciprocité c'est que les revenus diminueront et qu'il faudra recourir à la taxe directe. M. l'Orateur, je nie cela. Les revenus diminueront un peu sans doute pendant la première année, peut-être durant la deuxième, mais si j'en crois l'honorable député de Muskoka (M. O'Brien), nous n'avons pas grand chose à perdre. Il nous a dit cette après-midi que nous ne commerçons pas du tout avec les Etats-Unis ; que cela ne vaut pas la peine de s'en occuper. Cependant d'autres viennent nous dire : vous allez réduire les revenus ; on a commencé par dire de sept millions, et on a monté à quinze millions et peut-être que si la discussion durait encore quinze jours, on arriverait à 40 ou 50 millions, c'est-à-dire que nous perdrons le double de ce que sont nos revenus actuels.

Eh bien ! nos revenus diminueront un peu, mais ne conçoit-on pas que lorsque l'on entre en relation avec un peuple qui est à se demander par quel moyen il peut dépenser ses revenus, qui ne voit pas de remède à son progrès matériel, que nos achats avec les autres pays, que nos moyens de ressources augmenteraient, qu'ils décuplèrent et centuplèrent bientôt, et que nous pourrions commencer à diminuer un peu cette dette effrayante que nous avons contractée depuis quelques années dans un but que j'indiquerai tout à l'heure. Nous pourrions aussi diminuer les dépenses. Ainsi par exemple, en subventionnant à la veille des élections, quarante ou cinquante chemins de fer de moins ; en achetant quarante ou cinquante comtés de moins. Disons que l'on se déciderait pour une fois à aller devant le peuple les mains vides, simplement avec des arguments, et la vérité des faits ; on sauverait ainsi des dépenses considérables. Ah ! il y a bien des manières de diminuer les dépenses, et si les honorables messieurs qui siègent sur les banquettes ministérielles ne savent pas comment y arriver ils n'ont qu'à s'adresser à

la gauche et à lui donner leur place, et je suis certain qu'elle trouvera bien moyen de résoudre cette objection. Les dépenses pourraient être diminuées encore pour les douanes qui existent entre les deux pays. Naturellement, il pourrait exister une ligne de prévention contre les fraudes; cette ligne devra être maintenue.

Mais il y a un moyen dont l'efficacité ne peut être niée : c'est de limiter nos dépenses à nos revenus. Nous tâcherons de mettre à profit l'expérience de la vie ordinaire sur ce point. Puis avec le peuple des Etats-Unis, avec de bons associés nous ferons de bonnes affaires et augmenterons suffisamment nos revenus pour satisfaire à nos besoins. Ainsi bientôt cette objection disparaîtrait. La deuxième objection qui est faite est bien plus sérieuse, et ce formule à peu près en ces termes : nous serions injustes envers l'Angleterre. J'ai entendu l'honorable député de Muskoka, (M. O'Brien), nous représenter l'Angleterre comme une bonne mère et nous du Canada, comme des petits-enfants bercés et dorlotés sur les genoux de la bonne maman. Eh bien ! nous allons voir ce qu'elle a fait pour nous, cette bonne maman. Je vais maintenant, M. l'Orateur, pour vous édifier et édifier le pays là-dessus, avoir le plaisir de citer un peu longuement, il est vrai, — mais enfin il faut que ces choses-là soient connues, — une brochure, dont la reproduction, j'en suis sûr, fera plaisir au cœur de l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat (M. Chapleau), puisqu'elle vient d'un homme qui mérite toute son estime ; d'un homme qui a longtemps guidé le parti conservateur dans les élections ; d'un homme dont la plume est aussi abondante que le cœur est généreux.

Je suis certain que l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat reverra avec plaisir ces belles pages ; qu'il sera heureux de voir que les écrits de son ami de cœur, auront été cités devant cette Chambre. Cet ami porte le nom de Arthur Dansereau ; et la brochure qui a pour titre : "Protection et libre-échange," a été publiée en 1879. C'est avec cette brochure qu'on allait devant les électeurs à cette époque, et c'est avec cette brochure que nous y retournerons.

Je dis donc que l'honorable député de Muskoka fait un reproche au traité de réciprocité d'être injuste envers l'Angleterre, "cette bonne maman." Or, voyons ce que disait M. Dansereau, au nom du parti conservateur, et j'attire spécialement là-dessus l'attention de mes amis de la province de Québec qui ont comme moi des aspirations vers le véritable bien être de leur pays : —

Nous irons plus loin, puisque nous sommes en frais d'explications. Nous ferons à l'Angleterre le respectueux reproche de ne pas s'occuper de nous dans ses relations diplomatiques. Elle nous sacrifie constamment en tout et partout. Est-ce qu'elle songe à nous dans ses traités de commerce par exemple ? Si l'Angleterre avait été plus généreuse sous ce rapport, si elle nous avait favorisés comme elle a tâché de se favoriser elle-même dans ses relations commerciales avec le monde entier, peut-être ne serait-il pas question aujourd'hui de tarif protecteur en Canada

Je pourrais ajouter : peut-être ne serait-il pas question de réciprocité en Canada.

C'est quand nous avons vu les marchés de tous les pays se fermer même aux produits naturels du Canada que nous nous sommes demandés ce qu'il nous restait à faire. Autrefois, l'agriculture, la forêt et les industries qui en découlent nous suffisaient. Nous n'aurions peut-être jamais eu l'idée d'aller au delà, si l'on nous avait donné la chance d'en vivre. Mais l'Angleterre n'ayant pensé qu'à elle, le Canada a fini par se trouver à la porte de tous les pays, n'ayant plus rien à leur vendre, mais devant tout acheter d'eux. La pauvreté, l'épuisement nous a amenés à la conclusion la plus simple : prendre notre cause en mains, et travailler d'abord pour nous.

De plus, M. l'Orateur, avec la bienveillante permission de la Chambre, je communiquerai une liste des articles qui sont donnés par M. Dansereau, sur lesquels il donne les droits payés par les nations européennes, sur le marché français, et les droits différentiels contre le Canada :

Les marchandises canadiennes sont soumises à la frontière de chacun des Etats du continent européen à des droits différentiels contre le Canada qui équivalent à la prohibition directe pour une bonne partie de nos produits et à ce qui ne vaut pas mieux que la prohibition pour plusieurs autres articles. Ainsi, tandis que les producteurs de l'Allemagne,

M. AMYOT,

de l'Italie, de l'Espagne, du Portugal, de la Suisse, de l'Autriche, de la Suède, de la Norvège, de la Hollande, de la Belgique, de la France et de l'Angleterre peuvent échanger leurs marchandises à des conditions raisonnables, le Canada est virtuellement mis dans l'impossibilité de vendre ses produits dans ces divers pays et ne peut avoir accès à un marché qui alimente 200,000,000 de consommateurs, grâce à un tarif différentiel qui équivaut à la protection.

En prenant pour exemple le tarif français qui se répète dans tous les pays de l'Europe, nous trouvons que les produits du Canada sont prohibés comme suit :

| Articles. | Droits payés par les nations européennes. | Droits différentiels contre le Canada. | Plus par cent. |
|--|---|--|----------------|
| | \$ | \$ | |
| Navires en bois ou en fer, par tonneau..... | 0 40 | 8 00 | 1,900 |
| Fromage, par tonneau..... | 8 00 | 36 00 | 350 |
| Poisson, homard, par tonneau..... | 8 00 | 60 00 | 200 |
| Savon..... | 12 00 | Prohibé | |
| Empois..... | 3 00 | 50 00 | 1,500 |
| Alcool, par hectolitre..... | 30 00 | 69 00 | 100 |
| Coton tissé, par cent..... | 0 15 | Prohibé | |
| Vêtements en coton, par cent..... | 0 15 | Prohibé | |
| Tapis, par cent..... | 0 10 | 60c.p.lb. | |
| Couvertures, par cent..... | 0 10 | 24c. | |
| Sellerie, par cent..... | 0 10 | Prohibé | |
| Gants en cuir, par cent..... | 0 50 | Prohibé | |
| Corces de chanvre, par tonneau..... | 30 00 | 60 00 | 100 |
| Engins à vapeur, par tonneau..... | 12 00 | 80 00 | 550 |
| Instruments d'agriculture, par tonne..... | 12 00 | 36 00 | 200 |
| Machines, par tonne..... | 20 00 | 192 00 | 900 |
| Machines à coudre, par tonne..... | 20 00 | 192 00 | 900 |
| Faulx, par tonne..... | 40 00 | 228 00 | 620 |
| Fanilles, par tonne..... | 40 00 | 192 00 | 450 |
| Scies rondes, par tonne..... | 40 00 | 280 00 | 550 |
| Coutellerie, par cent..... | 0 15 | Prohibé | |
| Articles en fonte, par tonne..... | 10 00 | do | |
| Couchettes et chaises en fer, par tonne..... | 10 00 | do | |
| Gloves forgés, par tonne..... | 16 00 | do | |
| Serrures, pentures, par tonne..... | 24 00 | do | |
| Effets de construction, par tonne..... | 24 00 | do | |
| Vis en bois, par tonne..... | 16 00 | do | |
| Ustensiles en fer pour cuisine, par tonne..... | 28 00 | do | |
| Ustensiles en cuivre, par tonne..... | 40 00 | 280 00 | 600 |
| Carrosses, par cent..... | 0 10 | Prohibé | |
| Chapeaux et fleurs..... | En franch. | 14 p.c. | |
| Articles en bois, par cent..... | 0 10 | 18 | 80 |
| Meubles, par cent..... | 0 10 | 18 | 80 |
| Habillements confectionnés, par cent..... | 0 10 | 36 | 260 |
| Chaussures par cent..... | 0 10 | Prohibé | |
| Cuir, par cent..... | 0 10 | 54 | 440 |
| Lainages, par cent..... | 0 10 | Prohibé | |

Je puis dire ici, que lorsque l'Angleterre a fait son traité avec la France, cette dernière lui demanda : mais n'allez-vous pas y inclure le Canada ? et l'Angleterre répondit : non, le Canada s'arrangera comme il le voudra. C'est une accusation grave, M. l'Orateur, mais je la porte de mon siège, devant cette Chambre. Et parmi ceux qui m'écoutent, il y en a qui connaissent les faits. C'est une profonde humiliation pour nous de voir que l'Angleterre, quand elle fait des traités avec les autres pays, refuse d'y associer le Canada ; refuse de nous donner la chance qu'elle donne aux autres colonies.

Et M. Dansereau continue :

Un des représentants canadiens à la dernière exposition de Paris, exposait comme suit il y a quelques mois dans les journaux, le résultat de cette politique destructive. Après avoir cité le texte que nous venons de donner plus haut, il disait :

" Cette liste affligeante, déjà trop convaincante, pourrait être continuée de manière à démontrer que chaque homme d'affaires de notre pays en est affecté.

" De fait, nos exposants à Paris ont pu constater par expérience jusqu'à quel point le commerce canadien est affecté par ces droits différentiels. M. Malcolm, de Toronto s'est vu obligé de refuser pour ses selles de qualité très supérieure des commandes qui lui étaient offertes par les sportsmen français, parce que venant du Canada, sa marchandise se trouvait prohibée, tandis que celle de ses compétiteurs plus favorisés, des autres pays, n'avaient à payer que dix pour cent de droit. Une des maisons les plus importantes de Paris faisant le commerce des habilements confectionnés, avait l'intention de commander 6,000 pièces de tweed canadien, mais on dut lui dire que les tweeds du Canada étaient prohibés, quoique les produits similaires des autres pays fussent admis moyennant un droit de dix pour cent. De nombreuses commandes ont

été données pour des instruments aratoires. Sur l'une de ces commandes, consistant en 1,000 faucheuses et moissonneuses, M. Elliot, de London, Ont., aura à payer un droit différentiel de \$12,400 contre \$4,000 qu'aurait eu à payer un manufacturier de n'importe quel pays de l'Europe.

Cette exclusion du Canada dans les traités de la Grande-Bretagne avec les puissances européennes est d'autant plus extraordinaire que des faveurs de ce genre ont été accordées, à la demande de l'Angleterre, pour les laines de l'Australie, de la Nouvelle-Zélande et du Cap de Bonne Espérance, ainsi que pour le jute des Indes qui sont les principaux produits de ces pays.

Les autres pays n'ont pas oublié, eux, d'inclure leurs colonies dans les traités. La France, dans son traité de commerce et de navigation avec l'Angleterre, a stipulé en même temps pour l'Algérie dont les produits sont soumis au même traitement que ceux de la France continentale.

A propos de ce dernier traité voici un article dont la portée ne peut échapper au lecteur attentif :

“ Les navires anglais et leur cargaison, en France et en Algérie, et les navires français et leur cargaison dans le Royaume-Uni de la Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande, à leur arrivée d'un port quelconque et quel que soit leur lieu d'origine ou de destination de leur cargaison, jouiront, sous tous les rapports, du même traitement que les navires nationaux et leur cargaison.”

Le traité franco-espagnol concerne les produits de l'Espagne continentale aussi bien que des îles Baléares et des Canaries.

Le traité avec le Portugal bénéficie aux produits des colonies et des établissements lointains du Portugal ; et à ceux des îles Madère, de Porto Santo et de l'archipel des Açores.

Dans les différents traités de la Turquie sont compris non-seulement la Turquie d'Europe et d'Asie, mais aussi la Serbie, les principautés de Moldavie et de Valachie, l'Égypte et la Régence de Tripoli, en Afrique.

D'autres nations, telles que la Hollande ont aussi inclues leurs colonies dans leurs traités de commerce et de navigation avec l'Angleterre et la France, et c'est encore à ces conditions que se négocient actuellement les nouveaux projets de traités.

Mais il y a plus : dans le traité de commerce entre l'Angleterre et la Belgique, en date du 28 juillet 1862, l'article 15e est ainsi conçu : “ Les produits belges ne seront pas assujétis, dans les colonies anglaises, à des droits plus élevés que ceux qui sont imposés sur les produits similaires anglais.”

Qu'est-ce que cela signifie ? Tout simplement que l'Angleterre impose à ses colonies l'obligation de recevoir les produits des pays étrangers aux mêmes conditions que les produits similaires anglais. Ne pourrait-elle pas également faire participer ses colonies aux bénéfices qui découlent de ses traités avec ces mêmes puissances ?

En étudiant cet état de choses, l'on se convaincrait donc facilement que la politique suivie a été la politique de chacun pour soi. Puisqu'il en est ainsi, puisque personne ne nous tend la main, il nous faut donc “ veiller nous-mêmes à nos affaires.” Tous les ans nous restons en dette de quinze ou vingt millions. Cette pratique nous a ruinés ; il faut changer de tactique et de régime, et voilà pourquoi n'ayant pas été admis aux bénéfices du libre-échange que l'Angleterre pratique pour elle seulement avec les autres puissances, nous sommes devenus forcément protectionnistes.

Le gouvernement anglais, qui comprend bien la position, n'hésite pas à nous donner toute latitude à ce sujet. C'est à nous à en profiter. Il y a bien assez d'autres questions à propos desquelles notre état colonial nous impose ou nous imposera d'autres sacrifices. Ainsi, ne sommes-nous pas constamment exposés à faire, pour le bien général de l'empire, des concessions qui peuvent être parfois onéreuses ; à l'exemple de la Nouvelle-Zélande, qui a contracté une dette de \$20,000,000 pour soutenir une guerre déclarée par l'Angleterre et avec laquelle la colonie n'avait rien à faire.

En 1864, la surprise des maraudeurs de Saint-Albans nous coûta quelque \$60,000, que les États-Unis réclamèrent de nous pour n'avoir pas su surveiller notre frontière. En 1868, l'invasion fénienne nous coûta un million et demi, que l'Angleterre aurait pu réclamer des États-Unis, en vertu du même principe que les Américains auraient dû garder leurs frontières. Les fénians étaient tous sujets américains ; ils s'étaient organisés ouvertement dans les limites de la république américaine, avaient acheté leurs armes dans les États-Unis. Ils étaient beaucoup plus sous le contrôle de la police américaine que ne l'était l'Alabama en pleine mer, et cependant, jamais l'Angleterre n'a réclamé un sou pour nous des États-Unis, parce que les intérêts de l'empire l'exigeaient.

Lors du traité de Washington il a fallu consentir dans le but de contribuer au succès de la diplomatie anglaise, à ouvrir nos pêcheries, nos fleuves et nos canaux aux Américains. Nous l'avons fait sans nous plaindre, et quoique nous soyons déçus dans l'usage des canaux américains que nous devions obtenir en retour l'Angleterre ne croit pas devoir travailler à amener les Américains à des idées plus larges. En 1783, les Américains ne demandaient que la navigation de la rivière Saint-Jean ; mais la mère-patrie les a accoutumés à obtenir tout ce qu'ils ont voulu avoir. Quand il fut question d'interpréter le traité de 1814, dont les Américains n'étaient pas contents, l'Angleterre en passa facilement par la décision du Czar et consentit à échanger le Canada, en nous faisant perdre une partie du Maine. Mais quand il fut connu que le roi des Pays Bas, l'arbitre choisi par la convention de 1824, pour une nouvelle interprétation du traité de 1783, relativement aux frontières, s'était prononcé contre les États-Unis, ceux-ci refusèrent d'accepter sa décision et continuèrent à taquiner l'Angleterre jusqu'à ce qu'elle leur eût lâché 8,000,000 d'acres. Par le traité de 1782 seulement, elle a cédé aux États-Unis plus de deux cent soixante millions d'acres de terre dans l'Ouest.

Voilà trois fois que l'Angleterre a consenti à tracer la ligne de Pembina. Par le traité de 1814, les États-Unis prirent sur eux de vendre en

1824 la Colombie-Anglaise. Il fallut alors en venir au traité de 1842, en vertu duquel les Américains réclamèrent de nouveau, et nous ne saurions dire s'ils ne nous enlèveront pas encore quelque large portion de territoire, car il faut constamment recourir à de nouvelles commissions. Après les millions et les millions d'acres de terre depuis le Pacifique jusqu'aux grands lacs, y compris l'Oregon, le Wisconsin, etc., après Pembina, l'île St. Juan, ce peut être autre chose.

Ce n'est certes pas dans un but hostile que nous exposons ces faits. Nous voulons tout simplement démontrer que si l'Angleterre fait des sacrifices pour nous, nous en faisons aussi quelques-uns pour elle et nous ne nous en vantons pas, pas plus que nous nous en plaignons. Ce qui est fait est fait ; si cela était nécessaire à la consolidation de la puissance britannique, nous sommes contents d'avoir pu le faire et n'en parlons plus. Mais de grâce, que l'on soit un peu plus discret de l'autre côté de l'océan. Qu'on nous laisse relever nos affaires, comme nous l'entendons. La récente tentative de M. Bright et des fabricants anglais est d'un égoïsme révoltant. Pourquoi veulent-ils nous forcer à aller acheter chez eux, lorsqu'eux ne se gênent pas d'aller acheter leur bois, par exemple, en Norvège ou en Russie ?

L'Angleterre semble s'être étudiée à aller acheter du bois partout ailleurs qu'en Canada. Le tableau suivant en dit long :

BOIS IMPORTÉ PAR L'ANGLETERRE.

| | 1877 | 1878 |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| De Russie..... | £322,219 | £675,364 |
| “ Russie..... | 914,807 | 2,487,477 |
| “ Suède..... | 968,096 | 789,795 |
| “ Suède..... | 1,453,477 | 2,248,096 |
| “ Allemagne..... | 216,158 | 597,143 |
| “ Canada..... | 1,229,061 | 3,307,060 |
| Autres..... | 413,442 | 1,098,789 |
| Autres..... | 287,641 | 916,017 |
| | £5,299,901 | £13,119,741 |
| Total..... | \$26,499,505 | \$65,693,705 |
| Acheté en Canada..... | 1,120,305 | 16,535,300 |
| Acheté ailleurs..... | \$25,389,200 | \$49,063,405 |

Si l'Angleterre tient tant à l'union commerciale avec ses colonies, ne pourrait-il pas donner l'exemple !

Maintenant on vient nous parler aujourd'hui des avantages que l'Angleterre peut nous offrir. Mais quand y a-t-elle songé ? Quelle est la voix autorisée qui dit que l'Angleterre est prête à faire quelque chose pour nous ? Quel est le ministre anglais qui nous le dit ? M. Chamberlain nous dit le contraire. Il s'écrie : si vous voulez commercer avec les États-Unis faites-le, vous êtes libres, le lien qui vous uni à l'Angleterre est bien faible.

L'Angleterre, vu le mouvement qui se fait ici et aux États-Unis, commerce-t-elle à nous ouvrir un peu son cœur ? Je n'en vois pas d'indices. Est-ce par amour pour nous qu'elle nous a imposé, sans nous consulter, le sacrifice d'une des plus belles parties de notre domaine ? Sur ce point je défie la contradiction. N'est-il pas vrai que par le traité d'Ashburton on a volé au Canada une des plus belles parties de son territoire pour le donner au peuple voisin qui venait de se séparer de la métropole ? N'est-il pas vrai que le traité d'Ashburton est un vol commis par l'Angleterre au dépens de sa colonie ? Il y a encore le fait que nous venons d'avoir une conférence à Washington, où on a donné ordre à l'honorable ministre des finances de sacrifier nos pêcheries. Ces pêcheries valaient, il y a quelques années, \$4,500,000 pour une certaine période. Ces pêcheries, pour lesquelles nous avons combattu si longtemps, il a été donné ordre, j'en suis certain, nous en avons la preuve quasi-officielle, il a été donné ordre aux plénipotentiaires de les sacrifier pour éviter la guerre. L'Angleterre, cette bonne maman à la tête de 350,000,000 d'âmes, l'Angleterre si puissante a dit à ses plénipotentiaires : allez à Washington, et pour éviter que mes soldats fassent le coup de feu avec les États-Unis, vous leur donnerez les pêcheries du Canada. Il a bien fallu s'exécuter. Voilà la bonne maman qui prend le député de Muskoka (M. O'Brien) sur ses genoux et qui le dorlotte ! Mais qu'il écoute donc un peu les grands enfants qui sont de l'autre côté de l'Atlantique auprès de la bonne maman ; que disent-ils du député de Muskoka et des Canadiens en général : “ You are mere colonists.” Vous êtes de simples coloniaux. Voilà le respect que l'on a pour nous. On nous considère comme des enfants élevés à la cuisine, comme des enfants d'une autre famille ; voilà ceux pour lesquels on veut aujourd'hui sacrifier le bonheur du Canada. Quand un

Canadien va en Angleterre, on le regarde avec mépris et on lui lance cette épithète : You are a colonist.

M. l'Orateur, nous faisons des offres aux Etats-Unis, mais je dis que ce sont des offres futiles ; ce ne sont pas des offres sérieuses. La force de l'opinion, le résultat brillant de l'élection d'hier et de l'élection de Missisquoi il y a quelques jours, le sentiment populaire sont tels que ceux qui vivent d'abord pour le pouvoir,—et c'est bien naturel dans le monde, paraît-il,—ceux-là ont été effrayés. Ils ont aussi été éveillés par la voix éloquente de mon honorable ami le député de Northumberland (M. Mitchell), c'est sur son avertissement solennel qu'ils se sont décidés de dégager l'honneur du pays et de passer cet ordre en conseil, auquel ils étaient tenus par le statut de 1879. Je regrette pour mon pays, je regrette pour la Puissance du Canada, pour notre drapeau que l'on ait le triste courage de mettre dans un statut des offres à une grande nation pour ensuite se moquer d'elle.

Mais si quelqu'un aux Etats-Unis peut entendre la voix du parlement du Canada, il saura qu'il y a, dans ce parlement, un grand nombre de députés qui protestent contre cette conduite, qui sont indignés de la négligence du gouvernement, qui sont indignés du refus de dégager la parole donnée. Des centaines de millions de piastres peut-être ont été engagées par les Etats-Unis sur la foi d'un statut. C'est une supercherie de notre part ; nous le déplorons autant que nous le pouvons. Je rends hommage au député de Northumberland (M. Mitchell) qui représente un beau parti en cette Chambre, d'avoir, le premier, élevé la voix, et je rends hommage aussi à l'opposition de l'avoir secondé. Je suis heureux de voir que le peuple du Canada va enfin pouvoir élever la tête et dire au peuple américain : si vous avez été trompés, ce n'est pas notre faute à nous tous.

M. l'Orateur, dès 1869, il était question du traité de réciprocité, et dans un document que j'ai en main—je ne sais pas s'il a déjà été cité ; c'est un document du 3 septembre 1868, signé par John Rose, ministre des finances,—il était dit :

"In conclusion, the undersigned trusts that as the circumstances of political exigency and the important national considerations which, as stated by Her Majesty's Government, led to the concluding of the former Treaty of Reciprocity with the United States, still exist—and even in a greater degree than previous to the date of that Treaty—and as the interest of Canada continue to be seriously affected, Her Majesty's Government will not refuse to give the same weight to these considerations as before ; and that in any future negotiations between Canada and the United States, in reference to their trade relations, the Dominion will receive the cooperation and influence of Her Majesty's Government."

Cependant, M. l'Orateur, quelques mois après que voyons-nous ? C'était fort bien pour la montre ; mais quelques mois après, le 4 janvier 1869, nous trouvons une lettre signée par l'honorable premier ministre actuel dans laquelle il dit : il faut attendre que les Etats-Unis fassent le premier pas. Tout de même, dans ce temps-là, on pouvait dire que la réciprocité était bonne sans, pour cela, passer pour rebelle. Voici les paroles mêmes de Sir John Macdonald le 4 janvier 1869 :

"Should the United States Government express any desire for the renewal of the treaty, Canada will be prepared to send a delegation to Washington to act in concert with the British Ambassador on the subject. Meanwhile, Council think that it would be unwise for Canada to make any statements in advance of what she will be willing to do, and that the negotiations should be entered upon at Washington, without either party being hampered by any previous engagement or offers of any kind."

Mais je n'ai pas besoin d'aller si loin pour voir les offres que nous faisons aux Etats-Unis, au sujet de la réciprocité. Il me suffirait de rappeler la séance de cette après-midi, alors que l'honorable ministre des finances (sir Charles Tupper) qui jouit de l'estime générale, déclarait que, d'après lui, ce qui était contenu dans un statut même sous forme facultative, était impératif de nation à nation. Il nous a dit, de plus, que c'était le désir des deux grands partis politiques du pays d'avoir la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. D'un autre côté nous voyons nos voisins, le chef du gouver-

M. AMYOT.

nement (sir John A. Macdonald) nous dire formellement tout le contraire ; nous déclarer que la réciprocité serait ruineuse pour nous. Eh bien ! qu'est-ce qui vient de se passer ? Le 31 mars 1887, M. Bayard écrit :

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Ceci, M. l'Orateur, était adressé à sir Charles Tupper, et que répond ce dernier ?

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

On ne veut donc pas les régler, ces difficultés des pêcheries ? Voici le ministre des finances qui nous dit qu'il n'y a qu'un moyen pour les régler : c'est de régler en même temps toutes nos relations commerciales. Comme de raison on ne donne pas dans ces lettres les détails du projet ; cela ne se fait jamais ainsi ; mais on y énonce un principe, on y jette la base d'un arrangement ou traité. Ainsi, d'un côté on nous dit que la réciprocité est impossible, qu'elle nous ruinerait, et l'on trouve toutes espèces d'excuses, et de subterfuges pour ne pas l'obtenir. Mais d'un autre côté il y a division, dans le ministère même, certains ministres désirant la réciprocité. Mais voyons ce qu'a fait l'honorable ministre des finances (sir Charles Tupper) avant son départ de Washington à la suite de la confection du projet de traité concernant les pêcheries. Il a fait une dernière offre, le 3 décembre 1887 :

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Ainsi, M. l'Orateur, vous voyez que je n'ai pas besoin de remonter bien loin pour trouver que nous voulons presque tous la réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. Malheureusement, l'honorable ministre des finances a fait ces offres, il les a faites tout en ayant probablement reçu instruction de livrer quand même nos pêcheries. On avait déjà livré la navigation du Saint-Laurent ; nous en avons pour garant la parole de l'honorable premier ministre ; on nous avait antérieurement dépouillés d'une partie de notre domaine ; il restait à sacrifier nos pêcheries. Qu'est-ce qu'elle ne nous ôtera pas, cette bonne maman du député de Muskoka, puisqu'elle nous ôte nos terres, notre poisson et notre navigation ? Viendra-t-elle aussi nous ôter notre pain et nos enfants ? Quelqu'un en a peut-être le projet.

J'attirerai l'attention de cette Chambre sur l'importance qu'il y a pour le gouvernement d'agir bien sincèrement dans l'application de la loi de 1879. Je trouve dans le "Bradstreets' Journal" publié à New-York, pour l'année 1887, les statistiques suivantes.

L'importation des principaux articles de commerce pendant les trois dernières années fiscales apparaissent au tableau suivant :

IMPORTATIONS DES ETATS-UNIS DU CANADA.

Exempts de droits.

| | 1886. | 1885. | 1884. |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Poisson..... | \$ 1,071,217 | \$ 3,447,294 | \$ 3,720,412 |
| Œufs..... | 1,893,672 | 2,095,437 | 2,356,315 |
| Animaux vivants..... | 1,677,955 | 1,649,644 | 2,103,769 |
| Bois..... | 1,362,237 | 1,062,933 | 1,673,217 |
| Ameublement..... | 1,578,002 | 1,364,993 | 1,559,395 |
| Peaux et fourrures..... | 1,193,187 | 1,080,621 | 1,345,667 |
| Total des importations exemptes de droits..... | \$12,042,627 | \$12,871,884 | \$15,237,307 |

Imposables.

| | 1886. | 1885. | 1884. |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Poisson | \$ 1,005,382 | \$ 68,266 | \$ 153,387 |
| Bois et manufactures | 7,515,756 | 7,841,147 | 9,016,841 |
| Orge et houblon | 7,409,148 | 6,788,623 | 6,031,891 |
| Animaux vivants | 3,163,740 | 3,111,014 | 2,701,705 |
| Poin | 1,034,496 | 1,517,483 | 993,789 |
| Charbon | 1,014,116 | 1,074,029 | 1,007,354 |
| Total, importations imposables | \$25,453,711 | \$34,083,657 | \$23,778,533 |
| Total, importations de tous genres | 37,496,338 | 36,960,541 | 39,015,840 |

Ces chiffres font voir l'énorme quantité d'effets que nous vendons aux Etats-Unis et que nous ne pourrions pas vendre si les droits prévus par l'acte de 1879 n'étaient pas enlevés.

Je pourrais encore vous parler du traité de réciprocité proposé par l'honorable George Brown, car il est connu de tous que depuis que le traité de réciprocité a pris fin, tout le monde, tous les partis politiques, comme le disait l'honorable ministre des finances, ont demandé la réciprocité. Mais vous me demanderez pourquoi nous ne l'avons pas puisque tout le monde le désire... C'est ici que j'attire spécialement l'attention de la Chambre, c'est encore l'honorable premier ministre qui va m'en fournir la véritable cause.

Vous avez entendu parler depuis quelque temps, M. l'Orateur, de ce grand projet de fédération impériale. Vous avez vu des assemblées se tenir à Toronto; il doit y en avoir une bientôt ici, à Ottawa, et même il y a une proposition à ce sujet sur les ordres de cette Chambre. Or, que disait Sir John A. Macdonald, à Montréal, le 24 novembre 1875. Voici ce qu'il disait, et je le lirai en anglais afin que tous les honorables députés puissent le comprendre :

"Gentlemen, I look forward to a permanent union, and I look forward to it not as a mere Utopian speculation, but as the practical result of our connection with Great Britain. It is not an idea of to-day; and if you would so favor me, if you think it worth your while to look over the debates on Confederation in 1865 at Quebec, you will find that what I am now stating to you I stated then as being the hoped for future of Canada. It is this:—That England would be the central power (applause), and we auxiliary nations; that Canada, as one Confederation, would by degrees have less of dependence and more of alliance than at present; and that we would be all united under the same sovereign, all owing allegiance to the same Crown, and all inspired by the same British spirit; and that we would have a close alliance, offensive and defensive. You see now the progress of events in carrying out this scheme. You see South Africa about to form a great Confederation. The position of the Australian Colonies is such, strewn as they are around the edge of that vast continent, that they may not be able to form a Confederation so closely allied as our Provinces of Canada, but a Zollverein and arrangements by Treaty amongst themselves, by which their quota of land and sea forces, and their several subsidies for the purpose of doing their share in the defence of the Empire is quite probable. Now, gentlemen, twenty-five years is but as a day in the life time of a nation; let us go on as peacefully and happily as we are now going on, and twenty-five years, I fully except, should see the solution of that question. Great Britain, by that time, will have forty millions; Canada, ten millions; Australia, her millions; and these latter with South Africa, capable of unlimited extension; and New Zealand, nearly as large as England, will be separate auxiliary countries, all ranged around the Central Power, England. I do not look for Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament, because the Imperial Parliament, with such representation, would claim the right of taxation, but I look for the alliance of these auxiliary Powers with the Central Government under Treaty arrangements similar to the existing arrangement between England and Canada. The arrangement at this moment is that we are pledged to expend a certain sum of money on our militia in response and return for the pledge obtained from England that the whole military power of the Empire shall be used for our defence; make an extension of that arrangement by providing that the Central Power shall contribute so much, that each of the auxiliary nations shall give their quota; and then when any nation goes to war with England she will go to war with half a dozen nations. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It will give an assurance of peace to the world, and it will give an assurance of peace to us when it is known that if one extremity of the vast British Empire is attacked, British subjects and soldiery from every extremity of it will rush to the rescue. (Hear, hear.) Then, gentlemen, so powerful will be England that she will be safe from all attack (applause), and instead of being a source of anxiety and a source of weakness to the British Empire, we will find ourselves standing by our grand old mother, become a defence, a fortification, an outwork, instead of being a weakness and a source of expense. (Cheers; hear, hear and prolonged applause.) Remember, too, that Canada has already the

27-1888-4

fourth commercial navy in the world, and a large population of hardy seamen, and that all the Sister Colonies I have named must, from their position, become Maritime Powers. So that the Sovereignty of the Seas seems assured for all time to this United Empire. To this I look forward. It is a grand scheme, and it is a scheme quite capable of being carried into practical operation, and when carried out, gentlemen, it will not be too much to expect that the great nation, our congeners on the other side of the line, seeing that all the different peoples who speak the English language, but themselves, are formed into one great nation, as it were, for the purpose of operating as a moral police, and of keeping the peace of the world—it will not be too much to hope and expect that our congeners, speaking the same language, and being of the same race, will assist in the great work of keeping the peace of the world, and if necessary, gentlemen, of enforcing it. [Applause]. Gentlemen, in the great war, when Napoleon, by the power of his arms, had forced the nations of Europe to close their ports against England and English shipping, even then, gentlemen, although England's colonies were few and feeble, she fought that battle, and carried it to a victorious conclusion, and drove the tyrant from his throne, with the aid of the domestic commerce she had with her own colonies. And when all these become great nations, having one head, and being one people, and having one interest, England if all Europe were in arms against her, with her trade, her commerce, and her wealth, with the waves rolling about her feet, would be still secure, living in her children, and her children blessed in her. [Loud and continued applause]. One word more. While independence is generally annexation in disguise, some speculative philosophers, who look into the distant future, seem to believe that it will be our fate and our advantage to walk alone as a separate nationality. Mr. Goldwin Smith is one of those. I would fain hope that the future that I desire for the empire and its auxiliary kingdoms, might strike his imagination and be accepted as a substitute for independence. If this policy could only enlist his magic pen in its behalf, it would be an infinite benefit to the good cause."

Voilà le secret de la situation. L'honorable premier ministre nous dit que dès l'origine de la Confédération il a voulu annexer le Canada à l'Angleterre; il a voulu annexer toutes les colonies anglaises à l'Angleterre et faire ce qu'il appelle aujourd'hui la fédération impériale. De sorte que quand la bonne maman viendra en guerre, elle appellera tous ses petits enfants du Canada et d'ailleurs, et elle leur dira : venez combattre pour moi, mes petits enfants. Elle dira à ses bons petits fils des colonies : souscrivez pour me défendre, moi, votre bonne maman. Voilà la portée du projet de la fédération impériale; c'est pour y arriver que les Canadiens vont être privés de commercer avec soixante millions d'âmes. Eh bien ! quant à moi je déclare que je ne suis pas pour cette fédération impériale, et je crois que mon comté partage mes vues. Nous ne voulons pas épouser les querelles de l'Angleterre avec l'Irlande. Nous ne voulons pas aller combattre au delà des mers, jusqu'aux Indes, chaque fois que l'intérêt du commerce anglais l'exigera. Nous sommes chez nous, en Amérique, sur un sol de liberté, et nous entendons y rester. Que l'on ne dise pas que ce projet n'est pas sérieux. Et le gouverneur qui nous vient est reconnu comme favorable à la fédération impériale. Il porte le drapeau de cette fédération impériale, et voyez ceux qui s'agitent; voyez les principaux amis de l'honorable premier; voyez son voisin de droite (M. McCarthy). C'est un de ses hommes dévoués, son homme de confiance. Eh bien ! il l'a lancé en tête du mouvement à Toronto; il le lance ici encore dans la cité d'Ottawa; il lui fait même mettre une motion dans nos votes et délibérations. Et l'honorable premier qui est un génie politique expérimenté, je l'admets—j'ai pour lui tout le respect possible—l'honorable premier ministre qui a conçu ce projet, l'exécute à pas lents, mais sûrement. Il a commencé par annexer les provinces, la Nouvelle-Ecosse, le Nouveau-Brunswick, l'Île du Prince-Edouard, le Manitoba et le Nord-Ouest. Il a dit aux vieilles provinces : prenez 200 ou 300 millions et faites un grand chemin de fer qui reliera l'Angleterre à ses possessions de l'Asie. Nous avons fait le chemin de fer et aujourd'hui que fait-il ? Il nous dit : achetez l'Île de Terre-Neuve; elle ne vaut rien pour vous, mais prenez des millions et des millions et achetez-la, afin que nous puissions, comme un tout compact en bloc prendre le Canada et l'annexer à l'Angleterre. Et il fait venir pour couronner tout cela, d'Angleterre, un gouverneur qu'il sait favorable à la fédération impériale. Je lui reproche une chose; puisque c'est là son intention, il devrait le dire

franchement et ouvertement ; il devrait avouer qu'à un moment donné il dira au Canada : tu es endetté de \$100,000,000 que tu n'es pas capable de payer : l'Angleterre va les payer pour toi et va t'annexer. Voilà pourquoi le traité de réciprocité qui est désiré par les deux partis, nous dit, l'honorable ministre des finances,—désiré par tout le pays et qui ferait le bien du Canada et de l'Amérique,—voilà pourquoi, dis-je, ce traité nous est refusé. Je sais que l'esprit de parti va essayer d'empêcher ce traité de réciprocité de réussir cette fois. Je ne blâme pas les honorables députés qui ne pensent pas comme nous. Ils sont soumis à la discipline ; ils n'entendent pas autre chose que la voix de leur vieux chef ; mais il y a de ces moments solennels où les liens de parti devraient disparaître devant le bien public. Lorsque ces députés reviendront devant le peuple, peut-être que le peuple, qui, lui, a moins de liens de parti, qui a les yeux plus ouverts à ses véritables intérêts, leur répondra qu'ils ont oublié l'intérêt du pays.

Pour le moment, je le déclare à ma province et à mon pays : l'objet qu'a en vue l'honorable premier ministre c'est la fédération impériale ; il y travaille depuis vingt ans. Il achève de terminer cette chaîne de provinces avec laquelle il nous enchaînera ensuite s'il le peut ; il veut nous confédérer à l'Angleterre, il veut que nous épousions la cause de l'Angleterre. Quel rôle jouerions-nous là ? Je dénonce ce projet, et je lui dis que ce projet ne sera pas accepté par la Puissance. Il nous a dit bien souvent ces mots : Le Canada pour les Canadiens. Est-ce bien le Canada pour les Canadiens qu'il veut aujourd'hui ? Non, c'est le Canada pour l'Angleterre. Eh bien ! nous lui répondrons : non ; et s'il le veut, s'il le faut absolument, et c'est le sens des premiers mots que j'ai employés en parlant du drapeau américain,—s'il veut que le Canada soit pour l'Angleterre, nous lui dirons, nous, en réponse : le Canada pour l'Amérique.

J'avais l'intention de dire quelques mots sur les montants que nous allions perdre par le bill appelé le *Retaliation Bill* proposé à Washington, mais comme le gouvernement nous a déclaré cet après-midi qu'un ordre en conseil allait être publié samedi conformément à la loi de 1879, je n'en parlerai pas.

Je terminerai ces remarques, trop longues pour ceux surtout qui n'entendent pas notre langue, par deux ou trois mots de réponse à ceux qui m'ont précédé. J'espère qu'un temps viendra où les Anglais du Canada trouveront, comme les Anglais d'Angleterre, que le français est la langue de la diplomatie comme l'anglais est la langue du commerce ; qu'ils apprendront cette langue et alors nous aurons encore plus de plaisir à les rencontrer.

On est toujours à nous dire : nous avons hâte d'aller devant le peuple sur cette question de la réciprocité. Libre à eux, M. l'Orateur, ils n'ont qu'à signer un document, et nous irons de suite devant le peuple ; nous sommes prêts. Nous ne pouvons pas dissoudre les Chambres nous ; mais nous avons hâte, nous aussi, soyez-en sûrs, de consulter le peuple.

On a introduit dans la discussion l'échafaud de Régina. Ce doit être un grand génie celui qui a fait cela. Je crois que c'est encore l'honorable député de Muskoka (M. O'Brien), ce bon fils qui est tant bercé dans les bras de la maman. Un autre nous a parlé du parti national. Je puis leur dire que le parti national est né d'un mouvement du cœur, d'un mouvement patriotique. Le mouvement national, on l'a appelé d'abord un feu de paille ; il brûle encore, et que l'on ne croie pas que ceux des nationaux qui vont se détacher de nous sur la présente question sont complètement passés de l'autre côté ; ils demeurent avec nous et nous sommes tous les mêmes. Je ne voulais pas parler de cette question ici, mais puisqu'on l'a introduite j'y réponds, en disant que c'est le mouvement national qui fait augmenter les majorités dans les comtés qui nous appartenaient et qui nous en font gagner d'autres que nous n'avions pas. C'est le mouvement

M. AMYOT.

national qui nous a donné le pouvoir dans la province de Québec, et c'est lui qui nous donnera le pouvoir aux prochaines élections fédérales. Il est basé sur la vérité ; nous nous sommes indignés parce que nos ministres nous ont trompés et nous ont humiliés comme peuple, nous ont sacrifiés au fanatisme de quelques-uns. Mais il n'est pas question de cela dans cette affaire de réciprocité, que je n'ai pas traitée au point de vue de parti. J'en fais une affaire beaucoup plus grande que cela ; une affaire de pays, de richesse nationale. J'en fais une affaire de résistance à cette grande lutte qui commence en faveur de la fédération impériale. Il est temps que le peuple y voit ; il est temps que le Canada ait l'œil ouvert. Je le répète, on veut nous annexer à l'Angleterre en nous disant toujours : dépensez des millions, ne craignez rien, car le Canada est pour les Canadiens ; en nous affirmant toujours que nous allons nous enrichir. Voilà qu'arrive le moment où elle va s'engager, cette lutte. On nous dira : vous devez tant ; vous ne pouvez pas le payer, voici l'argent, l'Angleterre le fournit à condition que peuple et pays vous passiez de l'autre côté ; on nous livrera à l'Angleterre sous la férule de laquelle nous serions à l'avenir ; c'est ce qu'on appelle le Canada pour les Canadiens. Eh bien ! en terminant, je répète : quand l'on voudra dire le Canada pour l'Angleterre, nous répondrons : le Canada pour l'Amérique.

Mr. MASSON. A great deal of time has been occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to prove what perhaps they might have taken almost for granted, namely, that the members on this side of the House, the leaders of the present Government and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, had in times past a favorable opinion of reciprocity, and that, even at the time of the introduction of what is known as the National Policy, that was looked forward to as the thing to be aimed at, and that the National Policy was only a means to that end. I take it for granted that, at that time, all parties and all classes in this country looked forward, as a great boon to the country, to the attaining of reciprocity with the United States. There are many reasons why all classes of the various communities of which this great Dominion is composed looked to that as a very great boon. One of the principal reasons for that is that they looked back on the time of the old reciprocity from 1854 to 1866 as having on the whole been a very prosperous period, and, judging that the prosperity had been caused almost entirely, if not entirely, by the reciprocity then in force, they very naturally came to the conclusion that reciprocity would again bring about these fortunate and prosperous times. But, looking at the prosperity of those twelve years, I think it is often lost sight of that that prosperity, especially in regard to agricultural pursuits, was not due entirely to the reciprocity then in existence. During that period there were great public works being constructed in this Canada of ours ; we find that the Grand Trunk Railway was being built, that the Great Western was being built, that the nation of which we form a part—and of which we form no insignificant part, be it said—was engaged in several great wars. During the earlier part of this period we had the Crimean war ; following that, we had the East Indian mutiny ; then, shortly afterwards, our neighbors across the border were engaged in their civil war ; and all this tended to enhance the value of farm produce in this country. When we look back at those prosperous years and think only of reciprocity, we forget to take into account these great public works and these great wars which contributed more to our prosperity than the treaty itself. During this period of reciprocity, when the nation was comparatively at peace, before the effect of the Indian mutiny was felt in Canada, and after the result of the Crimean war had ceased, we find the year 1857 one of the blackest periods in the history of Canada ; indeed the oldest resident

cannot recollect such an universal bankruptcy and universal distress as was felt in the year 1857, yet that year was in the very period during which this reciprocity is supposed to have been making the whole of Canada rich. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite may be pardoned for having a preconceived idea that reciprocity would be beneficial, but when they seek to bolster up these ideas by evidence, they should be careful to present it in a straightforward and honest manner, and not attempt to present only one side of the proposition, and leave the other side unrepresented, in fact almost to falsify the figures that they are quoting from. However, as that part of the subject has been so fully dealt with, I shall not attempt to go into statistics relating to it, but I will try for a few minutes to show what I consider has been the effect of the National Policy on the agricultural interest of the country. Now, when we advocated the National Policy, we are often charged with having made the assertion that the adoption of a protective tariff and applying it to agricultural products, would have the effect of increasing the price of these products. Now, Mr. Speaker, as one who took part in the debate before the country at that time, one who was a strong advocate, in the election of 1878, of that policy, I may say that that assertion contains a certain element of truth. Statements were made that would be the effect, that relatively the price of grain would be increased. Some gentlemen, in speaking of it, have not used the word "relative," but they speak of a general increase in the price of farm produce, whereas we must always take into consideration the relative increase as compared with the various markets of the world. Now, Sir, the market of Liverpool at that time was acknowledged by both parties as being the ruling market in respect to wheat. Now, wheat is by no means an insignificant article of export from this country; it is really the largest, both in the number of bushels and in flour, of any article which the farmers have to dispose of, especially the farmers of Ontario. Now, hon. gentlemen told us that the markets of Liverpool then gave the price of wheat, and that they now establish the price of wheat. Well, I agree that the Liverpool market at that time did govern the price of wheat, but that is no longer the case. At that time the difference between the price in Liverpool and the price in Toronto averaged about 50 to 55 cents, often much more, seldom much less. The difference between New York and Toronto then averaged about 20 cents, often 30, seldom less than 20. Now, what was the effect of the National Policy on that one product? We find that the difference between Liverpool and Toronto gradually sank from 50 down to 40, 30, 20—in fact at the present time it is actually under 10. Now, there is, under the National Policy, a relative increase in the price of wheat. Hon. gentlemen opposite refer to the markets of those years, when, for many reasons, the price of wheat was higher in Liverpool, and higher in New York, and they will compare the prices then with the prices now. But that is not a fair comparison. If wheat is low in Liverpool and low the world over, how can any policy make it high here? The only question is, can we make it relatively higher? And that, I claim, has been done. There is no other reason to give for the fact we are now within 10 cents of the Liverpool market, while formerly we were 50 cents from it; there is no other reason to give why we are within 5 to 8 cents of the New York market, when formerly we used to be from 20 to 30 cents. Nor is wheat the only article to which these remarks will apply. What I have said in reference to wheat applies with equal strength to every other grains that the farmers produce, barley alone excepted. Now, one article of grain produced by the farmers is that of oats, and in that we find a difference ranging from 15 to 25 cents between Toronto and New York. It is stated by some hon. gentlemen that the present time is about the only exception,

whereas we find many exceptions, and if we trace back during the last eight years, we will find that there has been six exceptions to the average price which I have stated. Now, we are told that it requires an exception to prove the rule. I fancy that six exceptions out of eight must prove the rule the other way. It may be said that the assertion that this is due to the National Policy, is only an assertion on our side. I take that question up in this way; I say there is a reason for all these changes, and if we trace these reasons down we will see whether they are due to the National Policy or not. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns of these former years, we find that we were importing six, seven and eight millions of bushels of wheat, either wheat or flour into Canada, a wheat-producing country; we were importing nearly one-third of our annual product, and we were exporting at the same time a much larger quantity. But, now, all that has changed, a duty has been placed on the importation of wheat, and it has decreased so that now, the importation of wheat and flour, instead of being eight million bushels, is under two. Our exports at first decreased, naturally they would, we had not enough to fill our own markets, and therefore, we had to fall off in our exports; and hon. gentlemen would argue that that was an objection to the National Policy, because, forsooth, it increased our import and decreased our export trade. Why, the very object was to prevent the importation of things that were a rival to our home productions, and the result of preventing importation, the result of increasing home consumption, all tended to decrease in like manner the export of the same articles. Now, we find that the National Policy has given good ground for another rise in price—it has increased our home consumption, we are producing more and yet we are exporting more; we are increasing our home consumption, we have increased our home production, our towns are larger, our cities are larger, and villages are increasing in number. These cities, towns and villages have to be supplied with bread from the farmers, and every hon. gentleman will admit that the consumption of breadstuffs must be greatly increased. But we are told that the examples given by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in relation to the markets of the present day are wholly exceptional. A careful perusal of all the reports of the markets, as given by the *Globe*, which hon. gentlemen opposite no doubt will accept as correct, show that during the last eight years the prices as between Toronto and Buffalo have been more frequently in favor of Toronto than the other way. But I do not intend to go over the ground in regard to those markets, because they have been dealt with before; but I have what I consider a market which affects the interests of a part of the Province I represent, not only my own constituency, but all that portion of the Province similarly situated. I refer to that portion of the Province situated on the shore of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, and what affects those counties must necessarily affect Ontario to a considerable extent. I wish, therefore, to refer to the market of Chicago. I take the market of Chicago as compared with the market of Toronto, or, perhaps, what might be even a more fitting comparison, with the market of Owen Sound, between which there is water communication and the cost of transportation is well known and firmly established, and it is easy, therefore, to make a comparison. I take first the market of Toronto. We find on wheat there is a difference between Chicago and Toronto of from ten to twelve cents, the price in Chicago being that much lower on the average, not for a year or two, but for six or seven years, that it is so now and necessarily will continue so long as our present policy is in force. The cost of transportation is not over four cents at the outside. The cost from Chicago to Owen Sound is from two and a half to three cents and the cost to Toronto may be placed at four cents, so

there is a difference of from ten to twelve cents on wheat. Oats in Chicago on an average stand fifteen cents below Toronto prices, twelve cents being as near as it ever comes, and I may say that it stands in exactly the same relation to the market of Owen Sound, in fact it is very rarely within twelve cents of that market. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite what would be the effect on the markets of Owen Sound, Goderich, Sarnia or any places bordering on the shores of Lake Huron or Georgian Bay if the duty were taken off those two staple articles? They could be purchased in Chicago at ten or twelve cents below our price and they could be delivered in our market for three or four cents per bushel, the natural consequence of which would be a drop in our markets of about ten cents a bushel all round. That is only now prevented by the National Policy by the imposition of the duty; remove the duty and American oats would come into our harbors as they did in 1877. I well recollect in the spring of that year when oats were ranging in Owen Sound at 42 cents a bushel, American oats were brought in by steamer loads, and the result was that the price fell in one day from 40 cents to 28 cents. All that section of country does not depend so much upon the markets of Buffalo and New York or even the markets of Liverpool for the price of grain. They are confined to home consumption almost entirely, they have their markets at their own doors. The whole of the northern country to which they have access furnishes a large home market for oats and coarse grains generally, and we have to-day, notwithstanding the duty, to compete with Americans in these markets. I hold in my hand a letter from one John Andrews, of Spanish River, in the employ of the Spanish River Lumber Company. That gentleman writes to me, not for the purposes of this debate, a letter unsolicited, in which he asks to have a custom house established there, and he gives figures, which I will take the liberty of using. The three lumbering companies established on Spanish River have imported during the last year \$13,000 of American goods in competition with our Canadian goods. Those importations comprised lumber supplies, pressed hay, oats, corn and pork. We have to compete with the Americans there. We could not sell one barrel of pork, one bushel of oats, we could not sell one car load there if the duty was removed; that market would be taken away from our farmers entirely, and they would be placed upon the level they occupied prior to the adoption of the National Policy, and they would be forced by necessity to seek distant markets. And it must be remembered that what would apply to this section of the Province would apply with more or less effect to the whole Province, and what affected Ontario would affect the whole Dominion. During the navigation season last year there passed through Owen Sound about 3,000,000 bushels of western grain. When wheat in Chicago was twelve cents a bushel lower than in Owen Sound, and oats were fifteen cents lower, they were fortunately passing through in bond; but for the fact that they were in bond and that we have a duty imposed of ten cents per bushel on oats, our oats would not have remained fifteen cents a bushel above Chicago price but on a par with it or at most about two cents over. The local market on the north shore can be reached by the Americans about as cheaply as we can reach it, and it is the duty alone that keeps up prices upon those articles. I consider it is not a question as to what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or hon. gentlemen opposite thought of reciprocity in the past, but it is what the effect of reciprocity would be at the present time. That is the question we have to consider; it is the live question, and it is immaterial as to whether we thought reciprocity a benefit or otherwise ten or fifteen years ago. How would it affect us at the present time, and what affect would it have on our markets? I am satisfied that the introduction of wheat and of oats and of grain free of duty

Mr. MASSON.

would lower the prices of those commodities in Canada, and just in that connection let me ask what would become of our pea crop? The pea crop of the Province of Ontario is considered one of the most valuable crops. It is true that some farmers say it has an objection, as the straw is not so useful for many purposes as the straw of other grain. But, on the other hand, it is grown by many farmers to clean their land, and grown upon naked soil turned over for the first time when other crops there would be by no means certain. The very best crops of peas are grown in that way, and for our farmers generally, I believe it is a very good crop. What has been the effect of the western grain on the pea crop of the Northern and Eastern States? Why, it has driven peas out of the country. Take any paper in America, and look at the Detroit, Buffalo and other American markets, and you will find that they do not even mention the pea crop at all. What is the cause of that? Those countries grew peas as well as we do before the extensive cultivation of grain, but they found that they could not produce grain and peas. They have not been able to compete with the western producer of grain. The consequence is that the pea crop is entirely annihilated, and in the event of introduction of American grain free into Canada, what would become of our Canadian pea crop? It would vanish as the pea crop of the Northern and Eastern States has vanished. I ventured to remark, a few moments ago, that in the researches of the hon. gentlemen opposite for evidence in support of their contentions, they have sought to present to the House not all the evidence in the case, but, like prejudiced detectives who, having obtained what they considered a clue, they follow up only one class of evidence and ignore the remainder. They even go to the extent of suppressing evidence which will crop to the surface in spite of them when it does not suit their case. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. McMillan), in a very elaborate speech for which I give him credit for having gone very carefully into his side of the question, has set before us with great care all the evidence he could find to bolster up his statement that the National Policy was injurious to the Canadian producer. He enumerated a number of articles in support of his contention and I will refer to those articles which he named. He referred to horses, horned cattle, sheep, poultry, eggs, potatoes, vegetables, straw, hay, barley, beans, apples and wool. Strange when he was selecting these that he should omit other and far larger products of the farm. Strange that he should have selected some which are mere bagatelles; but stranger still that when he was referring to horned cattle he should have made an exception to them as regards the manner in which he treated other articles. He referred to poultry, eggs and potatoes by their value, as well as all the other articles except horses. I did not notice in particular whether he gave us the value or number of horses, but it is not very material. He tried to show that the trade of the United States was far more important to the Canadian farmer than the trade with England, and selected horned cattle as proof of this, but instead of referring to values as he did in the other cases he referred to numbers, and when asked from this side of the House "What about the values?" he went off on a tangent, so to speak, upon another subject, leaving the question of values unrevealed. I will therefore try to supplement what the hon. gentleman said in that respect by referring to the value of horned cattle as he referred to the numbers. He wanted to show, and he stated in plain language, that horned cattle exported to the States was 39 per cent., while to Great Britain the percentage was 54. Now, that may be a correct calculation as to numbers, but as to value it is entirely wrong. The value of cattle, as taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, where the hon. gentleman got the values of the other articles and the numbers of the horned cattle, shows that the value of cattle exported to Great Britain

was \$5,300,000, while the value of cattle exported from Canada to the United States was only \$887,000, or instead of being 39 per cent. on one side and 54 on the other, it was 82 per cent. on one side and 13½ on the other. I may say that the export of horned cattle alone to England was greater than the export of all the other articles he mentioned, to the United States, except barley. Leaving barley out of the table which he gave us, the value of cattle exported to Great Britain was greater than the value of all the other articles he referred to. I do not think that it was a fair selection to present to the House when he selected a lot of trivial articles. Potatoes would rank pretty high in the list, but Prince Edward Island gave almost the entire quota of that export. The other articles given here as evidence of what a great boon trade with the United States would be were trivial in value. As I said before when he referred to horned cattle he spoke of numbers instead of value, omitting to state that the value of that export to Great Britain was greater than the value of all the others. Why did he not give us the quantities of butter sent to Great Britain, as compared with the United States? We find that we sent \$757,000 of butter to Great Britain, while we only sent \$17,000 worth to the United States. Why did not the hon. gentleman refer to cheese when he was dealing with cattle and the other various products of the farm? Because he would have to admit that we export to Great Britain \$7,065,000 worth, while to the United States we only exported \$30,000 worth. Why did he not refer to oats? Because he would have to admit that we exported \$509,000 worth to Great Britain as against \$12,000 worth to the United States. Why did he not refer to peas? Because he would have to admit that there were \$2,000,000 exported to Great Britain as against \$300,000 worth to the United States. Why did he not refer to wheat? Because he would have to admit that there were \$4,278,000 worth sent to England, and only \$265,000 worth to the United States. I think that when hon. gentlemen opposite profess to give evidence they have obtained in this matter and when they profess to seek their evidence they should give us the whole truth. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also gave us some strange information. He gave us here a quota, which must be from imagination, because if a farmer produces the articles and the quantities that he says he produces on a 70-acre farm he must be an astonishing farmer and he must deal in many grains and articles entirely different to other farmers. He gave us a story about a colt, one yoke of steers, twelve lambs, three hundred bushels of barley, five tons of hay and thirty bushels of potatoes. Strange, very strange indeed, that that farmer had no wheat; strange, very strange indeed, that he had no oats; most extraordinary for an Ontario farmer that he had no peas and no pork. I think that farmer must be in the land of speculation, and not a genuine farmer. But he said that on that colt he would have got \$20 more. How so? What proportion of our horses go to the United States? The hon. member for East Huron tells us that that there were 18,779 horses exported from Canada, or about one to every 60 voters in the country; or, to be generous to him, give two votes for every farmer and it would mean that one farmer in every thirty has one horse to export. Now, we are told we must pay the duty on them. If we had the United States only as our market for horses, and there were no cities in Canada furnishing markets for the surplus of our farmers, then only would we pay the whole duty. The question who pays the duty depends on who seeks the market. In some cases it is difficult to apply that rule, but when it is properly applied the answer will be correct in every case. Will the hon. gentleman tell us that this country produces only 18,000 horses in the year? By no means. Our farmers do not go into horse breeding by any means as a paying business. Horses are bred in Canada more as a

luxury than for making money, and the farmers go into that business in so small a way that they do not count the cost; but any farmer who has attempted it on an extensive scale has come to conclusion that it does not pay. Still, 18,000 horses for the whole Dominion of Canada are a mere bagatelle compared with the number our farmers raise in their own economical way. Therefore it is unfair to say that the Canadian farmer in all cases pays the duty on horses. I think it was at Rochester that Mr. Wiman told the Americans, "you pay \$150 for a horse, and but for the duty you would get it for \$120." At Dufferin Lake he told the same story, applied to the Ontario farmer. "It is true, you sell your horse for \$120, and but for duty you would get \$150." I leave Mr. Wiman to settle with Mr. Wiman which is right. But isolated cases can never decide this question. We find there is but this small surplus, and it is not fair for any hon. gentleman to say that we must pay the whole of that duty when the surplus is so insignificant. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said one yoke of steers sold at \$40. Well, were those steers exported to the United States? Usually fat cattle which are fit for exportation are sent to England \$5,000, 000 worth of them, as against \$80,000 worth to the United States. Is it fair to represent that those cattle, which are sold to the butcher and slaughtered in a town within a few miles of where they were raised, and consumed by the inhabitants of that town, are charged with any duty? The National Policy has done a great deal to increase the local market for beef. In the town I have the honor to represent and the country surrounding it there has been a very good market for fat cattle during the last eight years, the prices having ranged higher than the Toronto prices during those years. At the same time we had cattle coming from Toronto and passing through our town for shipment to the north, and we had the Canadian Pacific Railway in course of construction and various other circumstances to improve the price. I do not claim all the benefit of the increased prices in those localities for the National Policy; I state frankly that the construction of the railway and the development of the North-West country gave us a much larger market and enabled us to compete with the Americans. Consider the quantity of cattle shipped to Duluth and Port Arthur and there distributed all along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The railroad gave us the market, and the National Policy preserved it to a very great extent to the farmers of Ontario. The farmer mentioned by the hon. gentleman had 12 lambs. In all probability they were raised in North Wellington and were slaughtered in the adjoining towns. Is it fair, then to say that any duty was paid on them? Then he spoke of the question of barley. Strange, very strange indeed, from my knowledge of North Wellington, that in that county the only grain the farmers raised to sell was barley, which is in demand in the United States, and for which a high price is paid there. But this farmer had five tons of hay, a very large quantity, and we are to suppose that he shipped that hay from North Wellington to the United States, and paid the duty on it. Is it fair to assume that any portion of that hay was exported? We know that hay cannot be shipped any great distance. We find that in towns twenty miles apart, there is often a difference of \$2 per ton in the price of hay. I have known a local crop in the neighborhood of a town to decrease the price there. Therefore, in the article of hay, the farmers have to rely almost entirely on the immediate home market. Then he had thirty bushels of potatoes. I will not occupy the time of the House in going over more of these details, but I say that of the \$70 duty which the hon. member for North Wellington taxed his farmer with, in all probability there was not a cent of duty paid. If hon. gentlemen desired to be fair in comparing the Canadian trade with the United States, with our trade with Great Britain, they would have found figures readily

at hand in the Trade and Navigation Returns. If they look into our trade in agricultural products, they will find that out of a total of \$'8 000,000 exports, only \$7,000,000 worth went to the United States. They will find that in animals and other products, out of a total export of \$24,000,000 only \$7,000,000 worth went to the United States and nearly \$17,000,000 to Great Britain and other countries. In the products of the fisheries they will find that out of a total export of \$6,800,000, we send only \$2,700,000 to the United States. So that in their comparisons, hon. gentlemen opposite have not been as fair in presenting the evidence as the nature of the case requires. I agree heartily in the opinion that the discussion on this question should be entered into dispassionately and a calm consideration should be given to the evidence on both sides. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that on the decision of this question depends the future of Canada. I am willing to admit that our very existence is at stake, and that we are called on to decide whether we will continue to deal here with our own finances, or whether we are to look to the White House at Washington for the direction of our fiscal policy. I do not intend to go very deeply into the statistics I had prepared, as at this late hour I do not think it would be wise to further trespass upon the time of the House. I admit that in 1878 I looked upon reciprocity as of very great value to this country; I will admit that up to a year or so ago, when this great question was first brought prominently to our attention, I was inclined to think that reciprocity would be of great service to our agricultural population. I was inclined to think that the resolutions of our statutes should be carried out to the letter, and reciprocity to the fullest extent in natural products be entered into. I therefore entered on the search for evidence with the same preconceived ideas that hon. gentlemen opposite have on this subject, but I did not shut my eyes to the evidence on the other side, and the result has been that the more I have searched into that matter, the more I have compared the markets of this country with those of the United States, the more I have compared the position of the farmers of this country with that of the farmers of the United States, the more I have been convinced that the duty on our natural products is necessary and important in the interests of the farmers of Ontario. As early as 1874, the Hon. Geo. Brown, in presenting the Canadian memorandum, in conjunction with Sir Edward Thornton, admitted that the result of the repeal of the reciprocity treaty has not been an unmixed evil. He referred especially to such products as wheat, flour, and provisions, of which the United States have a surplus as well as Canada, and he said the effect of the United States putting on a duty on these articles had been to turn Canadian products through Canadian channels, and to force the people of Canada to find markets in the Maritime Provinces, the West Indies, and Great Britain, *via* Canadian routes, instead of the same markets *via* New York and Boston. He went on to say that although it had a disastrous effect upon our traffic with the United States for a time, yet that during the seven years which had elapsed then since the abrogation of the treaty, our exports had reached the sum of \$235,000,000, or \$75,000,000 more than the highest amount they had reached during the existence of the treaty. What has been the effect since? We find that what was true then is true now; we have found more profitable markets for our products and an easier method of reaching them. Then the National Policy came to our assistance and gave us a home market, which is the best market of all, because it brings the consumer and the producer closer together, and the nearer you can bring the consumer to the producer, the better it is for both. I have occupied more time than I intended, but before taking my seat, I will just briefly refer to some of the arguments, or rather assertions, Mr. Masson,

that have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity or whatever they may choose to call it. They tell us that the country is not prosperous, and what remedy do they propose? They propose a policy that would lower the prices of our natural products and ruin our cattle trade which we have been at such great expense in creating. They propose a policy that would destroy our cheese and butter trade with Great Britain, that would close our factories, that would depopulate our cities, towns and villages, that would destroy our home market and render less profitable farming operations in this country. They tell us that our population is leaving us, but how do they propose to keep it here? They propose a policy that would assist the United States in offering greater inducements to our young men to cross the border; they propose a policy that would increase the trade of the United States, that would build up their cities, and hold out a greater bait to our young men to leave this country. They would open the door for a larger exodus, they would close our factories, they would turn our men out of employment, they would shut down every manufacturing industry in the country, they would drive out the people whom we are now trying to retain—that is the remedy that they propose for the evil which they say now exists in our population leaving us. They tell us that our farmers would sell their produce well, and they would open all our ports so that the cheap produce of the United States could pour in all along our border in consequence of the cheap carrying trade which is now established, so that the market of Chicago would be the ruling market for the Province of Ontario. They tell us that we are cursed with combines, and they calmly propose to cast us helpless into the lap of the mother of combines. They tell us that our railways are only paying $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on their investment, and they would tap our railways at every point, so that even the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. profit would be turned into ruin. Some of them tell us that our manufacturers are monopolists and are rolling in wealth; others tell us that they are not prospering. What then? We will take the view that they are rolling in wealth. If that is an evil, will that be bettered? How do they propose to remedy that? Destroy them. Let in the Americans. Let in wealthier manufacturers. Destroy those that we have, because they are rolling in wealth. But, if we take the other view, that they are not prospering, what do they propose to do? Create a trade which would drive men from our cities, take away our home trade, destroy our manufactures, close up our factories, silence our looms, close every forge in the country, in fact ruin our country in order to add to the manufactures of our neighbors across the border. I do not think any such remedies are called for. I do not think it is necessary for us to seek such assistance or to go begging to the United States to take us in. I think we have a glorious country of our own, and I might quote the remarks of the Rev. Father Coffey on that subject, in which he says:

"I fear not to call myself an admirer of America and American institutions. But while I do admire America, while I revere her people, and glory in her history and her achievements, I cannot forget that in the 22 years of national life that Canada has already enjoyed, this great though youthful country has made a progress, moral and material, without parallel in the world's history. * * * Not even the American republic with its proud record of development and progress can point to so many and such gigantic achievements as Canada has in so short a time accomplished. Of this country we have every reason to feel proud. To Canada we owe a debt of loyalty and devotion that cannot be too fully repaid. We have a country with free institutions, with every protection for all classes of citizens, with civil and religious liberty guaranteed to every section of the population, and its people in the enjoyment of a fairer distribution of wealth than obtains in any other portion of the world. Before the rising generation of Canada devolves the duty of doing its utmost to make Canada that which God and nature intended it should be—a truly great nation. A great nation must Canada become if its people continue to prove true to the Canadian principles that lie at the foundation of all true growth and progress. That they will so prove is my firm belief as it certainly is the sincere

trust and prayer of every lover of this brave land—the crown and the glory of the proud and fearless north.”

I think it is a spirit such as that, to love and praise our country, that we should endeavor to cultivate. We should enhance the value of our country at home and abroad, and not cry out ruin and desolation, and point to our weak points; but hon. gentlemen opposite are prone to point to all our failings, to all our losses and misfortunes, and at the same time they are prone to praise all the benefits of our neighbors across the border. If they must praise one country and depreciate the other, in the name of all that is sacred why do they not sound the praises and tell the benefits of our Canadian homes, and point to the discrepancies and the drawbacks of the Americans? But no, they tell us of the wheat fields of Dakota, and they do not tell us of the blizzards and the cyclones. They tell us of the rich pastures of another State, but they say nothing of the bug and the grasshopper. But, when they speak of Canada, it is only upon the evils that they can dwell, it is only the losses and the discouraging features of the case that they refer to. If they could but unite, as it is the duty of all loyal Canadians to unite, in pressing everywhere the claims of the country in which they live, so that in every land our praises may be set forth, we would not have the portrait of any hon. member of this House forming the frontispiece of an American pamphlet. We have many communities and many nationalities in our land, and all we want is that a united stand should be made, all we want is for the men of every Province and of every nationality in the various Provinces to unite firmly and to press forward the general work in the interests of the prosperity of our common country. If they will do that, Canada cannot fail to prosper, Canada must prosper. She is a land of rich resources, she is inhabited by noble races. Why, then, should she not prosper? I say that:

“English, Irish, Scotch and French together here combine
To emulate the deeds their sires have done in Auld Lang Syne;
Let's lay their failings all aside, their virtue and truth maintain,
And in this new Dominion they shall bring forth fruit again
Then as long as the old St. Lawrence rolls its course towards the sea,
So long shall Canada remain the glorious and free.”

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House at any great length at this late stage of the debate, but I desire to give some reasons which influence me in voting for the resolution of my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Before doing that, I desire to refer to some of the statements which have been made by the last speaker. He made some very extraordinary statements or, at least, they seemed so to me. He said that formerly, before we had the National Policy, the Liverpool market regulated the price of wheat, but that now the National Policy regulates the price of wheat. If the National Policy had secured for our farmers a market sufficient to absorb the entire product of our wheat, the hon. gentleman's statement might have had some shade or shadow of truth in it, but from the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that we export some five million bushels of wheat and 500 barrels of flour, and, as long as we export wheat and flour—it does not matter whether we export two million bushels or five million bushels or ten million bushels—so long as we have an export trade the foreign market must regulate the price. Then he seemed to be very much exercised with the idea that, if unrestricted trade were adopted with the United States, it would annihilate the pea crop of the farmers. I do not exactly see how that result would follow. Then he tries to point out what he alleges to be the weakness in the argument of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), when he stated that 45,705 cattle were exported last year to the United States. According to the idea of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) the hon.

member for East Huron should have given the amount realised for these cattle instead of the number; because the amount realised per head for the cattle exported to the United States was not as great as the amount realised per head for the cattle exported to Great Britain, he thought there was a weakness in the argument. Now, I know from certain knowledge that the cattle which we exported to the United States were mostly grass cattle, were store cattle, cattle that were exported for feeding purposes. Why did our farmers export these cattle? Because they found it more profitable to export their peas and barley instead of feeding it to the cattle, and if we had free trade with the United States in raw products, so that our farmers could obtain cheap corn as they did formerly under the Reciprocity Treaty, then they could have sold their barley and peas and they could have bought cheap corn and fattened these cattle and sent them to Great Britain and secured a much greater price for them. Another statement of the hon. gentleman was that it is a great advantage for our farmers and others to be able to sell our products in the nearest market. He laid down the principle that the nearer you can bring the producer and the consumer together, the better it will be for both. Now, that is exactly what we are proposing to do in trying to get reciprocal trade with the United States. We desire to bring the consumer and the producer as near together as we possibly can. Now, without referring any further to the arguments of that hon. gentleman, I will proceed to state to the House some of the ideas which present themselves to my mind on this question. The question of free trade between Canada and the United States has occupied the attention of the people of this country to a very large extent ever since the abrogation of the last reciprocity treaty. I think both political parties in this House and in the country are agreed that it is highly desirable that we should have freer trade relations with the United States than we have had at present. It seems to me that the only difference of opinion which exists is as to the form which these trade relations ought to take, as to the extent to which we ought to secure free trade with the United States. Well, if we could secure reciprocity in raw products, if we could gain free access to the United States for our farmers, our miners, our lumbermen, our fishermen, and all the producers of raw materials, that, in my opinion, would satisfy to a very large extent the desire for free trade in the Dominion of Canada. But the Government of the United States, as I understand it, have clearly and distinctly told us that for the present, at all events, they will not trade with us on that basis, and consequently it is our duty to see whether we can find some other basis on which they will be willing to trade with us. Failing to secure free trade in raw products, the strong desire which exist in this country for some kind of trade relations with our neighbors, has given rise to the discussion of several other projects. One scheme which has been discussed during the past year is known by the name of commercial union or Zollverein, and the proposal now before the House is known under the name of unrestricted reciprocity—free trade, without the complications which might arise in connection with commercial union. Under commercial union, as I understand it, the tariff to be levied upon foreign goods would have to be agreed upon between the two countries, it would necessarily have to be a uniform tariff, but under unrestricted reciprocity, as proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that is not necessary. Under that arrangement Canada can levy her own tariff, and the people of the United States can levy such a tariff as would suit them. The tariff would not necessarily require to be equal, and consequently our revenue would not have to be interfered with so much as some hon. gentlemen would have us believe. The principal objection urged by hon. gentlemen opposite against this scheme of

unrestricted reciprocity is that, as they allege, it will lead to annexation. That seems to be their strongest position. They declare, one and all, that it would lead to annexation. Now, if I believed for a single moment that it would have that effect I would hesitate before I voted for it, but I do not believe it would have that effect. I do not believe that it would have a tendency in the slightest degree to produce an annexation sentiment in the Dominion of Canada. Let us examine this statement for a few moments. No doubt hon. gentlemen are all aware that immediately preceding the introduction of the reciprocity treaty in 1854, there existed in Canada a very considerable feeling in favor of annexation among certain classes, but so soon as a reciprocity treaty was adopted, so soon as we obtained free trade in raw products with the United States, that feeling died away and we heard nothing more of it. Now, then, if, during the twelve years from 1854 to 1866 the farmers of Canada had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the lumbermen had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the fishermen had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the miners had free trade, and our artisans had the benefit of free trade, indirectly, through the greater prosperity of the farmers upon whom they are dependent for their prosperity, while our laborers have always been permitted to transfer their skill and their labor from one side of the line to the other free, and they have not become annexationists—if all these, and the class which I have enumerated, constituting by far the larger proportion of the population—I think I am quite within the mark when I say that they constitute three-fourths of our entire population—if such a large proportion of our population had free trade before, and did not become annexationists, why should they become such now? Then the question arises, Who are going to become annexationists under this arrangement? From what classes are the annexationists to come? There is only one other class left, and that is the petted and pampered manufacturers, those who have been enabled, during the past eight or ten years under the operation of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, to enrich themselves at the expense of the public, they are the only class left—and I do not believe that any considerably proportion of that class would become annexationists if these special advantages were withdrawn from them, and they were placed upon the common level of ordinary business men. It seems to me that we have not been so successful as we could have wished in establishing interprovincial trade between the different Provinces; although we have expended large sums with a view to secure that result. Unfortunately for Canada its fertile sections are situated so far apart, the geographical difficulties are so great, that we have not been as successful in cultivating interprovincial trade as we would desire. Those geographical difficulties do not exist between Canada and the United States. Our American neighbors ought to be our most profitable customers under any arrangement such as is proposed by this resolution, and it is quite clear that the nearer we can bring the customer to the producer the better it will be for both parties, and trading with our near neighbors is more profitable and more sensible than trying to find markets lying at a greater distance. The cost of transporting our goods or products to consumers in the United States is not so great as transporting them to more distant countries and returns are obtained more readily. Dealers can meet from time to time and arrange matters with regard to trade, and the difficulties which exist in connection with trading with distant countries do not prevail to the same extent with a country lying nearer home. The benefit and the great convenience of trading with our near neighbors is illustrated by our coal trade. We have endeavored by carrying coal from Nova Scotia to Quebec and Ontario even at a loss to encourage that trade, but in spite of all that has been done

Mr. BOWMAN.

to foster the trade, Ontario has all along brought her coal from the United States because the cost of transportation is less, and it was more convenient to purchase that article from our near neighbors. But the Minister of Marine tried to controvert the argument made on this side of the House in favor of trade with our near neighbors by trying to show that the nearer market was not in many instances the best market, and another statement made by that hon. gentleman was that our most profitable trade can be done with those nations which do not produce at all or only in limited quantities the articles we have to sell. I do not think that always follows. The hon. gentleman referred to France, and stated that if the near market was the best France ought to be the best customers for British goods and by implication he stated that the distant market of India and other foreign countries was more profitable for British productions. I find by the Statesmen's Year Book of 1885, that the trade of Great Britain with France, a nation which competes to a very great extent with Great Britain in foreign markets in manufactured goods—the imports from France to Great Britain in 1883 were \$190,000,000, while the exports from France were \$85,000,000, or the exports from Great Britain to France amounted to \$2.25 per head, while the exports to India were only 86 cents per head, taking the population at the lowest number given in the census return. Then take two other countries lying very near to Great Britain, Belgium and Holland. Those countries are among the most profitable and largest customers of British goods, and there is this remarkable circumstance connected with those countries, that Belgium and Holland seem to manufacture and produce precisely the same class of goods which they purchase to a very large extent from Great Britain. I find that Belgium, a country lying very near to Great Britain, with a population of five millions and three-quarters, exported to Great Britain in 1883, \$80,000,000 worth and took in exchange from Great Britain \$40,000,000 worth or \$7 per head for the whole population. Holland, with a population of four millions and a quarter, exported \$124,000,000 worth and took British goods in exchange to the extent of \$45,000,000 worth, or \$11 per head. So those countries lying near to Great Britain, and producing even the same classes of goods, were purchasers to the amounts of \$7 and \$10 per head, according to the population respectively. There is one very remarkable feature connected with the trade between Great Britain and those two countries, a feature which I think has some bearing upon the trade, which we think can be done under reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States. I find, for instance, that Belgium exported to Great Britain woollen yarns to the amount of \$7,000,000, and that Great Britain in return sold to Belgium in 1883 woollen goods to the value of \$6,000,000. Belgium, during the same year, sold to Great Britain flax and cotton goods to the value of \$6,500,000, and Great Britain in return sold to Belgium \$11,000,000 worth of cotton goods. I find also that Belgium sold to Great Britain in the same year iron goods to the value of \$3,500,000 and Great Britain sold to Belgium in return iron goods to the amount of \$2,100,000. So the House will see that there exists between those two countries a very large reciprocal trade in the class of manufactured goods which both countries produce; so it does not always follow that we can always sell most profitably to the country which does not manufacture or produce the goods we have to sell. The trade between Great Britain and Holland is of the same character. Holland exported iron and steel goods to the value of \$6,000,000 and Great Britain sold back to Holland \$5,500,000 worth. I find also that Holland sold Great Britain woollen goods to the value of \$8,000,000 and Great Britain sold back to Holland \$6,300,000 worth of the same kind of goods during the same year. Holland sold to Great Britain \$4,000,000

worth of cotton goods and Great Britain sold to Holland \$13,500,000 worth. So here are countries lying near to Great Britain manufacturing the same kind of goods as Great Britain and those two nations exchange the same kind of goods to a very large extent. And if that can be done between those two countries I do not see any reason why we in the Dominion of Canada under reciprocal free trade with the United States should not be able to sell a large quantity of manufactured goods to our neighbors as well as to purchase from them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is admitted by every one that free trade with the United States in the produce of the farm, would be of great benefit to the class of our people engaged in that industry. I think it is admitted by every one that our farmers would be largely benefited by freedom of trade between Canada and the United States. It is, I believe, a fact, which cannot be denied, that the British market is not as valuable at the present moment to our farmers as it was five years ago, and I think if we take into consideration the large increase in the production of wheat and cattle in other countries of the world which has taken place during the past five years, we must come to the conclusion that the depreciation in the value of the British market to our farmer, has become permanent. Therefore, I think, it is the duty of this House and of the Government to secure as valuable a market for our farmers with our American neighbors as is possible. Even under present circumstances and with a heavy duty against us our farmers sell a very large proportion of their products in the American market. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that in 1878 we sold 13,851 head of cattle to our neighbors, in 1880 the number had risen to 21,317, in 1885 it had increased to 30,593 and in 1886 we exported 45,765. Again in 1886 we exported 18,225 horses and 363,046 sheep, and poultry to the value of \$98,719. Of eggs we exported 13,000,000 dozen, valued at \$1,821,364; wool, \$1,297,876; of barley we sent 9,437,000 bushels; peas, 405,000 bushels; and potatoes, 1,276,000 bushels. Now, if our farmers can find their best market in the United States for such a large proportion of their products with a heavy duty against them, I think we have every reason to believe that they would sell them to much better advantage if the duty were removed, and to show you still further the value and importance of the American market to our farmers I would just quote our total export from the Dominion to the United States last year. They were as follows:—Ontario exported \$20,271,000; Quebec exported \$4,394,000; Nova Scotia exported \$2,733,000; New Brunswick, \$1,763,000; Prince Edward Island, \$667,000; Manitoba, \$212,000; British Columbia, \$2,230,000, making a total export from the Dominion to the United States of \$32,273,033, as against \$38,714,331 to Great Britain. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, that even under present circumstances the American market is quite as important as the British market to our farmer. Now then, the question comes up if the duty were removed, and if we were to secure free trade with the United States, would the price of the products of the farm increase at the same time, or would the taking off of the duty reduce the price so that the farmer would get no more than he does now. If it can be shown that the removal of the duty would not enhance the price to our farmers, then there is no practical object in getting the duty removed. I think it could be clearly shown that the removal of the duty would not reduce the value of our products in the United States market, and that consequently our farmers would just get as much more, or nearly as much more, as the duty amounts to. I find from the United States statistics that the farmers produced last year 61,000,000 bushels of barley, and that we sold to them 9,000,000 bushels. Now then, does anyone pretend to say that if the duty were taken off the 9,000,000 bushels exported to the United States it would

have the effect of reducing the price of the 61,000,000 bushels on the other side. The people of the United States require not only their own production but they require our 9,000,000 bushels as well, and consequently I do not believe that the price of barley would be reduced by a single cent per bushel if the duty were removed. Then speaking of our horses. There is a very large demand for horses in the United States. I think I am quite within the mark when I say that at least 95 out of every 100 horses sold in the United States are raised by the American farmer, and as everyone knows, there is no duty against their own horses. The remaining five out of every 100 is exported from Canada to the United States. Suppose the duty were to be taken off the horses exported from Canada to the States, does anyone pretend to say that the taking off of the duty from the five horses out of every 100 sold there would have the effect of reducing the price on the remaining 95 raised in their own country. I do not think it would have that effect. The demand for horses and the price for horses—would remain the same in the United States and the result would be that our farmers would get from \$20 to \$30 more for every horse exported to our neighbors. Even if the Canadian farmer did not get the whole benefit of the removal of the duty, it is quite clear that the \$20 or \$30 duty would be divided between the farmer and the trader, and I think the farmer would get by far the larger share. Now it has been alleged by some speakers on this side of the House that in consequence of the reduction in the market price of the farmers' produce the price of land in Canada has fallen within the last five years. It seems to me that it is hardly necessary to discuss this question. Everyone who has investigated the matter for himself in his own neighborhood, cannot help but come to the conclusion that the price of farming land has depreciated very considerably during the past five years. My own observation leads me irresistibly to that conclusion. It is evident that the loaning companies of the Province of Ontario do not loan as large an amount per acre on farm property to-day as they did five years ago, for the reason that they know very well that farms are not worth as much in the market as they formerly were. In my own county of Waterloo, where farming lands have held their value better than in most other counties, there is a very considerable depreciation in the values of farms. I know of one farm, for instance, in the township of Wellesley, which was sold two years ago for \$5,500, and about two months ago it was sold again for \$4,200, not by a forced sale, but on very favorable terms. I know another in the township of Wallace which was valued by company valuers five years ago at \$9,000, and which was sold two months ago for \$7,300. I know of a considerable number of farms in my own riding which could have been readily sold five years ago, but for which purchasers cannot now be found at the old figure, so that their owners, being unwilling to reduce the price, are unable to sell them. Some of the speakers who have preceded me have dwelt considerably on the question of the prosperity of our farmers. It is alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that our farmers are just as prosperous now as they were ten years ago. I do not agree with that statement. I think we have very conclusive evidence all around us that our farmers are not as prosperous as they were five or ten years ago. I know that in my own county our farmers are under the necessity of borrowing money from the loan companies much more largely than they did five years ago. Until within the past two years it was impossible for any of the loan companies to secure a loan in the north riding of Waterloo. I am connected with a company in Waterloo, which lends money to a pretty large extent, and until very recently we were unable to secure any loans worth speaking of in our neighborhood; but within the last two years we have placed more loans on farms in our immediate neighborhood than we did for ten years be-

fore: The reason of that is quite plain. While our farmers were getting better prices than they are now, they always had plenty of money, and there is no part of the country where the farmers have as much money as they have in North Waterloo. Previous to the great reduction in prices they had so much money that they were accustomed to lend it to neighboring farmers who wanted to borrow; but during the last two years they have not had any to lend, and the consequence is that the farmers who need money have to go to the loan companies for it. On this point I will just read a single extract from the *Trade Review* published at Montreal:

"It cannot but be concluded that Ontario is possessed of that important element, an enterprising population; but comparing the two periods, 1873-79 and 1879-85, it is found that the ratepayers and rural municipalities increased by 40,367, or 16½ per cent. in 1873-79, and only by 13,360, or 4½ in 1879-85. For the two periods the area of assessed lands in 1873-79 increased by 1,001,233 acres, or 5 per cent.; in 1879-85, by 622,978 acres, or 3 per cent. It may and must strike the reader that the comparison which has been made, demonstrates that Ontario has been going back instead of advancing."

The emigration of our people to the United States is another question which has been considerably discussed during this debate, and I think it is admitted on both sides that the emigration has been for years past and still is very large—much larger than any of us desire to see. I think it is generally admitted that the adoption of reciprocal free trade with the United States would benefit every class of people in this Dominion, except, as some hon. gentlemen opposite allege, our manufacturers. It is stated by the opponents of this resolution that our manufacturing industries would be wiped out, as they could not compete with those of the United States—that the result of the adoption of this policy would be that our markets would be filled with American goods, and that we would not be able to sell an equal quantity among our American neighbors. Now, if I believe that it would have the effect of wiping out our manufacturing industries, or even seriously injuring them, I would not cast my vote in its favor, because I quite agree in the importance of having manufacturers in our country as well as farmers. But I am inclined to the opinion that it would not seriously injure any considerable number of our manufacturers, while I believe it would benefit a great many. One hon. gentleman, I think it was the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), said this afternoon that he was satisfied that at least 99 out of every hundred of the manufacturers in this Dominion were opposed to reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. So they are.

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not agree with that statement. I believe quite a respectable number of our most intelligent, our most progressive, our most enterprising and successful manufacturers are in favor of this resolution. I have had some opportunities of acquainting myself with the opinions of the manufacturers of my own riding; and I think that I am quite within the mark when I say that there are no two towns of the same size in the Dominion in which there are so large a number of manufacturing establishments in operation as there are in the towns of Berlin and Waterloo. Our manufacturers, as a rule, have been very successful, more successful, perhaps, than they have been in some other parts of the country, and I am happy to be able to inform this House that some of them, at least, are in favor of this proposition. It is quite natural, however, that some of our manufacturers in my part of the country should be opposed to this resolution just as they are in other parts of the country, but we have in my riding a large number of millers who believe that under reciprocity they could compete with the United States millers in their own markets. Take the town of Waterloo as a centre. Within a radius of twelve miles of that town there are no less than twenty flour mills, some of very large capacity. A number of

Mr. BOWMAN.

them are owned by some of the most enterprising and progressive millers of the Dominion, who were the first to introduce the new process of milling, and who sold a large quantity of flour to our American neighbors during the period when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force, and even during the earlier years of the protective tariff. Of these twenty millers, I know that at least fifteen are strongly in favor of reciprocity with the United States. Then we have two factories in the town of Waterloo, who manufacture agricultural implements on a pretty large scale. I have not taken the trouble to ascertain the views of the proprietors of one of them, but the leading proprietor of the other told me a few days ago that he was quite willing to accept reciprocal free trade with the United States, as he could sell his wares among our neighbors to a much larger extent than he can at home. Then we have in Waterloo one of the most successful and largest woollen manufactory in the Dominion of Canada. It may sound like boasting of the capacity of our own people, but I will say that there is not another woollen factory in this Dominion, the proprietors of which have made as much money on their capital invested as have the proprietors of this Waterloo establishment. Its president and foreman, on two occasions, visited some of the leading factories of the United States, examined their machinery, methods of operation, cost of management, and products, and they both declared most emphatically that they are fully prepared to compete with the United States manufacturers. The president said to me a few days ago: Give me access to the American markets, and I will then run four factories just as well as I do one now. Another enterprising and successful firm in Berlin, Messrs. Brown & Erb, is engaged largely in upholstering. I asked Mr. Brown the other day his opinion on this question, and he said: I go in for free trade with the United States, and if I can get free access to the American markets I could have half a dozen travellers out through the Western States selling my goods. We have another industry in Berlin and Waterloo, which is not represented perhaps in any other part of the Dominion, that of the manufacture of buttons. One of these manufacturers, the manufacturer at Waterloo, has recently commenced to ship his goods to Buffalo, while the other, the largest manufacturer in the town of Berlin, has, during the past ten years, sold in the United States markets no less than \$120,000 worth of buttons, paying the duty upon them, and the managing proprietor told me that with such a duty we now have in Canada on German buttons, he is prepared to take his chances in the American market. It matters not what may be said on this question, the fact that they have been able to sell this large quantity of buttons in the United States during the last two years is the best evidence we can have that they can compete with the Americans. One objection urged against the adoption of this resolution is that under free trade with the United States, our manufacturers would have to change their methods of operation, and that instead of manufacturing a large number of articles in different lines they would have to confine themselves to one or two lines, and that large factories would have to be established to compete with those in the United States. The effect, it is argued, would be that our factories would all be centred in the large cities, and that the smaller towns would lose the industries they now possess. I do not believe this policy would have that effect. It has not had it in the United States. We find the largest manufacturing establishments in the United States are not to be found in the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and other large cities, but in the smaller towns, in places that were scarcely towns at all until those establishments were located there. A similar result would follow here. I believe that our manufacturing establishments would remain just where they are, largely located in such towns as Guelph, Galt, Berlin and Waterloo, and not in the

larger cities. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have great faith in the resources of our great Dominion. Whenever we speak about reciprocity with the United States, they begin to speak of our great resources. Hon. gentlemen on this side place just as high a value upon the resources of this Dominion as they do. We appreciate just as highly as they the great natural resources we possess, but we desire to adopt a policy which will enable us more successfully to develop these resources. We desire to adopt a policy which will give us a free market in the United States for our lumber, coal, fish, and other products. We desire a policy which, by enabling the people of Manitoba and the North-West to buy and sell in the nearest, the most convenient the most profitable market, will do more to develop that magnificent country than the policy of restriction, monopoly and disallowance of hon. gentlemen opposite has done in five or even ten years. We desire to adopt a policy which will give a free market to the farmers of Ontario and Quebec and the fishermen of the eastern Provinces. We desire a policy which will enable us to develop the resources of our Dominion and make of Canada a peaceful, prosperous and independent nation; and for the reason I have just given, it is my intention to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. McKEEN. This discussion has taken such a wide range and has extended over so many days, that perhaps there is little new that can be said on the resolution before the House, but the subject is so wide a one, embracing as it does our national and industrial interests of every kind, that, while the resolution is before the House, it should be thoroughly investigated from every standpoint. To my mind, the best way of doing this is for the representatives of this country to show how the industries with which they are more practically acquainted would be affected by the proposed changes. Evidence of that kind is likely to tell more powerfully than glittering theories, or what are called broad views. There is, of course, a wide difference of opinion on this whole subject in this House, a good deal of which may arise from the different views that are taken of the actual condition of the country. We have been told by the hon. and learned member from South Oxford, in his able speech on the resolution under discussion, and his utterances have been, more or less, endorsed by the hon. members supporting him, that business is depressed; that there is an exodus of our population; that we are hopelessly in debt, and that irretrievable ruin must inevitably follow a continuance of our present policy, and I notice there is a disposition on this side of the House to denounce those who talk in this deprecating strain, as disloyal and pessimistic; but I submit, Sir, that there is some excuse for these gloomy views, and that in justice this ought to be considered. We should remember that these gentlemen are Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and that, in their way, they are doing some service to the country; we should also remember that these hon. gentlemen have, time and again, told the electors that the Government of this country would be more honestly, economically and efficiently administered if entrusted in their hands; and that ruin, desolation, moral and financial bankruptcy must follow, should confidence be placed in the present Administration; and yet the country has, again and again, refused to listen to their denunciations or entrust them with power. Let gentlemen on this side of the House place themselves in the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I venture the assertion that their tone will be less jubilant than it is at present. In fact, when they were out of power for a short time, the wail over the condition of the country was almost as loud as it is now, but the wail then came from some of those who now see nothing but blue skies. Everyone knows that there was cause for lamentation then, and so the country decided. The misery and starvation

consequent upon that great depression, led to the adoption of a policy which has developed our own resources, which has made us commercially independent, and which has won for us the respect of our neighbors, on both sides of the Atlantic. But just as much of the lamentation cry might have been discounted during the lean years, to which I have referred, so I am sure that reasonable men on the opposite side will admit that much of what we now hear as to the country being depopulated and on the verge of ruin, must be taken subject to a heavy discount. Were these hon. gentlemen sitting on the Government benches, they would speak in more cheerful tones, they would then show us the other side of the shield. I claim that the exodus referred to is not peculiar to this country. There has always been, and there is now on a larger scale than ever before, a movement of population from northern to southern and western countries; from countries with a limited varieties of industries to countries which are more populous, and which offer more avenues to wealth. There is an exodus from northern to southern and western Russia; from Norway and Sweden, which are not at all over-populated, to southern and western countries; from New England to the south and west, and if Canada became part of the United States, it is not improbable that this exodus would not only continue, but would proceed with increased volume, as travelling facilities become greater. It has already been shown by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that there has been for years past a movement of population from the northern and eastern States towards the west and south, and to such an extent has this been going on, that, as has been demonstrated by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), and others, that the Eastern States similarly situated as to climate, soil and production with our own Maritime Provinces, show a much less decennial increase in population, than do the Provinces. Allusion has been made to Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, which have been compared in point of increase of population with the Maritime Provinces. For example the official census shows that the State of Maine in 1870 had a population of 626,415, and in 1880 had a population 648,936, an increase of 22,521, equal to an increase of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the decennial period. Now take Nova Scotia, which had, in 1871, a population of 387,800, and in 1881, 440,572, an aggregate increase of 52,772, equal to an increase per cent. of 13.6 against 3.5 in Maine. Again, looking at the State of New Hampshire, which had in 1870 a population of 317,277, and in 1880 had 346,991, giving an aggregate increase of 29,714 or 9.3 per cent.; compare this with New Brunswick which had in 1871 a population of 285,594, and in 1881 had increased to 321,233, being an aggregate increase of 35,639, equal to 12.5 per cent. as compared with New Hampshire giving 9.3. Once more, take the State of Vermont, which had in 1870 a population of 330,575, and in 1880 it numbered 332,286, giving an aggregate increase of 1,711, equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent.; now contrast this with the tight little Island of Prince Edward, which had in 1871 a population of 94,021, and in 1881 a population of 108,891, making an aggregate increase of 14,870, equal to 15.8 per cent., against $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. in Vermont. But flattering as these comparisons are to our own old Maritime Provinces, there exists cases of still greater disparity in favor of Canada. Take for example the following cities of the United States: Bangor, Maine, a city regarded as of considerable importance, had in 1870 a population of 18,289 and in 1880 it was 16,856, or a decrease, in ten years, of 1,433. Burlington, Vermont, had in 1870 a population of 14,387 and in 1880 it had gone down to 11,365, a decrease of 3,022, and yet these two cities have had for the last 120 years unrestricted trade with the whole United States, so with other numerous towns in the Eastern States, such as Belfast, Camden, Ellsworth, and others of Maine, Adams in Massachusetts, Burlington in Vermont, and Fond du Lac in Wisconsin,

&c. Not only in the old Eastern States but away to the west and south all over the Union are there dottings of this character. Whilst speaking of cities, supposing we compare Portland, Maine, with Halifax, similarly situated, and, at the present moment, to some extent rival ports. Well, in 1870, Portland had a population of 31,213, and in 1880 it was 33,810, a total gain in the decade of only 2,597, equal to 8.3 per cent. Halifax city had in 1871 a population of 59,582, which in 1881 had increased to 36,100, a total gain of 6,518, and equal to 22 per cent., against an increase of 8.3 per cent. of Portland in the same period. But, Sir, is it not a little singular that whilst our friends opposite appear only to find depletion and exodus of the population of Canada as they estimate it, they never appear to take into account the compensations which Canada receives in continuous additions to her population by immigration, whether it is that our friends knowingly ignore this important factor to the credit side, or unintentionally neglect it, I cannot say; but the fact remains, that we have in Canada very much more than compensation for the outward movement of population. For example, I find from the official statements of the Department of Agriculture that for the calendar year of 1887, 3,354 subjects of the United States came across the border and settled in Canada; and Canadians who had lived, and apparently settled, in the United States for a number of years, returned to their native Canada during the same year to the number of 19,677; and in this way Canada has drawn off from the population of the United States to herself, 23,011 persons. Nor is this all; for in addition Canada has received from Europe, by immigration, for the year mentioned, 84,526 settlers, who have added to the wealth of the country by bringing with them \$3,879,908. All these circumstances, highly satisfactory as they are to all Canadian people, are by no means the only, or even the greatest or most important, factor by which the population of Canada is being surely and steadily augmented, neither need there be any alarm at an alleged exodus. In point of natural increase our families are much larger in Canada than in the United States. We can spare thousands annually, and yet increase in numbers and wealth. Besides, the thousands who go do a work for their native land. The example of their industry, frugality, intelligence and virtue inspire our neighbors with respect for the country that rears such sons and daughters. The point for us to consider is, not how many go, but how many remain. It is a certain fact that the population of Canada is increasing. The financial position and public debt of the country has been a fruitful subject of deprecation with our friends of the opposite side, and the matter has been so fully discussed *pro* and *con* that I do not intend to impose on the indulgence of the House by adding materially to the array of figures already presented on both sides. It must be admitted that the debt of our country has increased, but the points to be asked are, have we not value for it? and, is it not wise, at times, to incur debt? We have the grandest canal system in the world; railways connecting the whole country together, such as no other country with so limited a population ever constructed; lighthouses; public works of all kinds which have developed the country. Our most progressive farmers borrowed money at 6 per cent. or 7 per cent. to improve their property, may it not be wise that the country should borrow at half that rate for the same purpose? Of course there is a limit here that should be regarded. Comparing our financial status with that of other countries, Canada occupies the proud position of standing at the head of the list of all countries whose securities are sought for in the great money markets of the world. Comparing, in like manner, our public indebtedness with that of our neighbors, it does not appear to be the terrific, grinding, destructive volume our friends have, year after year, been seeking to make it.

Mr. McKEEN.

Compared with other countries, it is found that the debt of England represents exactly \$110 per head; the debt of Austria \$60 per head; the national debt of the United States, to which our friends opposite bid us look with admiration, is \$30 per head, to which has to be added the State debts of \$17 per head (debts which, in Canada, are provided for in behalf of the Provinces of the Dominion) which brings the debt of the United States up to \$47 per head. In Canada the gross debt (not the net debt) is \$45 per head, against \$47 in the United States. In addition to this, the municipalities of the United States are burdened with very much heavier debts than are the municipalities of this country. Again, the debt of the Australian colonies is \$195 per head, against \$45 in Canada. Then, looking at our public debt, comparatively, in relation to its percentage on the national wealth, it is found that the debt of the United Kingdom is 9 per cent. of the wealth of the country; in France it is 11 per cent., and the public debt of France and Spain amount to 24 per cent. of the national wealth. Now, Sir, contrast these with the debt of Canada, which is a fraction below 6 per cent. of the country's wealth. In addition to this the additional and very important fact is to be added, that in no country in the world is the aggregate of wealth and the comforts of life so equally distributed amongst the whole people as in Canada. Then, Sir, it must be conceded that this country of ours is on the whole a most desirable country to live in, and a country most attractive to freemen of industrious habits. I invite the most casual observer of passing events to contrast the happy peacefulness prevailing amongst the industrial classes in this country, in comparison with the working classes of the United States, and the amity and good feeling which prevail in Canada between capital and labor, in comparison with these relationships in the former country, as demonstrated by the almost continuous, huge strikes and dangerous strifes that prevail there. Permit me to invite the attention of the House for a few moments to the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia. What undoubted evidence have we as to its actual condition? Without recalling what has already been brought forward by hon. members who have preceded me, I quote from authorities which hon. members of the Opposition cannot but regard as conclusive. I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued under authority of the Government of Nova Scotia in 1886, and being official in character, should be a sufficient guarantee as to the facts it assumes to furnish. The extract from this official publication quoted by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) in the course of this debate, shows that Nova Scotia is a most desirable country for farming enterprise, and that practical farmers with small capital may easily possess themselves of good and comfortable homes, and by energy, industry and enterprise, may make for themselves fortune and position in that country in a few years, such as they could not obtain in a lifetime in Great Britain. And in addition, the same high authority informs intending emigrants from Europe, as follows, on page 27:—

"The information contained in the foregoing pages may be relied on as a correct and unexaggerated description of the Province of Nova Scotia, and will, we believe, be found sufficient to enable any man of ordinary intelligence to form a very good idea of the general character of the country, its climate, resources, &c., and to see that for a man of energy and industry, combined with a small amount of money capital, no other part of America offers the same inducements, or presents the same advantages."

And yet, again, in reference to the condition of laborers' wages in Nova Scotia it says, on page 28:—

"Skilled labor is in demand in the Province, no matter whether it consists in the art of digging a ditch properly, or in manufacturing and putting together the most delicate kinds of mechanism. All classes of working people who understand the particular business in which they have been educated, either theoretically or practically, may succeed here if they are willing to put their knowledge to practical use. In short industry in any business will, in Nova Scotia, meet with a sure reward."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this witness is true, there is a reasonable amount of prosperity in Nova Scotia, the unskilled laborer, the farmer, the miner, and mechanic and the fishermen have good prospects ahead. The witness is true, and the people, like people everywhere else, desiring a larger measure of prosperity are fairly well satisfied. The people of Nova Scotia and of the Island of Cape Breton, in particular, have proved pretty conclusively, that they are satisfied, and that the Government is doing its best to promote their prosperity. But we have been told by the hon. member for South Oxford and by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., that the people of Nova Scotia were bribed by the hon. Minister of Finance, that were it not for the large Government grants given to this Province, he, the hon. Minister of Finance, would not have a corporal's guard supporting him in this House. Sir, I admit having listened to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen with a good deal of interest, and am willing to make large allowance for statements made in the heat of debate or hastily spoken; had these charges been made last year, when these gentlemen were suffering from the disappointment of defeat, when the causes of their defeat and their consequent inability to provide the position and offices which had been so freely promised their supporters had to be explained to the country, they might fairly have been regarded as of trifling moment; but now, Sir, the slanders are becoming monotonous, and judging from the recent records of the election courts can only be characterised as Pharasaical. We are reminded of the old adage, "that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones." I, cannot, however, in justice to the people I represent allow such gross aspersions to pass unchallenged; in so far as these reflections bear upon the people of Nova Scotia proper they have been fully met and dispelled by the hon. junior member for Halifax, who in the course of his eloquent speech told this House that the gold had never been coined that would buy the people of Nova Scotia. In so far as the people of the Island and County of Cape Breton are interested, a little sober reflection would, I think, have shown both these hon. gentlemen, that they had fallen into a grave error, gross and groundless aspersions of bribery which they have thrown at the people of Cape Breton. Will these hon. gentlemen inform the House, what was the bribe that bought the people of Cape Breton Island in 1882? When after four year's experience of the present Administration and the National Policy, they sent up to Ottawa a solid phalanx to support the Government? Can they point to any particular or especial grant then made to seduce the electors? What were the bribes by which the people were seduced in 1887, when after another four year's experience they sent up four supporters of the Government's fiscal policy against one in Opposition? Do these gentlemen refer to the railway then in course of construction through the Island. Why, Sir, this was a public work which had been before this House for years, even so far back as the administration of hon. gentlemen Opposite, and when it was being openly requested upon the consideration of this Government and the House, the claims of Cape Breton to a railway received the sanction and support of no less than the hon. absent leader of the Opposition, who said, that he fully sympathised in the justice of Cape Breton's claim to a railway. Was that bribery of the people of Cape Breton? And did the hon. leader of the Opposition propose to take a hand in this bribery? Surely not, and if the Government found that in this matter they had the rather extraordinary occurrence of the support of the gentlemen opposite to the measure they, the Government, could have no better assurance of the entire concurrence of the country. Sir, if the Government was guilty of bribing the people of Cape Breton with a railway, it does not lie with the hon. members for South Oxford and Queen's to expose the association of their own side in that bribe. I might here confidentially state to those hon. gentlemen the

bribe by which the allegiance of the people of Cape Breton was charmed away from the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs to supporting the present Government. This bribe, Sir, was the National Policy, which is giving our people increased prosperity, which has given us comforts and comparative plenty instead of misery and starvation. This, Sir, is the bribe, if bribe it may be called, which has won from our people their support to the present Minister of Finance. Now, Sir, what are the principal facts regarding this public work? The Island of Cape Breton, one of the oldest colonies of North America, having an area double that of Prince Edward Island, has within its limits the most valuable coal deposits in the Dominion, valuable mines of iron, copper and other minerals, some of the finest harbors in the world, and the nearest ports of the Dominion to Europe, and an extent of coast line and fisheries unsurpassed by any physical division of equal area in the world. This island, Sir, has not to-day, with all these natural resources, and a thrifty industrious population of 90,000, has not, I repeat, one mile of Government railway within its bounds in operation. True, it has about sixty-five miles of private railways engaged in operating the collieries, but not one mile of public railways. So, unconscious are we in Cape Breton of having yet received what is our just dues that our people of all shades of politics are at this moment petitioning this Government and Parliament, and also the Provincial Government, and Legislature of Nova Scotia, to grant us subsidies such as will enable us to extend the present line in course of construction from Canso to Sydney south-eastwards, so as to form connection between all the working collieries and the Government railways, and between these and the winter port of Louisbourg on the south and the magnificent harbor of East Bay to the west. I may here add that the extension to Louisbourg will give to this country the use of the most easterly winter port in the Dominion, for communication with Newfoundland and Europe. In short, we have won but an instalment of what should have been given to the Island long ago, and which both parties in this House have admitted to be justly due us and in the interest of the country. Now, Sir, in view of these facts I wish to ask if the hon. members for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Queen's (Mr. Davies) are prepared to re-assert that nine-tenths of the entire clergymen of Cape Breton County, who supported the Government in the last general election, gentlemen whose mission it is to elevate the standard of morality and truth, were bribed by consideration so contemptible. The question is now being asked to this House would not unrestricted reciprocity with the United States improve the present prosperity of this country? As being personally interested in the coal industry, and in which also the interests of the County of Cape Breton, which I have the honor to represent, are largely involved, I propose to show from figures under my hand how this industry will be affected by the proposed change. In this matter we have already had experience of the operation of a free market with the United States which was open to us under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 to 1865. We have also an opportunity of contrasting the trade of this period, with periods preceding and subsequent to these dates; and also contrasting both with the development of the coal trade under the present National Policy. First, I propose giving the figures of our coal trade with the United States under each of these periods. Taking the four years preceding the treaty, that is, 1850 to 1853 inclusive, we exported from Nova Scotia to the United States a total of 442,753 tons or an average annual export of 110,638 tons. Taking the first seven years of the treaty, 1854-60, which preceded the civil war in the States, we exported a total of 950,586 tons, or an annual average of 135,788 tons equal to an increase average of 22½ per cent, over the preceding not treaty period. During the civil war, 1861 to 1865, we

exported a total of 1,492,534 tons or an annual average of 298,507 tons for the five war and last treaty years, equal to an average increase of 119 per cent. on the non-treaty period. It is important to note here that increase of sales in the war period was abnormal and not due to any ordinary course of trade, which is proved by contrasting with the increase of the first seven years of the treaty. The year 1865 closed the treaty and also the war, and from 1866 to 1871 our coal entering the United States markets paid a duty of \$1.25 per ton. And in the sixth year period, 1866 to 1871, we sold to the United States a total of 1,561,972 tons or an annual average of 260,329 tons, being a decrease of only 13 per cent. on the sales of the war period. It is here important to bear in mind that under that high tariff of \$1.25 per ton the United States bought more largely of our coal than at any time, either before or after, except in the war period, and was, as we have seen, but a comparatively small reduction on that. Again, in 1872 they reduced their duty to 75 cents per ton, and in the first three years of this reduced tariff, viz., 1872 to 1874, our total sales to them amounted to 557,187 tons or an annual average of 185,729 tons, equal to a reduction of 28½ per cent. in these first three years of a reduced tariff, as compared with the higher tariff period of \$1.25 per ton. Now, taking the period of 12 years following, that is from 1875-86 inclusive, still under the lower tariff, our total sales to them in these 12 years aggregated 1,018,584 tons, or an annual average of 84,882 tons, equal to a decrease of 54 per cent. as compared with the preceding three years, 1872-74, and compared with our sales to them under a duty of \$1.25 per ton these 12 years under the lower tariff show a falling off in sales equal to 67 per cent. How do these incontrovertible facts and figures strike our friends opposite? How do they propose to account for these circumstances in relation to our coal sales to the United States. With the hon. member for South Oxford in 1878 tariff was nothing, and they were helpless to aid the depressed commerce of the country. Evidently they must find the solution of the circumstances which I have enumerated in something else than tariff, and I will here take the liberty of informing them that the solution is to be found in the wondrously rapid development of the coal production of the United States following the close of their civil war. Let me invite the attention of the House for a few moments to this. First, I find in looking over the coal areas possessed by different countries that the area in Great Britain is 11,900 square miles, in Nova Scotia, 18,000 square miles, and in the United States, 195,403 square miles, and, moreover, that this enormous deposit in the latter country is very fairly distributed over the entire face of the country, being found divided amongst 31 States and Territories out of a total 47 States and Territories. Now, I invite attention to the development of this rich possession of our enterprising neighbors. In 1864 the total coal production of the United States was 16,472,410 tons, and in 1870 it was 32,863,690 tons—an aggregate increase of 100 per cent. in the first six years following the close of the war. In 1871 their production was 34,081,415 tons, and in 1873 this production reached 49,130,584 tons; that is to say, in the 13 years from 1871 to 1873, inclusive, their aggregate increase was 63,399,049 tons, equal to 195 per cent. increase over that of 1871. Then in the next eight years, 1879 to 1886 inclusive, we find that the production in 1879 was 59,808,393, and that this went up by yearly bounds of tens of millions until in 1886, for which I have been able to procure returns, the production attained the overwhelming volume of 106,730,033 tons, an aggregate increase in these eight years over the preceding eight years of 57,650,449 tons, or an increase of over 117 per cent. And again, from the official figures just quoted, it is seen that the increase of the production of the coal mines of the United States for the year 1886, as compared with the production of 1864, gives an aggregate

Mr. McKEEN.

of 90,307,623 tons, equal to an increase of 548 per cent. in 23 years. This wonderful development of the coal production of the United States, taken in connection with the increased railway facilities to the Eastern or coast towns and cities in the Union, proves conclusively that these markets are wrested from us beyond hope of recovery. But if further evidence of this fact be required, I beg to call the attention of the House to the recent statements of Hon. Congressman Scott, reputed one of the largest coal operators of Pennsylvania, who in his advocacy of having all coals placed upon the free list, said, that the coal owners of the United States could afford to admit provincial coals into their markets duty free, because for every ton of theirs thus displaced, they would sell ten tons in the markets of Canada. In addition to this, I have the opinions of the United States mercantile houses, which for the past 30 years have handled all the provincial coal sold in their country. I have recently been in communication with these firms and they are unanimous in the expression of the opinion that under any conditions of trade it is impossible for us of the Province of Nova Scotia to regain any important footing in their markets. Sir, with the permission of the House, I beg to read a letter which I hold in my hand in further confirmation of this, from one of these firms which is an authority on the subject. This letter was written in reply to one from a friend of mine, asking what would be the effect of the admission free of coal from Nova Scotia into the United States. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—You ask my views respecting the effect of a removal of the duty upon Nova Scotia coal upon the trade in the United States.

"At present the importation of coarse coal from Nova Scotia amounts to nothing. I think it was less than 1,000 tons during the year 1887 at this port, and very little, if any, at other ports, excepting at Portland, from the Bay of Fundy Mines, for the Grand Trunk Railroad.

"The prices of our domestic bituminous coals are so low that they practically shut out all the product of the Provinces, even without a duty.

"Cumberland coal from Baltimore, Clearfield from Philadelphia, and West Virginia coals from Norfolk and Newport News, are all of superior quality for our uses to any coal from Nova Scotia, and will bring 50 to 75 cents per ton more in our markets. At the same time, the cost at ports of consumption has been less than the cost of the best coals from Nova Scotia delivered here. At New York, and all ports south and west of here, the margin of cost is in favor of domestic coals, and against the cost of Nova Scotia, as freights would be lower for the former and higher for the latter than for Boston and Eastern ports.

"Take for example Cumberland coal in 1887:—

| | Per ton. |
|--|----------|
| Cost f. o. b. at Balto..... | \$2 60 |
| Current freight through the shipping season..... | 1 10 |
| And discharging..... | 0 25 |

From vessel here—cost..... \$3 95

"The Clearfield and Kanawha coals sell at 15 to 25 cents per ton lower. Large season contracts were made last year to fit consumers' wants, at \$1.75 to \$3.90 per ton, delivered.

"In contrast with the above—

| | Per ton. |
|---|----------|
| Acadia coal (the highest cost in Nova Scotia), f. o. b. at Pictou..... | \$2 50 |
| Current freight in 1887..... | 1 90 |

Cost here.... \$4 40

"Albion costs \$2.25 f. o. b. (and is worth at least 25 cents less), costs \$4.15 here. The Cape Breton coals contain more sulphur than any of the above-named coals, and the former trade here from that quarter was for gas purposes, which is now monopolised by the rich gas coals from Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The removal of the duty would not secure that trade. For other purposes Cape Breton coals will not bring so much in our markets by 50 to 75 cents per ton as our domestic coals.

| | Per ton. |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| Cost at Cape Breton—lowest..... | \$1 50 |
| Current freight in 1887..... | 1 75 |

Delivered here..... \$3 25

The small quantity brought here (mainly culm at 30 cents per ton duty) comes forward by small trading vessels at low freights. Sales of say, fifty thousand tons here, would require tonnage outside of the ordinary trading vessels, and would enhance freight 25 to 50 cents per ton, to be added to the foregoing figures.

"In my opinion, the removal of the duty would furnish a market for a limited quantity only, say not over 50,000 tons, and I cannot at present see where half that quantity could be disposed of. I wish it were

otherwise, as my long connection with the Nova Scotia coal trade, more than forty years, would increase the business of my firm very much if sales from your quarter could be made, and would give us an advantage over all our competitors in the coal trade.

"Another view of the case: The removal of the duty here by reciprocity would necessitate the same action by the Canadian Government, and admit our domestic coals from Pennsylvania and Ohio into Canada, to the exclusion of your coals, and very seriously impair trade from your mines.

"A large quantity of coal is at present sent into the Upper Provinces, paying a duty of 60 cents per ton. If made free of any duty, such shipments would practically monopolise the trade in the Upper Provinces. If the free trade were made to apply to English coal, as would naturally be the case, a considerable quantity would be brought out in trading ships and steamers at ballast rates, and the sales from your mines would be confined to the local trade in the Lower Provinces."

This demonstrates that, in so far as the coal trade between this country and the United States is concerned, the relative circumstances of the two countries are entirely changed since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty; and the enormous production of the latter country has forced this change, not only upon the coal trade but apparently upon other industries as well. For instance, the official returns show that the total export of farm produce from the United States in 1860 was but \$40,000,000, while in 1886 this class of exports reached a value of \$500,000,000. It therefore does not appear very likely that any very extended market will be found in the United States for Canadian farm produce in opposition to their own enormous surplus. However this is a branch of the discussion which I leave entirely to the hon. members who have a more practical acquaintance with it. Now, if hon. gentlemen will bear with me a little while longer, I will give a short sketch of the Nova Scotia coal trade during the period of reciprocity *versus* that of the National Policy. For the five years, from 1869 to 1873, our total sales were 3,343,510 tons, or an annual average of 668,702 tons. For the five years, 1874 to 1878 inclusive, our total sales were 3,480,705 tons, or an annual average of 696,141 tons, equal to an increase in the latter period over the former of 4 per cent. Then, again, taking the eight years, 1879 to 1887 inclusive, our total sales were 10,635,489 tons, or an annual average of 1,329,436 tons, giving an average increase for the eight years under the National Policy, compared with the preceding four years, equal to 91 per cent. And comparing the Reciprocity Treaty, under the peculiarly favoring abnormal circumstances, with the National Policy period, we find that the sales of the former period give us an increase of only 46 per cent. as against 91 per cent. under the National Policy period, so that this makes it clear as noon day that reciprocity under more favorable circumstances than now exist, failed in giving us anything like the prosperous results which the National Policy has produced upon this industry, and perhaps the best feature of this increase is that under the National Policy our coal sales to the upper Provinces have increased from 80,000 to 650,000 tons, being 50 per cent. in excess of what we sold to the United States under reciprocity. Now, Sir, with this large increase of up-borne interprovincial trade, who will venture to assert that there has not been something like a corresponding downward trade? These facts should disprove the assertion which has been made by our opponents in Nova Scotia, that we buy \$10,000,000 worth of goods from the upper Provinces which are paid for in gold said to have come from the United States. And yet, Sir, in the face of such incontrovertible facts as these, we have hon. gentlemen opposite assuring us that the National Policy has not increased our coal sales by a single ton. Now, Sir, at the risk of trespassing on the time of the House I would refer to another point which has been urged as showing that the National Policy did not assist our coal sales inasmuch that more coal is imported into Canada than before it. Now, Sir, I have already shown that our inter-provincial coal consumption has increased largely from our

native resources; and if there be an increased importation of the article, what does this fact point to? Why, Sir, it can lead to one and but one conclusion, that is; that as coal is mainly consumed as a motive power, the National Policy, as a financial reform, has accomplished all that is claimed for it. It has already been shown that it took a number of years for the United States, under a high protection tariff, to drive our coal out of their markets. Now, Sir, is it too much to assume that, with the further and more rapid development of our mines, under the protection extended to us under the National Policy, and by the increased facilities of transportation of our coal through canals, and the opening up of railways, in a few years hence we may capture from the United States the large and important export trade they now have with us in coal, and which they are strenuously exerting themselves to increase? We find them competing with us in our own markets, quoting prices at Montreal and other points of competition at rates less than I am led to believe they sell for in their own country, after deducting cost of transportation. In closing my remarks under this head, I may say that, upon the ground stated, I believe our coal industry, under unrestricted reciprocity, would be seriously injured, and this injury would be felt by all classes, particularly such as the farmers of Prince Edward Island, who find one of their best home markets for their produce in our mining towns on the coast of Cape Breton. I may say here that we are also importing largely of farm products, such as hay, butter, oats and cheese from the Montreal markets to supply the requirements of our mining population. There is another industry on which I shall touch but slightly, as it has been dealt with ably by hon. gentlemen who preceded me and who are better acquainted with it than I am, and as it will be also treated by hon. gentlemen who will follow me. I refer now to our fishing industry, which is one of the most important of this Dominion. It has been said that this industry has been seriously injured, that it is becoming demoralised, and that our fishermen are unable to obtain remunerative wages, owing to the present depression of trade. If you will allow me I will quote a few figures from the Fisheries report, showing the number of men employed, the capital invested and the values of the products of Nova Scotia for the years 1882 to 1881 inclusive:

| Year. | Men Employed. | Value of Fishing Material. Capital Engaged. | Value of Product. |
|------------|---------------|---|-------------------|
| | | \$ | \$ |
| 1881 | 27,526 | 1,959,259 | 6,214,756 |
| 1882 | 28,503 | 2,127,589 | 7,131,418 |
| 1883 | 29,100 | 2,360,989 | 7,689,375 |
| 1884 | 29,997 | 2,670,938 | 8,763,779 |
| 1885 | 29,905 | 2,545,255 | 8,283,923 |
| 1886 | 27,490 | 2,370,537 | 8,415,361 |

If we take the last two years of free fishing to the United States fishermen within our three-mile limit, viz, 1883 to 1884, we find that, taking the value of the fishing product and the number of men engaged, it amounted in 1883 to \$ 61 per man, and in 1884 to \$292 per man. Then, take the year 1886, the first of Canada's protecting her shore limits, and when a duty was simultaneously imposed upon our fish in the United States. It is found that the fishery product of Nova Scotia is \$306 per man engaged, showing that the protection afforded our fishermen is already being realised. The above figures, which have but recently been brought to my notice, bear out the views of intelligent fishermen with

whom I have conversed upon this subject in my own county, and who are emphatically of the opinion that the protection to our three-mile limit is of more value to them than free American markets ever can be. I very much regret that the Fishery report for 1887 is not yet published, as I have strong reason to believe it will show superior results to the years above quoted. We find from the trade returns that the exports of fish and fish products from Nova Scotia from 1882 to 1887 inclusive, were as follows :

| Year. | United States. | Great Britain. | West Indies and other Countries. | Totals. |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1882..... | 1,353,773 | 635,437 | 2,448,454 | 4,437,364 |
| 1883..... | 1,883,546 | 564,582 | 2,639,370 | 5,087,498 |
| 1884..... | 2,145,622 | 555,739 | 2,614,696 | 5,316,057 |
| 1885..... | 1,990,309 | 633,085 | 2,120,482 | 4,743,876 |
| 1886..... | 1,180,103 | 608,621 | 1,984,942 | 3,773,666 |
| 1887..... | 1,358,024 | 717,485 | 1,823,568 | 3,899,077 |

Now, let us summarise this and it is found that in the last two years of our fish being admitted free into the markets of the United States that the product of our catch yielded \$261 per man, and in 1884, \$292 per man, and that 1886 gave a product equal to \$386 per man engaged, and against \$292 in 1884, so that there is little cause for the statement that our fishery industry is becoming unremunerative. Again the value of the fishery product for 1885 is to the value of the fishing material employed, viz., vessels, boats, nets, &c., in the ratio of 325 per cent. In 1886 the value of the fishery product is to the value of the material employed in the ratio of 355 per cent., that is a return of 355 per cent. in 1886 as against a return of 325 per cent. in 1885. Thus, these two facts, the dividend per man engaged and the amount value realised for the capital engaged, proves conclusively that as our coal sales in the United States increased largely under a duty of \$1.25 per ton, whilst our neighbors had not a supply of their own product equal to the demand, and that our coal sales fell off rapidly under a duty of only 75 cents per ton, precisely is this repeated in the case of our fish, which is increasing in value to our fishermen, in spite of the duty, and will continue to do so, as long as the Americans have not a supply equal to the demand, within their own borders. In conclusion, looking at the proposed unrestricted reciprocity from another point of view, have we any substantial reasons for supposing we can obtain unrestricted reciprocity if we ask it? Have we not time and again in the past made overtures for reciprocity, and every time received nothing better than diplomatic snubs in return for our humility? Hence, may we not reasonably conclude that if our neighbors would now listen to a proposal, such as contained in the resolution before the House, it would only be on account of the changed condition of circumstances within themselves. That it would be because of their now enormous surplus of production in the lines of almost every industry and art known to civilisation. They would reckon upon controlling our markets as well as their own in all things, and make our people their customers, not they ours. Nay, further, suppose the great extensive trade which the advocates of this scheme picture us under their proposals become reality, and that our exports went out from us, and imports reach us under an unrestricted reciprocity, what of our revenue necessary for public purposes? With the loss of income from customs, how is the public revenue to be sustained? Evidently but by one method, and that is by the old time and universally hated method of direct taxation. Upon this point I entirely concur with the hon. senior member for Halifax, Mr. McKEEN.

when he says that no party in this country would stand twenty-four hours if they went to the people with direct taxation on their banners. And I say deservedly so. Judging from what I have heard of this debate, I am quite persuaded that we could not enter upon this proposal of unrestricted reciprocity without demoralising our manufactures and general industries, and dissipating the capital invested in them. Those industries which have been built up and established by years of patient toil and in the face of strong opposition. It would endanger the sweeping away of these numerous enterprises that give happy homes of plenty to thousands of industrious toilers and their families. Industries, Sir, which have given Canada a place in the front ranks of civilised nations. I say, Sir, let us beware how we pull down the house which it has taken ten years to build. For my constituents and for myself we stood by it in laying the foundation stone, and speaking for them as I know them, I say we will stand now by its defence and security.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At this hour, I do not object to the adjournment, especially as I take it, from my hon. friend's moving the adjournment, that we will have the pleasure of hearing him to-morrow, and I should like to hear him at his very best, and I know what that very best is; but I think it is time that we should be getting to an end of this debate. I think this is the fifteenth day, and we have—and I do not regret it—set aside all other business in order to discuss this question exhaustively. Still, the Session is creeping on, and we are getting to the busy season, and I should be glad if the hon. gentleman could come to some arrangement by which we could close the debate to-morrow night.

Mr. LAURIER. All I can say is that we are just as anxious on this side of the House as the hon. gentleman is on his side, to come to an end of the debate, but I do not think I would be justified in pledging myself and pledging this side of the House that we shall come to an end to-morrow. We shall endeavor to bring the debate to as speedy a close as possible, in all probability I can say this week—not to-morrow, but the day after to-morrow, at all events. We shall do our best to have as busy a sitting to-morrow as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course we must have a long sitting to-morrow. We have been very careful of our health thus far, and I think we can afford to sit late to-morrow. I would like very much to come to an arrangement by which the debate shall be closed to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, we will try and do what we can. I would be very happy to communicate with the hon. gentleman to-morrow, and see if we can come to a conclusion, but I would not like to pledge myself at this moment, without knowing how many of our friends on this side desire to speak.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman is not able to come to an arrangement of that kind, because it would compel us to sit late, as we must get on with the public business. We have given the whole time, for the last fortnight or three weeks, to this question, and we did that in consequence of the importance of the motion itself, especially, in consequence of its being moved by a gentleman holding the high position of the hon. mover. If we had not done so, the debate would have gone on during the opening days of the Session, and we would have done a great deal of business. Therefore, I think I can appeal to the hon. gentleman opposite to assist us in closing this debate.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure we all fully recognise that the Government have given all the assistance we could desire in this debate, and so far we are grateful, but at this moment I do not feel justified in promising definitely. At all events, I will do my best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like very much if the hon. gentleman would cross the floor to-morrow and give us some information as to what can be done.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

27-1888-6

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, knows pretty well how many members on that side still desire to speak?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that, but I dare say the hon. gentlemen who sit behind me, if we came to an arrangement, would respect that arrangement.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a. m. (Thursday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 5, 1888.

No. 28.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE GLENGARRY ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election of a member to the House of Commons for the Electoral District of the County of Glengarry, wherein Patrick Purcell was appellant, and Alexander Kennedy was respondent, the appeal being allowed, and the ruling, finding and determination of the Hon. Mr. Justice Rose were reversed and set aside.

Upon the Orders of the Day being called,

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I wish to enquire who is responsible for the delay in the distribution of the French version of the Debates of the House. At the present moment there are 542 pages of the English version, whereas only 176 pages have been translated into French. I am informed upon reliable authority that last year, at the same date, not a single page was in arrear. New translators have been appointed, but whether they are responsible for that, I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER. The chairman of the Debates Committee ought to answer this question. The House well knows the publication and printing of the Debates in English, as well as their translation into French, are in the hands of a committee.

WRIT FOR THE RUSSELL ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the First Minister whether a writ for the election of the County of Russell has yet been issued, and whether a returning officer has been appointed, and who he is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The writ has been ordered, and I have no doubt it has been issued by this time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the Government if it is their intention to lay upon the Table of the

House the report that was made by the Minister of Customs in reference to the reduction of duty on those articles upon which the duty had been removed by the American Government? I understand that, some time ago, the American Government, through their consul, made a report—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will please make a motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will attend to that when I get through.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was really speaking to a question already.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, you cannot, now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have only a few words to say, Mr. Speaker, on that motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The Orders of the Day have been called.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, the Orders of the Day were called.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, There is one feature which has universally characterised this debate, in so far as it has been participated in by our colleagues on the other side of the House. Again on this occasion, as on every other occasion, whether in the time of Reformers who have

passed away or whether in the time of Reformers still living, the cry for reform has been met with the cry of disloyalty. It might be tempting to retaliate, and to show what is the true inwardness of that exuberant loyalty which ever gushes forth from the other side of the House when facts or arguments are deficient to meet the case at issue. It might be tempting to retaliate and to show that the loyalty of those monopolists who to-day clamor the loudest has no other foundation except the selfish one that the contemplated reform would put an end to, a state of things, which, however lamentable it may be to the country, is eminently profitable to some individuals. It might be tempting to show that loyalty has always been, is, and always will be the last refuge, the supreme argument of those ingrained Tories who imagine themselves born to rule, and who, having long been associated with Government, cannot contemplate the displacement of what Government means for them, patronage, office, subsidies and monopolies, without thinking such a displacement would be rank treason. On the other hand, I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of those prophets of evil who, at every step taken forward by this young country, never fail to see an impending rupture of British connection, and which a long series of sinister predictions, hitherto not fulfilled, have failed to make wiser or braver. Sir, I consider it would be perfectly useless to attempt any argument upon those monopolists or ingrained Tories whose supreme end and object in politics is to enjoy the fleshpots of office and whose loyalty springs from the stomach, but to those well meaning though timid men who incline to advance and still dread change, I would at once say: You who object to reform because you fear the good results will be accompanied by some evil result—are you satisfied to say of this country that nothing is to be risked for its advancement? Is it your opinion that if there be to the south of us inexhaustible fields of wealth, we should be deterred from the ennobling spirit of enterprise by the cowardly consideration that possibly increased prosperity would seduce us from our allegiance? Is yours the position of the man who would starve himself to death lest by eating food he might swallow poison? I also appeal to loyalty. I appeal to the loyalty of all we owe to our origin, to the blood that flows in our veins, to the example of our ancestors and the memories they have left behind them, and he I say who will stand truest to those examples will also stand truest in his allegiance to Queen and country. Let us remember that the great nation from which the greater number among us derive their origin and from which we have the institutions on which we pride ourselves, is so great to-day because at all periods of her history her people never shrank from performing the duty which the hour demanded of them, without fear of the consequences to themselves or to the country. Let us remember that our country, if it has attained the proud position which to-day it occupies, owes it to the unceasing efforts of Reformers of former days, whose every effort was assailed with the same taunt of disloyalty that meets us to-day. Let us look at our position such as it is, let us look at our position squarely and manfully, and if the result is that our position to-day demands reforms, let us, I say, strike for reforms, determined in advance that if in this as in every other matter evil is to be mixed with good, it will be time to grapple with the evil when the evil arises. Once more I say let us look at our position, not such as it ought to be, but such as it is, not such as it is when depicted in the speeches of the Ministerial orators, but such as we hear it every day depicted in the unvarnished talk of the people. With a varied and fertile soil, with a healthy northern climate, with tremendous agricultural resources, with abundant wealth, with unsurpassed lumber facilities, with the most productive fisheries in the world, this ought to be a land of universal prosperity and contentment.

MR. LAURIER.

What is the position to-day? I said a moment ago we have good reason to be proud of our country, proud of her people, proud of her history, proud of her institutions, proud of the position which she has already obtained among the nations of the world; but blind would he be who would fail to see that there is in her otherwise young and healthy body a deep wound that is depleting the very sources of life. When we contemplate that this young country with all her capabilities is losing her population, that every day a hundred of her sons are leaving her shores to seek homes in a country not more favored by nature than our own, the conclusion is inevitable something is wrong which must engage the attention of every one for whom patriotism is not a vain and empty word. Yet with these facts full in view the Government, speaking by the mouth of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, invites Parliament to declare that there is absolutely nothing to do but to keep on the policy under which such a state of things is possible, and we have seen member after member of Parliament rise in his place and declare indeed that there is nothing to do, that everything is for the best. I will not lose one single moment in discussing that point, but I place the assertions made on this side of the House against those made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and leave the decision to the judgment of the people of the country, in the judgment of all the people without exceptions, and all, with the exception, perhaps, of the monopolists, will say that there is something wrong in the condition of this country, that there is something which demands the attention of Parliament and of every one who claims to be a patriot. We have been told, and it is insisted on, that we are a prosperous country, that we are a happy country; and one hon. member, my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), if I remember aright, in dwelling on the great prosperity of this country stated we had no starvation amongst us. Well, Sir, prosperity is a relative term applied to nations as well as to individuals. A man in private life may have affluence in a certain condition of life and yet be in want in a certain other condition of life, and so it is among nations. If you judge us, if you gauge the condition of this country by the standard of older continents I would be quite ready to admit you may be a prosperous country. I grant at once, (and gentlemen opposite are welcome to the admission if they can find any comfort in it) that we have no starvation in this country. We have not any threat of famine, we are not in the condition of China in which country four provinces, some years ago, were carried away by hunger, and we are not in the condition of Ireland. We lose our people, but still we have not lost one-third of our population, as Ireland did in the space of two years. But, Mr. Speaker, the objection and the answer do not meet the point nor do they meet the charge. We have a young, healthy, and energetic and active population on this continent and it is not sufficient that they should be above starvation. Their aim is higher. The charge is not, Sir, that there is a scarcity of natural production, but the charge is, on the contrary, that there is an abundance of natural production, but that there is no issue and no outlet for the surplus beyond what the people consume. The charge is that while the produce is sufficient for our small and limited requirements, it is yet far below the producing capacity of the people. Sir, the people of this country have a right to expect that every child belonging to this country will, when he comes to manhood, find the same labor, and returns for his labor, that he will find on the other side of the line. The people of this country, especially the tillers of the soil, have a right to expect that their labor will always have command of the highest market obtainable in the best and most favored markets of the world. They have a right to expect that the money which, by the necessities of their

vocation, they are forced to invest in real estate will return its value, and when we find that there is no labor for every child born in this country, when we find that their labor is insufficiently remunerated, when we find that real estate does not keep up its value but decreases in value, when we find that notwithstanding all attempts made we have not yet succeeded in having any more than 5,000,000 of people on this continent, and when we find that at least 1,000,000 of Canadian born children are to-day citizens of the United States, or are working in the United States, I say again that we must come to the conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere which has to be remedied. Under such circumstances there is to-day a sentiment of irritation and discontent which must be checked, or it may become very serious in a short time to come. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that what we say to-day is not new. The hon. the Minister of Interior, speaking on that subject in answer to my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that the statements made by my hon. friend were not new and that they had been made in the election of 1882 and 1887. Sir it is perfectly true that those statements are not new. They have been made in 1882 and they have been made at the election of 1887, and my hon. friend might further have added that they were made in the elections of 1877. He might have added that he and his friends came into power because from 1876 to 1878 they blamed the Government of the day, of that time, for the emigration which I admit was then taking place. They blamed the Administration of my hon. friend on my left and stated that if they came to power they would put a stop to this emigration, and when they came to power they were pledged by their own words and their own writings to put a stop to that emigration. Now, Sir, in order to make that point more clear let me refresh the memory of gentlemen on the other side about their speeches anterior to 1878, and I cannot do better than to quote the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and the leader of the Opposition of that day, delivered at Parkdale in the month of July, 1878. These are his very words :

"Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufactories of the United States."

An hon. MEMBER. Read that again.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not read it again, but I will continue :

"Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and take up their abode in the United States because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise in consequence of the false policy of our rulers."

Sir, if it was a crying shame in 1878 that 500,000 of our fellow men should have crossed our borders to the other side of the line, by what epithet strong enough can we characterise the policy of those men who, bound to put a stop to that sort of thing and bound to stop that exodus, have brought it from 500,000 to 1,000,000. I do not say this, Mr. Speaker, with any view of recrimination. I speak to say that the evil is one of long standing, which must tax our energy and for which we must find some remedy. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that there is discontent prevailing in this land. The causes are at once political and economical. There can be no doubt at all that, in the political aspect, when discontent prevails it is largely due to the manner in which Confederation was forced on such and some sections of the country, and to the manner in which Confederation has been made a tool and an instrument in the hands of gentlemen on the other side to embarrass and to harass some sections of the country. There can be no doubt that in the east of this Dominion one Province at least was dragged into Confederation against her will, and in the

hearts of the people of that country the yoke after twenty years is as galling as it was the first day. There can be no doubt at all that in the west the unjust, the unfair and the tyrannical manner in which the Constitution has been abused and violated by the Government, in order to force upon the people of that section of the country an abhorred monopoly, has created a bitterness in the hearts of those people which would have had the most fatal consequences perhaps if, fortunately, the Government, acting as they did yesterday in the matter of the admission of American importations upon the free list, did not in that other instance also burst that policy and adopt a new one and surrender. There is no doubt at all that in the Province from which I come the numerous attempts made by the Government upon the political autonomy of the Province has created distrust and disappointment in the minds of the people. And at the same time there can be no doubt, and we can readily believe it, that if the country had been as prosperous as it should have been, or as prosperous as it is represented to be, a good deal of the discontent which now prevails would have been alleviated, for political causes alone seldom produce serious discontent, unless they affect injuriously the economic condition of the people. If our country had been as prosperous as it is represented to be, if Nova Scotia had found in Confederation the prosperity which was promised to be her lot in it, she would long ago have been reconciled to Confederation. If Manitoba had continued to enjoy the prosperity with which she opened her career, she would have been to-day as cheerful a member of the Confederation as she was ten years ago. But our efforts at increased prosperity have always been baffled. We never have had the measure of success which we expected from our efforts, and what is the reason? The reason is that we have not yet found the economical position necessary to make the country as abundantly productive as it should be. The consuming power of the nation is not adequate to its producing power; and we have not yet found a channel for the increased energy and activity of our people. Under such a condition, when the labor of the people will never yield as much as it would yield under a different economical condition, it is impossible to expect that there will be contentment in the land, or pride in the institutions of the country. The lumberman, the farmer and the manufacturer toil, but their efforts are comparatively barren; and if you ask them what is the economical condition they want in order to make their efforts as fruitful as they should be, they will tell you that it is space—a broader field in which to operate. The fisherman will tell you that if he could send his fish free to Boston and Portland, he would ask nothing more; the farmer will tell you that if he could send his productions to the cities and towns on the other side of the line, which are almost within arm's length, he would ask nothing more; the lumberman will tell you that if he had access to that immense range of territory which needs the products of our forests, he would ask nothing more; and the manufacturer will tell you—the genuine manufacturer, not the monopolist—that all he asks is a fair field and no favor, and that if you remove the barriers which stand in his way, he is ready to compete with the Americans in their own market. During the last summer Mr. Butterworth, who is well known in this country, and who has taken the same view that we take as to the trade relations that should exist between Canada and the United States, speaking on this question in Detroit, made a remark which seemed to me at the time to be singularly true historically. He said this :

"The history of all nations has been a record of efforts to broaden the area of their trade and commerce."

The more we think of this remark, the more we shall be convinced that it is eminently true. Does not the record of mankind show that as soon as a nation obtains its

freedom, the energy of the people which had hitherto been consumed in political agitation, is at once turned to labor and industry. At first the producing power of the people exceeds their consuming power, and from that time the nation seeks to broaden its area of trade and commerce. Such was the history of the Italian nations after they obtained their freedom. They gradually extended their trade beyond the walls of their cities until it covered all the lands washed by the Mediterranean and the neighboring seas. Such was the history of Holland in the seventeenth century. After she had freed her neck from the yoke of Spain, although having a population of only 2,000,000 she gradually extended her trade. Such was the case with England. For many years the English people were absorbed in political agitation, and during those years her trade did not increase; but having at last curbed the power of the Throne, asserted the supremacy of Parliament, and secured her political freedom, from that time the history of England became a record of the broadening activity and energy of the British people. The trade of England increased its area until it subdued continent after continent, and to-day it has no limits but the limits of the earth. The history of other nations has been our history. For years and years our people were absorbed in a political agitation for our freedom, and during those years the country made but little progress; but when at last we obtained responsible government and our legislative independence, what took place elsewhere happened here. The energy of the people, which had been previously absorbed in fruitless political agitation, was turned to toil and labor, and from that moment we had to seek for channels and outlets for our surplus energy. The forest, the mine and the sea are the fields to which the labor of our people has been directed. Ours is above all an agricultural country; and as we have abundance of lands at our disposal, vast tracts were every year added to the cultivated soil; and as the number of the tillers of the soil increased and the bulk of our productions became enlarged, there arose correspondingly a demand for new channels and outlets, and from that moment the history of this country became a history of efforts to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. If there is one fact which more than any other has characterised Canadian politics since the concession of responsible government, it is that it has always been the effort of the Canadian people to find new outlets and channels for their increasing energy. I do not mean to say that those efforts have been systematic or premeditated. On the contrary, they have been irregular and spasmodic, now in one direction, and then in another, but they have been a continual and instinctive aspiration to pass from an unnatural to a natural economical position, just as a man who finds himself in a vitiated atmosphere will turn in every direction to get a breath of fresh air without which he cannot live. As soon as the agitation for responsible government abated, as soon as our friends, the Tories—who, loyal in those days as they are in these days, endeavored by riot, bloodshed and fire to intimidate Lord Elgin and prevent the establishment of the new regime—had been forced to submit to the inevitable, the first act of the Government of the day—and it was a Liberal Government—was to seek new channels for the productive energies of the people. The Government found the natural channels of trade blocked and closed. There was to the south of us a great and progressive nation of kindred birth, from which we were separated by mountains of prejudice and a thousand artificial barriers; and the efforts of the Government were directed to removing some of the prejudice and breaking down some of the barriers, and the result was the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, which, although limited in its operation and scope, everyone will admit during its duration marked the golden age of our trade and commerce. That was our first effort

Mr. LAURIER.

towards broadening the area of our trade and commerce. It was eminently successful. However, the treaty was of short duration. As soon as the limit of its term was reached, the American Government gave notice that they would not continue it. Why? Was it because the treaty was not equally advantageous to the Americans? No; it is admitted that the treaty was just as advantageous to them as to us. The notice was given simply on account of the irritation caused in the United States by the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and Canada towards the United States during their great struggle for national life. That the repeal of the treaty was a blow to our commerce, no one has denied, and it has been the constant and unvarying effort of Canadian statesmen ever since to obtain a renewal of that treaty. Indeed, so much is that the case that, at a later day, when protection was adopted as the policy of this country, one of the reasons for its adoption was that thereby we might force the Americans to give us reciprocity. The resolution which formulated the policy of the Government upon that occasion has often been quoted, but it will bear being quoted again, because it is pregnant with meaning in the face of the amendment of the Government on the present occasion. The resolution is as follows:—

"That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home."

How far the policy has been successful we all know, but no doubt hon. gentleman opposite will say it has been in that respect eminently successful.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It only sent a million away.

Mr. LAURIER. The resolution goes on as follows:—

"That will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving—as it ought to do—in the direction of a reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

Now, if I give an unfair construction to the words of my hon. friend, I will ask him to correct me in due time, but if words have any meaning, what was the meaning of the concluding paragraph of this resolution? Did it mean anything else but that, however desirable protection might be for Canada against other countries, reciprocity, so far as the United States were concerned, was the thing which was desired and desirable. Now, Sir, in view of this resolution, I say that the amendment moved by the Government is not logical. What is the object of that amendment? Its object is to keep the National Policy intact in its entirety. The final object of the National Policy, as declared in the resolution I have just read, was to obtain reciprocity. It is evident that in this object it has not succeeded, and therefore the conclusion is unavoidable that something else must be tried. So ended our first effort to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. But at that time we had something else in contemplation. When notice was given of the abrogation of the treaty, the country was engaged in the discussion of the great question which ended in the Confederation of the Provinces, and there is no doubt whatever that in the minds of those who participated in the bringing about of that great event, the hope existed that Confederation would prove, not only a great political reform, but a great economical reform as well. It was urged on the floor of Parliament at that time that the Provinces, by adopting among themselves free trade, and it was proposed they should, would find an adequate outlet and channel for their surplus energy. The Hon. George Brown, who was at that time a member

of the coalition Government, enlarged upon that idea at great length and with great force. After having stated in the debate that the first object of Confederation was to effect a great political reform, he went on to say :

" * * * But secondly, I go heartily for the Union, because it will throw down the barriers of trade and give us the control of a market of 4,000,000 of people. What one thing has contributed so much to the wondrous material progress of the United States as the free passage of their products from one State to another? What has tended so much to the rapid advance of all branches of their industry, as the vast extent of their home market, creating an unlimited demand for all the commodities of daily use, and stimulating the energy and ingenuity of producers? Sir, I confess to you that in my mind this one view of the Union—the addition of nearly a million of people to our home consumers—sweeps aside all the petty objections that are averred against the scheme (What, in comparison with this great gain to our farmers and manufacturers, are even the fallacious money objections which the imaginations of hon. gentlemen opposite have summoned up?) All over the world we find nations eagerly longing to extend their domains, spending large sums and waging protracted wars to possess themselves of more territory, untitled and uninhabited. Other countries offer large inducements to foreigners to emigrate to their shores—free passages, free lands, and free food and implements to start them in the world. We, ourselves, support costly establishments to attract immigrants to our country, and are satisfied when our annual outlay brings us 15,000 or 20,000 souls. But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add in one day near a million of souls to our population—to add valuable territories to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing."

Now, everybody will admit that every word spoken here was perfectly true, that not one iota can be taken out of this passage as containing a single error. Still the theory he here advocated did not succeed, and it failed, not because of any error, but because of other circumstances which were overlooked at the time. I have quoted this in order to show that as far back as 1865, one of the master-minds which this country has produced, was of opinion that it was essential to the trade of the country that we should add to the consuming power of our population. The same idea was enlarged upon by Mr. Galt in the same debate, and he stated, with all the authority which at that time attached to his name as Minister of Finance, that in Confederation he expected to find a substitute for the American markets, which we lost by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. He said :

" * * * If we require to find an example of the benefits of free commercial intercourse, we need not look beyond the effects that have followed from the working of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. In one short year from the time when that treaty came into operation, our trade in the natural productions of the two countries swelled from less than \$3,000,000 to upwards of \$20,000,000 per annum, and now, when we are threatened with an interruption of that trade—when we have reason to fear that the action of the United States will prove hostile to the continuance of free commercial relations with this country—when we know that the consideration of this question is not grounded on just views of the material advantages resulting to each country—but that the irritation connected with political events exercises a predominant influence over the minds of American statesmen, it is the duty of the House to provide, if possible, other outlets for our productions. If we have reason to fear that one door is about to be closed to our trade, it is the duty of the House to endeavor to open another; to provide against a coming evil of the kind feared by timely expansion in another direction; to seek by free trade with our own fellow-colonists for a continued and uninterrupted commerce, which will not be liable to be disturbed at the capricious will of any foreign country."

Here, again, there is nothing to say against the theory that was then advanced, but the great expectations which were then entertained did not turn out to be true. Although every Government since that time has endeavored to bring together the East and West of Confederation, to bring about the interchange of the commodities of the east with those of the west, to-day we have not succeeded in developing any trade except a very insignificant one between the east and the west, and the glowing pictures which the men of 1865 drew as to what was to follow their endeavors to bring about that interchange of trade, have remained pictures. What was it that was left out, what was it that was omitted from their calculations? The fact which was omitted was, as has often been pointed out since, the geographical position of the different Provinces of the Dominion. The men of 1865 forgot that no legislative act, no executive decree

could suppress the long distances which separate the east from the west; they forgot that nature had interposed, against profitable trade relations between the east and the west, obstacles which no legislation could overcome. Sir, experience is the test of all theory, and, in the view of the experience which we have acquired during the last twenty years, let me show how deluded the men of 1865 were in regard to the hopes which they then entertained. Mr. McGee spoke in the same debate, and he emphasised the same idea which had been already expressed by Mr. Brown and Mr. Galt, and he particularised his meaning by instancing a particular trade, the coal trade of Nova Scotia. After having depicted, in his glowing language, the coal fields of Nova Scotia, he went on to say :

" These exhaustless coal fields will, under this plan—which is in fact our Reciprocity Treaty with the Lower Provinces—become, hereafter, the great resource of our towns for fuel. I see the cry is raised below by the anti-Unionists that to proceed with Confederation would be to entail the loss of the New England market for their coals. I do not quite see how they make that out, but even an anti-Unionist might see that the population of Canada is within a fraction of that of all New England put together, that we consume in this country as much fuel per annum as they do in all New England; and, therefore, that we offer them a market under the Union equal to that which these theorists want to persuade their followers they would lose."

There is not a word to be taken from that. It is quite true that the population of Canada was as great as the population of all New England put together, and that Canada consumes as much fuel as the whole of New England put together, but Mr. McGee had overlooked the fact that the market of New England was at the doors of Nova Scotia, and that the market of Western Canada was too far away to be of any service to Nova Scotia county; and if the valuable life of Mr. McGee had been spared, he would have lived to see Nova Scotia coal, protected by a duty of at least 50 per cent on the price of that coal at the pit's mouth, carried from the east to the west, carried on Government railways at favored rates, in fact at a loss, and he would have seen that not one lump of coal from Nova Scotia ever reached Toronto. We have been told that some few days ago some small quantity did reach Toronto, and that therefore we have developed an inter-provincial trade between the east and the west. I deny it. [I deny that we have succeeded in developing that trade between the east and the west.] We carry some small amount of merchandise between the two sections, but is that the result of Confederation, is it the result of the Union? It is not. [What trade we have between the east and the west is not a natural trade, but is due entirely to the fact that the country has to pay for the freight required to take it between the east and the west. You cannot legislate against nature, and nature has interposed obstacles in regard to the interchange of trade between the east and the west which no legislation can overcome;] and, as year has followed year, it has become more and more evident that the anticipations formed by the men of 1865 were mere delusions, that there could never be any profitable trade between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the one side, and the Provinces beyond Quebec on the other. Then, seeing that our efforts had been baffled, seeing that the channels were not opened for trade which we expected, for the first time protection became a practical issue in this country. The advocates of the new idea fondly hoped and, indeed, resolutely asserted that the promulgation of a high tariff would stimulate the creation of so many manufactures that it would bring in a large amount of immigration and would stop our own emigration, that we would find the markets here that we were hoping to obtain elsewhere. And although, during the agitation which took place in 1877 and 1878, all classes were promised that they would profit by the adoption of protection, the farmers were the class who were promised the greatest benefit. Indeed, the National Policy then was made to do duty all round, like the celebrated

magic bottle in the hands of the juggler, which supplied wine or spirits, or beer or water, just as the man was a water drinker or a wine drinker, or desired beer or desired whiskey. So the farmers were told that, if we had protection, they would find a market for their products at their doors. The leader of the Opposition at that time, in a speech which he made at Parkhill in July, 1878, said:

"By having all kinds of industries, we would have a great country; the industries would be twice blessed, our sons would be prevented from going to a foreign country to add to its wealth and strength and skill. The fruits of their labor would be exchanged for the fruits of the soil, cities would multiply, and not only would there be a demand for the larger products, such as wheat, flour, cattle, and everything we could raise, but for cheese, butter, eggs, roots and other kinds of small produce. Why was it that land around villages was more valuable than land away from the villages, land about towns more valuable than land in villages, and land about cities more valuable than land in towns? Land about Toronto was not so good, from an agricultural point of view, as it was 30 or 40 miles away from the city, and yet it was more valuable. The reason was because the farmers living near Toronto could get a market for everything they could raise. They were not obliged to send it away to a distance. The nearer the farmer was to the market the cheaper it was for him to send in his goods, and that single illustration would suffice to show how dependent the workmen, manufacturer and farmer were upon each other."

In so far as this language went, it tended to prove that the adoption of protection would develop a large manufacturing industry, and in so far as the hon. gentleman meant to say that a large laboring population is the best market for the agricultural classes, I agree with him. England to-day not only absorbs all her own agricultural products, but drains the agriculture of many other countries besides. New England is very much in the same position. It not only consumes its own agricultural productions, but it absorbs those of many other States and it draws largely from Canada, although the Canadian farmer has to pay a heavy toll on the frontier. But the prediction of the hon. gentleman did not come true. The country was not overrun with the manufacturing class. There was no great increase in immigration. Emigration was not stopped. Many dreams were dispelled, many dreams turned out to be mere deceptions, for it is a matter of fact that many of the principal advocates of protection who prophesied those great results were the victims of their own preaching. In their great anxiety for the success of this new idea, they represented the country as being overrun by manufactures, with magnificent buildings and tall chimneys growing towards the sky as the result of protection. They had represented cities and towns growing out of the ground, and teeming with artisans who would consume everything the farmer could grow, but these expectations did not come out true, and here again there was a failure. What was the cause? Why was it that the great expectations which were entertained of the future of the National Policy, were not realised? Because the agitators of 1877-78 completely lost sight of the fact that modern industries cannot thrive in limited markets. Modern industry in order to thrive must operate in large markets. The principle of modern industry is this, to minimise to an infinitesimal figure the profit upon manufactured articles, and then to increase the aggregate production to an unlimited quantity; in fact the profit upon a single article is always decreased in proportion as the aggregate production is increased. Under such circumstances no one can manufacture to advantage unless he manufactures in large quantities, and he who can manufacture in the largest market is always the cheapest manufacturer; and at the same time the man who can reduce the cost of production by ever so small an amount, will always drive his competitors from the field and will overcome all the barriers opposed to him. That is the reason why the National Policy did not succeed, that is the reason why the manufacturers did not multiply. Why, Sir, our manufacturers, burdened as they are by the tariff,

Mr. LAURIER.

burdened on account of their coal, burdened by their raw material, cannot prosper because they cannot meet the products of free trade countries. They are limited to their own market, and within our own market there is a population of less than 5,000,000; they cannot expand and therefore they cannot thrive. Take the single article of cotton. It was expected that under the favor of the tariff all the great water powers from Kingston to Montreal would be lined with cotton mills, that we would have legion of cotton spinners and cotton weavers. Yet to-day, Sir, we have only 23 cotton mills, with an aggregate of 597,683 spindles. These figures may seem large at first blush, but they are in reality insignificant. In the year 1871, England alone had over 22,000 cotton mills and 34,000,000 spindles; and at this very moment, in the town of Cardiff, one single company is erecting 30 mills with a capacity of more than 650,000 spindles. Therefore our figures are perfectly insignificant; our 23 cotton mills and 600,000 spindles are a mere drop in the ocean. But, Sir, after the manufacturers of cotton started out, they found themselves very soon with an immense surplus which they could not dispose of, and under such circumstances what did they do? They combined, they agreed to reduce the production, they reduced the working hours, they dismissed their employees, and reduced production simply to the requirements of the country; and upon the capital which had been invested, they agreed to pocket the large profits which the tariff gave them over foreign competitors. Yet, as I understand, those profits upon the large capital invested, are not large. Although we have but 23 mills and 600,000 spindles, yet these are too much for the requirements of the country. Not one of these mills is working to its full capacity to-day; they are all working on half time, or at least, not on full time. What is true of cotton is also true of woollens and other industries of the country, so the conclusion is inevitable that the National Policy has not realised the expectations which were entertained at the time. The National Policy has not developed our native industry, and has not created the home market for our agricultural products, as we were promised. But, Sir, the necessity of widening the area of our trade and commerce is so great that we have been looking around in this direction and in the other direction to find new outlets and new channels for our trade. In the debate on the Address during the present Session, the mover of the Address told us with pride that the Government had sent a commissioner to Australia in order to obtain the trade of that country; he told us that they had opened communication with the Argentine Republic in order to establish a trade with that country. What will come of these efforts? What has come of all similar efforts? What has come of our sending commissioners to Brazil, to the West Indies, and to Spain? Nothing, for the very obvious reason that, burdened as we are by our protective tariff, we cannot meet free trade England in those markets; so that the conclusion is inevitable that all the efforts we have made so far to develop our trade and commerce, and to broaden their area, ever since 1867, have been a succession of failures. What, then, is to be done? Is the problem without solution? Is the situation without hope? Is there nothing to be done but to fold our arms and to wait, and to wait, and to wait until something unforeseen and unexpected turns up that will, perhaps, do for us what we have failed to do for ourselves? No, there is a course open to us, and it is to revert to the only means which, in the past, have not failed—it is to adopt the resolution of my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), it is to open as wide as we can all the avenues of trade between us and the 60,000,000 of people to the south of us. And here again let me recall the language of Mr. Brown. He expected the greatest possible results from the accession of 1,000,000 souls to our market. Here are his words:

"But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add not only nearly a million of souls to our population, but to add valuable territory to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing."

Sir, these expectations would have been realised if natural obstacles had not interposed. But what we expect to-day from the resolution of my hon. friend, is not only the accession of 1,000,000 of souls to our market, it is the accession of 60,000,000 of the most wealthy people on the face of the globe, with not a single molehill to separate us. Yet the Government will not accede to our proposition. The Government have no objection to send commissioners to the antipodes, but they will not send commissioners to Washington. They have no objection to open communication with the Argentine Republic and its 5,000,000 of souls, but they will not open communication with the great nations to the south of us whose trade is a thousand-fold the trade of the Argentine Republic. But they have their reasons for it. They do not act on mere caprice. They have their reasons; they have a standing offer upon the Statute-book that they are ready to open our market, to a certain extent, to the United States if that country will open its market to us. But beyond that they will not go, they stand upon their dignity and they will not budge an inch. I say the offer which is made by the Government to the United States is an offer of a limited character, in natural products only. It is not what we ask for. It is not an offer of unlimited trade, such as is asked for by my hon. friend to my left. My hon. friend has proved, at least to the satisfaction of everyone who will take a calm view of the matter, that unlimited reciprocity is preferable to limited reciprocity. Now, if the Government had secured the limited reciprocity which they have offered to the American Government, we would have been glad to accept it, and the Government would have been entitled to the thanks of the country. But the Government have failed in their efforts. That standing order has been on the Statute-book for nine years now and the Americans have not yet chosen to bite at the bait; but it is not a bait, and I claim that such is an improper expression. It was a threat, it was intended as a threat to the American Government to make them see what evil consequences might fall if they refused to open their doors to us. The bait, however, has been ineffectual, and we must try something else. Now, limited reciprocity may be looked upon as an impossible thing. I have not heard one single voice raised on the other side of the line in favor of limited reciprocity, while eminent statesmen, members of Congress, influential merchants, boards of trade, have again and again pronounced emphatically in favor of unlimited reciprocity, and to-day there are before Congress two measures in that direction. This sentiment, which is evinced by the propositions of members of Congress, is not of yesterday. It dates as far back as 1861. In that year the Board of Trade in the city of New York petitioned Congress in favor of an enlargement of the Reciprocity Treaty which existed at that time. That petition to Congress was acted upon. In 1864 Congress considered a resolution from the Committee on Commerce in favor of an extension of the treaty and a widening of its provisions. That resolution was passed in March, 1864; it was laid over till December of that year, but nothing came of it I am sorry to say. And why? Because of the events which took place in the year 1864, because of the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and by Canada towards the United States in the great struggle in which they were engaged at that time. The Alabama cruisers, fitted out in the port of London, the St. Albans' raid, prepared in Montreal, so far embittered American public opinion that it would not allow that resolution to be carried any further; but of the sentiments which were entertained at that time by the Administration of Mr. Lincoln we can obtain an idea by a letter which was written by Mr. Adams, who was at that time Minister to the Court of St.

James, and which was addressed to Lord John Russell. It was dated November, 1864, and he said this:

"The welfare and prosperity of the neighboring British Provinces are as sincerely desired on our part as they can be by Great Britain. In a practical sense they are sources of wealth and influence for the one country only in a less degree than for the other, though the jurisdiction appertain only to the latter. That this is the sincere conviction of my Government has been proved by its consent to enter into relations of reciprocal free trade commerce with them almost as intimate as those which prevail between the several States of the Union themselves. Thus far the disposition has been to remain content with those relations under any and all circumstances, and that disposition will doubtless continue, provided always that the amity be reciprocated, and that the peace and harmony on the border, indispensable to its existence, be firmly secured."

Those were the sentiments of the Administration of Mr. Lincoln in 1864, those are the sentiments of the Administration of President Cleveland in 1883. Of the sentiments of the Administration of Mr. Cleveland upon this matter we have ample evidence in the correspondence exchanged between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper, in the letter addressed by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles. Although that letter has often been quoted, I quote it again because it seems to be pregnant with meaning. Mr. Bayard, after having alluded to the necessity of settling the disputes arising out of the fisheries question, proposed a settlement in this manner:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations."

These words are pregnant with meaning, but their precise meaning is fully made out by what follows. Mr. Bayard continues:

"The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demands entire frankness. I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility."

What is the meaning of his language, "staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility?" What was in the mind of Mr. Bayard? The only way to settle this question was to remove those causes which threatened "a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with hues of hostility." I am glad to find that the gentleman to whom the letter was addressed, and who, unfortunately, is not in his seat to-day, Sir Charles Tupper, fully reciprocated those sentiments, and he said in his answer to Mr. Bayard:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Those were the sentiments of two of the gentlemen who were afterwards engaged as plenipotentiaries each for his own respective Government. The American plenipotentiaries made propositions to the British plenipotentiaries. What were those propositions? We have not yet been able to find out, for reasons which have not been explained, the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries, and those proposals have been kept from the public. But what can they have been? We can imagine what they were; and what else could they have been except a reflection of the sentiment expressed by Mr. Bayard himself, the Secretary of State, when writing to Sir Charles Tupper, what else could they have been but proposals to settle the question upon a basis which would remove from our long frontier the danger of "staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility." What could they be but proposals for the abolition of customs between the two countries? I fail to find they could be anything else, and unless we are shown at a future day that I was in the wrong, and that they were not such proposals, I think we can fairly infer that such were the proposals emanating

from Mr. Bayard. Did the British plenipotentiaries answer in that spirit? No. The proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, and which we have before us, are not in the same spirit which dictated the answer of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Bayard. Sir Charles Tupper in that answer said that he hoped also that the question would be settled by a "straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries." What was the new proposition by the British plenipotentiaries? Was it for an entire settlement of the question upon that line? No; the proposal was simply an arrangement for greater freedom of commercial intercourse. Sir Charles Tupper's proposal to settle the question was by an entire discussion of the trade relations, but the proposition of the British plenipotentiaries was simply for greater freedom of commercial intercourse than now exists. I say the hands of the British plenipotentiaries were handicapped by some power, either by the British Government or the Canadian Government; but it is manifest that the intentions of Mr. Bayard were not reciprocated by the British plenipotentiaries at the discussion of the treaty. So that, Mr. Speaker, the time is eminently well chosen now to move in the sense indicated by my hon. friend on my left, and send a commissioner to Washington to confirm the principle, if he sees it is possible to confirm it, which would remove hostility from our frontier line. But the Government will not have that. Even if it were offered, as I believe it was offered in the negotiation of the treaty, they will not have it. They will not have unrestricted reciprocity. They maintain their line of restricted reciprocity; they maintain their line upon the offer they have made upon the Statute-book, of giving reciprocity in natural products only. What is the reason that they give for this? The reason they give is that, at present, unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactures. Well, Sir, as to that argument, "unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactures." But, Sir, it is admitted that unrestricted reciprocity would include reciprocity in natural products, and gentlemen on the other side are ready to give reciprocity in natural products. They admit thereby that reciprocity in natural products would be favorable and would benefit the growers of natural products, or, in other words, that it would benefit the farmers. They say that the interests of the farmers in this instance and the interests of the manufacturers are antagonistic. They admit unrestricted reciprocity which included reciprocity in natural products would favor the farmers, but they say at the same time that it would injure the manufacturer. I do not admit the argument whatever, for I think reciprocity would be useful all round. But if it comes to this that we are forced to choose between the growers of natural products and the manufacturers, for my part my choice is made, I stand by the industry which numbers 70 per cent. of our population. I stand by the industry without which no other industry can live. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not admit the argument at all. I do not for a moment admit that reciprocity in manufactured goods would be unfavorable to the manufacturers. What is the objection? The objection is that our infant industries, as they are termed, are not yet strong enough to compete with the industries of the American people. Sir, it is a peculiarity of these infants, called industries, that they never grow. They are monsters, whilst they lose their stature their appetites are insatiable, and yet they have not got strong. They have to be kept on the feeding-bottle all the time. You have to carry them in your arms all the time, and if you put them on their legs they moan most piteously and are too weak to stand. The poor things are in fact so very weak that they combine amongst themselves to extort from the country, not only what the country will give them willingly, but even what the country will not give them. I can well understand that the monopolist will not have unrestricted

Mr. LAURIER.

reciprocity. He has the market to himself; the market is not large, it is true, but he has it all to himself without competition, and furthermore if there were competition he would have to exert his brains and muscle in order to live as any one else has to live by exerting his nerve, his hand or his muscle. But, Mr. Speaker, the genuine manufacturer not only is not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity but will hail with joy the day that the American market is open to him. What is it that modern industry wants in order to thrive? It wants space, and nothing else but space; and give to our manufacturers that broad market of 60,000,000 of men, and every one with a heart in his bosom and a head on his shoulders will tell you that he is ready and eager to compete with the American manufacturer. My hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) stated the other day that he was opposed to the present movement because he thought unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufactures, and he spoke from a local point of view. I am glad that on this occasion I have to sever from him on this question. He said as follows:

"We know in the cities of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal the number of consumers of agricultural produce is largely increasing and our farmer goes to this market. Every week dealers go through our district buying eggs, poultry, animals, fruits and other articles of farm produce, and where do those articles go in much larger quantities than in the past? They go to the markets of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, where there are a larger number of consumers than in the past. Destroy by unrestricted reciprocity the manufacturing industry of those two cities, throw out of employment the thousands of workmen who gain their living in those manufactories, and what would be the result? Our markets for the agriculturists' produce would lose its importance."

Sir, I will say to my hon. friend that the opinion which he expresses on the result of unrestricted reciprocity with regard to the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe is not the opinion of the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe. My hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) is a manufacturer and he is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and I hold in my hand here a telegram from Mr. Boaz, who is a large and well-known manufacturer of St. Hyacinthe and who says if you give him the American market to-morrow, the day after to-morrow he will treble his establishment. This, Sir, is the opinion of a genuine manufacturer. It stands to common sense, and it stands to reason, that the larger the field is at the present day for the manufacturer the larger will be his exertions and the larger his profit and his trade. But, Sir, there is another objection, and a most serious objection upon the face of it. We are told that unrestricted reciprocity would largely affect our revenue. Under present circumstances the importations from the United States yield in revenue an annual amount of \$7,000,000. There is no doubt whatever that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted we would lose that revenue. Sir, I say at once and I say emphatically that the prospect has no cause of alarm to me. The prospect would be a serious cause of alarm, Sir, if the revenue of the country had been kept to the legitimate expenditure of the country, and if the revenue of the country had been kept to the figure indispensable to carry on the legislative business of the country. Then, Sir, the necessity of providing the deficiency of such a large amount to be levied every year upon the people of the country would be a serious problem. But, Sir, under the present high rate of taxation the revenue has been swelled far in excess of the legitimate requirements of the country. The equilibrium has been maintained by the Government between a large revenue and expenditure. But, how? By decreasing the revenue? No, but by illegitimately increasing the expenditure. But, Sir, this fact that we are illegitimately increasing the expenditure of the country beyond the natural requirements of the people is a serious matter which should grow on the consideration of the gentlemen of this House. It is fruitful of evil consequences. The United States to-day suffer from the same state of things. They have also

an abnormally large revenue, and although the expenditure has been kept down to a legitimate expenditure, still all the evils that we have to-day from a large revenue and a large expenditure have also arisen in the United States. In a recent number of *Harper's Weekly* the editor of that most valuable, able and high-toned paper, after having reviewed the policy of President Jefferson—who favored a large expenditure and in order to have a large expenditure would maintain a tariff providing for a surplus—goes on to speak in this way, and this language I commend to everyone who thinks of those matters in this House :

"Experience, however, has proved what Jefferson could not foresee, that the course he favored leads to over-taxation, class legislation, a general derangement of commerce and industry, and political corruption."

All of these evils we have in this country. We have had class legislation, we have over-taxation, and we have political corruption—political corruption so bold that it does not even seek at this day to hide its shame. Let me in this connection quote the words spoken only a few weeks ago by the Premier of this country in the city of Quebec. At the dinner given there to the Minister of Militia, he uttered these pregnant words:—

"Sandfield Macdonald, a Scotchman, and like all Scotchmen but myself, exceedingly economical, took great pains to save up a surplus. The Opposition abused him, and said he had not the heart to spend the money, but that when they got into power they would divide it. So that he was literally bought out with his own money. No Grit successor of the present Government will find much surplus left after us to spend among his supporters. Our opponents say that we bribe the constituencies, but we bribe them with their own money."

Sir, this is the level to which the politics of this country has been lowered by the false system which we have been pursuing for so many years. Sir, I will hail with joy the day when it will no longer be in the power of this Government or any other Government to bribe the people of this country with their own money. I will hail with joy the day when no more money will be extorted from the people of this country than is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the country; and if unrestricted reciprocity were to do nothing else than to reduce the expenditure to such a normal figure that it would be impossible for any Government to distribute money among the constituencies to bribe them, with both my hands I would vote for unrestricted reciprocity. The advantages, Mr. Speaker, of a free, untrammelled commercial intercourse between this country and the great country to the south of us cannot be denied. Indeed, they are not denied. No assertion has been made on the other side against the assertion made on this side that great benefits would follow such an interchange. The objections made are not made to the idea itself, but all the objections are based simply on the supposition that this course would be fatal to some interests in our own country. But, Sir, the one great objection which we have heard from all quarters on the other side of the House has been the cry of disloyalty. That cry came as a lugubrious knell in all the speeches we have heard on this question. The objection was taken that to admit all the importations from the United States free of duty, while you tax the importations from Great Britain, it would be disloyal. The objections made on that subject were crystallised in one sentence by the hon. Minister of the Interior, in an interruption of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island :

"What I said was that a differential duty against England was disloyal to the mother country and inconsistent with our position."

Sir, if this objection means anything it simply means that if we find it to be to our advantage to adopt reciprocal free trade with the United States, we should forego that advantage because we are a colony of England. That is the proposition made by gentlemen on the other side. I denounce such a proposition; I repudiate it; I denounce it as unmanly, as anti-Canadian, and even anti-British. To pretend, Sir, that our colonial allegiance demands from us that we

should be deterred from the spirit of enterprise, that we should refuse to extend our trade and to increase our prosperity according to the best methods which commend themselves to our judgment, to pretend that this is loyalty, I deny; and if I were to characterise the sentiment in the only language in which it ought to be characterised, I would say this is not loyalty, but this is mere flunkeyism. We are a colony of England, it is true; but we are a colony not by force but by choice; and if we are a colony to-day, it is because we are convinced that at the present day our colonial independence is quite compatible with all kinds of national advancement and material prosperity. If you on the other side pretend that our colonial relation curtails and limits our possibilities, that England would allow us to reach a certain altitude and not go higher, I say you slander England; and if any man were to rise on the other side and tell us that England would be jealous at whatever we could do to improve our condition, I would say that man does not know England; he mistakes the England of to-day for the England of 100 years ago. I commend to the consideration of these fervent loyalists on the other side, whose mouths are ever full of the word loyalty, the following words spoken by Lord Palmerston 20 years ago in reference to the British North American Provinces:

"If these Provinces felt themselves strong enough to stand upon their own ground, and if they desire no longer to maintain their connection with us, we should say, 'God speed you and give you the means to maintain yourselves as a nation!'"

These are the sentiments of British statesmen. They tell us that whenever we want our political liberty, we are free to have it. But what we ask, Sir, is not political independence; we want to keep the flag of England over our heads; but we affirm that we are economically independent as we are legislatively independent. Sir, colonies have interests in common with the mother land, but colonies have interests of their own also; and to-day we levy a heavy toll on all imports from Great Britain. We have done that not only for the sake of collecting revenue, but also for the purpose of protection, to enable us to manufacture ourselves what we had formerly purchased from England, and to that extent to destroy British trade. There was a time when this would not have been tolerated; there was a time when England would have disallowed such a policy; but now we adopt it as a matter of course; now our policy is never questioned—why? Because England has long ago admitted the principle that colonies have interests of their own, and that it is within their right and power to develop and foster and promote those interests, even to the point of clashing with British interests. It was not always so, however. In the last century, England lost her American colonies because that principle was ignored. The American revolution broke out simply for the revindication of the principle that taxation and representation should go together. Principles may lie dormant for generations until called forth for the solution of some great issue. And what was the issue which called for the vindication of those principles by the American colonies? The issue was this. At that time there was a trade in the American colonies, and there was also a British trade; and the British Parliament, from which the colonies were excluded, legislated exclusively for British trade against the interests of American trade. In our own country, in the year 1837, a rebellion broke out in the two largest colonies left to England, and in both the provinces the cause of the rebellion was the same. It was that the British Government persistently ignored the interests of the colonies as represented by their Legislatures. The British Government, at that time, did not hold upon those matters the same opinion that it holds to-day; but when rebellion broke out, not only in Lower Canada, where the population was not of British origin, but even in Upper Canada, the British Government sent a commissioner to investigate the

cause of the rebellion. In their selection of Lord Durham they were most lucky, for in him they chose a man of great sagacity of mind, great personal courage, and large and liberal views. If it were my duty to review his report, I would be bound to take exception to the conception which he formed of my own countrymen; but as to the main conception of the report, as to the main idea which governed it, it was one of the greatest conceptions of an age fertile in great conceptions. It was indeed a revolution. Lord Durham found at once that the colonies had interests of their own, and that these interests had to be prosecuted to their logical end; and he came to the conclusion that local parliaments were the only parliaments fitted to deal with them. He suggested therefore to give the colonies responsible governments. That was indeed a revolution. Every country which, up to that time, had colonies, always thought it was necessary to keep its colonies closely in hand; they all believed that to grant the slightest emancipation would generate a desire for complete emancipation. Lord Durham found that the converse proposition was true. He found and maintained that coercion generated the desire for emancipation, but that freedom would be a bond of union. That was a revolution in ideas; it was one of the greatest conceptions of the age, and all the greater because of the circumstances under which it was formed. There was a rebellion at the time in which two Provinces participated. There was a rebellion in the upper Province of Canada, where the population was of British origin; there was a rebellion, a far more dangerous one, in Lower Canada, where the population was of alien origin, and had only recently been made subjects of England. And at that very moment, when the country was in the throes of civil war, when the soil was reeking with bloodshed, when British domination had to be maintained by force of arms, at that moment Lord Durham said: Make them free, and we will make them loyal. And we who live to-day are the happy witnesses of the sagacity of his mind and the realisation of his prophecy. We who live to-day have seen how his policy has planted deep felt loyalty where, fifty years ago, rebellion existed. But, Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what is the extent of the freedom which was then granted to us? I say it extends as far as Canadian interests extend, and to that extent we, on this side, limit it. At that time, it is true, Lord Durham had not one disciple. British statesmen could not conceive that responsible government could exist in a colony as it existed at home, and it was not until another master-mind, Lord Elgin, came to this country, that the policy of Lord Durham received its full measure of adoption. But Lord Elgin went further. He negotiated the treaty of reciprocity, and in that treaty he admitted the principle of discrimination against British trade. Is there an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who will pretend that these great men, Lord Durham and Lord Elgin, did not save the British Crown on this continent? Will anyone pretend that the colonies would have long consented to be governed by the Colonial Office, through the instrumentality of a petty family compact? Who is not aware that the Reciprocity Treaty negotiated by Lord Elgin in 1854, effectually quashed the agitation for annexation which followed 1849. I say to our hon. friends opposite: You want to maintain British connection on this continent, and so say I; but I add this, that if you would maintain British connection on this continent, British connection must walk abreast with all the requirements of this country. In this connection, I cannot do better than quote the minute of council of the Coalition Government of 1865, which is pregnant with meaning, in view of the present circumstances. That minute is as follows:—

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government, which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada,
MR. LAURIER.

in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitations for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Province has wholly disappeared."

Here is the admission that reciprocity with the United States effectually quashed the agitation for annexation which followed 1849:

"Although the colony would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government, of mere commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed, they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity of the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

There is no fear of any desire for organic changes as long as the people are prosperous. But the moment the people will begin to believe that their prosperity would be increased by an organic change, from that moment danger may arise; and as to our moral right to act as we have acted in this matter, I have not the slightest doubt. The objection of hon. gentlemen opposite would have been a much stronger one, at least in my eyes, if it had been made from a different standpoint. If instead of telling us we have not the right to propose to discriminate against England, they had said it would not be generous to England to discriminate against her, the objection, to my mind, would have been far stronger; and if I am not trespassing beyond the limits of good taste, in speaking of my own individual sentiments, I would say that this is a consideration which gives me much concern. We have been told in the course of this debate, in many instances, that sentiment should not be allowed in politics. That view I do not take. My view is that sentiment may, as well in politics as in everything else, shape our actions to the extent of making us generous, if we can be generous without any sacrifice of duty. Sir, I am a subject of French origin, and I have often stated—and you, Mr. Speaker, agree with me—that there is no more loyal race of men under the British Crown on the American continent than Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. Loyalty is natural to you, men of British origin; it flows in your blood, you have inhaled it from the heart of your mothers; but I tell you that gratitude has worked in the hearts of my countrymen the feeling of the same nature which is implanted in your hearts by your origin or your birth. With all my soul I say, let my tongue adhere to the roof of my mouth if it were ever to speak an unkind word of England; let my right hand wither, if it ever participated in anything which would be unfair to England. But this is not a question of sentiment. This is a question of duty, and, if you put it in this light, that I have to choose between the duty I owe to England, and the duty I owe to my native land, I stand by my native land. And there is not an Englishman, with an English heart in his bosom, that will not say the same if he is a true born British man. Sir, England would treat us with contempt if we were to act otherwise than we are acting. England expects from us that we shall do the best we can for ourselves, and she will take care of herself, without any assistance from Canadian Tories. I am quite sure of one thing. It is quite possible that Jumble may grumble, but in his grumbling there will be as much pride as anger, and Jumble will feel flattered if there is an offspring of his so much like the old gentleman that he will not lose any occasion to turn an honest penny. Jumble will feel flattered, if he finds that that scion of his is a true chip of

the old block. But there is another kind of loyalty which has not been alluded to on the other side of the House, and which should be taken into consideration in this instance. I have not heard from the other side a word about the loyalty which we owe to Confederation. Twenty years ago, we united the British Provinces on this continent with the view of making them a new nationality and with the hope of making them a nation. It was then a union on paper. It was expected that it would be made a real union. The union has lasted twenty years, and what is the result to-day? What have we achieved during those twenty years? I say that to-day, after twenty years, the union which, in 1867, was a mere union on paper is to-day still a mere union on paper. The hearts of the people by the sea are not in the union.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They are.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was once rebuked for saying that he was a Nova Scotian by birth and a Canadian by Act of Parliament. I say, and I think I speak with knowledge, that the sentiments which were then uttered by my hon. friend are the sentiments entertained by 19-20ths of the people of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. Perhaps it will be said that I have no cause to speak that way, because Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government. Sir, the reason why Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government is that the issue which the Liberal party placed before the people of Nova Scotia was not repealed. I believe in Confederation; we believe in Confederation, and we want the people of the Maritime Provinces to understand that it is the policy of the Liberal party not to induce them to return men to support us, but to win them over to Confederation, and to make them not only loyal British subjects, as they are, but loyal Canadians as well. If you want to do that, if you want to achieve that object, you must reverse your policy altogether; if you want to achieve that object, you must give to the people of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces their natural market. Let them trade where it is most profitable for them to trade, and their hearts will be won over to the Canadian flag, and not only to the British flag. It was our hope at one time to make this country a nation. It is our hope yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I hail that sentiment with joy, with unbounded joy, all the more that it is altogether unforeseen. I had expected, from the talk we have heard from these gentlemen on the other side of the House, that they expected that this country would forever and forever remain a colony. I see now that they have higher aspirations, and I give them credit for that. Colonies are destined to become nations as it is the destiny of the child to become a man. No one, even on the other side, will assume that this country, which will some day number a larger population than Great Britain, is forever to remain in its present political relation with Great Britain. The time is coming when the present relations of Great Britain and Canada must either become closer or be severed altogether. For my own part, I do not intend at present to carry out this line of thought any further, but I say simply that, if ever and whenever Canada chooses, to use the language of Lord Palmerston, to stand by herself, the separation will take place not only in peace, but in friendship and in love, as the son leaves the house of his father to become himself the father of a family. But this is not the question of to-day. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. To-day we have to face a problem of no small magnitude, which is to provide the best means of developing and broadening the area of our

trade to such an extent as to afford to our struggling industries the space they require to thrive and develop. This is the duty of the present hour; this is the task which has to be faced and met. We, on this side of the House, believe that the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) exactly meets the case; we believe that the solution of the problem is complete unrestricted reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us. I fully appreciate the objection of our friends on the other side, who would say that our course is not generous towards England. My answer is simply this, I only wish that we could offer to England the same propositions that we offer to-day to the American people. England has opened to us her doors. Gentlemen on the other side have closed our doors against England. They have done it, I know, not in any spirit of hostility towards England, but because they thought it was in the interest of this country. They have adopted protection as their deliberate policy. England has the policy of free trade. England is 3,000 miles away from us. The policy of the United States is a policy of protection, the same as ours. They are our nearest neighbors. There are our channels of trade. Therefore, the course we take is not a matter of choice, but the dictate of reason. I fully appreciate as well the objection of those who say that this is the first of a series of changes which must end in annexation. Sir, I grant at once that there is force in the objection if you look only at the surface; but it is the greatest possible misconception in politics to believe that the same moulds will produce the same casts of events. It is true that history ever repeats itself, but history never repeats itself in identically the same terms. It is true that the same causes always produce the same effects, but those effects are always modified by a variety of concomitant circumstances. Who, for instance, would have expected, fifty years ago, that the concession of responsible government would have resulted, as it has resulted, in a closer union between England and Canada? All the wiseacres of that day predicted that the concession which was made at that time would result in the absolute severance of Canada from the Empire, but all the prophecies have been falsified. The result has been to draw the two countries closer together than ever. We anticipate on this side of the House that the carrying of my hon. friend's resolution will have the effect of bringing about such prosperity to this country that trade will increase, not only between Canada and the United States, but between Canada and Great Britain herself, and make the bonds of union still stronger than they are. Nor, Sir, would I treat lightly the misgivings of those who, on the threshold of a great event, as this is sure to be, cannot but dread the unknown. I can well conceive that sentiment. Even when the mind is satisfied that a given political situation has become intolerable, that a change has to be made, even then the contemplated reform may, perhaps, be looked upon with misapprehension. For instance, the most radical Reformer amongst us, convinced though he may be that a revision of the Union Act which binds the three Kingdoms together, has become necessary, still he may not look without apprehension to the impending change when the past has been so glorious; when the present condition of things, though it has wrought intolerable evil, has made England so great, even he who is determined to amend the present circumstances and amend them effectually, to remove existing evils—even he, Sir, perhaps, would not touch the existing fabric except with a gentle hand. But at the same time the staunchest Tory must admit that the history of England has been an unceasing transformation. There has not been one century when England did not change, when England has been the same as in the the century before. England moved onward and onward, from progress to progress, until she has reached her present position. Yet every one of those changes would have made England what she is to-day, has been met by Tory,

and by Conservative, with the taunts of disloyalty with which we are met to-day. As you go further back from the present century to the period when Catholic Emancipation had become unavoidable, all the Tories of England, from the King downward, wept over the fall of England. When the Reform Bill was carried, all the Tories of England wept over the downfall of their country; when the Corn Laws were abolished, still the Tories of England had more tears to shed. In our own country when responsible government was first agitated, all the Tories of Canada wept over the intended rupture of British connection; and when, a few years afterwards, responsible government was carried into effect, the Tories no longer wept, but they raved, they burst out into a torrent of passion. Their rage was perfectly genuine, but the tears they shed were merely crocodile tears. What the Tories, British or Canadian, wept over upon these occasions, was not the downfall of England, was not the rupture of British connection, but it was for some privilege or some monopoly which upon all these occasions was removed from their grasp. Sir, if the views of the Canadian Tories had prevailed fifty years ago, Canada would still be a medley of scattered Provinces, the Government would still be in the hands of a small family compact. If the Tories of to-day, if those whose lamentations we have heard for the last fifteen days, had lived fifty years ago, they, like their ancestors, would have howled with loyal yells against the reforms which have raised Canada from the position which she then held to the proud position which she occupies to-day; they would have opposed those reforms with the same cries of loyalty with which they meet us to-day; and I venture to say, judging of the future by the past, that the Tories thirty years hence will rejoice at the adoption of the resolution of my hon. friend, as it must be adopted some day, though, if true to their Tory nature, they will shrink from the reforms which will then be necessary. Sir, I am not disposed to treat otherwise than with respect those protests which have been raised against the disturbance of the present state of things. I am reminded, in this connection, of some words written by Armand Carrel, a Frenchman of great power and greater promise, who, unfortunately, fell a premature victim to that curse of French civilisation, duelling. Armand Carrel had been an officer in the French army, and had deserted and joined one of those numerous insurrections which took place in Spain about the year 1820, in favor of constitutional government. He was taken prisoner, court-martialled and sentenced to death; but after a series of dramatic incidents he obtained a new trial, and was finally acquitted. Referring, some years later, to the event which had brought on those insurrections, the French revolution, the Napoleonic wars, and the organic disturbances created by those events, the new aspirations developed, in consequence, in some classes of society, and in other classes of society, the intense attachment to the old regime, and the intense desire for its restoration, he concluded as follows:

"Events in their continual and fatal transformation do not carry all minds with them, nor curb all characters with an equal facility, nor take care of all interests; this must be understood and something must be forgiven to the protestations which rise in favor of the past. When a period is ended, the mind is shattered, and it is enough for Providence that it cannot be reconstituted."

Those words seem to be full of meaning, and they seem forcibly to teach the lesson that it is the duty of Reformers ever to stand up to the duty of the hour, without fear of the consequences, either to themselves or to the country; ever respecting, but still never heeding, those protests which are sure to be raised in favor of the past—in the words of President Lincoln "with malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." Sir, believing that, I appeal to all Reformers on

Mr. LAURIER.

the present occasion; I appeal not only to those who belong to the Reform organisation, but I appeal to all those who believe that the world cannot remain stationary; I appeal to all those who believe that new exigencies are always arising which require to be dealt with; I appeal to all those who believe that the present economical condition of Canada is false and dangerous; I appeal to the old men who, in former years, have borne the brunt of many battles in favor of reform, and who have lent a helping shoulder to bring up their country to the high level it occupies to-day; I appeal to the young men whose aim it is still to raise their country higher—of all I ask their support in the task we have undertaken at this time. Sir, our opponents on this occasion again drag up their old-time crop of abuse. They tell us that we are disloyal, that we are traitors, that we are annexationists. With such invectives we are not concerned. Those invectives are only an anticipation of those with which we will be assailed by our opponents. Then, again, they will appeal to all the prejudices which can be brought against this policy. They will again torture noble sentiments in order to arouse suspicion against this policy, they will again probe the secret crevices of the heart in order to awaken that may be found there low and vile against this new policy. But with such we are not concerned. Such calumnies have been faced before and we must face them again. They say that without a doubt the people will repel us, that victory will again perch on the banners of the Conservative party. With such considerations we are not concerned. Our considerations are higher, our aims are higher than such low, vulgar, vile, selfish considerations. And, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to all those who believe that politics is neither a trade nor a gain; I appeal to all those who believe that politics is a duty which must be discharged, not with a view to the gain to be attained but discharged simply for duty's sake, and to those, in the language of the poet, I say:

"Onward! throw all terrors off!
Slight the scorns, scorn the scoff.
In the race, and not the prize,
Glory's true distinction lies.
Triumph herds with meanest things,
Common robbers, vilest slings,
'Mid the reckless multitude!
But the generous, but the good
Stand in modesty alone,
Still serenely struggling on,
Planting peacefully the seeds
Of bright hopes and better deeds."

I believed, Mr Speaker, that my hon. friend to my left planted the seeds of brighter hopes and better days for this country when he moved this resolution. We may be defeated; but, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr Davies), said a few days ago, time is with us. Yes, time is with us, the cause is true and it will prevail. We are to-day in the last month of a long and severe winter. Nature, which is now torpid and inert, will awaken in a few days under the penetrating influences of the warmer sun, and the great river at the foot of the cliff on which we stand, now imprisoned in the close embrace of the frost, will throw off her shackles and roll unfettered and free toward the sea. So sure as this will happen, I say that under the penetrating influence of discussion, of better feelings on both sides of the line, the hostility which now stains our long frontier will disappear, the barriers which now obstruct trade will be burst open and trade will pour in along all the avenues from the north to the south and from the south to the north, free, untrammelled and no longer stained by the hues of hostility.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, if I were not in the midst of a deliberative assembly, discussing the interests of the people, and having as much as possible to take care that the discussion is restricted to the subject which is before the Chair, I would gladly have joined in the applause

with which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House greeted the great and eloquent effort of the leader of the Opposition. For rhetoric, for eloquence, for great forensic power, my hon. friend is known, and no one in this House admires him more than I do; and I would not rise now to answer him, I would not offer the few remarks I have to make in this debate—this debate which has been so protracted, but which I must say has not been too long,—were it not for a few assertions made by, and occurrences connected with, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I do not wish, as I have said, to add much to this debate—I could not. Interesting it will be in the future when this Confederation, in spite of the efforts of its detractors, shall have passed from youth to manhood, for those who will be living then, and for ourselves, old as we may be, to read over the report of this debate, of this battle upon which might depend the destiny of a whole nation. I again say I would not have risen to add anything to this debate were it not for some utterances of the hon. gentleman against which I am bound to enter my strong and solemn protest. It is the habit of the hon. gentleman in every one of his speeches in this House to display not only his great loyalty to the British Crown and the British Empire and his most British feelings in words—it is his fashion to say not only that he is loyal to the British Crown and the Empire, but that no one except himself and his party have any of the elements of true patriotism and loyalty. Against that I must enter my protest. The hon. gentleman says he is loyal; I believe him. He may say as long as he likes that he would take his solemn oath, and that his arm might wither if he was not anxious to maintain the integrity of the British Empire and the glory of the British Crown; but I would have preferred if he had said it in time of danger. Instead of brandishing his sword in defence of the British Crown to-day he should have done so during those days which have passed, and which I hope will be forgotten by every one in this country; but, on the contrary, he then said he would have shouldered a musket, which certainly is not loyal and which certainly was not acting to protect the interests of the integrity of the Empire. This I say only as a contradiction of the action of the hon. gentleman. I do not wish to deny him the right to express his opinions, as he has expressed them and as he has a right to do. I say it is his right to do so, but at the same time a man must not make a parade of a virtue only on parade and not in action. But, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is especially speaking for the Province of Quebec, of which he is one of her bright sons, and I may say the Province is proud of him as such. My hon. friend appears to say, and he wants the people to believe that true patriotism is only to be found in the ranks of the party which he leads now, and that “those Tories” as he calls us possess none of the ingredients which go to form a good patriot. It is true, Mr. Speaker, and it is one of the protests I enter here—that my hon. friend, not more than two years and a half ago, said the same thing of a man whom he could not help but praise and whom he could not praise too loudly. During the lifetime of the lamented Sir George Cartier, the true representative in his time of the French-Canadian element in Confederation, my hon. friend was one of the first to call that distinguished and lamented gentleman a Tory, to call him a slave of England, to call him a man whose sense of honor for his country and for his fellow-countrymen was nothing, but whose subserviency to England was everything, while his love for his country and for his fellow-countrymen was nothing according to the hon. gentleman then. Still in 1885 when this agitation commenced in the Province of Quebec, we saw in the newspaper of my hon. friend, that there was no man who ever existed in this country who was such a great patriot as Sir George Cartier, nor did there ever live a man who had been such a lover of his country, and who had been such a successful

builder up of a Canadian nationality. Yet, Sir George Cartier was vilified by those gentlemen during his lifetime. I have hope, one of those days, that although our party is now abused by him, that some of the younger friends of the hon. gentleman will say that in occupying the position which the Government occupies to-day, we acted as the true friends of Canadian nationality and that we acted as the true friends of our Province. They will naturally say in the time to come what the Province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada has already said of the men who at the present moment are at the head of this Dominion of ours. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has stated that the National Policy, inaugurated in 1879, was ruinous to the country and that the country was tired of that policy. When he said this he stated that he was speaking for the Province which he specially represents in this Parliament. To that assertion of my hon. friend I reply that, in speaking as he did, he did not represent the true feelings, the true sentiments, and the real opinions of that Province of Quebec from which he springs. If there is in the Dominion a Province which has adopted sincerely and heartily, and I might add, practically, as well, the National Policy of 1879, it is the Province of Quebec. Perhaps I may be contradicted, but I will state here that in no other Province was the movement for a National Policy commenced earlier than in the Province of Quebec, and to prove it I might perhaps quote an authority which my hon. friend himself will not deny. I may say that as far back as December, 1867, and the first time that I had the honor to speak on the floor of the Legislative Assembly in Quebec, I advocated the National Policy, that is to say, I advocated the encouragement of manufactures and to prevent—what? To prevent exactly the state of things which my hon. friend now says is the great evil and the great disease of the country—emigration to the United States. In my efforts in this direction I was followed and supported by many. Even as far back as 1867 and 1868 the National Policy, as the policy for the Federal Government to adopt, was agitated in the Province of Quebec, even before it was agitated in other Provinces. I have here in my hand a book in which I find an extract of a speech which I myself heard delivered by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition when we were colleagues and happy to be colleagues in the Legislature of Quebec. In the debate upon colonization grants which at the time was the popular debate in the Legislative Assembly at Quebec, my hon. friend was endorsing the policy of his colleagues. On our side of the House we believed that the great curse of the Province of Quebec was that a great many French Canadians were emigrating to the United States. When we were complaining of that emigration from our Province, strange to say it was during the time that the Reciprocity treaty existed between Canada and the United States, and I can assert here that the tide of emigration to the United States, in comparison with the population, has never been greater than it was during the period between 1854 and 1866—during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty. What did my hon. friend then say? He could not even then help speaking of patriots and patriotism. If in the speech which he has just delivered we did not hear him mention the name of the great Papineau it is certainly only the fault of his memory, because I am sure if he thought of it he would have had the name of Papineau on his lips. My hon. friend, speaking in Quebec in 1871, said:

“It is now many years ago since the great patriot of Canada, that great patriot whom we have just lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, seeking to remedy our misfortunes and the evils of the day was resuming his delivery of that speech in that simple language of his, ‘We must not buy anything from England.’”

And the hon. gentleman adding his opinion to that of the great Papineau, said:

“I am of opinion that that policy imposes itself upon us to-day. That with as much and more force than at the time it was formulated. It is

for us and especially for us, French-Canadians, a duty to create a national industry and a National Policy."

It was only during this debate I remembered that discussion, and it was only during this debate I was favored by that little extract which was sent to me by the kindness of the Librarian. I think my hon. friend will not deny that he has used this language, and I know that my friend will not deny that he was a patriot and that he was a National Policy man. He cannot deny the history of his party in his Province. Mr. Speaker, I mention the speech delivered in 1871; I can also mention to my hon. friend and to those who are conversant with the political history of the Province of Quebec, that in 1871 and 1872 the great National Policy originated in Montreal under the auspices of my hon. friend and his friends, not ours. Their great National Policy began with Mederic Lanctot, and ended when the chief of the Government took the real National Policy into his hands and wrested it from those children's hands. By whom was that policy originated and instigated? By the friends of my hon. friend; by the partner of my hon. friend at that time, though I may say to his credit that the partnership did not last very long. In 1871 and 1872, especially in 1872, when the movement was set on foot in Montreal to defeat the giant of Canadian politics in the Province at that time, Sir George Cartier, what was the platform invented in the hope of putting up those small men and putting down the great man? It was this absurd old National Policy. I will mention the name of one man who is now out of politics, but who occupies a seat on the bench, to which he does honor—the Hon. Mr. Jetté. When he was a candidate against Sir George Cartier in Montreal, in 1872, what was the policy of the hon. gentleman's friends. I will quote what he said; I have not the newspaper—it was too bulky, though it was a Liberal paper—but I will read what Mr. Jetté said on the 25th of July, 1872—and I beg the indulgence of the House in translating as I read:

"Three elements are the sources of greatness of a country and the development of its resources—agriculture, commerce and industry. Agriculture cannot alone retain the population which is leaving. The Government should have recourse to the establishment of manufactures; but that system having been considered contrary to the interests of the metropolis, the Government has abandoned it. New England, where our fellow-countrymen are emigrating to, is essentially a manufacturing country. Here we have greater advantages for the establishment of manufactures, and the Government should adopt a policy to protect such manufactures. When people are speaking of the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen, the latter have argued that the advantage they found elsewhere, that is, labor, should be given to them here; and that advantage will be given to them only when manufactures will be flourishing in our country. Then, and then only, can we call our fellow-countrymen from the United States. Capital is dormant in the banks of this country. If we had manufactures we might utilise that capital. Our Government has adopted an industrial policy which is only in favor of foreign manufacturers, and not to the profit of Canadian manufacturers."

I quote this extract because it is a type of all the speeches and declarations of those gentlemen at that time. You may also judge of the policy of the party, by the organ of the party. We do the same now. Great papers having changed their appreciation of the policy of the Government, new organs have been created. At that time the old *Le Pays*, which was the organ of the party, was changed into another organ, which was called, according to this policy, *Le National*. Oh, this National; that is a great word—a word which has been unfortunately used and abused a great deal in our Province by our hon. friends on the other side of the House during the past two or three years. If my hon. friend says it was only a little local movement in Montreal, I shall quote a resolution proposed in 1872 by a man whose name is venerated by all my hon. friends on the other side, from the Province of Quebec at least—the Hon. Mr. Letellier, who was the incarnation of Liberalism, who, I can say to his credit, was undinehing in his Liberal views and opinions, and who to the last moment

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

declared himself a protectionist." Mr. Letellier, in 1872, in Quebec, seconded a resolution in which it was said that the Government should not mind whether the interests of the manufacturers in England should be injured or not, but that it was a sound and patriotic policy on the part of the Government of this country to protect our manufactures so as to create in this country centres where manufacturing industries could be developed, and where the hands that were idle during the winter months could be utilised, and our people prevented from emigrating to the United States. But if 1872 is too remote a date for the changeable affections of my hon. friends, if it is too much for their dull memory of the political events of the country, I might come to 1873. Who was their standard-bearer in Montreal in that year? Who presented himself as the representative of the Liberal party against my hon. friend from Montreal East? A strong Liberal, whose principles were known to all his friends and who declared himself in favor of the National Policy. Who was the candidate that in 1878 held up his banner of free trade? Was there one from Gaspé to Pontiac? No, Sir, every one of them, in accordance with the dictates of the leader of their party, was for protection. Shall I quote the Hon. Mr. Joly, who was for a long time the dignified Premier of the Province of Quebec, a man whose sentiments were shared in by my hon. friend, and whose opinion cannot be a matter of suspicion? Shall I quote the answer he sent to Dr. Orton who was chairman of the Committee on protection to manufactures? Did not Mr. Joly send his answer in saying that even if he had to separate from his party, even if he were to receive the censure of his party, he would be true to his Province and country in advocating a national policy and protection.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the House adjourned I was pointing out that not only in the electoral movements in Montreal of 1871 and 1872, but that during the electoral campaign of 1878, the question of protection to our manufactures had not only not been repudiated by the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, but had been taken up as a part of their programme; and I was about to say that if those reminiscences were not fresh enough for the dull memories of my hon. friends, I might recall to them another fact. It is still fresh in the memory of all of us in the Province of Quebec, that, at a certain moment during the electoral campaign of 1873, a wave came over the electorate which threatened to engulf the people. It was then thought that the then leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Mr. Blake, was certain to see victory perched on his banner. It was then thought that power would be attained by him and held for at least the next five years, and in some parts of our Province, as in some of the Maritime Provinces, especially in Prince Edward Island, this belief in the certainty of the success of the Liberal leader was a great factor in the elections. In Montreal, what was it that occasioned the doubt which came over us, leading us to think that perhaps the Liberal party would win the day? It was the fact that when the great leader, Mr. Blake, came to Montreal to arouse the energy and the courage, which were rather flagging at the time, of his followers, he addressed the electors of Montreal and made the following declaration, which I take from the report of his speech in the *Montreal Herald* of the 21st January, 1837:

"Mr. Blake declared that it was even clearer in 1886 than it was in 1882, that a very high scale of duties must be continued on goods such as we can manufacture at home. He added that free trade was not practicable in Canada, and he reaffirmed his statement that there was no possibility in a change of our system of taxation."

The words uttered by the same gentleman, which were quoted the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Interior, were even stronger than these. In 1872, in 1878, and 1887, the Liberal party, in the Province of Quebec at least, for which Province my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) more specially spoke, was in favor of the National Policy, if not as a political party, at least at heart, desiring to be in harmony with the wishes and aspirations of the whole country. I challenge my hon. friend to cite a single fact which would authorise him to speak in the way he has spoken this evening, as representing the opinions and the wishes of the people of the Province of Quebec. I may go further, and say that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is an attempt, under false colors, and on false pretences, to win the sympathies of the country. Reciprocity with the United States, as we all know, cordial commercial relations with the United States, is popular in this country. We know that a large measure of reciprocity with the United States meets with the sympathies of the population of this Dominion, and my hon. friend's resolution is a move to take an unfair advantage of that sympathy. I will tell the hon. gentleman, and this is not the first time that hon. gentlemen opposite have heard it from Conservative lips, that what the Government of the day desire, and what the people desire, is to have reciprocity with our neighbors in the natural products of the sea, the farm, the mine and the forest. This is the broad reciprocity which we, on this side, have always advocated. My hon. friend quoted the expressions of sympathy which were interchanged between the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bayard, and the hon. the Minister of Finance in this country, previous to the conference at Washington. The letters on both sides, which the hon. gentleman read, accurately expressed the views, I am sure, of the Governments of both countries, and these are the only papers that it was in the power of the Government to put before the House, because the Government were bound by the decision of the plenipotentiaries at the conference. My hon. friend, however, has—I do not say, intentionally, but he has—given an interpretation to the propositions made at the conference, and based conclusions on that interpretation, which certainly should not be allowed to go to the country uncontradicted. He asked how is it that Mr. Bayard wanted to have all these questions of commercial intercourse settled and that Sir Charles Tupper answered in the same sense, and yet when the conference met, the proposals of the British plenipotentiaries for reciprocity were not accepted by the plenipotentiaries of the United States? My hon. friend then drew the conclusion that the reason was that the propositions of the British plenipotentiaries for reciprocity were not framed in that broad, liberal spirit, which inspired the letter from the Secretary of State of the United States. This should not go to the country uncontradicted. There is nothing to warrant such an insinuation. The policy of the Government, as it is expressed in the official press, as it is expressed in the Conservative press of this country, the explanations given by the Government go to the country, and my hon. friend should not have gone further than that. A proposition was made that there should be reciprocity between the two countries according to certain terms and conditions, but all propositions tending to reciprocity were declined by the other party, the American plenipotentiaries wishing to restrict this treaty and saying that they were bound, by their instructions I suppose, within the limits of the fisheries question. I do not know more than any other hon. member of this House, but we all know what the American press said, what Mr. Bayard and other American politicians have said, we know that the declarations have gone throughout the breadth and length of the United States that no proposition for reciprocity of trade could be entertained by the United States, because the Senate and Congress

would repudiate it, and would repudiate anything in regard to which the Government of the United States went further than the discussion of the fisheries of the Atlantic. On our side, we have not been reticent in saying what we wanted. We have said what the people of this country want, and, when I stated that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was an attempt to build up a political platform on false pretences and under false colors, I was right. My hon. friends here are desirous to have reciprocity to a certain extent. I do not mean to say that the whole country is in favor of reciprocity, because, with such an immense frontier as we have, covering different conditions of production, there are some parts of the country in which reciprocity, even in raw products, would be considered objectionable. I know there are some parts of Ontario in which reciprocity in those articles referred to in the Order in Council would be objectionable, but we have in this country to give and take. We know that the interests of the Maritime Provinces are not always in accord with the interests of Ontario, but we know that if the different parts of the country have to make sacrifices, and that each portion of the community must give something for the general benefit of the whole community. It was a member from the other side of the House who gave me the idea I am just going to express. What will be the verdict of the people on the motion now before the House, and on the policy which my hon. friends are trying to induce the country to adopt? Reciprocity? Yes. Large reciprocity? Yes. But unrestricted reciprocity? The people will say no; unrestricted reciprocity we cannot have and will not have, and the people of this country would not allow us to adopt it even if we were willing to do so ourselves. In a country like ours, where we have no foreign policy, the programme of the Government is necessarily more limited than it is in independent countries, and it must be the aim of the Government to build up a national spirit in such a way that all the resources of the country should be developed, that all the institutions of the country should be protected, that the laws of the country should be enacted by the free will of the people, and that the general action of the people and that the general policy of the Government should be untrammelled by any foreign influence. Although, in that way, the legitimate struggle for power may not have the same interest that it would have in independent countries, at least the efforts to gain the confidence of the people has a wide scope, a wide horizon, and wide possibilities for the intelligence and the energies of the people, and I say that this struggle becomes a sinister comedy when we find people constituting one party, in their contention against the other, forgetting their national pride, forgetting the main interests of the people they are representing, and inducing the people to look across the frontier for assistance, and to barter the interests and the destinies of the nation against the possibilities and chances of a Ministerial defeat. On this question an appeal has been made, I must say, to the low interests of the people. What is it that we are telling the people of this country? We are a nation and we must remain a nation. It is true that we are only five millions of people in an immense territory, larger than the territory of the United States, but we must try and build up this nationality. Our industries may not be as prosperous as they should be, but, if they are not as large as they are on the other side, we must protect ourselves, as the youth must be protected and as the child must be protected; we must protect our industries instead of saying what our hon. friends opposite say. My hon. friend who spoke before me said that the National Policy was nothing, that it had done nothing except to feed by the spoon some rich capitalists who had made large fortunes and were trying to protect them by combines, that we should not have a

National Policy, that, being an agricultural county, we should look only to agricultural pursuits for our prosperity. It is true that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) took a different ground. He said that if we had free reciprocity in manufactured articles, we would have larger and more prosperous manufactures, but he has forgotten what the people in every part of this country know, that if we had complete reciprocity or commercial union or annexation—because that is the last word of the resolution—though we might have larger manufactures, more prosperity if you like, still it would not be our country. The people in this country understand that. They have said yes, and they will say yes, to the building up of our country by protection to our manufacturing interests. My hon. friends may say that they want to educate the public opinion with their theory. They may call it a policy, some of them may call it a theory, but I call it a Utopia. Are they speaking for the people of this country? No, they are not. The country spoke in 1878, the country spoke in 1882, and again in 1887. They do not speak for the country. They may say that they want to educate the country, and I do not blame them; but for whom are they speaking? Are they speaking for the United States? They disclaim it, and even if they answered, yes, as I hear that answer made by some hon. gentlemen around me, I would say, no, they do not even represent the public opinion in the United States; they do not represent the sentiment of a single statesman of standing in the United States, in the proposition which they make to-day. And why, Mr. Speaker? Unrestricted reciprocity, without any power to interfere in the tariff of this country by the United States—is there any business man in the United States who would say that they wanted reciprocity with us if we in this country had a right to fix our own tariff, to say, for instance, that we would have a duty of 40 or 50 per cent., while on the other side of the line they might wish to impose a duty of 10, 17½ or 20 per cent.? No such an idea has taken root in the minds of American statesmen. On this point, I will quote the energetic, if not very parliamentary, expression that was used outside this House, by an hon. member of this House, who said: "Unrestricted reciprocity alone, and not commercial union—the Americans never thought of such arrant nonsense." Yes, Mr. Speaker, this motion is merely an attempt to make the people believe that they would enjoy great material prosperity if they had an immense market for their products. It is true that we would have an immense market for our products, but the manufacturers of the United States would also have our country for their market, and then where would be our products if the American manufacturers were at liberty to compete with ours? I see my hon. friend smiling. I may quote an expression that he used. He said, the greater the market, and the more extensive the plant employed, the cheaper would be the cost of production of any article. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what our manufacturers were saying in 1878, when they overthrew the Administration of that time. Then our people were saying, it is true we have the benefit of the American market, but the Americans have the benefit of our market; how can our manufacturers, with their smaller plant, with their smaller capital, compete with the large manufacturers of the United States? It is a law of gravitation that the larger body attracts, and necessarily in the end, absorbs the smaller body. Under unrestricted reciprocity the American manufacturers could do as they have already done, make this country a slaughter market and kill off our nascent manufactures. I need not enlarge upon this point. The fact is known to every one. It is a by-word among all the manufacturers and workingmen of this country. Unrestricted reciprocity is an impossibility. It is a thing that hon. gentlemen opposite are discussing, but which the Americans

MR. CHAPLEAU.

will not consent to. I understand they would consent to commercial union, and those in the United States who favor that scheme do so under the impression that it would end in annexation. Why have not Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth succeeded in persuading the people of Canada to accept that scheme? They have done everything that men could do to make the movement successful, why have they failed? Because the people of this country understood that under commercial union the fiscal policy of the Dominion of Canada would have to be arranged in conjunction with the tariff of the United States. What is the meaning of that? When, in a company of shareholders, one represents three-fourths of the capital and another represents only one-fourth, we know what course will be taken, we know what the board of directors is, we know what the policy of the company is, and we know the general result of such an association. If a man with a penny and a man with a pound go into partnership, we know very well what the result will be. If the tariffs of the two countries were to be fixed by a joint commission, we know that the policy of the more powerful country would necessarily prevail over the policy of the other. Commercial union has been repudiated by the people. Those who advocated it at first, either in the press or on the hustings, are ashamed of it to-day. But it is said that it might bring about annexation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall not indulge in such magnificent periods as my own friend has done, and say that the man who is true to his native land, is the true patriot, and is the true and loyal citizen. That is true, and I tell him that is not because we are subjects of our beloved Queen Victoria that we are giving up the interests of our land, if they come into conflict with the material interests of the mother country. I agree with the hon. gentleman in what he says about annexation. My hon. friends opposite, at least those from the Province of Quebec, must not be scandalised, because some of their best men in the Province of Quebec have been agitating annexation. They have been making speeches to the people on that question. I say annexation is a question that might be discussed, but it would not be approved of by the people of this Dominion. I remember a circumstance that occurred, I am not certain in what year, in an election in Ontario, when a gentleman, a friend of my friend, came before an Ontario audience. It was in the county of Prescott, and not knowing that he was speaking to a population who had not the same ideas as those of his Liberal friends in the Province of Quebec, having been absent a long time from the country, he said in a moment of eloquence, after I had charged some of his friends with having annexation sentiments: "O yes, when the question of annexation comes up you will find more people supporting it than you have any idea of." That was before an Ontario audience, and I give my hon. friends opposite credit when I say that the chairman of that meeting, who was a good Reformer, got up and said: "My friend, if you come here from the Province of Quebec only to say such things, the sooner you leave the better for you." I only mention this, Mr. Speaker, to show that the question of annexation is one which might be discussed, but it would be repudiated by the country. But if you say that Canada would be better under the American flag, say it clearly, say it above board, make a platform of it, and then we will discuss it. We are not afraid of the verdict of the people. If you find dozens and dozens of eloquent men, as my hon. friend is, to stand on platforms in the Province of Quebec and say that we will be patriotic to our native land, and that our native land will be prepared for annexation, I say the good sense and good judgment of the people of my Province and of my fellow-countrymen will be against them ten to one. Yes, Mr. Speaker, on these questions, on a question like this we are now discussing, it is not the men, the politicians, the

statesmen, who are proposing such questions on the people. When bread and butter is at the bottom of the question it is the people themselves, the masses themselves, that give the word, and those who in public appear to be teachers are nothing, if they be true, but faithful echoes of the masses, the people themselves. On some abstract questions men can dictate to the people, they can state certain opinions and impose them on the people; but on a question of policy like this it is the voice of the people that decides; and the voice of the people is against you. Your statistics may be good, and you may be able to make them prove anything you want, but the only statistics I want are statistics of the sentiments and feelings of the people; and those are against you. Mr. Speaker, what I say is correct. The people themselves have their say, and in discussing questions of this kind abstract theories of men have no influence over them. Free trade is in the hearts of the people of England; and why? Because in England after long years, I might say after centuries of well digested, of well guided, of well applied protection, the manufacturing genius of the English people has acquired a perfection that cannot be surpassed or equalled. Manufactures in England challenge and defy all competition, and in a country like England where the largest possibilities of production have been attained, cheap living is the desideratum of the working classes. Free trade is in the hearts of the people of England, whatever might be the difficulties which at the present moment it might entail on the financial condition of the country. On the other hand, protection is in the hearts of the people of the United States; and why? Is it because the genius for manufacturing industries has not developed there? It has to an immense extent; it has so much that American manufacturers are the rivals of Great Britain in almost all the markets of the world. Why is protection still in the hearts of the people of the United States? It is, and will be so long as there is a productive south, an extensive west, affording opportunities for the activity and intelligence of the sons of workingmen to progress under the protective policy which has done great benefit in the past. But it is still more in the hearts of the people of the United States, because the structure they have built necessarily requires further time to become consolidated so as to be able to defy the world. Again, why is it in the hearts of the people of the United States? It is because in their view of developing manufacturing industries they look to this northern part of the continent as being very soon or in the future, or in the near future to become one of the accessories of the great republic, not by war, not by coercion but by the good policy they have impressed upon the minds of their people and which our Government are trying to impress on the minds of the people of this country. Should we not pursue the same course, should we not build up our own prosperity, our own national spirit and our own nation? We are doing it. Again I say that the hearts of the people are not with hon. gentlemen opposite on the question covered by this resolution. I was saying a moment ago that my hon. friends opposite had changed their views, at least in the Province of Quebec on the subject. Up to the time the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power those were the sentiments of my hon. friends, and I say—and I speak with authority in what I am going to say—that in 1877, at the time when my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) joined the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, there was in the Province of Quebec in his own party a strong movement to try and impress upon the leader of the then Government the desirability of taking up a policy of protection for manufactures so as to gain the support of the people of our Province. I am not revealing a secret, I am not unwittingly saying it, but that celebrated manifesto and protest signed by many members of the Liberal party in Quebec, which was presented to the leader of the Government just at the moment

when my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) was entering the Administration, that protest, that celebrated memorandum in which the great majority of the Liberal party of the Province stated that the members of the Government from Quebec were not having their views carried into legislation, and in which it was stated that they should have some influence on the fiscal policy of the Government, that document which represented two-thirds of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, and to its refusal by the leader of the Government is attributed the first defeat of my hon. friend in Drummond and Arthabaska, and in 1878 the defeat of his party and of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I have heard before hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that no great question should be placed before Parliament unless the will of the people had been manifested in a certain manner. We had at the beginning the expression of opinion about commercial union; but that has broken down and disappeared. We have had now three weeks' debate, and before the debate took place there was a notice of motion on unrestricted reciprocity. Where are the petitions presented to Parliament asking for unrestricted reciprocity? From what county have we expressions of opinion in favor of the movement? I have heard some hon. members say they were in favor of it. I heard the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), the other day state that we were essentially an agricultural race, that manufactures would spoil our population in Quebec, that manufactures had a deleterious influence over the people, and that the policy of the Government was the reason why such a large number of the population had emigrated from the Province of Quebec to the United States. My hon. friend here and my hon. friend there forgot to say one thing. Why are French Canadians emigrating to the United States; for what reason do they go there? Do they go there as agriculturists? No, they go there to work in the factories; and I believe that if our manufactures were better developed in this country than they have been up to the present time emigration would cease. I have already said that the period of the greatest emigration to the States was during the time of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. But is the emigration now as large as my hon. friends opposite are pleased to say it is? I say, no; and strange to say my authority for this assertion will be an expression of opinion very recently given by one of the papers on which my hon. friends opposite will not cast suspicion. I quote now from the *Montreal Witness* of the 4th April:

"For some weeks back the incoming trains from the United States have had more passengers belonging to the working classes on them than usual at this season of the year. Heretofore large gangs left for the brickfields and other industries in the State of Massachusetts, but this year that state of affairs has been reversed. Not only the breadwinners are returning but their families and they are bringing with them large quantities of their household effects; so much so that extra help has been put on to handle the baggage and see it delivered safely at its destination. Very few of the passengers come through to Montreal compared with the large number that get off at the different way stations this side of the line between St. Lambert's and St. Armand's. They have been gradually increasing until extra cars have had to be put on to carry the people and their baggage back to their native place in Canada."

Mr. FISHER. Read the entire article.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think there is enough there to prove what I have said but I will finish it. I did not know that my hon. friends on the other side of the House had been so much interested in the article, but it appears now they must have seen the article and that it was touching a little upon their toes. They have seen that it has a certain bearing on the discussion and I am glad to see that they have read it. My friend has asked me to continue the article and I will do so:

"A *Witness* reporter asked the father of a family of thirteen children—"

That is a good exodus from the United States.

—"the cause of so many of the French Canadians returning to Canada. He said the different factories had been shut down for the most part,"—Is it that my hon. friends would insist on my reading? and that they were coming back to work in the manufactories of Canada.

—"as they considered they had a sufficient stock on hand for present demands."

Do my hon. friends want me to continue with the article? I do not indulge much in reading the *Witness*, but it is an interesting paper at times, and I will continue:

"Have they any more now than they have had for two or three years back?" asked the newspaper man."

I do not know what member of the other side suggested that question.

"Oh, no," was the reply, "but we have been informed that another presidential election will take place next fall which may bring about a good many changes in the tariff which might prove ruinous to manufacturers if they had a large stock on hand, and this is the reason they give for throwing us out of employment."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read on; is there any more?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is all, I cannot read more because it is the entire article. But I am thankful to the interrupter who has given me a chance of showing one thing more than I intended when I began to read that article, and that is that the Americans are so much afraid that the result of the next presidential campaign might be against protection, that even now they are beginning to emigrate to Canada for protection. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to continue the discussion any further. I do not wish to take the time of the House any longer and I think I will close my remarks. Before concluding I beg to apologise to the House if I have not put my remarks in as good form as my hon. friend who spoke before me has done. At all events I speak as I feel. I may not speak very well, but I speak as strongly as I can, because I feel very strongly on this subject. The whole *résumé* of the argument of my friends on the other side against the Government is this: They say to us: "We want more manufactures, we want Americans to come here and manufacture for us; we are not satisfied with the strides this country has made during the last twenty years and especially during the last ten years under the policy of the Government. We want to have the same impetus in the way of progress that the American Union has had." Mr. Speaker, I challenge this assertion, and I think I am right in saying that Canada during the last ten years has made greater strides in the road of progress and prosperity than the American Union has done in comparison to its population. And, Mr. Speaker, what authority shall I give you to prove this. I shall give you the authority of the Americans themselves. Not long ago I read in an American paper an article saying that if the Americans allowed this country to go on as we were going, if they allowed the Government of this country to follow the policy we had been following, that we would see greater progress, greater advancement and greater superiority in this country than could be claimed even by the spread-eagles of American papers for the United States. I take the opinions of the Americans to show that we are making greater and vaster progress than they themselves have made. But not only can I give you the opinions of Americans on this subject, but I can give you statistics which prove clearer, better and more conclusive than any other statistics we can have. I do not like, however, reading long arrays of figures to the House. I take it that the arguments of my hon. friends are that the Government has over-estimated the capacity of this country in the liabilities which have been undertaken by the Government during the last twenty years. That same old argument of the gentlemen opposite is used to-day, that the Government has made an extravagant expenditure, and that the Government has over-estimated the capacities of the

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

country to meet its liabilities. I say that this argument is not only a false notion, but that it is also a false teaching to the people. This teaching has been repeated for the last twenty-five years, and the answer to it is found in the lists of the money markets of the world. In 1867, as a young man I used to hear in my county the same arguments and the same speeches as we hear to-day—that the Conservative Government was leading the country to ruin, and that in a few years we would be bankrupt; but we are not bankrupt yet. I find by the *Economist*, the leading financial paper of England, that in 1866, in the month of August, Canadian 5 per cents were quoted at 76, and 6 per cents at 96-97, and in the month of November the 5 per cents had risen in view of Confederation to 81-82, and the 6 per cents to 96½-97½. That was at the time my hon. friends on the other side were saying that Confederation was going to ruin the country, that the ambition of the Prime Minister to make a grand country on this North American continent was a scheme to ruin the old Provinces of Canada. What was the course of our securities from 1867 to 1878? I see by the same financial paper that in December, 1878, Canadian 6 per cents were quoted at 101.

Mr. JONES. That is because you got the Maritime Provinces in to give you credit.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So much for the scheme of Confederation which was denounced by the hon. gentleman; and I hope that Nova Scotia, with her good representatives, my hon. friend included, will still contribute to put higher the credit of Canadian securities.

Mr. JONES. You have been telling us that the small country always suffers by connection with the larger.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry the enthusiasm the interruption has raised has prevented me hearing the hon. gentleman's remark. I was about to say that our 6 per cents in 1878 were quoted at 101-105, and our 4 per cents, maturing in 1904, were quoted at the same time at 89-91. Then, if we come to that worst period of all under the present Administration, we find the same 4 per cents quoted on March 22, 1888, at 115-117. Our 3½ per cents securities one-half per cent. less than the late consols of England, were quoted on the same date at 108-110. We generally say that we are better appreciated by our neighbors than we can be appreciated at home; but there is another saying which is very true, and I apply it to my hon. friend with his poetical quotations, and with all his great prophecies—nobody is a prophet in his own country; and surely, if nobody is a prophet in his own country, the Opposition for the past twenty-five years have been very bad prophets, and it has been for the good of the country that their prophecies have never been fulfilled. My hon. friend quoted the opinion of one of his friends, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), with regard to the industrial movement in that city, and stated that Mr. Boaz, who I think is at the head of the worsted woollen manufactures there, had sent a telegram to the effect that he would like to see reciprocity with the United States, because with it he would sell his products better than he does now. I would ask my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe, who had some interests in 1878, if the reason he did not withdraw the capital he had then in manufactures was that he could not withdraw it because they were bankrupt at that time. I might quote to him the evidence of one of the most successful manufacturers in this country, Mr. Côté, of St. Hyacinthe, and I would ask him to say whether protection has not done this country not only an immense good, but removed it from the danger of bankruptcy which was threatening it if the Americans had been allowed to continue to make the country a slaughter market. In 1878 the woollen manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe were on the brink of bankruptcy, now they are prosperous; and I give credit to that

little town, Liberal as it is, and I do not find fault with it because it is Liberal. But I would add what my hon. friend has forgotten, that that town has prospered not only on account of the National Policy, which the hon. gentleman has denounced, but on top of the protection given by the Government, it has voted liberal bonuses to manufactures, which have startled other towns in the country which were asserting that St. Hyacinthe was going to ruin. That little town has proved that protection was good even when it went one better than the Government. I say, that if the Government were doing what my hon. friends were saying they were doing, overestimating the capacity of the people of this country to meet the liabilities the Government have incurred for the development of the country, I would say that even this I would approve, and the country and the electors would approve. The electors will always be for a policy that is on the side of hope and progress, and that looks to the building up of a nation; and the electorate will always hold that a policy of hope, of progress, of the building up of a nationality, should be the great aim and object of a Government deserving of the trust of the country, which trust we have received and are doing our best to fulfil. Better than that. In carrying out what is said in the motion in amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster); in declaring not that we want unrestricted reciprocity with the Americans, which would mean the destruction of our manufactures, but that we desire, as good Americans also desire, to have the best of feeling and larger trade relations between the two countries, while taking care to give due consideration to the interests of our own manufacturing industries, and to this end we shall continue to work for the good of the people and the glory of the country.

Mr. FLYNN. It is not my intention to occupy the attention of the House at any length, as this great question has been ably and exhaustively discussed by hon. gentlemen who preceded me on this side, but I feel that I would not fairly discharge the duty I owe to those I have the honor to represent, if I gave a silent vote on a question so important as this. I desire also to say that I do not approach the discussion of this question in any party spirit. Had the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) been moved by any member of the Government or by any of their supporters, or had a resolution embodying the same principle been moved by them, it would have equally received my support and approval. I look upon this question as too broad and comprehensive, as affecting too closely the interests of all classes in this Dominion, to be discussed from the narrow standpoint of party. I support the resolution for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, because I believe it would be of great benefit to the Dominion. I know that unrestricted reciprocity would be of great benefit to the Maritime Provinces, and I know that an overwhelming majority of the people of the Lower Provinces would view any measure embodying that policy with a great deal of favor. Much has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite against the resolution, but their arguments may be narrowed down to two: Disloyalty and injury to our manufacturing industries. There was one gentleman from the Province of Nova Scotia who addressed the House on the resolution, with whose manner I was pleased, but I was surprised at some of the statements that he made. I allude to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). That hon. gentleman declared that, on this side, we said our people were not prosperous, that our people were not contented, and that they were forced to go to the neighboring republic in search of employment. Did that hon. gentleman attempt to deny those statements? What did he say? He denied that our people were leaving the country, and he contended that the National Policy had established factories all over

the land which gave employment to our people, and enabled them to live happily at home. Let me take the eastern part of Nova Scotia. In dealing with this question, I will speak of that section of country with which I am most familiar. I will take the four counties of Cape Breton, the two adjoining counties, making six counties, with a population of over 120,000, and I will take the neighboring province of Prince Edward Island with a population of 108,000; and I say that the National Policy has not built one factory in eastern Nova Scotia. Take the county of Halifax, which has a population of 65,000, with the exception of three factories that were brought into existence through its influence, there is none in all eastern Nova Scotia, including the county of Halifax. It is true the National Policy has built up three industries there: two sugar refineries and a cotton factory. But what was the result? All the original stock of the sugar refinery in the city of Halifax was completely lost, and \$100,000 was due to the bank of which this hon. gentleman was president. The hon. gentleman knows also that the refinery, which was started into existence at Dartmouth under the auspices of the National Policy, had scarcely begun running when it also collapsed. It is true these refineries are again running, and may perhaps be doing a little business, but the result I have given was the result in the first instance. The cotton factory was started under the auspices of the National Policy, and now I believe the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) would not give fifty cents in the dollar for its stock. So much for the three factories brought into existence in Nova Scotia. We had some factories in the Maritime Provinces before the introduction of the National Policy. We had three very important factories, Logan's factory in Pictou county, Nova Scotia, the Londonderry steel works in the county of Colchester, represented by the Postmaster General, and Parks cotton factory in New Brunswick. These three factories, under the revenue tariff, previous to the introduction of the National Policy, were able to keep afloat, but after the introduction of the National Policy they collapsed and went to ruin under its benign influence. It would have been better had the hon. gentleman, when he made the statement that our people were employed happily at home in our factories, stated to the House what factories the National Policy had brought into existence in Nova Scotia, and what people were employed in them. Hon. gentlemen on this side, when they made statements that numbers of our people were leaving this country, forced to leave it for the want of employment, were decried throughout this country. It is certainly not pleasant to have to say that people are forced to leave Canada, but, as representatives of the people, we have a solemn duty to perform, and whether hon. gentlemen opposite call the performance of that duty decriing the country or not, the statements are true, and we are justified in making them. I speak with more particular information of the section of country which I represent, and I say that our people have been leaving and are still leaving that section in large numbers for the States. No later than the other day, I received a letter from a friend of mine in the county I represent, who said:

"Hundreds are leaving for the States. The agent of Hawkesbury sold, I am informed, seventy-five tickets in one day this week for Boston."

In another letter my informant tells me:

"The steamer *Rimouski* continues running here. She has taken a great number of our people within the last fortnight, many of them Frenchmen, who are going to the States. I am told there is a large number preparing to leave between this and the first of April."

I know that last year large numbers left not to return, bringing their families with them, and taking up their domiciles in the United States; and the same emigration continues this year, notwithstanding any statements of hon. gentlemen opposite to the contrary. So far from the National Policy being a benefit, I look upon it as the great

est evil that could have befallen the lower Provinces. Now, as to the other arguments that have been adduced in opposition to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that have been given to the House as evidence of the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada. One is the deposits in the savings banks. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), exultantly pointed out the amount of the deposits in the savings banks in Nova Scotia, and in the Dominion, and said it was absurd for anyone to deny that this was a test and a proof of the prosperity of the people. At the outset, I say that it is no test. I say that the deposits in the savings banks are no test of the prosperity or wealth of this country, and that it is absurd to say that the increase of the deposits in the savings banks is any evidence of an increase in our prosperity. Let me call your attention to the condition of affairs in 1873, which was one of the most prosperous years that we have known in this country. The Finance Minister, in this Budget speech of that year, congratulated the House and the country on the prosperity which existed, and he might well do so. In that year, our imports amounted to \$157,514,594, and our exports to \$89,789,922, the imports exceeding the imports of 1886 by \$28,000,000 and the exports exceeding the exports of 1886 by \$4,500,000. That was one of the most prosperous years in the history of the Dominion of Canada. That was admitted on all sides, and this is the evidence that it has never been exceeded in the amount of the trade we did in any year before or since. Well, we find that in that year, the deposits in the savings banks amounted to \$10,221,393. We are all aware that a wave of depression swept over this country just after that time, which continued from 1874 to 1879, and I believe there was no more depressed period in the commercial history of Canada before or since. If this savings banks doctrine is true, the savings and accumulations of the years of prosperity should have been taken out during the years of depression, but was that the case? Not at all. I find that, during the period of depression, during the period that hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the "flies on the wheel," and said that the country was going to ruin, the deposits in the savings banks were increasing from year to year until, from \$10,000,000 in 1873 they reached, in 1879, \$15,375,124, or, during that period of depression the deposits in the saving banks increased by more than 50 per cent. If, during the period of depression, there was a continual yearly increase in the deposits in the saving banks, I would ask hon. gentlemen how those deposits can be an evidence of prosperity, I would ask them how they can say that this is the true test of the wealth and prosperity of the people? I think it is so absurd that I shall not further waste the time of the House upon it. But, if it is a true test of the prosperity of the people, and an index of the wealth and progress of the country, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the savings bank deposits in the New England States. I will take the six States in New England and give you the population of each and the deposits in the savings banks.

| | Population. | Deposits. |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Maine | 648,930 | \$ 35,111,600 |
| New Hampshire..... | 346,991 | 47,213,219 |
| Vermont | 332,286 | 11,723,625 |
| Massachusetts | 1,783,000 | 274,998,413 |
| Rhode Island | 276,500 | 51,816,390 |
| Connecticut | 622,700 | 92,183,425 |
| Totals | 4,010,526 | \$ 513,345,572 |

From this we find that these six States in New England, with a population less than the population of Canada, have savings bank deposits amounting to over \$500,000,000, or an amount equal to \$125 for every man, woman and child; while we in Canada had, in 1886, an amount of \$38,173,813, or about \$7.50 per head of the population. Those six States

Mr. FLYNN.

had something over \$513,000,000, while we had only \$38,000,000. The little State of Rhode Island, with a population a little more than one-half the population of Nova Scotia, and possessing none of her natural advantages, without her wealth of soil, her inexhaustible fisheries, and her undeveloped mineral resources, had an amount deposited in the savings banks of over \$51,000,000—a great deal more than the amount of the deposits in the whole Dominion of Canada. Still hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in giving us the saving banks deposits as an evidence of the progress and prosperity of the country. I said at the outset that there was nothing in it, and that it was no test whatever of the progress and prosperity of the country. The people of the Maritime Provinces, having realised the benefits flowing from the limited Treaty of 1854, are fully satisfied that unrestricted trade with the United States would be of vast benefit to them. Trade hampered and restricted as ours is with the country nearest to us must injure and has injured the Maritime Provinces very much. There can be no better proof of the value and advantage of unrestricted reciprocity to the people of the Maritime Provinces at all events, and I think to the people of the whole Dominion, than the progress which was made during the existence of the Treaty of 1854. From the first year of that treaty, our trade with the United States steadily increased until its termination. For a period of nine years previous to the treaty of 1854, our trade with the United States had only increased \$12,000,000. In 1845 it was \$8,000,000 and in 1884 \$20,000,000. But what was the result? The very first year of the treaty, it increased from \$20,000,000 to \$33,000,000, \$13,000,000 in one year, \$1,000,000 more than the total increase during a period of nine years previous to the treaty. This increase continued year after year until, in 1866, the last year of the treaty, it had reached the enormous sum of \$84,000,000. During the existence of the treaty, a period of 12 years, our trade had increased \$64,000,000, while, during a period of nine years previous, it had only increased \$12,000,000. What do we find the very first year of its abrogation? When the treaty was abrogated in 1866 and the restrictive duties became operative again, there was a falling off in our trade with the United States of \$27,000,000. Let me call your attention again to the effect which this had on the Maritime Provinces, for I have been referring to the trade of the whole Dominion. The trade of Nova Scotia with the States amounted, in 1854, to \$4,500,000; in 1866 it amounted to \$7,300,000. The trade of New Brunswick with the United States amounted, in 1854, to \$4,050,000; in 1866, to \$5,300,000. The trade of Prince Edward Island with the United States amounted, in 1854, to \$20,000; in 1865—the Island fiscal year closing in December—the trade was \$1,050,000, while the increase in the other Provinces was very great indeed. The increase in the trade of the Island was marvellous, amounting to over 400 per cent. These figures show what great advantage the Reciprocity Treaty was to these three Provinces during its existence. Now, Sir, I have a statement here, from which it appears that while the treaty was in existence our population kept on steadily increasing, but after its abrogation the population decreased. This appears from the following statement:—

| | 1851. | 1871. | Percentage of increase. |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------------|
| Nova Scotia..... | 276,851 | 337,800 | 40.0 |
| New Brunswick | 193,800 | 285,594 | 47.4 |
| Prince Edward Island..... | 87,000 | 96,226 | 40.3 |
| Totals | 557,654 | 767,415 | 42.7 |

| | 1871. | 1881. | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|------|
| Nova Scotia | 387,800 | 440,572 | 14·3 |
| New Brunswick | 285,594 | 321,233 | 12·5 |
| Prince Edward Island..... | 96,226 | 108,891 | 15·8 |
| Totals | 767,451 | 870,696 | 13·5 |

Reducing these percentages to the base of yearly increase we get—

| | Average increase per year. |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 42·7 per cent. in 20 years | 2·135 |
| 13·5 do 10 do | 1·035 |

Now, if, during those 12 years, we increased so much more rapidly than during the following ten years, it is fair to assume that if the whole term had been under reciprocity, our progress in population would have been twice as rapid as it was in the period without reciprocity. I have given this evidence of the progress of the country during the existence of that treaty as a proof of the great advantage we would derive from a renewal of it. At all events, to the people of the Maritime Provinces it is a question of vital importance, more particularly to the fishermen. I have the honor to represent a constituency largely engaged in the fishing industry, and I know how much that industry has suffered from the duties it has to pay on fish now exported to the United States, and I know how many of our fishermen leave, year after year, to man American fishing vessels, because as was stated the other night, the man who fishes in a Nova Scotia fishing vessel labors under a disadvantage as compared with a Nova Scotian who fishes in an American fishing vessel; he saves so much duty on his codfish, and \$2 a barrel on his mackerel. Now, it was stated here the other night by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) that the United States was the only market for our mackerel. That statement is correct; I state also that the only market for the mackerel produced by the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, is the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the testimony of these two hon. gentlemen, let me give the testimony of an hon. gentleman whose opinion will be accepted with the highest respect, at least by hon. gentlemen opposite—I allude to the Premier. In 1871, in discussing the Washington Treaty, in this House, the Premier said:

"They are so anxious to get free admission of their fish into the American market that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market, that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry, and I say that being the case—if it be to the interest of the fishermen and for the advantage of that branch of national industry, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for the Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that is that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen. They are made the hewers of wood and the drawers of waters for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen or the American merchants, engaged in the trade and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people."

Again, in the same speech on that occasion, in alluding to the period during the existence of the treaty of 1854, he said:

"More goods were imported than ever before, commerce was brisk, stores were open and profits made which never would have been realised but for the existence of the treaty."

Again the Premier said on that occasion:

"That our fisheries are valuable, I am, well aware. Their value, under favorable conditions, could not be overestimated, but that value will be great or small, just in proportion to the markets we possess."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could use no more expressive or powerful language than this, to show the value of the markets of the United States to the fishermen of the Lower Provinces. There was one other point thrown out, with which I will deal briefly, that is the question of direct taxation. It was stated here by some hon. gentlemen that we levied \$7,000,000 in customs duties on imports from the United States, and that if the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford was to come into effect, and we were to have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we would lose this revenue of \$7,000,000, and that this loss could only be made up by direct taxation. Mr. Speaker, I deny that, I deny that one dollar of direct taxation would have to be levied on the people of this country as a result of reciprocity. In 1878 the present Finance Minister, then in Opposition, stated, when the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration amounted to \$22,500,000, that it was more than enough to govern this country, and he stated in this House that if he and his friends were again restored to power, they were capable in the future, as they had in the past, of governing this country wisely, economically and well, but within certain bounds and limits. What were those limits? Within the limits of \$22,000,000 or \$23,000,000. That same statement was made by Sir Leonard Tilley, then Mr. Tilley, the member for St. John. He stated that the Mackenzie Administration was extravagant, and that an expenditure of \$23,000,000 was much more than was needed to govern this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the expenditure last year? I think it was \$36,000,000—I am speaking from memory. If it was \$36,000,000 it would be something like \$13,000,000 in excess of what hon. gentlemen made out. If you take \$7,000,000 from the \$13,000,000 you still have \$6,000,000 left, and adding that to the \$23,000,000 would give \$29,000,000, even without the \$7,000,000, which hon. gentlemen opposite say we would lose. We will suppose that if unrestricted reciprocity came into force we lost the \$7,000,000. Who pays that amount? Those are duties on goods which are paid by the people of the Dominion. If we had unrestricted reciprocity we would lose those \$7,000,000? The people of Canada instead of paying \$7,000,000 in duties, would be purchasing goods to that value. But supposing there was a loss to the revenue of the country, is there any way of balancing the account by retrenchment? I say there is. There are many items on which retrenchment can be made. In the first place, if we had unrestricted reciprocity we could save \$150,000 annually expended on the protection of our fisheries. No less than \$27,000 has been expended of the Railway Commission and \$24,000 on the Labor Commission up to date, a total expenditure of over \$50,000, and whatever benefit it may be to Ontario or Quebec I unhesitatingly say that will be of no benefit to the people of Nova Scotia. Then there is the Franchise Act, which is not necessary in my opinion, which costs \$500,000. That amount could be saved. Then there is the expenditure on immigration, regarding which the policy of the Government has been changed this year. That amount could be saved. Then there is the militia expenditure, a large amount of which is unnecessary, there is a large expenditure also for the Mounted Police, and there are also various items on which saving could be effected if a policy of retrenchment were pursued. But above and beyond all, if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I maintain that such would be the prosperity of the country that the volume of dutiable goods from other countries would so greatly increased and the purchasing power of the people would be much enlarged as to make up any deficiency for the loss sustained. Give us reciprocity, and there is nobody in Nova Scotia

who will fear to face the \$7,000,000 deficiency. Two of the main arguments used by hon. gentlemen who opposed the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are the disloyalty argument and the loss to our manufacturers. I fail to see how the exchange of a few barrels of fish or a few bushels of potatoes with our neighbors across the border could affect our loyalty. Of course, since the Finance Minister spoke yesterday afternoon, the opposition to the resolution has taken quite a different turn. The resolution was opposed outright by the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but yesterday during discussion the Finance Minister said it was the policy of the Government now, as it had been their policy before, to obtain reciprocity in natural products. Therefore, he has relieved us from the crime of wanting in allegiance, or disloyalty so far as natural products are concerned. It was asserted before that, that would be an act of disloyalty, but anything in regard to manufactured goods would be an overt act of treason compassing the death of Her Majesty, according to the views of some hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me go back as far as the year 1847. Such a depression of trade prevailed at that time in Upper and Lower Canada that a petition was sent to Her Majesty asking the Imperial Government to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Nothing came of it, but it resulted in the annexation movement of 1849. We had a treaty in 1854 in natural products and also a treaty in 1871, and if that treaty was not a more extended treaty it was because the British commissioners could not get a more extended treaty. There was no disloyalty then in regard to those who framed the treaty for an interchange of commodities with the United States; and if we ask more extended terms for an interchange of manufactures as well as natural products, are we open to the charge of disloyalty? Not at all. If it was not disloyal at that time, it cannot be disloyal now. I quote now from the Minute of Council of 1865, which has already been quoted, but it is one of those documents which it is necessary to bring forward because of the contentions put forward by hon. members, and in fact the Secretary of State himself used the word "annexation" 50 or 60 times during his speech and the whole tendency of his utterances was not to meet by argument the resolution of unrestricted reciprocity and to show that it would be an injury to Canada, but he sought to lead the people off the track by inducing them to believe it would bring on annexation. That is the reason I quote this statement from the Minute of Council in 1865, in which it is stated:

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Provinces has wholly disappeared."

In the same document in urging upon the British Government the necessity for renewing the treaty they say:

"They cannot err in directing the attention of the English Government to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen—the desire to perpetuate a Dominion, founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

Here we have it laid down as a doctrine that political contentment exists with material prosperity. Thus if we had material prosperity under the tariff of 1854 we had the assurance that we would have that prosperity increased under the treaty for unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States, and having that prosperity we would have contentment. If there is an annexation feeling existing to-day, and I know it does exist, so long as we are shut out of the neighboring republic it will exist, so

Mr. FLYNN,

long as trade is depressed, so long as we have high tariffs on both sides it will exist. Let us have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States to-morrow and a free interchange of natural and manufactured products and that feeling will disappear at once, because I believe no matter whether the Government is one by a Czar or republic, there will be contentment if there is prosperity. It was said in 1878, when the present Premier, then in Opposition, moved his resolution, that it was not for a protective policy but that its main object was to secure a reciprocity of tariff. That was in 1878—I recollect it well—and on every hustings in Nova Scotia where we fought the battle we had two things to meet. They knew the Maritime Provinces would oppose a protective policy, that it would be injurious to their best interests, and it was then said we asked for a protective policy in order to obtain reciprocity. It was a readjustment of the tariff or a reciprocity of tariff leading up to a reciprocity of trade. Here was the statement:

"Will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade."

It has not developed that interprovincial trade. The interprovincial trade has been one-sided, because, as has been repeatedly said, you cannot legislate against geography. The people of Ontario do sell us a lot of goods, but we sell them nothing in return. They take none of our farm produce, because it is too far and too costly to send to them; they take none of our coal, because that is bulky and costly and they cannot take it, but they buy American coal notwithstanding the duty upon it. It is true that the Province of Quebec may have taken some coal from the Province of Nova Scotia, but how has this happened? As was stated here to-night, it was done at the expense of the people of the Dominion of Canada. You send it from Pictou to Quebec a distance of 637 miles at 80 cents a ton, 20 cents less than we have to pay from Pictou to the place where I live. That is the way you force that interprovincial trade. I shall say nothing in reference to the standing offer as enough has been said on that question within the last few days. The cry of loyalty is one used as a bugbear to frighten weakminded people, but I do not think it will have much effect. The people of Canada have always had a strong attachment to the mother country. It is the land of our fathers, and everyone of us feels strongly attached to the old country. But we have another land. There is this Canada. It is our home and we in Parliament who are entrusted with the legislation of the country should have as our aim and our object, to legislate in that direction in which we may advance and promote the best interests of Canada. That is the true way, and it should be the true object of every Canadian legislator. Now, Sir, in addition to the benefit from a commercial point of view, there is another good result that would follow from unrestricted reciprocity. If we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States it would settle the fishery question, that question which has time and again given rise to serious complications between England and the United States, and one that may at any time, by an act of imprudence on the part of an officer in charge of one of our police vessels, involve both countries in serious difficulties. I say that in addition to the commercial advantages that would follow from unrestricted reciprocity the settlement of this question would be one very desirable result which would be sure to follow. We must protect our fisheries. They are ours by solemn compact. We have certain rights that foreign fishermen are excluded from. We have always been willing, and are willing still, in consideration of a fair equivalent, to give within our territorial waters the same rights as we possess ourselves, but until we get that fair equivalent those fisheries must be protected, and during their protection serious difficulties may arise which it would be well if we could avoid, and I believe that only by unrestricted reciprocity can we avoid them. I believe, Sir, too, that the overwhelming majority

of the people of this Dominion favor the resolution submitted by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—all but the manufacturing class. But, Sir, all those engaged in the manufacturing industry are not opposed to unrestricted reciprocity. I saw the other day in one of the leading journals of Toronto forty or fifty names of leading manufacturers who were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and I have heard gentlemen on this side of the House name others who are not afraid of that policy. I cannot see what our manufacturer has to fear. With all the modern appliances, cheap machinery, cheap raw material, with as cheap labor as they can procure in the United States, with proper care, and proper supervision over their industries, what have Canadian manufacturers to fear? Nothing whatever, Mr. Speaker. Under unrestricted reciprocity in place of five millions as consumers they would have sixty-five millions, and therefore they have nothing to fear. But suppose some of those industries would suffer; is the limited few engaged directly and indirectly in the manufacturing industries of this country to stand in the way of the prosperity of the great majority? Let us compare the few engaged in the manufacturing industries or those who give employment with the lumbermen, with the fishermen, the farmers, the mechanics, the laborers and all the other classes who are not benefited in the slightest, but who are oppressed by this system of taxation which protects the manufacturing industries. Our total exports in 1886 were \$80,000,000. Our export of manufactured goods was \$3,000,000 and the exports of the forest, mines, fisheries and the soil were \$77,000,000. Here we have an export of \$80,000,000 and only \$3,000,000 of which was exported by manufacturers, and yet we are asked to stay our hand and not to accept reciprocity with the United States because we will injure the manufactures in this Dominion by so doing. We have engaged in agricultural pursuits 657,281 people; laborers 165,000; fishermen and other occupations over 250,000, making a total of 1,580,000. I take those statistics from a book issued by the Agricultural Department, the Statistical Record of 1886. Of those engaged in manufactures we have 2,390, of operatives 5,846 or 8,236 as compared with over 1,000,000 engaged in other pursuits, and yet we are asked to stay our hand in order to protect the few, when we could benefit the majority. Now, Sir, unrestricted reciprocity would not only give us a market for our natural products, but would give a great stimulus to the development of our mineral resources. We have in this Dominion a great many valuable mineral deposits, particularly in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and they only await capital for their development. If we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States the necessary capital would flow in and employment would be given to the people and our mines would be developed. Now, Sir, the amendment moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), refers to reciprocity in our coasting trade. It is not necessary for me to say much on this, because we all know that it would be of immense advantage to us if we could have the coasting trade of the States given for reciprocal privileges on our side, and it would be a great boon to the people of the Maritime Provinces if we could have the reciprocal right of registering our vessels in the United States. Much has been said about it being beneath the dignity of Canada to approach the United States, and we were pointed out the standing or statutory offer as regards reciprocal arrangement. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing dignified in the part of Canada approaching the United States, but we need not approach them, as they have approached us by Mr. Bayard. In order to have this fishery question settled, he has invited Sir Charles Tupper in these words:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States, has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to.

Your own able, earnest and patriotic services in the Government and Parliament of the Dominion are well known, and afford ample proof of your comprehension of the resources, rapidly increasing interests and needs of British North America. On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

In reply to that, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Now, Sir, here is a proposition by Mr. Bayard, the United States Secretary of State, in which Sir Charles Tupper concurred, and I concur in it also. I believe, Sir, that it is the only way to settle the fishery question—that the only true solution of that difficulty must be founded on a basis of unrestricted commerce between the two countries. Now, it is said that the United States abrogated both the treaty of 1854 and the treaty of 1871. That is true, but what were the reasons? Under the treaty of 1854, by which we had an interchange of natural products only, I believe Canada had the best of the bargain; but we all know the unfortunate attitude assumed by England towards the United States in regard to the war that raged in the Union. Not only England, but Canada largely sympathised with the South, and such was the feeling in the United States against England on that account that the American Government took the earliest opportunity to give notice of the abrogation of that treaty. Under the treaty of 1871 \$5,000,000 was awarded to Canada for the use of our fisheries, but that was only for ten years. The Americans believed, whether rightly or wrongly that they were giving too much, and the only way to avoid paying any more was to give notice of the abrogation of the treaty. But to-day we find a better feeling in the United States; we find that this question of freer commercial relations has been discussed by the leading men there and has been brought before Congress; and if there ever was an opportune moment to approach the United States on this great and important question, it is the present. If there is one reason more than another that would induce me to look with favor on the treaty recently negotiated at Washington, it is the hope that its adoption would lead to kinder and more friendly feelings between the two countries, and tend to bring about unrestricted reciprocity. I believe unrestricted reciprocity would give a great impetus to the trade of Canada, especially to the lumbering, the farming and the fishing industries. It would open up our vast mineral resources to capital. It would, I believe, remove the discontent now existing in the Maritime Provinces, and would give them prosperity. It would produce on a more extended scale the great benefits that resulted from the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. It would give our young men employment and keep them at home, and inspire them with hope in the future of their country. It would, by permanently settling the fishery question, remove all cause of ill-feeling between England and the United States, and lead to amity and friendship between the two foremost nations in commerce and civilisation, in the world, in whose friendship no part of the Empire has greater interest than the Dominion of Canada. For these reasons I intend to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I would not at this late hour of the debate have dreamed of adding one link to the long chain of argument which we have had, if the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford in opening this discussion had been adhered to by hon. gentlemen opposite. But in consequence of the amendment to the amendment of the hon. Minister of Marine, which was moved by the hon. member for Halifax, looking to a request for a reciprocal coasting trade and a reciprocity in the registration of ships,

and in consequence of the strong terms and glowing language with which the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in anticipating that amendment, have spoken of the value of reciprocity in the registration of ships, I thought it my duty, not having heard this point dwelt upon by any hon. member on either side of the House, to address a few remarks to the House with reference to it. These hon. gentlemen spoke—I say it not disrespectfully—as if they had found a mare's nest and hit upon a new wrinkle in this country. But I would remind the House and the country that this is not the first time, nor the second, nor the third, nor even the tenth time in the history of Canada that efforts have been made by the Canadian people to secure reciprocity in the coasting trade. I quite agree with all that was said as to the value of that trade, and with the cheerful and hopeful spirit with which the hon. member for Halifax spoke of our shipowners, those who man and build our schooners, brigantines and brigs in the Maritime Provinces, and of their ability to fit up those ships and sell them in the American market, and to do a very large portion of the coasting trade. With all those remarks in appreciation of our own people I agree. If we could secure a part of the coasting trade, the people along the coasts of the Maritime Provinces would find their interests advanced. There is no doubt about the excellency of the hon. gentleman's proposition, but there are grave doubts about its practicability. The serious question is, whether the amendment of the hon. gentleman is likely in any way to advance the proposition. He has tacked it on to a resolution which is clearly not in accord with the temper of this House, and it is not, therefore, likely to advance that action which we all agree would be salutary to Canadian shipping. Of all strong and powerful commercial nations, the United States of America have shown themselves the most jealous with regard to their own coasting trade; they have most jealously guarded it, and most jealously excluded from all share in it the vessels of foreign nations. That could be proved if the time of the House would allow me to do so, but I will not trespass on the time of the House to prove it. I will only ask hon. gentlemen to read the section of the American Shipping Act and contrast that with the section of our own Act, and still more with the Canadian Order in Council of 1886, and they will find our coasting laws are very much more liberal than theirs. In all attempts to negotiate treaties with the United States, we have failed to secure reciprocal coasting trade. To go back thirty years, I will refer to the fact that in the negotiations which lead to the reciprocity treaty of 1854, there was not one advance made by the Americans, there was not one response made by the American negotiators to our request that our vessels should be allowed to participate in their coasting trade; and I desire to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that in all the provisions of the treaty of 1854, there is not one that looks in the direction of reciprocal coasting trade. Within the last hundred years there never has been in our history any period in which there was such a feeling of amity and good will between Great Britain and the United States as in 1853 and 1854. All the bitterness of the old wars had faded almost from memory. The generation which then ruled had forgotten the quarrels of 1776 and 1812, and that period antedated by six or seven years the bitter feeling that was to arise out of the American civil war. But even in those years of amity and good will Americans were unwilling to grant us anything like reciprocal coasting trade. In 1871 once more Her British Majesty's plenipotentiaries are found in Washington, undertaking to negotiate another treaty, the Alabama treaty. A Canadian statesman was one of the five British Commissioners, and if the House will permit me I will read the record, to show by the protocols of the treaty of that year, that once more an ad-

Mr. WELDON (Albert.)

vance was made by the British Commissioners in the direction of obtaining reciprocal coasting trade between the United States and Canada, but once more the reply was discouraging. The plain cold words of the reply as shown in the protocol to that treaty are as discouraging as words can be. The protocol reads as follows:—

"The British Commissioners then suggested: That, if any considerable modification were made in the tariff arrangements of that treaty, the coasting trade of the United States and of Her British Majesty's possessions in North America should be reciprocally thrown open, and that the navigation of the River St. Lawrence and of the Canadian canals should be also thrown open to the citizens of the United States on terms of equality with British subjects."

And the answer given was:

"The American Commissioners declined this proposal."

In 1874 once more we find the representatives of Great Britain and the representatives of this Dominion in Washington, undertaking to negotiate a trade treaty with the Americans and once more the record shows that our Canadian representatives asked that a scheme of reciprocal coasting trade should be considered and favorably entertained by the American commissioners. In the draft of the treaty of that year, you will find the record is as discouraging as it was in 1871. Read the protocol of that treaty which the Hon. George Brown, on behalf of Canada, undertook to carry through:

"We propose that during the continuance of the treaty the coasting trade of Canada and the United States shall be thrown open to the vessels of both countries on the footing of complete reciprocal equality."

Here is the second proposal:

"We propose that during the continuance of the treaty vessels of all kinds built in the United States and Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country."

There is the precise proposal. To this proposal the United States gave as before an unfavorable reply. Therefore in 1854, 1871 and 1874, the Canadian people have been knocking at the door of the United States asking for this boon in vain. It is not dignified, it is unworthy of us, it is idle, it is, if I may use the expression, puerile, to be clamouring for all the good things of life when we cannot get them, and to be like children reaching out their hands for the moon; clamouring for something which our past experience shows us we are not at all likely to obtain. I shall vote against the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and in so doing I do not apprehend that I am in the least degree voting adversely to our interests as regards reciprocal coasting trade. When that is voted down, the position will be this, that we are a people who have had for eighteen years on our Statute-book a clear law, offering to go half way, not with the United States alone, but with any people who will go half way with us in the direction of reciprocal coasting trade. In the Act of 1880, chapter 14, section 2, are these words:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act, shall not, while such Order in Council is in force, apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place in such country to another, and may, from time to time, revoke or alter such Order in Council."

In other words, as soon as any foreign state will admit Canadian vessels to the enjoyment of their coasting trade, we will admit them. We will not ask them to wait for several months, until Parliament meets, but we will at a day's notice, as soon as a meeting of the Council can be held, empower them to come and share our coasting trade. This Act was put on the Statute-book when the right hon. the First Minister held the same position which he holds to-day. It was put on the Statute-book by the party which we are supporting. We have shown our good faith in this matter, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot tell us, in regard to

this, as they do with reference to the Tariff Act of 1879, that it is a delusion, a sham and a blind, that it is insincerely put there, because almost continuously since 1870, with scarcely the intermission of a year, the Canadian Government has been making representations, through the British Minister at Washington, calling the attention of the American Government to the existence of this statute, and asking that they should go half way to meet us. Furthermore, we have evidence that eight or nine of these States, which have the largest commercial marine in the world, have accepted our offer. The great Mediterranean state, Italy, the great Northern state, Germany, Austro-Hungary, the Netherlands, Belgium, the Scandinavian powers, Sweden and Norway and Denmark, have accepted it; and the young republic to the far south of us, the Argentine republic, with which we in New Brunswick are in hopes of cultivating a large and successful trade,—this young sister of our own, starting on the career of life with about our population and with the same hopes, has opened her coasting trade to us as we have opened ours to her. The very fact then that these eight or nine nations, many of them powerful nations and the foremost carriers of the world, if you except France and the United States, have admitted our coasting vessels to enjoy their trade, shows that the Act of 1870 is not a delusion or a blind. In 1879, our Government made an energetic representation to the American Government, asking them to meet us half way, and during this year of grace 1888, not six weeks ago, representations have been made to the Americans, once more calling attention to the existence of this law on our Statute-book of 1870, and which appears on the statutes to-day. Therefore the Government have shown the most perfect good faith and the most unrelenting anxiety to secure this trade, and the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite have of obtaining some little sham credit by introducing their amendment to the amendment is a vain and delusive hope. In the nursery tales, children are told that where the rainbow arc rests on the hill, at the foot will be found a pot of gold. Children running for that insubstantial treasure are not running on a more fruitless and frivolous errand than hon. gentlemen opposite would have us run when they ask us to vote for this amendment. I would sit down and would not say one other word, having spoken on this particular matter, were it not for the remarks uttered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition this afternoon, remarks which I was deeply pained to hear and which I deeply regretted that he should make. We must all admire the duel which took place between the two brilliant French Canadian statesmen, the Liberal leader and the Conservative Minister, in a language which is not their mother tongue. But, while we were delighted to listen to that, as one who comes from the Lower Provinces I was deeply pained to hear the unnecessary remark which was made by the Leader of the Opposition, that our Lower Provinces were on the verge of revolt. If it be parliamentary to say so, I state that that is unmitigated rubbish. I declare that there is not any man in the Lower Provinces out of politics who believes it, and that there is no one out of politics in those Provinces who will venture to make the statement; and, further, I say that there is not a county in New Brunswick to which any man can go with any chance for election on the ground of repeal. I see before me the hon. member for the City of St. John, and I am sure that he will not contradict me in regard to that, and, if my hon. friend from the City and County of St. John were here, I am sure that he would state that I am not mistaken.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in regard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will speak of Nova Scotia presently.

28—1888—4

Mr. JONES (Digby). He is not entirely mistaken in regard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Gillmor) will say as I do, that no one who attempted to stump the county of Carleton in favor of a repeal of the Union could hope to carry that county. I speak with moderation, and I speak in all sincerity, when I say I do not believe there is a single county in New Brunswick where a man would have a ghost of a chance of election who ran on the ground of repeal. Now, with reference to Nova Scotia, although I have lived there for five years, I have no possible right to speak for that Province; but, as a bystander, I know something of the feeling, I know something of the wave which struck that Province in the summer of 1886; I know that the Province of Nova Scotia at that time put on record its constitutional decree in favor of a repeal of the Union; but I tell the hon. the leader of the Opposition that, when he was advised that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Nova Scotia were in favor of the repeal of the Union, somebody was stuffing him. I hope he was not misled in the same way as his friends were misled when they thought that the local election which took place at that time was an indication of the feeling of the Province. We were told that 19 out of the 21 members from Nova Scotia would support Mr. Blake, and we know the result. I will put against the information which the hon. gentleman has received, the facts as they are recorded in the leading Liberal paper of the Maritime Provinces, the *Halifax Chronicle*, and I desire to read an extract from a speech made by Mr. Fielding, who was the head and front of that movement, and who carried his party into power on the wave which that agitation raised. He has abandoned that movement and has said that, while he thought the people of Nova Scotia gave a mandate in favor of repeal in the summer of 1886, he finds that in February, 1887, they have withdrawn that mandate. I quote from a speech delivered by Mr. Fielding on the 24th February last, and printed in the *Chronicle* on the 25th February, 1888. This is what is reported of the utterances of Mr. Fielding, the Premier of Nova Scotia, in the paper which for many years he edited himself:

"The people of Nova Scotia in 1886 did seem to return a majority to this House favorable to the policy of repeal. Previous to that election the Government were met with a taunt that they would not dare to submit such an issue to the people, but when they proved that they did dare to do it our opponents said it was done in haste and that no importance was to be attached to the result. The next election, the Dominion election, seemed to tell a different story, and the same constitutional state of affairs which made it appear previously that the people desired repeal, made it necessary after the elections of 1887 to recognise the fact that the people had not declared in favor of repeal, but against it."

When the leader of the repeal movement in Nova Scotia has abandoned the matter, as he has; when he is afraid of it and is anxious to get rid of it, it is little short of a calamity that we should have hon. gentlemen opposite stating that nineteen-twentieths of the people of that Province are in favor of it. I credit those hon. gentlemen with sincerity. They bear the taxes and the burdens of the people as well as ourselves, and I have no doubt that the overwhelming majority of hon. gentlemen opposite have the same love for the country as we have ourselves. What good end is gained by scattering abroad these unfounded stories? We know that the Island of Prince Edward, from which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) comes, was approached in the summer of 1886 by Mr. Fielding, and that, in that year, which seemed to be favorable to that purpose, the overtures of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley were not received very well by their political friends in that island. We know that Mr. Blair, that very able and astute political leader in New Brunswick, had not very favorable words for Mr. Fielding when he approached him on the same subject. I say that this Canadian Confederation, young as it is, although its life was threatened by

those political incendiaries in Nova Scotia in 1886, who I believe were not sincere in their attack when they laid their knife to the throat of our Canadian Confederation, will continue to live; and I assert that the overwhelming opinion, not only in New Brunswick, but in the whole of the three Provinces by the sea, is in favor of standing by the Canadian Confederation.

Mr. SEMPLE. I do not desire to say very much at this late hour and at this period of a protracted debate. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass, as I live in one of the most fruitful agricultural constituencies in the Dominion. We have heard a great deal on the other side from the standpoint of the manufacturers, and I think there should be a little heard also in regard to the farmers. I have never yet met a person who did not agree that the reciprocity with the United States which we had from 1854 to 1866 was a great benefit to this country. It was something that the people saw they had an advantage in, and, no matter what their politics may be, they have all said that they would like to see a return of the same good times. When that is the case, I think we should endeavor to obtain a return of those good times. For my part, I would be well satisfied to have the same reciprocity as we had before, but it appears that we cannot get it, and that we must go a step further and have reciprocity not only in natural products but in manufactured articles as well. We are led to believe from those manufacturers who are established on a sound basis and are self-reliant that they have no fear for the future and are willing to meet competition. It is only the portion of the manufacturers who are spoon-fed, who have been getting from the Government an Act of Parliament to suit them and to give them special privileges, and in that way to take it out of the consumers, who object to this. The insinuation has been thrown out that hon. members on this side of the House decry the country. It is no such a thing. We can speak well of the country, but not as well as we possibly might, and we think it would be well to have something done to help the country. Now, the county from which I come, and those adjoining it, are doing very well, to all appearances, but when you speak with the people they will tell you that the country was never in a worse position than it has been these last six years. The whole county of Wellington has decreased in population, in six years, 237. The property valuation has gone down, although that is something hard to estimate, because they generally make the same valuation from year to year, as it seems to make no difference to the people in a township or the county whether the valuation be high or low, so that a change is not made. But when we come to examine the prices at which farms are disposed of, we realise the depreciation in the value of property. I will give you one or two instances. I know a farm of 170 acres that was bought five years ago for \$10,000, and it has recently been offered at \$8,500. I know a house that cost \$4,000, the building was put in the market and the best offer that could be obtained was \$1,700. There is any amount of property for sale, but there is no one to buy. When I passed through the city of Toronto, I noticed in a hotel a bill of a Mr. Daly, real estate agent, who stated that he had 500 farms to sell. Now, 500 farms by one agent is certainly a large number. Nothing can give a better indication of the state of a country than the decline in the number of inhabitants and the depreciation in the value of farm properties, and in both these particulars the facts show that the country is not in a prosperous condition. Now, Sir, I went over the census returns for a number of counties, and I find that in 26 counties there has been a gain of 21,413, while in 10 counties there has been a decrease of 8,830. The whole value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario is \$989,497,911, and in those 26 counties it is \$696,101,331; so you see that where land is the best, where

Mr. WELDON (Albert.)

property is of the greatest value, there has been a falling off, because there is not nearly the natural increase in the population that we should expect. Now, I will read an extract on this subject from the Bureau of Industries:

"Out of the 45 counties and districts into which the Province is divided, not less than 17 show a slight falling off in the rural population of 1886 as compared with that of 1877. The decreases occur mainly in the older counties along the shores of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and in the figures of rural populations chiefly. Whenever towns or villages come within the bounds of counties with a decreasing rural population, the increase in these generally suffices to offset the falling away in the county; but in the counties of Norfolk, Haldimand, Huron, Perth, Durham, Northumberland and Prince Edward, the total population was less in 1886 than in 1877. In this table the cities are included in the respective counties within which they are situated, and a comparison of the totals at the foot of the table will show how much more rapidly the population has grown in the cities, towns and villages than in the townships. During the ten years the township population increased from 1,103,671 to 1,144,520, being for the ten years a fraction over 3 per cent. In the same period the city, town and village population grew from 511,672 to 674,506, an increase of nearly 32 per cent."

Thus you see that the towns, cities and villages are gaining very rapidly, and the rural sections are falling behind. That is one of the effects of the National Policy; it is making the people who raise the supplies poorer, and is increasing the population of the towns and cities. Now, there is another question that came up concerning which we have had extracts read from Professor Brown. I have heard his statements spoken of as extravagant. I suppose he was something like a tailor I heard of. Thirty years ago some of the tailors were itinerant, and went round from house to house to make clothes for the people. On one occasion this tailor had made a coat. It was tried on, but it did not fit the person for whom it was made. "Well," said the tailor, "I think I have taken the wrong figures." And so with Professor Brown, I suppose he has taken the wrong figures in his dividend. Now, I will read you the report of a greater man than Professor Brown, I will read you the report of Professor Mills of the Experimental Farm at Guelph, who in his younger days, was a practical farmer and understands the situation very well. His report contrasts with that of Professor Brown. Here is what he says:

"In this country the price of produce is exceptionally low, and we have coupled with it the comparatively high price of manufactured articles. Generally speaking, we may say that what the farmer has to sell is cheap, and what he has to buy is dear. Therefore the agricultural atmosphere is disturbed. A feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction is abroad. The farmer finds it increasingly difficult to make a comfortable living, and something must be done to remove the difficulty or the whole community will suffer. Farmers often get credit for grumbling without any well-defined reason. But in this case the trouble is really serious—so much so that no one can question its existence, and wise men will not minify its gravity. * * * The farmer requires a small amount of the produce of his farm for his own use. But all that he has, over and above this amount, is no benefit to him unless there is demand for it. Even a very limited demand for his surplus produce makes it of some use to him. But there must be a sufficient demand at a price which will cover the cost of production and pay a fair rate of interest on the capital invested, or continuance in the business will soon lead to bankruptcy. Hence Canadian farmers have imposed upon themselves taxes for the building of railways in order to reach or create markets for their produce. But, after all, a demand for farm produce in the Dominion is limited, and the prices are exceptionally low."

"Now, in view of these facts, nothing can be clearer than that the farmers have reason on their side when they demand that no restriction on trade, which this Dominion has power to remove, shall be allowed to interfere with the price of grain, fruits, live stock, or dairy products of this country."

"Not having studied the pros and cons of commercial union, we have nothing to say on that question, but simply lay it down as fundamental, that we should seek the best trade relations which we can possibly get, whether it be by negotiation with England, or the United States, or any other country."

"Ontario farmers, at least, seem to understand the situation, and are waking up to the necessity of united action in a matter of so much importance. Let them get a clear understanding of what their interests under this head really are, then unitedly indicate their wish, and it must be granted. If, however, they allow interested men of any class to divide their ranks, and play them off one against another, they will undoubtedly fail, and bring upon themselves the well deserved contempt of every other class."

That is a very fair description of the situation. Another reason why I think something should be done to help the country is the enormous taxation, which has been rapidly increasing. If we have heavy burdens imposed on us we should be afforded some chance to improve our position if possible. During the time Mr. Mackenzie's Administration was in power it was charged with being corrupt and spending money lavishly; but what are the facts? After the Government had been in power four years, the amount to be raised was \$23,500,000, an increase of \$200,000, or an average of \$50,000 a year. What has been the position of affairs since the present occupants of the Treasury benches assumed power? The increase in ten years has been \$12,500,000 or an increase of \$1,250,000 a year. It is thus evident that the expenditure can be kept down, and I have no doubt it can be done again. In regard to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), of which I very highly approve, there is nothing cringing about it, as has been alleged, but it is a resolution simply stating that it would be for the advantage of the country if the Government would endeavor to bring about freer trade relations with the United States. When Mr. Greenway came here to make an arrangement respecting Manitoba it was said that he would only be humbugged and be compelled to return without getting anything, but he appears to have been successful; and we do not know but that if a proper offer was made to the United States in the direction indicated in the resolution it would not be successful. When the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed some years ago there were several reasons why it was done. The United States was passing through a civil war, involving a great loss of life and destruction of property. They needed all the taxation that could be raised, and I believe Hon. George Brown was not successful at Washington in 1874 because the Americans wished to impose duties on all goods entering the United States. We know very well that the Reform party in Canada have always desired reciprocity, it has always been a plank in their platform, and they have always been ready to have it carried out. It has been stated by some hon. members that this question was never talked of at the elections. I have stated to my constituents repeatedly that as a representative of the people there was nothing I could do better than to further in any possible way the obtaining of freer trade relations with the United States and the keeping down taxation, and I say so still. The proposition covered by the resolution is worthy of a fair trial. At the conclusion of the civil war the Americans had not very kindly feelings towards Canada, for Canadian and British sympathy was in favor of the South. Every thing was taxed by the Americans at that time; if a man had a watch, a carriage or a box of matches each article was taxed. That prevailed during the Republican administration. It was a good thing that the Republican administration did not always last, and the Democrats came into power, for it is well known that they have always had a better feeling towards this country. The President in his Message spoke of having freer trade with the country to the north. In this connection I will read the words of Secretary Bayard, a statement that cannot be too often quoted. He is a statesman who understands the situation very well, and he says:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

The United States, no doubt, are satisfied with the size of their country. There is Cuba, a very rich and fertile island, in which rebellions have very frequently occurred, and which could have been acquired by the Americans, but it

was not done; and I have not read that any man in the United States wished Canada to be annexed. The feeling in the United States is growing that their taxation should be reduced. The Secretary of State spoke of one manufacturer who proposed to return to Canada. All this indicates that the public feeling is that manufacturers in the United States have bled the country sufficiently, and that it is time for the people to obtain relief. There is also a Bill before Congress providing for the reduction of taxation by \$55,000,000. I observe by to-day's paper that a Senator of Minnesota has submitted to Congress a Bill to place a number of articles on the free list. I see also an article copied from the *New York Post*, which states that on an average the duty is 42 per cent. and that before 1890 it will average not more than 25 per cent. If there is this reduction in the tariff in two years, commercial union will not be such a bugbear. It is, however, only necessary at this time to discuss the general principles of freer trade relations, and the details can afterwards be settled by the representatives of the two countries. The Farmers' Institute of Ontario passed a resolution, by 61 to 13 votes, in the following terms:

"At the meeting of the Central Farmers' Institute, Toronto, 46 institutes were represented and by a vote of 61 to 13, the following resolution was carried:

"That this meeting desires to place on record its high appreciation of the value to this country of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and we fully endorse the actions of the institutes which have discussed the subject and passed resolutions favorable thereto, and it is of opinion that so soon as it is introduced into the Dominion Parliament and becomes a party question its further discussion in the institutes should be discontinued."

At two meetings which I happened to attend last summer the farmers were nearly unanimous on that question. Wiman spoke at the meeting and I can assure you that the construction put upon the remarks of that gentleman by members of this House was not at all the proper one. The question of "broilers" seemed to cause a great deal of merriment and I heard him speak on that question. He mentioned it incidentally, saying that in the United States when the people wanted anything they generally paid a high price for it at a particular season of the year. One of those articles in demand was broilers. He did not state that if the people got closer relations with the States he would invite them to raise those broilers for sale. We ought to be proud of such a man as Mr. Wiman, who, leaving Canada, has obtained such an important position in the United States. I heard Mr. Butterworth make mention of the fact that Mr. Wiman was very generous in New York and that if any Canadian, or any man was in difficulties he would help him if he could do so. Mr. Wiman is always willing and able to help a Canadian, and it is well known that he has a warm interest in this country. When he used to live in Toronto any citizen who was in straightened circumstances always found Mr. Wiman willing to lend him a helping hand, and he made to the people of the city a present of the Wiman Baths. Taking Mr. Wiman's position and influence into consideration, I think the sneering remarks made in reference to that distinguished Canadian who has worked his way up so well in the United States against so many competitors, should not have been introduced into the discussion. Now, Sir, I look at the Trade and Navigation Returns and I find that in 1887 the produce of the mines amounted to \$3,805,959; fisheries, \$6,875,810; forests, \$20,484,746; animals and their products, \$24,246,937; agricultural products, \$8,826,325, and manufactured goods, \$3,079,972. So you see that the manufactured goods were only a very small proportion of all the other articles. I would also mention that in 1876, when they had no protection, the export of manufactured goods was \$5,000,000, or \$2,000,000 more than at the present time. It is wonderful that when the manufactures have been hampered so and have got so much assistance

that such would be the case. We should have thought they would have exported a much larger amount, but they evidently do not wish to do that. Their only wish is that the tariff should raise their prices, that they may make more money for themselves, that they may make the country pay more. That is what those gentlemen do, they are good calculators, they make a mathematical calculation and understand their business very well. It has been told us that we are very foolish to seek a market in the United States, when our market is in Great Britain, and as the only result would be to come into competition with the United States, there would be no use to seek a market there. The statistics give us some information where the produce of the field and the stock raised on the farm is exported to. There are six articles which we raise and which go to Great Britain at the present time, and there are eight articles which go to the United States. The export of wheat to Great Britain last year was 5,048,084 bushels, value \$4,278,417; to the United States we sent 341,075 bushels, value \$265,940. But then we imported of wheat 3,550,844 bushels, value \$3,152,478; that is if we take the wheat we sold from the wheat we bought, our net cash is \$1,391,879. Now the oats is the second article. We sent oats to Great Britain 1,627,629 bushels, value \$509,875; to the United States 40,342 bushels, value \$12,210, making in all \$521,085; so that those two articles which cost the farmer so much labor and so much trouble amount to \$1,912,964, just exactly \$87,405 more than we get from our export of eggs. We sent to Great Britain 3,348,180 bushels of peas, value \$4,026,670; to the United States we sent 405,358 bushels, value \$331,349. Then there is cheese, which brought us \$7,065,983, and butter, of which we exported 4,076,365 lbs., valued at \$757,261. We exported to Great Britain 63,622 head of cattle, valued at \$5,344,375. Those are all the articles that go to Great Britain, and let us take the articles which go to the United States. Barley, 9,437,717 bushels, value \$5,345,968; hay, 69,450 tons, value \$670,749; potatoes, 1,276,809 bushels, value \$328,602; horses, 18,225, value \$2,214,338; sheep, 363,046; value, \$974,482. Then there are lean cattle, for which there is no market in Great Britain, but which are sold in the back districts and shipped to Buffalo, which is the market for that stock. In regard to oats, sometimes the United States is the principal market. A large dealer informed me just before I left home for Ottawa that when oats were bringing only 39 cents a bushel in Toronto, he had shipped them to Buffalo and got 68 cents a bushel and paid the duty. He shipped three car loads of peas to the United States, and received 90 cents a bushel for them, and after paying the duty and the freight he realised more than he could get in this country. Mr. Cluxton, of Peterboro', formerly a Conservative member of this House, in addressing the Farmers' Institute in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, mentioned that he had sold 180,000 bushels of oats in the United States, and after paying the duty he had a good profit. So that I believe that if the duty were taken off, the United States would be a market in every season for peas, and in most seasons for oats. Now, the question as to who pays the duty has been touched upon, and that is a very important question. I thought the proposition advanced on the other side of the House the other evening that our barley was just the same as the United States barley, and that the people of the United States paid 10 cents a bushel more for it than for their own barley, was a rather strange proposition. I would rather agree with the hon. gentleman who spoke the other night, and who said the Yankees generally wanted a dollar and a-half in return for a dollar. But we should look at that matter as the hon. Minister of the Interior said we should consider the price of grain—on one occasion when he was canvassing Welland for a railway bonus? He said grain was worth the price paid in Liverpool less the cost of trans-

Mr. SEMPLE.

portation. Goods of all kinds that are sent from here to the United States are worth the price they are in the United States less the cost of transportation and other charges, and the charge on barley entering the United States is 10 cents a bushel. Every individual who makes a trial trip to the United States knows very well who pays the duty. We have been told of a man in the Province of Quebec who had repeatedly sold his hay in the United States, and when it was worth \$10 a ton there he took it across the line and paid \$2 duty. He knew who paid the duty, for he knew that he got \$2 less for his hay than he would have got if he had lived across the line. The same thing is true of lean cattle for which there is no market in England. They are brought from the counties of Wellington and Grey and shipped to Buffalo, and are charged with a duty of 20 per cent. The same duty is charged on lambs, and even on turnips there is a duty of 30 per cent, of which a large quantity is shipped to the United States, and on which the farmers make about 3 cents a bushel. In all these cases our farmers would receive the enhanced price but for the duty. Then, dealers in cattle are subjected to difficulties and great loss on account of the duty; they are sometimes charged with undervaluation. So that with unrestricted reciprocity our farmers would not only gain the amount of the duty, but they would also be saved from many annoyances that the shipper has continually to meet. Now, I will make what I consider a reasonable estimate of what would be the advantage to a farmer on an average farm of 100 acres. I shall take six articles. I take first barley; we will say he has 400 bushels, the produce of ten acres; the duty on that would be \$40. Then he has one horse, worth \$100, on which the duty is \$20; cattle of the value of \$100, and the duty \$20; 100 lbs. of wool, at 10 cents per lb., the duty \$10; 18 sheep and lambs, of the value of \$60, the duty \$12; five tons of hay, the duty \$10; \$112 in all. With regard to hay, there is an extensive buyer at Fergus who tells me that he is buying hay, and he cannot place it at present, but that if the duty was removed he could place it. What seems to terrify some hon. gentlemen against unrestricted reciprocity is the fear of direct taxation. I have always been afraid of debt; but when once debt is incurred I do not suppose it is of great consequence in what way it is raised. Now, this year there has been imported of dutiable goods \$105,000,000, which yielded a duty of \$22,438,308. In 1883, when the country was more prosperous, we imported \$123,000,000 worth, which proportionately would produce within \$3,000,000 of the amount of taxation we would require to raise, supposing we received no duties from the United States at all. So that with a little more prosperity and a little more economy, we could make both ends meet, and there is no ground for my hon. friend holding up that as a bugbear to the people. If the farmer could make \$100 more per hundred acres, it would be of very little consequence if he had a little more direct taxation to pay. As he would be getting in more, he could afford to pay out a little more. I notice from the Abstract and Record that the goods manufactured in Great Britain and exported to different countries amount to \$266,533,819. Of that Canada takes \$35,766,173, or in every \$1,000 worth \$15.75. It would not take a very large amount of manufactures in Great Britain to make up that quantity which goes to Canada, and if we could show Great Britain that it is to our best interest not to take quite as much from her as formerly, she would be glad to consent to the change. It is just like the case where a young man has started out in life for himself, and after some years have elapsed tells his father that owing to the distance between them, they cannot trade very well together, and it would be better for him to trade elsewhere, the father would say to his son: Do the best you can, I only rejoice in your prosperity, and hope the step you take will

give you satisfaction. That would be a common sense view to be taken by Great Britain, even if her manufacturers lost by this arrangement, and I do not think they will. Look for instance to the United States, which has a higher tariff than ours. Last year Great Britain sent to the United States \$49,000,000 worth of iron and steel and other manufactured articles, being an increase of \$12,000,000 over the previous year, so that if we become more prosperous, we in Canada will be able also to buy more English goods. Should our farmers make \$50 a year each extra through this policy, they will not roll it up in a napkin and put it aside, but will spend it in various ways throughout the country and a certain amount will be expended in the purchase of manufactured imports. Make the whole country more prosperous, and our trade with the mother country is bound to increase. I can remember very well the time when the treaty of 1854 was in force. It was about the time that I began to sell grain, and I can endorse the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Victoria as to the great prosperity that then existed. That hon. gentleman has given an account of what happened in Victoria, and I could tell the same story with regard to the county of Simcoe, where land, which was worth \$2,000 per 100 acres, in a short time was worth \$6,000, property having increased in value threefold. People were anxious to buy farms; laboring men were getting higher wages; there was a demand for everything; and I remember when our farmers had to team their grain forty to sixty miles to Toronto to meet the American schooners which wanted to get the white wheat that we raised of the best quality, and were prepared to give the highest prices. Any one who has seen the good times that then existed would like to see them recur again; and we believe that by judicious management, and by freer trade with the United States, a vast gain will be secured to the country. It was said in 1878 that one of the evils of this country was that the balance of trade was against us. Since Confederation I see, by the Abstract and Record, that the balance of trade has been \$28,000,000 against us per year, but the idea was propounded in 1878 that a new era would dawn, when we would manufacture all the goods we required and take nothing from Great Britain in return. Well, that has not been accomplished, and only last session the hon. the Minister of Finance had to take a new departure. He told us how much iron and steel was used in the country, and he propounded a scheme of putting on taxes on these articles, by which means he said 100,000 people would be employed in these works in a short time, and we would not have to go to Great Britain for our iron and steel. That project has not so far been carried out to any great extent, and the only effect I see of his scheme is an increased burden on the farmers, who have to pay 50 cents extra a hundredweight on the nails they use in making improvements on their farms; and other manufacturing articles have been increased in price, into the construction of which iron and steel enter. That has been the result of the tinkering in the tariff on iron and steel last session. It has been repeatedly stated that the National Policy would give to the farmers a great market for their produce, but so far we have had nothing to substantiate that statement. I find from the census of the assessors, that in 1886, the number on the roll in the Province of Ontario was \$1,819,046, and in 1878, it was \$1,646,035, or an increase of \$172,979 in the manufactures of this country. The employment of the small number required to make this amount of manufactured goods would surely not affect the markets for our staple farm products. I do not doubt that in large manufacturing places, at certain seasons of the year, when butter and eggs are scarce, they will increase in price to a certain extent, but as regards the staples of wheat, oats and potatoes, they will not be affected at all. I think also that the prices we have had for the last five years do not show that they have increased the value

of the market very much. I find that the average price of wheat for the five years from 1882 to 1886, was 88.5 cents. In 1882, it was \$1.01; in 1883, \$1.05; in 1884, 80 cents; in 1885, 81 cents; and in 1886, 73 cents. The average price of oats for the five years is 35 cents. In 1882, it was 43 cents; in 1883, 38 cents; in 1884, 33 cents; in 1885, 31 cents; and in 1886, 32 cents. Two years ago, potatoes sold for 15 cents a bushel, so it is clear that they had not been very hard on the potato crop. It has been held out as another bugbear that, if we had free trade with the United States, we would be disowned by Great Britain, and they would not take any of our produce. They have an established rule there, and whoever sends in grain or whatever they have to sell have a chance of disposing of their produce, and that will continue to be so. They shut out nobody, and they would not shut out Canada. This is only thrown out in order to frighten people, but I do not think that many will be scared by it. It has also been said that the geographical position of this country in regard to the United States is of no consequence, because we have railways. I think it makes all the difference imaginable if a person is 50 miles from a market or 500 miles. I am credibly informed that in Prince Edward Island potatoes are only worth 20 cents a bushel, while in Toronto they are worth from 60 to 65 cents a bushel. Oats are only worth 25 cents a bushel in Prince Edward Island, while in Toronto they are worth 45 cents. Thus it is the geographical position that makes the difference, and it is on account of the geographical position of this country in relation to the United States that it would be better for us to have our trade relations extended. If we were as close to the mother country as we are to the United States we would be one. But we are not. We would desire nothing better. But we are 3,000 miles away, and when our best customers live so near us, that is a very important consideration. A dealer stated that he could ship grain from Drayton to Buffalo as cheaply as he could to Toronto. The farmers do not dread competition. The county I represent raises some of the best cattle that are raised in the Dominion of Canada, and the farmers of that country would hail with delight the news that they would be able to compete in the markets of New York, Detroit and Albany. When our fairs are held, there are buyers from Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, and all over the Dominion, and, with extended trade regulations, we would have them from different points in the United States. As to the price of oats, it has been said that oats coming from the United States lower the price in this country. That has never been the case. I remember that, at the time when oats were shut out, we were selling them for 25 cents a bushel; and that when they were coming in from the United States we were selling for 55 cents a bushel, and these were manufactured into oatmeal and sent to Detroit and our farmers never made such profits as they did when they had a chance to send to the market in the United States. I say that, with the large and well equipped mills which we have in Canada grinding oatmeal, many of which are now idle for the want of markets, if we had free trade with the United States, those mills could take and hold the trade in the large cities of the United States. When this Confederation was formed, it was supposed that it was to confer a great benefit on the people, a great and lasting benefit, and no doubt it will if it is properly carried out; but, if on the other hand things are carried on as they are now and there is a combination of members affected to make Provinces that have built their own railways grant subsidies and build railways in every part of the Dominion, it will soon make the Province of Ontario say that it was a mistake to enter into Confederation. In 1886, the amount of subsidies granted for railways was \$2,396,065, of which Ontario got \$390,000. In 1887, the amount of subsidies was \$2,075,600, and Ontario got only \$570,000. The Province

that pays half of the taxation and has built her own railways is now called upon to pay subsidies to railways in all the other Provinces. If this is to be continued, and if our debt is to be increased, I think the people of Ontario, as well as those of the other Provinces will show their dissatisfaction. It is well known to people who understand the Province of Ontario that we have a network of railways over that Province, that townships and villages and cities have bonused railways to a very large extent in order to get better communication. The Ontario Government has also bonused railways. The county I represent gave a bonus to the Credit Valley Railway of \$135,000, which was paid by two townships, and the village of Fergus and the village of Elora issued \$10,000 in debentures and took bonds from the Credit Valley Railway for the same amount. They sold their bonds for fifty cents on the dollar, and lost \$5,000 on the transaction. Then there is the town of Orangeville, that granted a large bonus to a narrow gauge railway, and afterwards was one of a group that granted \$135,000. Then it granted \$15,000 the same as Fergus, and they lost \$7,500 in the transaction. They wanted to have competition, but today, instead of having two railways in competition, there is only one; competition is swept away and they cannot get their grain moved. The conditions under which they granted this bonus have been swept away, on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway absorbing these two lines. Now, Sir, considering these things, there is good reason why a stop should be put to subsidies to railways. I think it was the member for Queen's himself who said he wanted subsidies to railways to be continued. Well, if he gets subsidies and does not have to pay for them, and other people do, I suppose he would like to get them, but I think places that have built their own roads, do not want to build roads in every other part of the Dominion. This question seems to have had an important bearing on the elections in some of the Provinces. Last session the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) made use of the following words:

"I am prepared to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that question. I will just point out to my hon. friend the result of the last election. My hon. friend well knows that the question of the railway route in the Island of Cape Breton, was the question upon which, to a very large extent, the elections were fought in that Island, particularly in my own county. As regards the general fiscal policy, it was a one-sided question with the people of the Island, which party should hold the reins of power in this Dominion. The elections of previous years showed that fact from year to year, so that the question of a railway route, I might say, was the sole and absolute question which was before the people on the occasion of the last election."

So you see the subsidies had a very important bearing on the election. I will read another short extract bearing on the same subject, from the remarks of the Minister of Finance made last session in answer to a question of Mr. Eisenhauer:

"I am much inclined to think that the hon. gentleman's object is to get this grant struck out of the resolution. I believe that is the object which the hon. gentleman has in view. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Kaulbach, the late representative of the county of Lunenburg, pressed the construction of this road upon the Minister of Railways in the most urgent and earnest manner. He went to every member of the Government, and year after year he urged upon them the great importance of the construction of this road. It was rather a large undertaking; it involved a considerable expenditure of public money, but he represented that his constituents in the county of Lunenburg were extremely anxious that the road should be constructed. Finally the urgent entreaties and strong representations made in this House and out of it as to the importance of having this road constructed, induced my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and the leader of the Government to express the intention of asking this Parliament for the means of constructing it. The Government supposed that the people of Lunenburg attached great importance to that road; but they found that when Mr. Kaulbach went back to the county, the gentleman who had succeeded in obtaining this promise of support from the Government for the construction of the road, was defeated, and that the county of Lunenburg had sent a gentleman here to oppose the Government that had expressed its desire to construct the road. The Government would therefore be perfectly justified in accepting the action of the people of Lunenburg as a reason for not proceeding with this work, and in holding to the conviction that they did not wish it done. As the

Mr. SEMPLE.

Government are prepared to give a certain amount of aid, I think, looking to the future construction of the road, that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. But I believe, from the tone of the speech made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that he is very anxious that the Government should strike out this grant, as I think the Government would be justified in doing after the manner in which it has been received. As to the hon. gentleman's references to the future of Nova Scotia, which I think it was somewhat indelicate for him to make, if he is as well prepared to meet his constituents in the county of Halifax, which he will probably be called upon shortly to do, as I or anyone standing in my place would be to meet the people of Cumberland, he would be a very fortunate man."

So you see that was a very important question. These words were uttered by the Minister of Finance, stating that the grant was given in the expectation that the county of Lunenburg would return a supporter of the Government. But they did not, they rejected the bribe which was held out to them, for the purpose of stifling their consciences and destroying their convictions. These railway subsidies have a tendency to corrupt the people, and when the Minister of Finance uttered these words in the most guarded manner before so many members of Parliament, we can well suspect what he would do in a constituency where no one was taking note of his remarks. But, Sir, the people, in the case of Yarmouth, did their duty. They seemed to think that the time might come when the designs of Providence would be fulfilled, and that better things were in store for them. It is a fact that the present Ministry has been long in power. But if we take a review of English history, we shall find that the most corrupt Ministry that England ever had, the Walpole Administration, was the longest lived, but even that Administration came to an end; and we believe that by the discussion of the question, the same result will follow in this country. Now, another matter that has just come to my mind is the question of the sugar duties. A great deal has been said in relation to that matter. I examined the Trade and Navigation Returns and found that the duty on sugar was 68 per cent. Now, it has been stated that a poor man may live in this country and not pay a dollar of duty. He would be a very poor man indeed, and would be fit to go to the House of Industry. Certainly he would not be a working poor man, because a working poor man, in six months, buys a dollar's worth of sugar, and he would have to pay 68 cents duty, or \$1.34 duty a year on his imported sugar. If he got it from the Drummond refinery he might get it for \$1.25 in duty. They make a little difference just to sell, and to keep up the price as high as possible. I am further informed on good authority that in Buffalo four pounds more of the same quality of sugar can be got than can be got in this country. We must do away with that extravagant profit and seek to cut down the duty, for the less duty there is the better chance there will be to bring American sugar into this country.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made such a remarkable speech that I will not attempt to follow him in all his wanderings. I have made a few memoranda for my own use in order that I may reply to some of the points that I think are worthy of attention, and I will take up the question where he left it—his last reference was to the excessive price of sugar in Canada owing to the excessive rate of duty. He told us that the rate of duty on sugar imposed by the policy of this Government was 68 per cent. I am not disposed to quarrel with the hon. gentleman's figures, but I wish to point out to the House that in 1878 the Administration which the hon. gentleman would support if the same party were in power to-day that was in power then, imposed a duty \$2.39 per hundredweight on sugar, and to-day this Government impose only \$1.58 per hundredweight. I give that to the hon. gentleman as one portion of my reply on the question of sugar. Let me give him a further and a better one. The tendency of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and of the remarks of all hon. gentlemen opposite throughout the whole of the debate, has been to show that if we would only

accept commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity everything would be bright and happy for Canada. Let me deal with this question of sugar in the United States, and while I will not touch the cost of production I will touch on the duty on the product. I have taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States this information for the hon. gentleman, and probably he will make a note of it for use in future so that in taking up this question of sugar duties, he will not impose on an intelligent community who can read and think for themselves, or on an unsuspecting farmer who he may meet in the town hall in his county or in some village, and make them believe that we in Canada impose a higher rate of duty on sugar than is imposed by the United States. Here are the records, and sugar is the very first item at the head of the list. Sugar, molasses and confections, \$74,242,000 worth was imported into the United States, on which a duty was collected of \$58,000,000, or at a rate of 78·15. The hon. gentleman complains that we charge 68 per cent., but he is ready to fall into the arms of a people charging 78 per cent. duty on sugar. That shows the anxiety of the hon. gentleman to obtain commercial relations with a people who know how to protect all the interests of their own country, and in protecting them they have at times imposed unreasonable rates of duty as they would appear to us; still the hon. gentleman would have it appear that sugar was charged less duty in the United States than in Canada. Let us have a little more of competition and a little less of combination and we will have the same result here as in the United States. I showed the House, however, one clear indisputable fact that the United States charge 78 per cent. as against Canada 68 per cent. Let me take up another item that the hon. gentleman thought worthy of bringing to the notice of the House, and I think his observations on that point are worthy of some little reply. He dealt with the question of oats. He said they are cheaper in Canada than they would have been if we had not had the National Policy. He says oatmeal mills are silent, and he named a number of them, and this, he says, is in consequence of the National Policy. I challenge hon. gentlemen to deny what I am going to state, that there has been a combination among millers to buy up the smaller mills and close them up, the combination paying them a percentage on the silent machinery,—and they have done that to control the price of oatmeal in Canada. I tell the hon. gentleman that in my own county, the county of Perth, there is in the town of Mitchell the president of the Oatmeal Millers' Association; that when the National Policy was brought into force that gentleman said it was impossible to live in Canada, and accordingly he sold out and went to the United States and remained for some years, entering the same business. What was the result? He came back to Canada and to-day is president of the Millers' Association which controls the mills of the country, and he is doing it and making money out of it too. The hon. gentlemen opposite are very ready to take advantage of all those circumstances and trade combinations and then blame the National Policy with having closed up a number of mills. I challenge the hon. gentleman or any hon. gentlemen opposite to take up the *New York Herald*, *Boston Herald*, *Buffalo Courier* and any United States newspaper, east, west, north or south, and show me that the markets of the United States furnish as good a price for oats as the markets of the Dominion. I have the tables here, and if necessary I can give the quotations. I have the *New York Herald*, the *Boston Herald*, *Buffalo Courier*, *Toronto Globe*, and *Montreal Herald*, and I do not think one of those papers can be charged with favoring the Government, I do not presume any hon. gentlemen would say that the market prices were prepared in the interests of this Government or National Policy, but we assume they are correct.

According to the *New York Herald* the prices of oats, on 3rd April, were as follows:—

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| New York..... | 37 cts to 40 cts per bushel |
| Montreal..... | 42 cts to 43 cts " |
| Buffalo..... | 35 cts to 39½ cts " |
| Toronto..... | 48 cts to 49 cts " |

An hon. friend beside me says that they are to-day 50½ cents in Toronto.

Mr. WELSH. They were 44 cents in Toronto on 4th April.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has attempted to show, and he would make the farmers of Canada believe that farmers in the United States obtain a better price for oats than our farmers do here. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to produce quotations in this country and in the United States and lay them side by side, and I venture to say that the prices for all products of the farm are as high in our markets as those of the United States. I will show the House why I make this statement. The Americans have immense quantities of natural products to export from their own country. Is it reasonable to presume or to suppose that we in Canada can find a better market in a country that produces an enormous surplus for which they have to find a foreign market, than we can have in a country to which the American people themselves export their surplus. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite can expect the people of Canada to believe that statement. Let me take the article of wheat. According to the *New York Herald* the highest price for the best quality in New York was 85½ cents. Sales were made at 89, and sellers were asking 83½. Now, Sir, the price in Montreal was 89 and 90 cents that same day, according to the *Montreal Herald*, and if the hon. the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) were here, I presume he would think that a pretty good authority. That very same day, in Toronto, the quotation was 91 cents for Manitoba wheat, and in Buffalo, which is a corresponding market to Toronto, it was quoted in the *Buffalo Courier* at 84½ to 87½. What will hon. gentlemen think of this? In Toronto the same day it was 85 to 89 cents, or wheat was sold one and three-eighths cents higher in Toronto than in the city of Buffalo. How can hon. gentlemen say in the face of this that New York or Buffalo are the best markets for our wheat? I have given you exactly the figures for those places and the names of the papers and you can see them yourselves. In Chicago we find that 72½ to 72½ was the highest price for wheat, while in Toronto, on the very same day, it was 85 to 89. In Detroit the price was 83½ cents, 85 cents being the highest, as against 89 cents in the city of Toronto. In St. Louis wheat was from 80 cents to 81 cents, while it was 89 cents in Toronto. In Milwaukee the price was 74½ to 75½. I have been very exact with those figures, and I have quoted them very carefully, because I knew I would be watched, and it would not be fair to myself or to the country to make any incorrect statement. In the face of those facts what is the use of saying that the American market is the best market for our produce. We cannot hope to find a good price in their markets when they themselves are seeking a foreign market for their surplus products. They produce the same things as we do, and yet they are looking around for the best market in which they are likely to get high prices to export their surplus to. They find themselves compelled to go to Great Britain and to find a market there, as we find a market there to-day. From the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States I find that the Americans had to find a market to export \$523,000,000 worth of the products of the farm. Let hon. gentlemen remember that. It is a matter of very vital importance to people of this country to comprehend the whole case and to see whether or not the American

market is our best market, and whether it would be desirable that we should take any hasty step in this matter which we might afterwards have to repent when we had abandoned the trade with that great country which gave many of us birth, and to which we look for protection, and sympathy, and help when the time comes that we need it. I tell you it would be a most unwise thing to throw away our connection with that great and grand old land to run after some possible chance of getting a better market for perhaps our barley or possibly a small quantity of peas. I may point out what hon. gentleman perhaps may forget that last year the United States had to export, of wheat \$90,000,000 worth; flour, \$52,000,000 worth; corn, \$19,000,000 worth; oats, \$15,000,000 and pork, \$62,000,000 worth. All those articles are produced by our farmers and all those American products have had to find a market abroad. Will hon. gentlemen contend that we should be simply producers of those in the raw state and hand them over to the American middleman to make the profits on shipping them abroad, or that we should take that traffic from our own steamship lines and our own grand lines of railway, which have been built up at such great expense to this country with the hope of making it one solid confederation and a grand nation in the future. Are we to hand over the carrying trade of our country to the United States and enable them to be the parties who handle this product and make profits out of it? I say no. I say it is our duty to seek the best market, and that a market in a country that does not produce the article and must purchase the article is at least the best market for us, so long as we have a surplus to export. That leads me to the thought that what we hope for from the National Policy and what we said it would accomplish it has accomplished to the extent of building up within our country a better home market, which we have always maintained is the best market. The effect of the National Policy has been to enable us to consume a large proportion of the products of the country at home, which would have to be exported abroad were it not for the National Policy. The Americans consume about 90 per cent. of the products of their own farms. I presume that the business men, the farmers, the mechanics and the workmen of Canada consume as much and live as well as the people do in the United States. I may assume that we consume at least 90 per cent. of our products. Well, Sir, if we have a home market to the extent of 90 per cent. of the products of the farm this has been caused by the effect of the National Policy on the industries of the country. I say, Sir, we have accomplished all that was professed to be accomplished by the National Policy in giving employment to the people of our own country. We have afforded better markets to the producers of those products which otherwise would have to be exported at least in many cases to the United States or to greater distances abroad. I shall follow the hon. gentleman a little further in some remarks he has made. He mentioned the name of the father of the new platform of hon. gentlemen opposite, although it is pretty hard to say who the father is just now. It was Mr. Wiman a short time ago; to-day I believe the hon. member for South Oxford. But the reference of the hon. member for Centre Wellington to Mr. Wiman and his address before the Farmers' Union of Ontario brought to my mind this fact, that that gentleman had a different story for the people of Canada when he was discussing this matter before them from what he had for his own people—because, although he says he is a Canadian, I have a very serious suspicion that he has changed his views in reference to which country, after all, he has the greatest interest in. I cannot conceive that the gentleman, with all his wealth, would consent to live in the United States for the benefit of Canada. If he is really a sincere Canadian, let him reside in Canada; he has wealth enough to choose his home, and

Mr. HESSON.

if he really takes an interest in this country, he should live in it, and not on an island of New Jersey. In his address before the Commercial Club of Cincinnati, on the 26th of March, on the question of commercial union, he said:—

"I came to undo the mistake made 100 years ago when the Declaration of Independence should have covered the whole North American continent. The Boston Tea Party had a good effect upon England."

Later on, speaking of the French Canadians, he said:

"The Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons is the twenty-fourth child. Show me the twenty-fourth child of an American?"

What his object was in referring to that I do not know. Again:

"I bring you the trade of half a continent."

What does he mean by this? Is it that the Americans will take possession of the trade of this country? Is that his purpose? If it is, I say it is about time we should reflect whether we have any interest in that trade ourselves,—whether if the United States cannot exhibit a better market for us than they are able to exhibit to-day, we can afford to trade with them in those articles of which we have a surplus to export. Later on he says:

"Just so sure as the Americans invite the Canadians to a free interchange under Commercial Union, just so sure will Canada accept. If England refuses to allow the measure, then we will say to the British Crown: We have no further use for you in North America."

That is a very loyal sentiment. He knows, and the people of the United States know pretty well, what that means. I will give the hon. gentleman one more quotation; I will read what the *Boston Advertiser* says. It quotes the resolution submitted to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford, and says:

"As Sir Richard Cartwright pointed out, the right to enter our markets free is the only commercial privilege which can make Canada prosperous, and without it she can never be so."

"Senator Frye, who has given this subject more careful study than any other member of our Congress, has expressed it as his opinion that it is simply a question of time when at least the Maritime Provinces of Canada will be forced to ally themselves to the United States on whatever basis they can obtain, with this provision of a free market thrown in. He believes Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at least, will be forced by the necessities of the case to demand of Great Britain a peaceful separation from Canada on condition that they may be annexed to this country."

Is it at all unreasonable for this paper to take that view, or for gentlemen on this side of the House to have very serious misgivings as to the ultimate object of their resolution? It goes on to state further:

"It may be that this result may not happen directly, but the whole tendency of public discussion in those Provinces looks in that direction, and while it would be a severe blow at English Imperial pride to give up these Provinces to this country, and to sacrifice the splendid harbor of Halifax, which for more than a century has been the headquarters of the British naval force in this hemisphere, yet we believe that the necessities of the case are so great that a large party in Canada prefers free trade with us to any consideration of national pride."

What party does this paper refer to? Does it refer to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite or to the party on this side of the House? I hope hon. gentlemen will just take that into their consideration, and remember that it is very serious language so far as our good faith towards the mother land is concerned. I am proud and pleased to say, with all sincerity, that I believe there are many men on the other side as loyal as gentlemen on this side; but there are a large number, I am sorry to say, who hold other views, and who are not slow to state them in either public or private. I am afraid it is to that party that this paper refers when it says that they would not hesitate to give up their connection with the mother land for the sake of some paltry advantage. We have some further information on this subject. We have Mr. Wiman stating in St. Paul:

"Canada is the natural market for the manufacturers of the United States"

Is it? Is that the object of hon. gentlemen opposite—that the United States should manufacture for us? I say no, we can manufacture for ourselves.

"Commercial Union means to create a market for the excess of United States production which protection has stimulated."

"The extent and character of the tariff would necessarily have to be left to the Congress of the United States, they being the larger representative body, while the total amount realised from its enforcement and also from the enforcement of similar internal revenue taxes should be put into one pool and the sum realised divided by *per capita* proportion according to population."

"Commercial Union means that which would have been accomplished, so far as trade and commerce is concerned, by the extension of the Declaration of Independence over the whole continent instead of over less than one-half of it."

"Canada under Commercial Union could no longer resist the attractive forces which would prevail towards a political absorption."

"If England should not consent to it, it would be the most momentous pause in the history of Canada, and then, as I said to Chamberlain, 'look out for another Boston tea-party.'"

"I come to you to offer you half a continent. The largest part of the British Empire shall be given to the United States without tax, if you so desire it."

"If England refuses to allow the measure, then we will say to the British Crown we have no further use for you in North America."

Now, after reading quotations like this, I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to say whether or not we have good reason to doubt their sincerity, when they make a pretence of wishing to retain our connection with the old land. From all the evidence which we can gather from the gentlemen who are promoting this scheme on the American side, backed, I am sorry to say, by some prominent gentlemen on this side, their sole intent and purpose is to sever our connection with Great Britain. I, for one, shall protest as long as I live against such a movement. We have been too well treated by the mother land, which has helped in many trying circumstances and invariably treated us with kindness, to go back on her in this way. For my part I shall never be a consenting party to anything that will grant to the United States greater privileges in our markets than we grant to the mother land. I shall never be a party to opening a trade with the United States for the exchange of all sorts of products on terms more favorable than those we grant to Great Britain. To do so would be most disloyal, and I must say that the men who propose such a course deserve indeed to be charged with disloyalty to the British connection. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), dilated at length on the taxation imposed on the people by the National Policy, and he wants us to escape that taxation by adopting the United States tariff. Under our National Policy, the taxation is something like an average of 23 or 24 per cent. on our imports, but I hold in my hand a statement taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States, of the total imports into that country, and the total revenue collected therefrom, which shows that the total imports were \$450,000,000, on which the duty collected was \$212,000,000, or a taxation of 47·10 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to rush into the arms of a people who are taxing their imports to the extent of 47 per cent., and yet they complain of the small taxation which we imposed upon our imports. They say that the poor man here is heavily taxed, but let them look in the returns of the United States and see what relief the poor man has there. On woollen goods, which are imported to the extent of \$60,000,000, the taxation imposed is \$35,000,000, or 58·81 per cent. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to accept a tariff, in the framing of which we cannot have the slightest influence, and which imposes on the woollens of the poor man a taxation of 53 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of our duty on iron and steel, but the Americans imposed a duty on these articles of 40·92 per cent. On cotton they imposed 40 per cent., on silks 49 per cent., and on jewellery and precious stones—I wish hon. gentleman opposite to make a note of that, because it is a matter of considerable interest to the poor man—10·58 per cent.

28—1888—5

That is the relief the poor man has in the United States. He only pays 10 per cent. on his jewellery and precious stones, if he has to pay 58 per cent. on his woollens. On glassware they impose 59 per cent., and on earthenware 56 per cent., but what does the poor man care about that when he can get his jewellery and precious stones at 10 per cent. Another duty, which I am sure will gladden the heart of the poor man and make his wife and children smile with contentment, is the duty on rice of 64 per cent. Compare that with Canada. I do not understand that we collect anything here on rice. But then in the States the poor man can get in his jewellery and precious stones at 10 per cent. The hon. member for Centre Wellington was kind enough to say that our towns and villages were growing, but he said they were growing at the expense of the farmers. The hon. gentleman must have his wail one way or the other. I may say that the farmers are glad that the towns are growing, for they are always pleased to have a home market, which is their best market, at their own door. That hon. gentleman lives in one of the gardens of Ontario. Wellington, Perth, Bruce, Huron, and the Waterloos, and the Middlesexes, and the Brants, are amongst the best in all Ontario, and yet the wail has come from that riding, and from Huron and from Waterloo, and I am going to talk to the member for North Waterloo later on. The wail has come from the gardens of Ontario, but they are doing it for a purpose. They are doing it to make a point against the Government; they are doing it with the object of blinding the eyes of the farmers, but I shall take good care that they do not succeed in doing it. I ask that hon. gentleman where are the vacant farms in Wellington? There are not any in South Wellington, or in North Wellington, or in Centre Wellington. In many cases—and no doubt that has caused a great deal of the exodus from the country—farmers have found that growing grain is not as profitable as it was in other days. They find that they have more competition, and they would have been driven out of the country altogether if it had not been that the Government have given them better communication with the mother country, and better markets by giving them greater railway and steamship facilities, and so greater access to the European countries. We have had a better price on the Liverpool market than we ever had before, but, notwithstanding that, the price of grain is just as low in the great American nation, because of the great surplus which exists. That is not only the case on this continent, but if you go to India, or to Russia, or to China, you will find that the market has been flooded. Year after year it is going on in the same way. The opening up of the Western States, the opening up of our own great North-West, where there are twelve million bushels of grain waiting for a market, have contributed to this. Are they going to sell that grain from the North-West in Chicago or in Milwaukee or in Minneapolis, when the Americans are exporting much larger amounts out of their country. The farmers of Canada are realising that they cannot grow grain and make money by exporting it, and consequently they have been increasing the size of their farms, have been raising stock, and going into dairying, and possibly in that way they have found a better market. Our farmers are doing very well, and I do not hear any murmuring among them. It is only when I come here that I hear of their bad times, and that is alleged in order to make a point against the Government and against the National Policy, which is the object of their everlasting hatred, a hatred that will keep them on that side of the House as long as they entertain it. I again challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a statement of the vacant farms. There are many farmers who have 50 acres and have taken 100, and many who had 100 who have increased them to 200, and many of their sons have gone to the North-West

or to the American side in consequence, and that also is part of the exodus. While dealing with that question, I may just as well reach my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan). In his speech the other night he threw out this challenge. I quote from *Hansard*. Referring to the statements made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in reply to the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) says:

"The hon. gentleman has taken his report from the Bureau of Industries, and I challenge him to go over whole report, and show that my statement is not correct. I have no fear that any hon. gentleman will be able to show anything of the kind."

Well, I am just going to see if I can show that. I have here the very book from which the hon. gentleman quoted. I will give you exactly what he said in reference to it. He said:

"There has been a good deal said with respect to the decreased value of land in the Province of Ontario. I will say, as a farmer, that this is, perhaps, a subject with which I am better acquainted than many others, as I have had an opportunity of testing the value of lands in the County of Huron and in the County of Perth which very few farmers have had. I had the honor to be appointed twelve months ago to value the whole County of Perth for equalisation purposes. I went over it along with another gentleman and put a value on every lot of land there, and I can assure you, Sir, that the reduction in the value of land in that country amounts to 10 and 15, and in some cases more, per cent. I am certain that the same reduction has taken place in the County of Huron, to which I have the honor to belong."

Now, we will see what Mr. Blue says about that, and we will also see what the hon. gentleman said about it on another occasion, when he was under oath, when he was making the statement not for political purposes, when he was selected for the purpose he refers to there, to value every farm in the county of Perth, and he dares to come and use language like that against one of the finest counties—I have no hesitation in saying—in the Dominion of Canada. I accept this challenge, and I produce the proof. I have the evidence of his own report, and I will quote Mr. Blue's report as to the value of lands in that county. In 1882, which is the date he used further on in his speech, and I will take his own sworn statement, sworn to last May, for I took the trouble to send to the county clerk for it, he and his colleague, one Wm. Long, made their sworn statement. In the year 1882, land in the county of Perth under the equalised report made by the county council itself in its June session, was put down at \$19,408,293 for real property, or an average value of \$35.67 per acre. Now, I have Mr. Blue's report, which bears that out within a fraction. The council passed that equalised assessment, and every township came into it. I will give you what the hon. gentleman says in reference to the value in 1886, the year for which he makes the report, and he leaves out all the buildings and all that sort of thing, I believe. The equalised report of the hon. gentleman is as follows: \$21,930,996. I told you that it was \$19,408,000 in 1882. The assessed value for 1882, as made by the corporation, was \$18,445,000, or \$15.67 per acre. The gentleman who made the statement that land had declined in value from 10 to 15 per cent. in the county of Perth, and he includes Huron, swears that when he made this report the value was \$21,930,996, or \$42.40 per acre, an increase of \$6.73 per acre over the assessed value. Now, let me give the hon. gentleman further information. Lest he might doubt my words, I will send him the report and he can see for himself. The council met in June, 1877. The hon. gentleman's report was before them, they were dealing with it. The council in equalising the various municipalities—I omit the towns and cities, because they have nothing to do with the farms—put the value of real property under the very same heading that my hon. friend does; and where he gives \$21,930,000, they put it \$22,968,000, or in other words they go about a million and a-half better. Probably the

Mr. HESSON.

hon. gentleman knows more about it than all the wardens and reeves of the county of Perth; probably he knows more about it than he did when he made that sworn statement; he knows more than Mr. Blue did in 1882. I shall make the hon. gentleman a present of the figures, and I ask him to apologise to the House and to my county for having made such a statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would scarcely believe after the pious way in which the hon. gentleman made his statement, that he would attempt to do anything that would cast a slur upon a neighboring county, that I think has done him no harm, and who elected him for his good judgment—I have no doubt he has good judgment—it is difficult to believe that for mere party purposes he would not only damage my county but damage his own. But he can do what he likes with his own, although as a neighbor I protest against it. I think I may go further and say that the value of real estate has increased in the county of Perth from 1882 to 1886, as I have stated, but when you come to take the total valuation of farms including personal estate, such as cattle, and implements, and including the houses on the farms, which is a fair test, when Mr. Blue in 1882 gave the value of \$34,296,739, in 1886, he gives the value as \$35,059,249, or an increase of \$762,510. So we find that even by the worst report we could get of the county, because Mr. Blue, whose report the hon. gentleman uses, was certainly no friend of the Conservative party, we ask no favors from him, but take his own report, still the county of Perth stands \$762,000 better than in the report of the hon. gentleman. Now, then, I will deal with the hon. gentleman's own county briefly. In 1882, according to Mr. Blue's report, the value of farm property was \$47,289,529. In 1886, notwithstanding all the cry of wail and despair, that the hon. gentleman has made, the alleged depopulation of the country, the farms getting poorer, and the mortgages increasing, and the mortgages have increased for the reason that the farmers have increased their holdings, where they owned 50 acres they have bought 100, and where they owned 100, they have bought another 100; in that way they make liabilities for themselves, no doubt, but in 1886 the value had increased to \$49,110,033, or an increase of \$1,820,504, according to Mr. Blue. If the hon. gentleman wants later information, he can get it in the report for 1887. Then the hon. gentleman directed his attack against the whole Province of Ontario. We find that in 1882, the farm lands, buildings, implements, and live stock were valued at \$948,000,000, and in 1886 at \$989,497,000. Here is what Mr. Blue says in his report of November, 1886, on page 5:

"These values are made up from the June schedule of farmers. They show an increase on the figures of last year, \$21,587,804 in farm lands; \$6,518,849 in live stock; \$1,961,211 in implements, and a little over \$1,000,000 in building, or about an excess over the values of 1885 of \$31,338,171, and of \$41,195,106 over the values of the four years."

He goes further than that, he says:

"Compared with 1882, in 1886 the increase was \$41,195,106 over the Province of Ontario."

Now, what are people going to think of a gentleman who, for mere party purposes, tried to make them believe that the country was going to ruin, and all for the paltry purpose of gaining some political advantage? Now, the hon. gentleman did not stop at that. The reason I direct so much attention to the member of South Huron is that I have got a pretty high respect for him, seeing that my county engaged him to do a certain work, and no doubt they had a good opinion of his judgment as a valuator. The hon. gentleman went further. Dealing with the stock and the cattle he says—I quote from *Hansard*:

"Now, Sir, in 1887, there were 70,000 head less cattle in Ontario than there were two years previously. The farmers are in a very bad condition indeed. I think the farmers are in the worst condition of any class of population in the Province of Ontario."

Again, he says:

"In the report I received last August we have 70,683 fewer horses and cattle than we had in 1882."

We will see what Mr. Blue says about it. I find in Mr. Blue's report that in 1882 we had 508,998 horses; in 1886, 569,649, or an increase of 60,651 horses. That gentleman also deals with the number of cattle, but I must take horses and cattle together. The number in Ontario in 1882 was 1,680,056; in November, 1887—and I sent especially for the latest returns—the number was 1,948,264, or an increase of 340,280; yet the hon. gentleman said the number was less than formerly, and he passes in the country as a fair and honorable gentleman in dealing with public questions, while at the same time he is damaging, not only his own county and my county, but the whole Province of Ontario. If we take the two together, horses and cattle, we find that instead of there being 70,000 less, as stated by the hon. member there was an excess in 1886 over 1882 of 406,571. The hon. gentleman got the sheep mixed with the question and tried to pull the wool over our eyes. It is very true that we have less sheep now than formerly, but he did not mention them when he said there were 70,000 head short. The truth is he got sheep, cattle and horses mixed, and, as I said, he tried to pull the wool over our eyes, but he did not succeed. We will again see what Mr. Blue says on the subject. On page 62 of his report he says that the value of animals in 1882 was \$98,325,797; in 1886—and the hon. gentleman said that our farmers had been exporting all their cattle, because they were too poor to feed them, and they had sent their store cattle to Buffalo—the value was \$107,000,000 odd, or an increase of \$8,883,843. That covers sheep I suppose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. HESSON. I do not think hon. members are ready for a division yet, but when the time comes they will swallow this resolution as they have others, and they will vote against the National Policy as they have done in the past. I have a dose yet for the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). That hon. gentleman could not leave my county alone. He made the same mistake, whether willfully or not I do not know, or he may have taken his figures from some other gentleman, at all events he raised the same wail of despair that has been raised by every hon. gentleman on that side of the House. He said the farms in Wellington had been mortgaged to a very great extent. The hon. gentleman knows more about mortgages than I do, because it is in his line of business. The hon. gentleman knows something about some of the unfortunate farmers there, and I rather think they know something about him too. I want to give the hon. gentleman a better idea of his own county than he possesses himself, and I am very sorry that a gentleman representing such a noble county as Wellington should fall into the same mistake as has been made by the hon. member for South Huron. The hon. gentleman said there had been a great decline in the value of farm lands, and in support of that statement he quoted statistics regarding his own county. According to Mr. Blue's report the value of farm lands in Wellington in 1882 was \$34,354,286, in 1886 \$35,416,621, or an increase of \$1,060,000 odd. I feel an interest in my neighbors, and as hon. gentlemen who have spoken for counties surrounding my county have spoken of the want of prosperity in those counties, I desire to examine as to what the cause is, and to what extent the statement is true. Last evening the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman), one of the garden counties of Ontario, made the very same departure. He did not open it with a wail but he closed it with a wail. He said that the value of lands had depreciated there and I presume that if he is in the loaning business he will know all about it. He is a very

nice gentleman and represents his county faithfully and well, but I do not think his constituents will be thankful to him for representing that noble county as on its last legs. If there is one county more than another which is holding its own and holding more than its own it is that grand county of Waterloo, and if there is one man who ought to be proud of that, it is the gentleman who represents the Germans of that county, the most industrious, hard working, and honest citizens in Canada to-day. To see their beautiful homes, their magnificent farms and the growth of their glorious towns is a sight to be admired. Let the hon. gentleman go to the town he resides in Waterloo, and let him look around him there and how can he come here and wail against the National Policy. He cannot help admitting that the National Policy has built up the town he resides in. Look at Berlin, one and a half mile distant, it is a perfect marvel of progress. I may say it is a Manchester in a small way. What was it before the National Policy was introduced? I am not afraid to say that with the exception of one firm in that town, Messrs. Erb, Brown & Co., who are extraordinarily bitter Grits, not a man in that magnificent little town could be found to say that the National Policy had not been the making of their business. I am surprised that my friend from Waterloo had the courage to say that he represented the opinions of the manufacturers of that town. The town has doubled its wealth and population since the National Policy came into force, and I challenge that hon. gentleman to stand up and say that he can express the opinions of the manufacturers of that town, for the manufacturers voted solid for the National Policy. In 1874, when the hon. gentleman represented that county before, he was elected by acclamation. No man dared to enter in the field against him. It was a county known for years as one in which no Conservative had a right to show his face, and it was only when the National Policy had so benefited the people of that county and that town that my hon. friend was defeated by the gentleman who represented the county in 1878, and until the House was dissolved in 1882. The gentleman I refer to was Mr. Kranz. Although the hon. gentleman who now represents the county was previously elected by acclamation the town of Berlin gave 250 of a solid majority against him. While he may have a right to represent the farmers on this question I challenge the right of the hon. gentleman to profess to represent the people who are engaged in the manufacturing industries in that town and to say they are not in favor of the National Policy. Let him go to his native town where he has lived for a long time, and where he is respected highly, and I do not think there is any other gentleman in that riding more respected than he is for he has friends and relatives everywhere and he has represented North Waterloo in an able and distinguished way. Indeed that gentleman in his own town could not get a majority while in the rural places he was able to throw the veil over the eyes of the farmers. Right in his town there was no less than a majority of 58 against him. I think I have devoted enough attention to those hon. gentlemen and perhaps more than the subject is worthy of. I for one enter my protest here against any attempt to put into the hands of the United States Government the power to levy the rates of duty that people will have to pay in this country on their imports into this country. I protest against our looking to them for what they may choose to dole out to us for the purpose of the public expenditures of this country. I protest against Canada ever having to submit or to surrender her right to legislate for herself in those matters, and to decide under her own good will what is best for her people. You may call me ultra-loyal if you will, but I protest, and so long as life continues I shall protest, against anything that would lead to a severance from the old land that we all love so well. I believe, that if

there is one thing that we could desire better than another, it would be that the grand old country should make with us and her colonies which, look to her for encouragement and aid in time of distress, one grand Zollverein against all foreign nations, giving the right of her markets, under conditions that would be denied to other countries. I believe that we should look to this instead of turning our backs upon the British Empire and upon our glorious Queen. I say it is our bounden duty, as British subjects, whilst at the same time considering our own interest, to look towards the mother land. I believe our interest points in that direction, and even if you put it on the very lowest grounds, I believe it is to our advantage in every possible way to keep up that connection and to strengthen it more. Above all things, never allow the Americans to legislate for us in matters that we understand ourselves best. I believe that the course I have referred to will make our people contented and prosperous, as I believe they are now, outside a few politicians in this country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, as it does not appear to be the wish of gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that we should be permitted to adjourn at this late hour of the evening I certainly will have to bow to their desires and wishes. They being in the majority, of course we on the side of the minority must submit as we have always submitted with the best grace possible. But, Sir, a question of this kind, a question involving itself results which may be of serious consideration to the country, a question in which we are all deeply interested, should have a proper time for consideration and discussion. This late hour is hardly a proper time for a person to express his ideas and his reasons for the vote that he may be called upon to give. I must say that I was more or less amused by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). I do not really know whether he was serious in the statements he has made or whether he desired the House to understand or consider that he was discussing the question of unrestricted reciprocity, or whether he was offering a few remarks so that he might congratulate some hon. members on this side of the House on the manner in which they had addressed the House. I must say I am surprised that any hon. member of this House should so far forget what is proper and right as to deliberately accuse any hon. member of this House of attempting to draw the wool over the eyes of any of the people of the Dominion of Canada. I very much regret that he should deliberately and positively affirm, from his place in this House, that my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) should have succeeded in drawing the wool over the eyes of the farmers in that locality. Does he pretend to say that the farmers are so ignorant that they do not know when or how to record their votes? He may imagine that he is addressing himself through this House to an ignorant class; but I will give him to understand distinctly that I have had an opportunity of meeting farmers in various sections of this country, and no class in this Dominion are more intelligent, or more thoroughly understand what is best for their own interests. I might also say, with reference to his remarks about my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), that the statements made by that hon. gentleman were correct in every particular; and I think any dispassionate individual within the hearing of my voice, will agree with me that, taking into consideration the opening up of new territories in the North-West, and the departure of many people from this country to the United States, farm lands are not at present

Mr. HESSON.

in Canada as valuable as they were a few years ago. But it matters very little whether the lands be assessed high or low. There is a certain amount of taxes to be raised, and if the land is assessed low the rate of taxation will be high, while if the land is assessed high, the rate of taxation will be low. Therefore the assessed value of the land is no certain indication of its real value. The hon. gentleman stated another thing which I take exception to. It has been the rule among hon. members opposite, when they rise to address the House, to hurl across the floor the charge, not only that we are on this side are disloyal, but that we are continually decrying the country. Now, Sir, I challenge any hon. member opposite to point to a single statement made by any member on this side in any way disparaging to this country. I say they are the individuals who are decrying the country. Not one single breath of detraction has been uttered by any member on this side of the House. We have simply stated what we conceive to be true, and I have yet to learn that any of us feel that we are doing wrong when we are stating the truth. It may be very congenial for hon. gentlemen opposite to withhold the truth or to be not free to express candidly what they feel to be the facts. I am not going, Sir, to decry my country. I believe we have as fine a country as lies under the sun. I believe we have a class of inhabitants that perhaps cannot be surpassed in any country in the world. Our situation and surroundings conduce to render the human product of Canada one of the most superior products in the world. If we take into consideration the climatic conditions of Canada, our people in longevity surpass probably any others; and for physical endurance, for strength and bravery, we know that no other country has been able to show the equal of our people. Knowing these facts, would it be reasonable for us for one moment to decry a country that produced such fine physical specimens of men as Hanlan or McKinnon? If that is not sufficient, let me call your attention to something with which you are more familiar, perhaps, than the exploits of those individuals. Let me call your attention to the circumstances that unfortunately took place in 1885 at the time the rebellion sprang up in the North-West. What did we find on that occasion? We found young men from the counting house, from the college, from the farm and from various avocations and callings, responding gloriously to their country's call; and their physical power of endurance during the time they went to subdue that rebellion would command the admiration of any veterans. You know full well, Mr. Speaker, what they were called on to endure. You know that they were called on to go to the North-West without the necessary comforts that ought to have been supplied to them—that after they started on their journey they were obliged to ride on the cars day after day and night after night without the rest and refreshment which are necessary to the sustenance of the human system. Not only that, but they were compelled to make forced marches through snow in a temperature which was almost enough to freeze them to death. They endured all that, and when they reached their destination, they subdued one of the most grievous rebellions that was perhaps ever recorded in the annals of any race. Within ninety days after they had reached their point of destination, they put down the Indian rebellion. With these facts before us, will any one attempt to decry for a moment the human product of this Dominion. Take the people of Canada as a whole, and there is not a finer race under the sun. This being the case with the people, let us consider what sort of a country we have. Have you found, Sir, any individual who attempted to speak upon this question say that our soil, our climate, our situation in every respect, is not only equal but in many respects superior to that of the United States. We have as good soil as they, we have as good a climate as they, we have as good water communica-

tion as they, and having a race equal to theirs, we ought to march onward in civilisation, in the advancement of manufacturing industries and of farming industries, with a pace equal to that of the people of the United States. But have we so advanced? Have we made progress equal to that made by our neighbors? If we have not, there must be some reason for it, and we ought to consider wherein lies the fault. If a fault exists it is our bounden duty to remedy it. I might, perhaps, follow the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) through some of the remarks he made, but I really think, as I have said, that he was hardly sincere in his remarks, and was merely endeavoring to take up as much of the time of the House as he could without touching at all on the question of unrestricted reciprocity. True, he read a number of letters from Mr. Wiman, and I should judge from his speech that he had taken extensive notes, before coming to Parliament, on the question of commercial union, and, having neglected to separate unrestricted reciprocity from that question, fired off the unprepared, half digested, very crude speech, he had intended for some other purpose. Therefore, it is hardly worth my while to take up the various points, if points I could call them, and answer them in the manner in which the hon. gentleman presented them to the House. I have said to you that our territory is as great as and equal in every respect to any portion of the United States, and I may say to many portions of the old world. Take, for instance, the Province from which I come, not that I consider it is any better than any other Province of the Dominion, for I believe every Province is equally adapted for the maintenance and support of the human race, but let me take the Province of Ontario and compare its extent with that of other countries. From Point Pelee on Lake Erie to Fort Albany on James Bay, it is more than 700 miles wide. It is larger than the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois or Michigan by 10,000 square miles; yet the population of each of these States far exceeds the population of Ontario, and you will also find that the manufacturing industries of these States far exceeds those of the Province of Ontario. What is the cause of this? Why have we not made as great a progress as those States across the border? The Province of Ontario is also larger than the six New England States, and is larger than New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland by some 25,000 square miles. It is larger than Great Britain and Ireland by 75,000 square miles, and is only 4,000 square miles less than the French Republic and 8,000 less than the German Empire. Let us take the Dominion of Canada and what do we find? We find, if we compare it with the United States, that the territory of the Dominion with its 5,000,000 of population is greater than the whole territory of the United States. We have in the Dominion of Canada some 3,500,000 square miles of territory, whereas in the United States they have only 3,036,000 square miles, but we have less than five millions population, while the population of the United States is nearly 65,000,000. Why is it that the United States have increased so rapidly while we have to remain comparatively stationary? It is not on account of lack of energy on the part of our people or lack of ability to perform the duties which are essential to the prosperity of the country. There must be some cause why we have not made the same progress as the people across the border. We have ample territory for the founding of a great kingdom, or a great nation, and I can well understand the aspirations of the people of Canada that the time may come when we may be one of those glorious empires of kingdoms compared with other nations of the earth; but I am afraid that, at our present rate of progress, if we do not make more rapid strides than we have made, it is long in the future before we can expect to emulate other nations. Besides this broad expanse, we have a fertile soil, an invigorating climate, vast forests, great mineral wealth and water power of limitless capacity. Let us con-

sider for a moment the advantages which we would have if we were a manufacturing country as our friends on that side of the House say they are endeavoring to make us. What might we not accomplish in consequence of the water privileges we possess? But have we not since 1879 attempted to build up factories in this country at the expense of the consumers? Have we not raised our duties and protected articles that could be manufactured in Canada in order to prevent their importation from foreign countries, and have we succeeded to the extent to which we ought to have succeeded? Have we accomplished what it was expected the new fiscal policy would accomplish? I think that every ardent lover and well wisher of the fiscal policy which was inaugurated in 1879 will admit that as much as he desired has not been accomplished, and, if it has been in the past so fruitless of results, can we expect in the future to receive any greater advantages in that direction than we have in the past?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No doubt some of my hon. friends will cry "hear, hear" to anything which conveys the impression that the National Policy is performing some wonderful duty. I might perhaps give you the opinion of some in reference to what they consider the condition of Canada. I would read to you what is stated by Mr. J. R. Larned, of the United States Treasury Department in 1871:

"Ontario possesses a fertility in which no part of New England can at all compare, and that particular section of it around which the circle of the great lakes is swept forces itself upon the notice of any student of the American map as one of the most favored spots of the whole continent, where the population ought to breed with almost Belgian fecundity."

Here we see that the American people do not hesitate to tell the truth in reference to the condition of Canada, but, if we unfortunately on this side of the House should happen to make a favorable remark in reference to the territory across the line, we are held up as being inclined to annexation or as having a desire sooner or later to throw ourselves into the arms of the United States. Here is an American opinion in regard to the condition of Canada. Is it right that we on this side of the House, knowing these facts and feeling an inherent desire for the welfare of Canada, should be branded by every member who happens to get upon his feet on that side and should be charged with degrading or belittling our country? Have our people, as a people, proved themselves worthy of the Dominion of Canada? Have they done their share individually to increase the prosperity of the country? Are they individually to blame for the condition in which Canada is to-day? I think they are not. If we look at the various Provinces of the Dominion, what do we find? In Ontario we find that every care is taken to better the condition of the people, and the same remark may be made of every one of the other Provinces. We have a good form of government in the Province of Ontario, and we have good forms of government in all the other Provinces, and, thanks to the intelligence of the people and to their cautiousness, we have to-day a reform government, a progressive government, in almost every Province of the Dominion of Canada. That being the case, we would naturally expect that they would have the interests of the people at heart; and if we examine into what they have done in the various Provinces, we find that it is not owing to any lack of duty on the part of the Local Governments that the Dominion has not improved as rapidly as it ought to have improved. Take, for instance, the encouragement to agriculture. They have adopted every means to render assistance to the people to foster and encourage the industry of agriculture. They have established an agricultural college in the Province of Ontario, where young men have an opportunity of receiving instructions which will render them more competent to perform the duties of successful

farmers. Our educational system will command the admiration of any country under the sun. We have expended enormous sums of money for the purpose of constructing railways. The Local Government of Ontario has granted large subsidies to railways; and not only that, but the municipalities have granted bonuses to various roads with a view of enabling every farmer to have an opportunity to dispose of everything he has to dispose of to the best possible advantage, and at as little expense as possible. Not only that, but we have constructed various roads so as to render the country more accessible to the markets. Good markets are built up in almost every town and city in all parts of the Province. But we find that the people are prepared, and have been prepared, to submit to what is so obnoxious in the ears of many, direct taxation, whereby the municipalities may have a certain amount to expend for educational and other purposes. We find that every Province is well managed by its Local Government, and why is it that the Dominion, as a whole, has not been as successful as it ought to have been? It must be either on account of the fiscal policy of the Government or the bad management of the Government. Sir, if that be found to be the case, if it is on account of their fiscal policy being inimical to the best interests of the country, the sooner the Government come down and submit some means whereby the evil may be remedied, the better it will be for the country. Sir, it is no great sin if they find they have been going wrong, candidly to confess it and try to repair the wrong. It is not cowardly to confess they have been wrong. I do not suppose there are many hon. members in this House who would regard them as perfect. We had an illustration a few days ago of a case wherein they had resisted for four or five years the entreaties of the members on this side of the House to grant certain concessions so as to put us in a better position with regard to the people of the United States. They firmly resisted our entreaties. I can remember well when the late Minister of Finance, now the Postmaster General, was entreated by members on this side of this House not to increase the duties upon small fruit trees coming into this country from the United States. It was pointed out to him then that the United States had passed an Act in 1883, removing duties from these very articles upon which the Government had taken authority, by Order in Council, to reciprocate with the United States. They resisted that request. They said it would injure a very large class of the citizens of Canada; they said we have a large number of nurserymen and small market gardeners, and if we allowed these fruits to come into the country, it would destroy these industries, and the market gardeners would not be able to get as good a price for their strawberries, their peaches and other fruit. They said it would be a wrong, it would be, to a certain extent, abandoning the National Policy that they had been fostering for a number of years. A large number of their supporters on that side of the House raised their voices in strong condemnation of any such gross injustice, being inflicted upon the nurserymen, the market gardeners and the small fruit men of Canada. But, Sir, did we not see the spectacle a few days ago of the announcement that a proclamation had been issued, placing upon the free list the very articles that we had contended for a few years ago? Where were the responsive voices that stood up a few years before and condemned us for advocating the very same thing that was done a few days ago? Quiet they say, unresponsive; no voice was raised, still as death. They may have felt grieved, they may have felt annoyed, but their master has said that they were to submit, and they quietly submitted and took the dose without a grimace. Sir, if it was a proper thing to make that concession and give away a portion of their National Policy, I would entreat them to come forward now and be still more generous and still more just. If they

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

say the country has not made that improvement which it ought to have made during the last few years, they should come forward now and say: Here, we have virtually conceded that the National Policy has not been a success; we have had to do away with a portion of it, and we will concede the balance; we will allow the United States to send in not only the cereals and natural products of the soil, the mine and the forest, but we will allow them to send their manufactured articles, and we will do the same to the people of the United States; why should we not do this? Let us make a comparison. Take for instance the State of New York, and put up a high tariff wall around it, what would be the effect? Do you suppose the State of New York would go on and prosper as it has been doing? I think we would find that in a very short time its population would decrease, its manufacturing industries would decrease, and that, instead of being the banner state of the Union, in a short time it would fall to the third or fourth place. Now, Sir, we find that if we take the natural fertility of the Province of Ontario or any other portion of the Dominion, and compare it with that of some of the other States of the Union, our country will compare most favorably; in fact we in Canada will be able to raise a larger percentage of grain than they can in the United States. Let me compare fall wheat in Ontario with some of the States of the Union wherein that grain is most favorably grown. If you take the fall wheat from 1882 to 1886, it would average 14.8 bushels per acre in Pennsylvania; Ohio, 13.3; Michigan, 16.4; Indiana, 13; Illinois 12.9; Missouri, 10.9; California, 12; Kansas, 15.2. What was the average in Canada during that period, and, mark you, I take from 1882 to 1886 inclusive, during one of which years there was almost a total failure in the Dominion, much worse than in the United States. The average for Ontario during those five years was 21 bushels per acre, a larger average than they have in the United States. Next take spring wheat. The average during the same period in Wisconsin—and I select the States most favorable to the growth of spring wheat—was 12.7; Minnesota, 13.2; Iowa, 11.4; Nebraska, 12.7; Dakota, 13.1; Ontario, 16.1, thus exceeding Iowa by 4.7 bushels and Dakota by 2 bushels. Next I come to oats. The products in New York State on an average during the same period, and it is a State favorable to the growth of oats, was 29.6; Pennsylvania, 28.8; Illinois, 34.5; Ohio, 32; Michigan, 32.9; Indiana, 28.8; Wisconsin, 34; Minnesota, 34.6; Iowa, 34; Missouri, 26; Kansas, 31.9; Nebraska, 32.2; Ontario, 37.1. We have heard during the discussion something on the question of barley. Perhaps there is no country, neither the United States nor any foreign country, where the same quality and same quantity of barley can be raised as in this Dominion. The production of barley on an average taking the same number of years, was as follows: New York, average per acre 23.1; Wisconsin, 24.2; Minnesota, 23.4; Iowa, 22.5; Nebraska, 22.3; California, 19.3; Ontario, 26.9. These facts show that Ontario exceeded any of the States of the Union in the quantity per acre and the quality is superior to any raised in any State. If we could obtain reciprocal trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States we would there find a market for all the barley we could possibly raise. All the barley we could raise would not in any way overstock the market of the United States, therefore it would not in any way reduce the price. Again, if you take the very small acreage of barley in Canada, it shows that it is on account of the 10 cents a bushel we have to pay to send barley into the United States that causes our farmers to raise less barley than they otherwise would do. The average quantity of land occupied is about 48 acres to the 1000. If we had reciprocity between Canada and the United States we would be able to occupy a much larger acreage per 1000 than at the present time, and, therefore, even that should

induce the Government to consider favorably anything that would, to a certain extent, relieve the farmers from the condition in which they are at the present time. You may say that the farmer is prosperous, that he has succeeded in his occupation; but remember what the hon. member for North Perth said, that it was quite out of the question at the present time that a farmer in the Dominion could cultivate as much land as a farmer cultivated on the prairie, and it was unreasonable to expect our farmers to do so. If that be true, as stated by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), is it not the duty of the Government to make an arrangement with the United States if possible? But the House knows well that the Government do not feel anxious to do so; that rumor is that whenever election time comes round that one portion of the community is more liberal towards assisting to secure the present Government in power than the other portion, that the farming community do not respond so readily to calls, they are not willing to supply the sinews of war and furnish assistance to keep the Government in power, and therefore the Government turn their back upon those who do not extend aid. That is the reason why the Government treat with indifference the portion of the community that includes 75 per cent. of the whole population. But the time is not far distant when they will find the farming community rise in their might and say they are no longer going to have a Government legislating in the interests of a certain class against the masses of the people, and the sooner the day comes the better it will be for the future hope and aspiration of those who regard and wish their country well. But this is not all. If we have not succeeded as well as we might expect in establishing our various industries, how has our population increased compared with what it ought to have been? I will not detain the House to show that the population has not increased in the ratio in which it should have increased. The population increased from 1873 to 1879, and mark you that was a period when there was a great depression in the country, and when there was a very small amount of money spent in public and other improvements. The population then increased by 78,961 or 22 per cent. From 1879 to 1885, when very large sums of money had been expended upon railways and other subsidies, yea and for the purpose of influencing the electorate at the polls, we find that the population during that period increased only 44,889, or 10 per cent. That is not all. We know that during the latter period a very large number of supposed immigrants were brought to the country, when several million dollars were expended for that purpose, and, Sir, if we compare the number of immigrants that were reported to have been brought here and the number of the natural increase that ought to have taken place, we find that the population in 1885 was really less than it was in 1879. Why ought this to be the case? You can all understand full well that it must be partially owing to the fiscal policy, or the restrictions that the people of the Dominion of Canada had to sustain on account of the fiscal policy inaugurated by a Government which could not fully comprehend what really was in the interest and for the welfare of the Dominion. Taking the years 1873 to 1879 we find also that the assessed lands of the municipalities increased by 1,001,233 acres or 5 per cent. During the second period when the Government was expending money lavishly on railroads and expending money in our North-West, we find that the assessed acreage increased only by 622,978 acres, or about 3 per cent. During the time that the present Government then in Opposition, charged the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) with neglecting the interests of the country and driving the people out of the country to the United States, while we find that the assessed value of the land increased more rapidly than it did when this "heaven-

born" Government assumed power and promised to make everyone prosperous in the country—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Yes, you might well cheer when I ironically said "heaven-born Government." A more unmeaning remark I never made in my life. The Government that appealed to the people under the pretense that they were going to make the country prosperous have been in power since 1879, and during that time, on account of mismanagement and misgovernment, they have driven thousands of people out of the country. During that time they inaugurated a policy that we feel and we know has not conduced to the welfare of the country. Not only that, Sir, but they have run this country hopelessly in debt during that period by a lavish and extravagant expenditure upon it. Yes, Sir, I said a "heaven-born" Government. I retract that, and you can retract your cheers. If we take the urban municipalities we find that the acreage during the first decade was much greater than it was during the second decade. In the first period it was 22 per cent., in the second decade it was only 10½ per cent. Although the times were regarded as hard in the first period I refer to, we find that the rural sections and the urban portions of the country raised a much larger amount of taxes during the first year to improve their farms, improve their conditions, educate their children, and for necessary expenses, than during the second period. The percentage during the first period was 27½, and during the time that our friends opposite have managed the affairs of the Government it has only been 16½. The people were unable since to raise the necessary taxes to educate their children and defray their expenses. Sir, we know full well what all this means; we know what will be the ultimate outcome if we go on in this way. We know full well that we in Canada cannot remain in the condition that we have been in for a number of years past. We know, Sir, that we must have an opportunity to extend our trade greater than what we have had. We are not like the frog, we cannot live in the well, nor are we like the coon that can retire into his seclusion during the winter. We must have an extended trade to other countries and not merely be traders with ourselves. The doctrine advocated by the First Minister that we should keep entirely within ourselves, that we should manufacture everything that we want, and that we should trade amongst ourselves and be excluded from the rest of the world is the most unreasonable doctrine ever preached by a man calling himself a statesman. Suppose the hon. gentleman had carried out that policy that he announced he would carry out at the time he appealed to the country, I ask you what would have been the result? The grievous wail that we hear against the members on this side of the House, that we are doing an injustice and a wrong to the mother land on account of asking reciprocal trade between the United States and Canada, would not have been indulged in by gentlemen opposite, for the hon. gentleman then said that he was going to manufacture everything and import nothing from other countries. Sir, if he carried out the doctrine that he then preached, a grievous wrong would have been committed by him. If we seek to become a great nation, if we expect to extend our trade with other nations, we know that we must adopt a different policy to that which we have adopted. We know full well that even now with the restriction placed upon the articles coming from the United States to Canada that a very large amount of those articles do come and that we raise a considerable amount of revenue from their importation. We know that with free trade with the mother country, and with every opportunity of conveying everything that we have to trade to them, we have extended our trade from 1879 up to the present time but by a very small amount.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto said that England gave us market enough for all the surplus cereals we raised in Canada now or will raise for a hundred years. I would ask him, have we not had England for our market for the last ten or twelve years? Shall we have it any the less if we enter into unrestricted trade with the United States? It is perfect nonsense to say that it would injure our trade with the mother country. Everyone knows that the mother country desires the prosperity of Canada, and that anything we may do to promote its prosperity and increase its population would only endear Canada to the mother country; and I say he is not a true patriot who would try to restrict the progress and success of the Dominion of Canada. I am not aware that we should be doing any injustice to the mother country at all; but if unrestricted reciprocity injured anyone in the mother country, it would only injure a few Birmingham and Manchester manufacturers. True, we receive from them about \$40,000,000 worth of goods a year. True, there are about 500 people in all who realise a profit. They might be affected; but they are not the mother country; they are only a few of the citizens of the mother country. Are we not citizens of the mother country just as much as they? Are the 5,000,000 people of Canada to suffer what we conceive to be injurious to our country for the sake of pleasing a few manufacturers in Birmingham and Manchester? The whole profits that those manufacturers realise from us might be perhaps \$2,000,000 a year. But you must bear this in mind, that the manufactures of Birmingham and Manchester are not the only people in England who have an interest in Canada. There are others in England who have enormous sums invested in Canada; I suppose \$500,000,000 of English capital is to-day invested in this country. Are we to do what will mar the success and the enterprise of those investments for the purpose of pleasing a few of the manufacturers of Birmingham and Manchester? We know that a great proportion of the money invested in our railroads comes from England; we know that the greater portion of the money invested in our loan societies and manufacturing industries comes from England; and I ask you, Sir, if we should get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and by that means increase the wealth and prosperity of the Dominion of Canada, whether in benefiting that large number of capitalists in the mother country who have their money invested in Canada, we should not be benefiting the mother country. Then consider our railroad interest. If we could get unrestricted reciprocity, whereby we could increase the traffic between the United States and Canada, the earnings of the railroads would increase enormously, more than to the extent of \$2,000,000 that the manufacturers of Birmingham and Manchester might lose. Therefore it is most unreasonable to say that we should be dealing unfairly with the mother country by adopting unrestricted reciprocity. I say that it would be in the interest of the mother country for us to obtain it, and we should do everything in our power to bring it about. But, Sir, there is another consideration in this matter. If we do not extend our trade, it is just possible that some fine day the bonding system may be done away with, that the United States may say to us that no longer is it in the interest of the United States to continue the bonding system; what would be the effect on the Dominion if such a thing took place? We know that it would be an almost fatal blow to railroading in the Dominion of Canada. There are many here whose interests are considerably identified with railroads, and I appeal to them to consider whether it would not be better for us, when we have an opportunity, when the olive branch is held out to us by the American Government, to embrace their offer at the earliest opportunity. Now, I am well aware that many statements have been made to show that our population has not to any greater extent gone to the

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.)

United States during the last decade than it did during the Administration of the hon. member for East York. I agree that we must always expect that there will be more or less interchange of population between the two countries which no Government or people can prevent. I think you will find that during the last decade, a larger number have left Canada than during the previous years; and that being the case, it is evident they must have thought Canada was not the best place for them to obtain either work or cheap lands. If then it be found that it is to our interest that we should have unrestricted reciprocity, is it not our bounden duty, as true loyal Canadians, to do that which is in the interest of Canada. You can rest content, Sir, that England will look after herself and that the United States will look after themselves, and that in Canada we must look after the interests of our own people. I feel thankful for having had this brief opportunity of making the remarks I have made. Let me say before sitting down, that I am strongly in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and I will appeal to my friends from down by the sea, whether they can conscientiously vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax in favor of our coasting trade. We know the great advantage that would accrue to us were we permitted to have the privilege of the coasting trade from one port to the other of the United States. It would also be a great benefit for the people on the great inland waters along the lakes between the United States and Canada. On account of our not having that reciprocal privilege, the shipping along our coast has disappeared almost completely, and unless we can obtain something in that direction, we will not be able to carry on that business which a country such as this Dominion should carry on, and I appeal to them to lay aside party feeling and do that which they ought to do in the interest of the people of the whole Dominion. Entertaining those views, I shall cordially support the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), believing that the policy it embodies will, in the future, if carried out, make Canada one of the first nations under the sun. I also believe that if our trade and our relations with the people of the United States remain restricted our interests will be crippled, our trade will be curtailed and Canada will not be the country we all desire it to be.

Mr. KIRK. As this is one of the most, if not the most important question perhaps that has been before this House since Confederation, hon. gentlemen should approach the discussion of it with at least clear heads and at a time when they are not drowsy for the want of sleep. It is now nearly 2:30 o'clock, and I would rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. KIRK. I believe there are several other gentlemen who wish to address the House on this question, and it is unfair to try and shut them off or force them to speak at this early hour in the morning. However, we are able to stand this thing as well as hon. gentlemen opposite. And as they evidently intend to continue the sitting for some time longer, I shall ask the indulgence of the House whilst I give some of my opinions with regard to this question from a Nova Scotia standpoint. Before entering on my subject I wish to say a word with regard to a remark made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). This hon. gentleman said that the leader of the Opposition had declared that the Maritime Provinces were in a state of revolt. Well, the leader of the Opposition is in his seat. He may have said that, but I did not hear him say so, and I do not think he did. I believe he said something quite different. At any rate that led the hon. gentleman to talk of repeal, and he said that no constituency in the Maritime Provinces would return a member to this House on a question of repeal. I said he was mistaken with regard to Nova Scotia,

and I believe the hon. member for Digby said he was not mistaken. Let us see which is right. I happen to have the honor of being elected to this House as a repealer, by a constituency in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct the statement he imputed to me. What I said was that in the Province of New Brunswick, and I was speaking for that Province alone, no member could secure his election as a repealer.

Mr. KIRK. That makes it all right so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned. I understood him to say no constituency in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for Digby, in reply to the statement that the hon. member for Albert was mistaken with regard to Nova Scotia, said he was not mistaken. I issued an address to the electors of my county when the House was dissolved, and announced myself as a candidate. In that address I laid down my platform. I pointed out among other things that I was in favor of repeal, and this is what I said:

"I am fully convinced that the only effectual remedy for this unbearable state of affairs is the entire and complete separation of the Maritime from the upper and Western Provinces, and in a union of the Maritime Provinces; and should New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island fail to co-operate, then the separation of Nova Scotia from the other Provinces of the Dominion and a return to a state of an independent Province of Great Britain, with sole control—subject to the Imperial Government—over all its internal affairs, including tariff and taxation.

"Should you do me the honor of renewing your confidence in me by re-electing me as your representative to the Canadian Parliament, I shall deem it to be my duty to cordially co-operate with the Local Government and Legislature in effecting a repeal of the British North America Act so far as it affects Nova Scotia."

I think that declaration of my position in regard to repeal and of what I myself would do proves at any rate that the Province of Nova Scotia had one constituency that returned a repealer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. One.

Mr. KIRK. Do the hon. gentlemen mean to say that I was the only candidate who was returned in favor of repeal?

Some hon. MEMBERS. What did you do?

Mr. KIRK. Never mind what we did. That proves that the people of Nova Scotia are dissatisfied with the condition of things, and they are dissatisfied because the pledges of those who brought us into Confederation have not been carried out. We were dragged into Confederation without our consent and against our will, and every prediction which was made by the leaders of the Anti-Confederate party has been more than fulfilled, for we have been taxed more than any one of those leaders ever anticipated, and, until the present time, we believed there was no party in the Dominion, there was no party in Ontario which was willing to adopt the policy which has been taken up in this Parliament and to advocate full and free reciprocity with the United States. The United States of America are our nearest and our best market. There is not a man in the Province of Nova Scotia who is old enough to remember the condition of affairs when we had reciprocity with the United States, but remembers well that all things prospered, and the people were contented and happy. But things have changed, and are the people contented and happy?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. KIRK. Not a bit of it. They would not have voted as they did in 1886 if they were contented and happy. We know that in 1886 the Local Legislature went to the people at the polls with a square issue of repeal. We know that both parties, those opposed to repeal and those in favor of repeal, had the same chance of success at the polls. What was the result? Out of 38 members, only 7 were beaten—31 were returned pledged to vote for repeal. That was the

condition of affairs in Nova Scotia in 1886. It may be true that in 1887, one year afterwards, there was seemingly a reverse vote, but it was not a reverse vote. We find that to-day only those on the Liberal side are elected from Nova Scotia who pledged themselves for repeal. Those who went to the polls not pledged for repeal were defeated, every one of them. Had they taken up the repeal cry, as they should have done, we would have had more members on this side of the House than we have. And why is it so? We know that in 1878, when the policy of protection was propounded, or rather when the change of policy was propounded, because it was in 1873 only a readjustment of the tariff that was announced which was not to increase the taxes of the people, the leader of the Opposition at that time, who is now the leader of the Government, stated that he did not intend to increase the taxes, he stated that tariffs did not increase taxes, but it was only debt that increased taxes, and they would not increase the debt and therefore they would not increase the taxes. It was to be only a readjustment, which would make everything boom, and would bring prosperity to the agricultural, the mining, and every other industry; but we find that, instead of a readjustment of the taxation so as not to take money out of the pockets of the people and not to increase the taxes, which the people have to pay, the tariff has been, not quite doubled perhaps, but enormously increased, the taxes have been enormously increased and, because of that, the people have become dissatisfied and have desired to be relieved from the Union.

Mr. MADILL. Why does not your leader take up repeal?

Mr. KIRK. I will promise the hon. gentleman one thing that, if this Government will make it a plank in their platform, if they will say to Nova Scotia, if you vote for repeal you will get repeal, nine-tenths of the people of Nova Scotia will vote in that way, and nine out of ten of the representatives of Nova Scotia will be elected pledged to repeal. Will the right hon. gentleman take up the challenge? Of course he will not, because he knows that what I say is true. What is the condition of affairs? They say that in 1882 they had the majority of the votes of the people of Nova Scotia. They went to the polls a year before Parliament expired by limitation, and why did they dissolve a year before the time? The reason was given that there were foreign capitalists who were ready to expend millions upon millions of dollars in order to develop the mineral resources of the country, most of which, or at any rate a very large proportion of which are in the Province of Nova Scotia. We are a small Province, and it may be a poor one. It is poor in consequence of the fiscal policy of the Government, but I say that in its mineral resources there is no country under the sun wealthier than that little Province. It is true that the Province of Nova Scotia is not as great an agricultural Province as the Province of Ontario, but she is an agricultural Province notwithstanding. We have in that Province as fine agricultural lands as can be found in Ontario, and we have a great deal of ordinary land. We have fine forests, we have mines the like of which are not to be found anywhere else in Canada, we have gold, and silver, and coal, and copper, and iron and many other minerals. These lie undeveloped. I ask, why is it that the Province of Nova Scotia, in common with the rest of the Dominion of Canada, is so far behind the United States in the development of the resources of the country? Why are the iron mines there lying untouched, although the Government promised in 1884 that millions of money would be introduced into the country if the people showed they had confidence in the Government of the day? Why, after six years have elapsed since the people showed that they had faith in the Government, has not one dollar been expended on those iron mines? The people were deceived into voting for the Government at that time. There are but 160

men employed in the Province of Nova Scotia in developing the iron mines of that Province, on which the Government promised that millions of money would be expended. This is why the people of Nova Scotia are dissatisfied with Confederation, and want to get out of it. They remember well the flourishing condition they were in between 1854 and 1865, and they desire to see that prosperity brought back again. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance the other day declare himself so strongly in favor of reciprocity with the United States, in the natural resources of the country; I was exceedingly pleased to hear it. I know that he and the leader of the Government had always declared that their object in imposing a high protective tariff, was to force the United States to give us reciprocity in the natural resources of the country. Well, we have been nine years under this National Policy and we have not forced the United States yet, but it looks very much as if the United States are going to force us. It seems there are two sets of opinions in the Government ranks. We have the Premier declaring against reciprocity in natural resources, and we have the Finance Minister declaring that he was in favor of it, and whether the Prime Minister liked it or not, he was obliged to support the view of the Finance Minister, notwithstanding that only a week ago he had declared against it. The Government appear to have a Mikado and Tycoon; which is the Mikado and which is Tycoon, I cannot tell. But we do know that almost every hon. gentleman behind the Premier who has spoken, has agreed with him against reciprocity either in manufactured goods or in the natural resources of the country. Scarcely an hon. gentleman opposite has spoken who did not declare that if we had reciprocity with the United States in the natural products of the soil it would ruin the farmers, yet almost every one of them says that he is willing to support a policy for reciprocity in the natural resources, although the whole tenor of their speeches went to show that it would ruin the farmers. They are willing to ruin the farmers by reciprocity in natural resources, but, oh, do not touch the poor manufacturers! The Secretary of State declared that he was in favor of reciprocity in the natural resources, but he said he was in favor of protection to the manufacturers. Now, I find it is admitted on all hands that both in the United States and here there is no hope of a reciprocity treaty in the natural resources of the country. That has been stated over and over again by leading business men in the United States and Canada, and even by the Premier himself. I will read what the First Minister said on that point in 1884, when he spoke to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies):

"I believe that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural productions of the two countries. The Americans said—whether truly or not, I do not know—that it was a nominal reciprocity, but all the advantages were on the side of Canada. We had no market of sufficient importance to offer to them for their productions of grains, and cereals and fisheries, we, on the other hand, had to gain everything by their market being opened for the articles specified in the Treaty. That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States will come, at sometime or other, to a conclusion that they will be willing to enter upon a Reciprocity Treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as our natural productions, we will never have a treaty."

Here is the hon. Premier himself saying that he is willing to have a treaty with the United States in the natural products of the country, and we have this follower behind him saying that they are willing to have a treaty with the United States in the natural products, but they are not willing to have an unrestricted reciprocity in manufactures as well as in natural products; whilst the Prime Minister said only three or four years ago that it was impossible to get a reciprocity treaty of any kind unless it included both classes of articles. Now, why will hon. gentlemen stand up here to-day and tell the people, deceive the people by telling them, that we are in favor of a reciprocity treaty in

Mr. KIRK,

the natural products, and lead the people to believe that we could get it, while they know as well as they are sitting in their seats, that we cannot get it unless we go the whole figure? Hon. gentlemen say that it is useless to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States in articles which they export as well as we, and in articles which they grow as well as we. They say, if you have reciprocity with the United States in cereals, horses and sheep, the United States export these as well as we, therefore it will be an injury to us if we open our markets to them and they open their markets to us. They say that we must protect ourselves against the Americans. In order to be able to compete with them in the markets of the world. Why, Sir, we compete with them successfully now in all the markets of the world. All we want is that the barriers be broken down between the United States and Canada, so that we may have the privilege of trading with them on equal terms in their market. We then will have an additional market of 60,000,000, whilst they will only have an additional market of 5,000,000. It appears to me that the advantages are very much on our side, and if we can but get it, it would be a blessing for us. Well, Sir, Nova Scotia, previous to the reciprocity treaty of 1854, exported to the United States \$1,529,721 worth of goods, and we imported in 1865, the last whole year of the treaty, \$3,691,797 worth of goods, or more than 200 per cent. of an increase. Now, in 1887, twenty-two years afterwards, we exported to the United States only \$1,733,990 a decrease of \$857,798. We exported to the United States last year \$857,798 worth less of goods than we did twenty-two years ago. Why was this? Was it because we had not the goods to export? That could not be the reason. The reason was we had to find other markets. Last year Nova Scotia exported to the United States \$304,096 more goods than to Great Britain's free market, notwithstanding the fact that we had to pay an enormously high tariff in the United States. The total exports of the Dominion to the United States was of the value of \$77,964,020, of which \$22,275,033 went to the United States, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say the United States is no market for the Dominion. If the barriers were thrown down between the United States and Canada, I venture to say that the exports of this country would double in a very short time. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the United States is not our best market for fish. I find that we exported of fish last year to the United States \$2,717,519 worth. Every one who knows anything about the fisheries is aware that the United States is our only market for fat mackerel. When we send mackerel there they meet a duty of \$2 per barrel; when we send herring there, and it is our best market for fat herrings, they meet a duty of \$1 per barrel, and codfish meets a duty of 50 cents per 100 pounds. It has been said that the people of this country are leaving for the United States. The fishermen can scarcely do anything else. They leave for the United States because they can get better pay on United States' vessels than they can on Nova Scotian vessels, because the custom is that the captain and crew of fishing vessels work on shares and seldom on wages. They receive a certain portion, I believe one half of the whole catch, the owner of the vessel receiving the other half. The fishermen have an advantage in hiring with American outfitters, taking shares on American vessels, because they get clear of the duty levied on the fish, \$2 a barrel on mackerel, \$1 a barrel on herring, 50 cents per 100 pounds on codfish. They have that advantage over men who hire with outfitters of Nova Scotian or Canadian vessels. Take two vessels fishing together, one American and the other Nova Scotian, New Brunswick or Canadian. Each vessel catches 1,000 barrels of mackerel, which is taken to the United States, the only market. The crew of the American vessel

receives one-half of the catch, 500 barrels. These are sold in the market at \$10 each. They have to pay no duty, and \$5,000 falls to the share of the captain and the crew. The Nova Scotian crew have the same number of barrels, which are sold also for \$10 per barrel; but they have to pay to the United States \$2 per barrel duty, and they thus lose \$1,000 on the transaction, they receiving \$4,000 for their fish instead of \$5,000 obtained by the crew of the American vessel. Will anyone tell me that the Nova Scotian fishermen are not placed at a disadvantage under that state of affairs? It is very obvious that the men will seek employment on American vessels, and that the Nova Scotian vessels will have great difficulty in obtaining crews. Next take the case of codfish. The duty on dried and green codfish is the same, 50 cents per 100 pounds. That practically shuts green codfish out of the American market, it is actually a prohibitive duty, and therefore the Nova Scotian fishermen must send all their green codfish to other markets. The effect of that is to overstock the other markets and reduce the price of their fish. For these reasons our fishermen are exceedingly anxious that the duty should be removed from fish. I heard the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) state that the Americans paid the duty on fish and not our fishermen. I maintain that such is not the case. I find in discussing the question as to who pays the duty, the Premier in 1878 placed himself on record with respect to this matter. Here is what he stated in regard to who pays the duty on barley, and I say that if the principle is true that the Canadian barley raiser pays the duty, I hold that the Canadian fisherman also pays the duty, in fact the fishermen know they do pay the duty. Here is what the First Minister said in regard to the duty on barley:

"I find that the farmers of Western Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going into the United States. It is said the consumers paid the duty and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement, but when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no answer. I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canada side of the line and 100 acres of land on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets \$1 a bushel for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85 cents per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. duty for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it be said in this case that the consumer pays the duty. It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers."

Can the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) contradict those figures?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if Canadian barley is not quoted 15 cents higher than American barley in the city of New York?

Mr. KIRK. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say it is, in any quotation you wish to refer to.

Mr. KIRK. I will leave the hon. gentleman for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to settle that question with his leader. Now, Sir, we are told that the West Indies was our market for fish and that the United States was not our market. The hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman) told us this, and the Government pretend to make us believe that they are doing all they can to open up markets in the West Indies and other places. Notwithstanding the fact that this duty stands against us in the United States the exportation of fish from Nova Scotia to the United States is increasing while the export to the West Indies is decreasing. Notwithstanding the boast of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he is doing such great things by scientific means to open up markets in the West Indies for the products of this country I find that in 1878 the export of fish to the United States was \$1,073,449, while last year it

was \$1,358,024, or an increase in 1887 over 1878 of \$284,575 worth. We exported to the British and Foreign West Indies in 1878 \$2,411,044, worth, while last year we only exported \$1,494,983 worth a decrease of \$916,061, or nearly 40 per cent. Then we have a large lumbering interest in Nova Scotia as well as in other parts of the Dominion, and we find that the United States is a good market for our lumber, but it has to meet with the very heavy duty there and consequently it is impossible for Nova Scotia at least, to send much of her lumber to the United States. I find that out of a total export of \$20,484,746 worth of lumber we sent \$9,353,506 worth, or nearly one-half of the total lumber export to the United States. We are not a very great agricultural Province in Nova Scotia but we have a surplus of agricultural produce to export from the country and do we send it to Ontario or Quebec? Not a bit of it. The hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is a farmer and I would like to know if he sends the products of his farm to Ontario or Quebec? I venture to say he never sent \$100 worth, unless some hon. gentlemen in Canada bought some of his thoroughbred stock.

Gen. LAURIE. I send it to Newfoundland.

Mr. KIRK. Yes, he sends them to Newfoundland, but the Government here promised to give us an interprovincial trade, they promised that under the National Policy we would be able to send goods to Upper Canada as well as Ontario and Quebec sending goods down to us. We know the trade is all one way. We have heard a good deal about jug-handled free trade, but this is a jug-handled trade within the Dominion. We are obliged to buy goods at a dear rate and pay for them without sending anything to Ontario in return. Ontario imports about \$600 worth of fish annually and according to Mr. Fairweather, of St. John, Ontario and Quebec take about \$53,000 worth of fish from Nova Scotia.

Mr. HESSON. We take 650,000 tons of coal.

Mr. KIRK. I am talking of fish. I say that although Nova Scotia exports about \$4,000,000 worth annually of fish, Ontario and Quebec only take about \$53,000 or at most \$60,000 worth. Of the \$600,000 worth of fish imported to Ontario and Quebec the greater portion of it comes from the United States and not from Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said the other day that he had got an order from some firm in Prince Edward Island for \$20,000 worth of buggy tops, and he thought the people were well off down there if they could afford that. He admitted that if there was not a higher tariff the people of Prince Edward Island would have gone to the United States. Why should they go to the United States if you could sell them in Canada as cheaply? They would not come here unless the high tariff forced them to come. The fact of the matter is the people of Nova Scotia are ground down between the upper and the nether millstone. We have a high tariff when we send our goods to the United States, and we meet a high tariff when we bring the goods back. The tariff is so high that we cannot afford to bring the goods back, but we have to bring the cash back in our pockets, and send it to Ontario to pay for those \$20,000 worth of buggy tops and other goods which we are forced by this high tariff to take from Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is about as true as you generally put anything. I did not say I had got an order; I said a firm in Gananoque had got an order, and I said it was for top buggies.

Mr. KIRK. I just transposed the words.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what you generally do.

Mr. KIRK. Instead of saying top buggies I said buggy tops, and I will say that it was a firm in Gananoque, of which I believe the hon. gentleman is president.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he is not. He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. KIRK. I have been informed with regard to that that there was no order at all, but was simply a consignment sent down to an agent at Prince Edward Island of that amount of goods to be sold on commission.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can tell the hon. gentleman that that statement is not true.

Mr. KIRK. I did not say it is true. I said I was told that it was. Well that is the thing we complain of that we are forced by this high tariff to come 1,500 miles to get our goods when we ought to get them by stepping across the street and when you take nothing from us in return except our cash. Now, Sir, I find that the United States is a good market for our agricultural products. Canada exported to the United States last year, \$2,214,338 worth of horses and to Great Britain only \$38,230 worth, notwithstanding the fact that those we sent to the United States had to pay a duty of 20 per cent, while those we sent to England were admitted free. We imported from the United States only \$100,115 worth of horses. Of horned cattle we sent to the United States last year 54,765 head, and imported only 1,192 head. Of sheep we exported to the United States 363,046 head, and imported, exclusive of British Columbia, only 9,182 head. Of eggs we exported to the United States last year \$1,121,361 worth, and if there had been a duty on eggs, I venture to say we would not have exported that many. Now, the only industry in the Province of Nova Scotia which the National Policy has in the slightest degree benefited is the mining industry. Every other industry in the Province has been injuriously affected by that policy. I will admit at once that the duty on coal has benefited the coal industry there to some extent, but not to the extent claimed by the supporters of that policy. I say that this National Policy is simply making the people of Nova Scotia hewers of wood and drawers of water for the upper Provinces, nothing more and nothing less. When this policy of high protection was being advocated in this House, its advocates declared that its object was to force the United States to take off their duty, and it was declared on the floor of this House that if the United States would reciprocate in coal the eastern cities of the United States would be supplied by the coal mines of Nova Scotia, whilst Toronto and the other cities of Western Canada would be supplied by the United States. We were promised that if 50 cents a ton were placed on coal, we should get the markets of Quebec and Ontario for Nova Scotia coal. Here is what the Finance Minister said with regard to that matter:

"He believed that the effect of his policy would be to give free coal to both the United States and Canada at a very early date. The whole object of the imposition of the duty on the part of the United States would fall to the ground the moment Canada adopted a policy similar to theirs. Then the natural result would follow that the coal mines of Nova Scotia would supply the Atlantic States, and the coal mines of the United States would supply coals to Toronto and the western portions of Canada."

A duty of 50 cents a ton was placed on bituminous and anthracite coal; but hon. gentlemen have found that their policy has failed to accomplish what they pretended it would accomplish so far as coal was concerned—that it has not given the markets of Ontario to the Maritime Provinces; and what did they do? They took the duty off anthracite coal. It is true more coal has been sent from Nova Scotia to Quebec than formerly, but no coal is sent from Nova Scotia to Ontario at all. Ontario gets its coal from the United States, while at the same time we have not secured any of the markets of the United States for our coal. As early as 1865, under the Reciprocity Treaty, we exported

Mr. KIRK.

to the United States 404,252 tons. Last year we exported only 73,892 tons. I am taking the calendar year in both cases; the last fiscal year gives 81,574 tons. The increased sales of coal in Nova Scotia, and they have largely increased, can be accounted for very largely without reference to the National Policy at all. We know perfectly well that about the time the National Policy was adopted the Intercolonial Railway was completed. It was only opened up in 1876, and at that time the Intercolonial Railway and all the other railroads in the eastern parts of the Dominion burned wood. Now they all burn coal. Then the villages and towns which were opened up by these railroads formerly burned wood, but to-day they burn coal. Many farmers now also burn coal who formerly burned nothing but wood. A large quantity of coal is also sold to steamers as bunker coal. I find that Ontario and Quebec imported last year 2,172,561 tons of coal, of which 1,207,870 were bituminous. In 1878, Ontario and Quebec imported 852,466 tons, and last year they imported 2,172,561. Why has not the National Policy operated as the Government claimed it would? Why has it not displaced this coal? We find that the coal market in Ontario and Quebec has increased in a much larger ratio than the sales of coal have increased in Nova Scotia; and the Government, recognising the fact that the National Policy had failed in its object, took the duty off anthracite coal. I now come to another important industry, the shipbuilding industry. There was a time when the Province of Nova Scotia boasted of having more ships per man than any other country in the world of the same population. It was our boast that the sails of her ships whitened every ocean, and we were told in 1874 by the Finance Minister, who was then leader of the Opposition, that a protective policy would have the effect of destroying the shipbuilding interests of the Maritime Provinces. He declared that a protective policy had swept the American flag from the seas. Well, it has had that effect, the very effect he predicted it would have, since it has been introduced in to this country. Here is what the Finance Minister said with regard to a protective duty and its effects upon the shipbuilding interests of the United States. He said:

"Let the hon. the Minister look at the neighboring republic, and he will find that the policy of that country has swept their flag off the seas, and given to others, the trade of the world. A protective policy would close down the shipyards in the Maritime Provinces."

Well, we had a thousand shipyards in the Maritime Provinces which have been closed up since the introduction of the National Policy. In 1865, Nova Scotia built 31,038 tons of shipping; in 1877, just previous to the adoption of the National Policy, Nova Scotia built 72,101 tons of shipping, and that industry began then to decline.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Iron ships.

Mr. KIRK. I know hon. gentlemen will say that the National Policy had nothing to do with the decline of shipbuilding, but that it is to be attributed altogether to iron ships. I admit the latter have had something to do with it, but not all. Were there no iron ships previous to 1874 and 1877? It is only nine years since the National Policy was introduced, and the effect of the change was to reduce the shipbuilding trade from 72,101 to 14,266 tons last year, or a decrease of 57,755 tons.

An hon. MEMBER. Prove it.

Mr. KIRK. Let the hon. gentleman look at the report. If the National Policy has had nothing to do with it, ask the Finance Minister what is the cause of the decline? I am not called upon to prove that fact. We have heard a great deal about the number of men who have obtained employment in the factories since the introduction of the National Policy, but what does this amount to in comparison with the number of men who have been thrown out of employment by the destruction of the shipbuilding industry

in this country. Last year we built 57,735 tons of shipping less than in 1877, and if you take the nominal value of that shipping what will it amount to? Say the value is about \$40 per ton, we find more men thrown out of employment in this one industry than are engaged in the manufactures of the whole Dominion altogether. How many men are employed in the manufactures of Canada? I have taken the figures from the statistics prepared by the statistician, and I find he gives the number of operatives at 5,848. Well, I will venture to say it would take more than 10,000 men to build 57,000 tons of shipping. Therefore I maintain that whilst the Government have perhaps increased the member of operatives in the manufactures by some 2,000 or 3,000, they have thrown out of employment by the destruction of this one industry more than three times that number. I have no desire to detain the House any longer at this late hour. Had I the opportunity of speaking earlier I would possibly have touched upon other features of this question, but I shall not do so just now. I have only to say that I heartily coincide in the resolution moved by my hon. friend for South Oxford and that I do not believe in the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What is the resolution? That amendment reads as follows:

"That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since receive in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people."

It is as clear as anything can be that that resolution means that we are to have no reciprocity at all, not even in the natural resources of the country. Do we not find that gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that this National Policy has fostered not only the manufacturing industries but the agricultural industries of the country? We find hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia declaring that the National Policy has fostered the mining interests of the country; they claim that it has fostered the whole of the interests of the country, and, therefore, this resolution declares that we are to adhere to that policy which fosters all the interests of the country; and I think it may be assumed that it is only when the Government cannot resist the pressure from the United States that we may ever expect to have any reciprocity on any other article that we have not reciprocity on now. For that reason, I am entirely opposed to the amendment of the Minister of Marine, and I shall, with great pleasure, vote, not only for the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but also for the amendment to the amendment which has been moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), because I believe that if anything can be done for the shipbuilding interest, in order to restore it to something like the position it was in before the National Policy was introduced, it will be by a reciprocal coasting trade with the United States and by our having a right to reciprocally register our vessels.

Mr. PLATT—

"The breath of night's destructive to the hue of every flower that blows,
Go to the field and ask the humble daisy why it sleeps
Ere the pale moon her oriental veil puts off.
Think why, nor let the forest flower which nature boasts
Be exposed to night's unkindly damp.
Well may it droop and all its freshness lose
Compelled to taste the rank and poisonous air
Of midnight theatre and morning ball."

I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

28-1888-7

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this is the maiden speech of the hon. gentleman since he went to his constituents, I think the courtesy of the House requires that a member addressing it for the first time after his election should have a fair show.

Mr. PLATT. I have no objection to proceeding with the few remarks which I intend to make. It was out of compassion for the House and for yourself, Mr. Speaker, that I moved the adjournment. I do not think it wise or consistent with the deliberations of this assembly that we should be compelled to sit to this early hour in the morning, when I am certain that this debate would close at as early an hour this afternoon if we were to adjourn as if we went on. I am certain that most of the members assembled here now will agree with me that, at the close of every long continued debate, our proceedings are not conducted with that amount of decorum, with that amount of solemnity, I may say that with that amount of dignity that would befit an assembly of this kind. We understand the reason why this course is adopted, but I ask hon. members to recollect that, behind and beyond us there is an audience that is listening to the debates of this assemblage, an audience that is weighing the remarks which we make here, and which is perhaps more deeply interested in the result of this discussion than we may seem to be ourselves; and I think that, notwithstanding the pressure which is brought to bear upon us to continue this discussion even at this hour of the morning, it should be continued with that degree of decorum and that respect for the people whom we represent and whose interests we are attempting to subserve here on this occasion which—

Mr. LAURIER. If my hon. friend will excuse me, I would suggest to the First Minister that at this hour of the morning we might adjourn, and might possibly come to some understanding to close the debate this afternoon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course it is getting very late, or rather very early, and, if we can come to a positive understanding that the vote will be taken at the next sitting to-day, we might adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. There are a good many members on this side of the House who would be anxious to speak, but we think that this debate has been already sufficiently protracted, and we are ready to come to a vote at the next sitting of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think under that understanding we may adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.30 a.m. (Friday).

Mackenzie's time at all comparable in importance to those of Garrett's boot manufactory, Silver's boot manufactory, the Wilson and the Gardner sewing machine factories, the Canada Clock factory, the Olmstead foundry and the Burn-Robinson manufactory, all of which have taken place under the much-vaunted National Policy and the beneficent régime of Sir John Macdonald whom you worship? Dare you deny, Mr. Brown, that the mercantile failures, both in the wholesale and retail lines, in your own city, have been more numerous and disastrous under the Tilley tariff than under the Cartwright tariff? Are there not more bankrupt stocks now upon the market than at any time when Mr. Mackenzie was in office? Are not many of your fellow-citizens, Mr. Brown, who were rich and independent in Mackenzie's time, now chronically hard up, owing to unremunerative investments in National Policy factories and North-West land speculations fostered by the policy of your dear John A.?

"Knowing as much as you know, Mr. Brown, about the woes and calamities which the protective tariff and Tory misrule in general have brought upon your constituents, it requires a deal of assurance for you to stand up in Parliament and repeat that old speech."

I fancy that you will agree with me, Sir, that that quotation is perfectly in order, because it substantiates the line of argument which I have been pursuing all through, namely, that the National Policy has not operated to the benefit of the workingmen of this country or of the merchants of this country, or of any class of the community, except a few manufacturers who still believe that they are unable to compete in the foreign markets of the world with those who are opposed to them in the same lines of business. Should the claims of 657,287 farmers for fairplay be ignored for the benefit of 2,390 manufacturers. It is admitted on all hands; it is admitted by the First Minister and Finance Minister, and by the Secretary of State, who declared yesterday that it was almost a sin on the parts of the Liberals to have taken up this policy. The policy, he said, would be popular all over the Dominion. Yes, the policy is one which the people are going to adopt, and the Government know right well that should this policy be taken up by the Reform party, it will carry them to victory at the next elections. It must be evident to every reasonable mind that where the interests of the great mass of the people are concerned, the great mass of the people would be guilty of great folly if they did not adopt a system with regard to their trade relations with the United States which would be of practical benefit to them. I would like to dwell longer on the case of the farmers, because I represent the farmers almost exclusively, but I will just say this, that it is admitted on all hands unrestricted reciprocity would be a great boon. We know that when we had reciprocity from 1854 to 1866, our trade increased from \$33,000,000 to \$34,000,000 in those years. Take the case of barley alone. Last year we exported 9,447,717 bushels, valued at \$5,245,000; and the farmers of Canada, according to the contention of the First Minister, lost no less than \$943,000 of hard earned money which was extracted out of their pockets by virtue of the tariff imposed on our barley by the United States. This duty we have reason will be removed if we will approach the United States Government in the spirit which ought to actuate us in dealing with this great question. Then we exported to the States last year 18,225 horses, which were valued at \$2,214,338, and the paid duty on those horses amounted to \$142,000. I will not quote any further items, but in those two items the farmers of Canada lost \$1,385,000 and we have the word of the First Minister of the Crown that this statement is true. With regard to the manufacturers, I will not admit that all the manufacturers are in favor of the continuance of the National Policy. I believe that the National Policy has not been conducive to the best interests of many of the manufacturers of this country, because it must be remembered that the raw material of one manufacturer is not the raw material of another manufacturer, and the manufacturers have been weighted down to an enormous extent by the protective tariff on the raw material. I might give you one instance to substantiate this statement. Last year the Finance Minister brought down his Budget and increased the iron duties to an enormous extent, and we

have the evidence which was given before the Combines Committee of this House by Mr. Massey, one of the largest agricultural implement manufacturers in Canada, that the increased iron duties imposed by this Government on his business last year alone amounted to \$30,000. That is to say, he had to pay \$30,000 more on the iron which entered into the manufacture of his reaping and mowing machines than he had in previous years. Who pays for this? There can be no doubt at all that the consumer, that the farmer pays this addition to the burdens which are borne by Mr. Massey.

Mr. GUILLET. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Massey stated before the Committee that he paid \$30,000 more duty?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. So I understand. I was not present at the Committee, but I was informed by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who is a member of that Committee, that that was the statement made by Mr. Massey before the Committee. I give my authority, and I think it is a good authority. I do not like to trespass on the time of the House, but I desire to make a statement in regard to the assertion which has been made that, in former times, under a revenue tariff, this country was made a slaughter market for the manufactures of the United States. The facts do not bear that statement out. The results which have been developed under the benign influence of this great panacea that was offered to the country in 1878, which was to cure all the ills of Canada and was to make every man rich within its bounds, show that the Americans still continue to slaughter their goods in the Canadian market, and that they have increased the slaughtering process. Canada has not been kept for the Canadians, as was promised by the First Minister and his supporters in 1878. Canada has, to a large extent, been kept for the people of the United States. I have here a statement of the value of the imports and the duty paid upon them, coming from the United States in 1877 and in 1887, and it is as follows:—

| Articles. | 1877. | | 1887. | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Value. | Duty. | Value. | Duty. |
| Cigars and cigarettes..... | \$126,595 | \$ 39,056 | \$ 54,859 | \$ 48,416 |
| Carriages | 91,770 | 16,060 | 166,953 | 57,285 |
| Brooms and brushes..... | 22,706 | 3,973 | 42,401 | 10,603 |
| Baking powder and biscuit. | 35,841 | 6,272 | 121,551 | 25,642 |
| Blacking | 30,581 | 5,352 | 41,928 | 10,771 |
| China ware and furniture... | 276,383 | 48,373 | 185,854 | 65,093 |
| Candles of all kinds | 14,474 | 2,445 | 14,565 | 3,820 |
| China and earthenware | 49,594 | 8,749 | 57,894 | 17,442 |
| Clocks and parts..... | 49,708 | 8,699 | 112,880 | 39,110 |
| Carpets | 47,212 | 8,262 | 13,222 | 6,731 |
| Cordage, rope and twine... | 91,478 | 10,769 | 103,805 | 22,991 |
| Combs, &c. | 19,215 | 3,359 | 24,483 | 6,155 |
| Glass and glassware..... | 322,314 | 56,442 | 486,758 | 164,670 |
| Brass and manufactures of. | 99,347 | 16,176 | 301,488 | 81,472 |
| Metals and manufactures of. | 67,449 | 8,954 | 238,232 | 61,431 |
| Agricultural implements... | 177,526 | 30,975 | 115,826 | 41,826 |
| Jewellery | 129,183 | 26,610 | 368,394 | 73,689 |
| Gold, silver and plated ware | 162,324 | 28,410 | 139,738 | 42,150 |
| Pianos, organs, melodeons, &c. | 438,113 | 76,675 | 308,429 | 102,499 |
| Paper and manufactures of. | 266,073 | 43,333 | 713,389 | 190,635 |
| Rubber and manufactures of..... | 165,392 | 28,947 | 563,323 | 156,923 |
| Ink of all kinds..... | 26,040 | 919 | 49,090 | 10,464 |
| Leather and manufactures of..... | 720,466 | 119,409 | 886,647 | 174,540 |
| Oil, coal, kerosine, naphtha, petroleum and products of petroleum | 205,448 | 94,784 | 651,903 | 381,661 |

I may remark, by-the-by, that, in the city of Hamilton, which is represented by the hon. gentleman to whom I re-

ferred before, after the National Policy was started, they got up a joint stock company to build clocks. They thought, by the extraordinary protection afforded them against the United States, they would be able to build up a first-class paying establishment. What was the history of that establishment? From the day it was commenced, although the parties to it put in all the capital which was necessary to carry it to a successful issue, notwithstanding that they had engaged the best skilled artisans that could be obtained on the American continent, that factory went from bad to worse year after year, until about a year ago it became entirely bankrupt, and I believe the men who invested their money in that enterprise lost every cent that went to make up the capital stock. That is an evidence of the way in which the National Policy has fostered our industry. In regard to this last item of oil, I would advise the First Minister to make a bargain with the manufacturers of petroleum to furnish enough lubricating oil to lubricate up his National Policy, and make it more useful to the people of this country than it has been during the last ten years. Now, it is claimed that these infant manufacturers are not able to stand alone, that they ought to be spoon-fed at the expense of the great mass of the people of this country. I do not think that it is a creditable position, as has already been remarked, for any of these manufacturers to take, and I am glad to say that there are scores and hundreds of manufacturers, possessed of sufficient enterprise, and capital, and energy, and perseverance, and ability to compete in the fair markets of the world with their opponents, men of business, who are not afraid to enter into competition with their opponents. The National Policy is not conducive to the carrying on of trade with foreign countries, because we know that the United States, under their protective tariff, have ruined the shipping of that country, and have destroyed their intercourse with other nations. But even against that assumption that high protective duties are not conducive to trade with other countries, we find that there is one Canadian manufacturer who is opening a market for himself in foreign countries. I will read an extract from the *Brantford Expositor* of 17th March, in regard to a cotton mill that has been established there for some years:

"For over four years the Craven cotton mill, like every other cotton mill in Canada, has not run near its full capacity——"

There is the same old story again;

—"on account of the producing having got so far ahead of the consuming power of the country. This has been a great loss to stockholders and work people. We are glad to say that the future prospects of the cotton industry are much brighter, owing to the opening out of new markets which will take all the surplus production of the mills in Canada. Mr. Slater having sold through a New York house 500 bales of cotton sheetings to be shipped direct from Brantford to Shanghai, China, the Craven Mill will start full blast on Monday next, as they have to commence delivery of these goods in April. The Hochelaga mills, Montreal, and Kingston cotton mills have also taken large orders for the same market."

Now, this shows that the Canadian manufacturer can compete, dares to compete, with his opponents in the markets of the world. This shows that even in New York, the commercial metropolis of the United States, a business man was found who was desirous of purchasing Canadian cottons in preference to Yankee made goods. He gave the preference to Canadian cotton, because, I suppose, it was a better quality of goods, and because it could be manufactured at less cost than he could get it at home; and this is a fair sample of what the manufacturers of this country could do if they would stand up like men, like British men, who are prepared to say that they will face the world in fair competition, and ask no favor in a fair field. Now, Sir, I contend that protection has not even benefited the manufacturers. It has created a desire to become rich, as the leader of the Government said he was going to make the people rich in 1878; he was going to make every man in the country rich. I tell you, Sir, that if there is one man in

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

the Dominion of Canada who is an adept at humbugging the people it is the talented leader of the Government at the present time. He knows how to do it. He has set a good example to the politicians of this country; he has shown them how to manipulate the voters of this country for his own interest. He told them that he was going to make them all rich, and a desire to make themselves rich caused the people of this country to make over-investments in every line of manufactures, and it brought about the natural result of combinations, and we find that almost every manufacturing industry in this country is a party to a combine of one kind or another, to keep up the prices and restrict production; and if they restrict production, then to reduce the value of the labor, of the employes in their manufactories, to make the workman poor at the expense of the rich. I contend, Sir, that I have proven beyond a doubt that the National Policy has not been a benefit to the people of this country. Then, as to the general principle of the protection. There was an admirable exposition given of the principles of protection by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, at Fremont Temple, Boston, the other day. I shall trespass on the good nature of the House so far as to read a short extract from it, as in it is embodied the true character of protection, and shows to the people the absurdity of any action attempting to build up the prosperity of a nation by means of a protective tariff. Mr. Wheeler said:

"The monstrous absurdity of the protective system is simply this: That it really asserts that scarcity is better than abundance; that it is an injury to you to trade with other countries; that the benefits which flow from the free exchange of merchandise with Pennsylvania and Illinois would not flow from the exchange of commodities with England and with France. Who can tell me why it is not as good for a man who earns his living in Massachusetts to be able to buy English goods or French goods, if he likes, and to be able in return to sell American goods to the people of France or England if he likes? If we trade with them it is because they have goods that we want and we have goods that they want, and thus the trade is a benefit to us both. The protectionists themselves admit that trade with foreign countries is a benefit to America. For they deplore the decay of American shipping, and are proposing to give a bounty to American ships for carrying the products of other countries to this country, and for taking ours back in return. What monstrous inconsistency! They enact a high tariff, far in excess of the needs of revenue, not for the purpose of taxation, but for the purpose of excluding the goods of other countries; and then, having crippled commerce with one hand, they propose to nurse it with the other."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good exemplification of the result of the operation of protection. I might just say here, in passing, that if it is not good for us to trade with the Americans and to deal with our neighbors, what sense is there in the Government appointing a Commissioner, with a view to establishing trade with the West Indies and the Argentine Republic? I think it may not be out of place to say that the gentleman entrusted with this mission is a hanger-on of the Government; he wanted something, and he has got it. I understand he has gone down to the Argentine Republic on a pleasure trip. I fancy his labors there will be just as productive to the people of this country as the results of similar missions in former times. And the loyalty cry comes in here. I am afraid to touch it, for I generally get out of order when I speak of loyalty. They say it is not loyal to trade with the United States and have a tariff against Great Britain. Yet these same men have had a higher tariff against Great Britain, at least they have levied a larger amount of duties on the goods coming in from Great Britain than on the goods coming in from the United States under the present tariff. Here are the figures:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total imports from Great Britain in 1887... | \$44,962,233 |
| Duty collected on same..... | 9,318,920 |
| Average rate of duty | 20·7 |
| Total imports from the United States in 1887 | \$45,107,036 |
| Duty collected on same..... | 7,299,591 |
| Average rate of duty..... | 16·3 |

They do not wish to discriminate against their manufactures—it would be disloyal for the people of this country

to favor our neighbors across the line; and yet, while they have the hardihood to make such a statement, they have been discriminating against Great Britain all the time by this tariff which injures the commercial and the well-being of this country. It is claimed that a high protective tariff is in favor of the workingman, and that he does not pay the taxes. I desire to show by an extract from the blue books that the large proportion of taxes levied in this country is paid by the workingman. I find that on baking powder imported last year there was a duty paid of \$20,628. A poor man has to use baking powder, he cannot have salt-raised bread all the time, and he must have something to puff up his pastry just as much as the bloated bondholder to whom the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) referred, or even a manufacturer. On blacking and shoemakers' ink, \$13,822. A workingman must have his shoes blacked as well as the aristocrat. Then there are Bibles and prayer books, \$132,403. Hon. gentlemen opposite have even to tax Bibles and prayer books, which are intended to make the people of this country religious. Then there is laundry blue, \$8,683. A poor man cannot even have a starched shirt without paying an amount into the treasury. Boot and stay laces, &c., \$40,524. Why, the ladies cannot even have their stays laced without paying duty. Breadstuffs, \$4,450. Carpets, \$322,681. I suppose a workingman is allowed to have a carpet in his best room, but he has to contribute to the revenue for that article. Clocks and springs, \$46,814. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that workingmen have more need of clocks than rich people. A workingman has to rise at a certain hour in the morning, and where I live when the hands go down to the cotton factory—when it is at work and when it is running full time—they go down early in the morning and they are obliged to have alarm clocks. Cottons, \$1,389,369. Coal and coke, \$1,178,964. Collars, cuffs and shirt fronts, \$37,574. I suppose the shirt fronts are used by workingmen—gentlemen have full shirts. Coffee, \$13,163. Drugs, dyes and medicines, \$330,365. Why, a workingman cannot even get sick without having to pay duty. Earthenware and china, \$226,685. Fish, \$86,098. Fruit and nuts, \$156,079. Gloves and mits of all kinds, \$124,326. Hat boxes and bonnets, \$322,908. Leather and manufactures of, exclusive of gloves and mits, \$345,849. Coal oil and kerosene products, \$343,944. Paper and manufactures, \$315,019. Plants and trees, \$18,882. By the way the Government have taken the duties off trees, under pressure. Butter, cheese, lard and meats, \$267,852. I thought they were going to keep our markets for Canadian produce. Salt, \$12,655. Seeds and roots, \$60,052. That is taken off too. Soap, \$36,414. Why, a workingman cannot even wash his face and keep himself clean without paying an enormous duty to keep up the extravagance of the Government. Spices, \$37,000. Sugar, \$3,167,528. That is to keep up these bloated monopolists—I make this as a quotation, and I do not think I am out of order—who in a few years can make sufficient fortune to go to the old country and buy a castle and palatial residence and immense grounds, and live there at the expense of the people of this country, live there out of the riches they have heaped up for themselves here and which they have dragged out of the pockets of the hard-working tax-payers of Canada. Molasses, \$92,516. Workingmen cannot even have molasses without paying an enormous duty. I find also that workingmen cannot smoke the pipe of peace with those manufacturers for whom he slaves day in and day out, in order to enrich them, without paying an enormous duty. No less than \$305,515 duty was paid on tobacco. And then we have vegetables, \$46,178. We thought vegetables were to be grown in the country. We have wood and its manufactures, \$314,098; watches, \$99,439, and woollen manufactures, \$2,373,240. That shows who pays the taxes. It is all nonsense for hon. gentlemen on the

other side to get up and tell the workmen, the farmers, the mechanics and the operatives of this country that they do not pay the taxes. They do pay the taxes, and they are bled every day of their lives, in order to uphold this Government and in order to uphold the manufacturers in this country. Now, I do not wish to talk on the loyalty question, as I said before. You know that Artemus Ward once said "that a man must be a mighty limited cuss if he couldn't build himself up without pulling his neighbor down." Now I do not apply that to the gentlemen on the other side, but I say there are gentlemen on that side who are mighty limited, and I think that is enough for me to say. I would just conclude by saying, Sir, that I have great pleasure in voting for this resolution, and it affords me great pleasure to say that I am in favor of the adoption by this House and by the people of the country of the resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am also in favor of the amendment which is proposed to be added thereto in favor of the encouragement of the coasting trade of the Canadian people. I think, Sir, it would be a grand thing for this Canada of ours, a country which every Canadian has a right to be proud of, a country which we cannot boast too much of with regard to its extent, its resources, its capacity and its wealth. I say, Sir, as Canadians we have a right to be proud of our country. I am proud of our country, but I am not proud of the gentlemen who govern the country, and I hope to live to see the day when we shall have, directing the affairs of this country, men who will conserve the interest of the people more closely than the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have conserved their interests since they introduced the National Policy. I have great pleasure in saying that I vote for this resolution, because I think that it is in the interests of the great mass of the people of this country. I wish to oppose every legislation that is in favor of a special class. Class legislation ought to be a thing of the past, and it ought to be the duty of this Government as well as of the Government of every free and enlightened country on the face of the globe, to legislate in the interests of the great mass of the people and not to legislate for 2,390 manufacturers at the expense of the millions of people in this country who are taxed for their benefit. I therefore say, Sir, that I have great pleasure in voting for the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, you will be glad to know, and the House will be pleased to learn, that I do not intend to occupy your time at any considerable length. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down must, I think, have imagined that he was addressing a meeting in his own constituency from some public platform where he desired to make an impression against the Government of the day, and in support of the party with which he is connected. That hon. gentleman, upon the present occasion, has endeavored to show, as hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House have during the nine years since the present Administration came into power, have endeavored to show the reasons for the support given by the people of this country to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government on this side of the House. He has endeavored, as they have endeavored, both in this House and out of it, to try and account for the support given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and against those on the other side of the House. They have tried to explain this by every reason except the true one. They endeavored to account for it as this hon. gentleman did to-night, upon the ground that the leader of the Government had corrupted the people, upon the ground that the Government of the country was corrupt, and upon every possible ground except the true one, which is that the people of this country are in favor of the Conservative

party and against the Liberal party in Canada. Why, Sir, are they in favor of the Conservative party and opposed to the Liberal party in Canada? Is it because that the Liberal party during the time they were in office from 1874 to 1878 governed the country in the interests of the people of Canada? Is it not rather to be conceived that it is because the people of Canada have judged the two parties by their records? Judging the party upon the opposite side of the House by their record during the time they were in office, from 1874 to 1878, and judging the Conservative party by their record during the long series of years which they have governed this country, the people have come to the conclusion that, in the interests of the people of Canada, the Conservative party should be retained in power and that those hon. gentlemen should be kept in the place they at present occupy. The gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, since the present Administration returned to office in 1879, have been endeavoring to discover some policy that would make them acceptable to the people of Canada. They have devoted themselves during those years to a very great extent to decrying their opponents, and finding that after the two elections, in 1884 and 1887, that the mere detraction of their opponents did not succeed in bringing them the support of the people of Canada, they are endeavoring now to bring forward some policy that from their point of view will be instrumental in relegating them to the Treasury benches on this side of the House. Sir, I did not think that I would have addressed the House upon this occasion even the few words I propose to offer for your consideration but for the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution based it upon the ground that certain classes of the people in this country were suffering under the present and existing state of things. He laid great stress upon the fact that the farmers of this country and the lumbermen, and the miners, and the artisans were suffering, and that it was necessary to provide some remedy for the great evil under which the country was groaning at the present time. I, Sir, represent a constituency in which we are interested in the successful prosecution of two of those industries, at least the successful prosecution of farming and lumbering, and I think I shall give good reasons why I shall vote against the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not propose to offer for the consideration of this House any long array of figures. We have had since the commencement of this discussion long arrays of figures presented to this House and we have had those figures brought up in battalions, and in squadrons, and in companies. They have been hurled from one side of the House to the other against an innocent and unoffending House of Commons. I shall therefore to-night not use any more figures than I consider necessary (and that will be very few indeed) for the purpose of illustrating the few arguments which I propose to present for your consideration. Let me say also, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion—and I have always found from observation that my opinion is correct—that there is not the greatest possible reliance to be placed upon the statistics that are quoted in Parliament and out of it. Especially let me say that from my observation I am convinced that the statistics which are furnished by Mr. Blue, the statistician of the Province of Ontario, are not wholly and entirely reliable. I say that, Sir, because I believe that the conditions which prevail in my own constituency must prevail to a very great extent throughout at least the whole Province of Ontario; and when I find it stated, it has been stated during the progress of this discussion, that the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario, according to Mr. Blue, rose from \$10.02 an acre in 1873 to \$18.14 in 1878, an advance of \$8.12 during those five years, and that the same farm lands only increased from \$18.14 in 1878 to \$19.71 in 1885, I am

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.)

convinced from facts which have come under my own observation that those statements cannot be based on fact. I know as a matter of fact that farm lands in my own county from 1873 to 1871 materially decreased in value, and that it was almost impossible in 1878 to dispose of a farm at all, or if any were sold they could only be sold at a ruinous price, while to-day they are worth three or four times what they could be purchased for in 1878. I know, in addition to that, that large sums of money, amounting to tens, and I might say hundreds of thousands of dollars, which were borrowed on mortgages on the lands in my county, have been paid off since this dreaded and detested National Policy has come into force. I know also, for I have the records in my hand, that the assessed value of property in my country rose from \$2,200,000 in 1875 to \$4,515,000 in 1887. Having all these facts before me, as well as those that come under my daily observation, I cannot believe it possible that the farmers of this country are in the dire state of distress which hon. gentlemen declare them to be in. It is because I do not believe they are suffering any such distress that I do not consider it necessary to apply what these gentlemen call this heroic remedy at the present time. I believe the farmers of Canada are capable of holding their own in the race for subsistence which is going on throughout the world. Although I am quite free to admit that the lumbermen of Canada would be benefited to some extent by the entire removal of the duties of lumber, yet when I look at the records of the prices obtained for timber lands, especially in the Province of Ontario, I am forced to the conclusion that the lumbermen are not suffering those great injuries which hon. gentlemen opposite say they are suffering at the present time. I presume that the best test of the condition of our lumber trade during the past fifteen years is the increase or decrease in the value of timber lands. Let me tell you that the lumbermen are not fools; they know pretty well what they are doing, and they are not likely to pay an increased price for timber lands unless they expect to secure a return for what they pay. Let me, then, give you the prices of timber lands, as ascertained by the auction sales that have taken place in the Province of Ontario. During the last fourteen years there have been three large sales of timber lands in that Province. The first took place in 1872, when the average price obtained was \$200 per square mile. Another sale took place in 1881, shortly after the present Government came into power, when the price obtained was \$600 per square mile. In 1886, after this improvident and corrupt Government had been in office for a number of years, the third sale took place, when, notwithstanding the fact that a short time before the stampage dues were increased 33½ per cent., and the ground rents were increased 50 per cent., you would hardly believe it, but the price obtained was \$2,957.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very much to Mr. Mowat's credit.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not aware, Sir, that the fact that lumbermen were able to pay a larger price in 1886 than they were in 1872 is any evidence of great ability on the part of Mr. Mowat. It may be a fact that Mr. Mowat secured those high prices by submitting the lands to public auction; it may be that he is entitled to some credit for that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He got the cash—that is better than the credit.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). He got the cash, that is quite true; but I am sure my hon. friend from South Oxford will agree with me that in the figures I have submitted to the House, and which he will not deny, there is no evidence that the lumbermen are suffering to any great extent. I

listened to day to the hon. member for Bothwell making a statement in regard to the importation of raw material and manufactured goods, and I dare say he thought he was making a great impression on the House when he told us that while he thought it was quite proper from our point of view that a horse should be imported free of duty, he thought it would be contrary to the constitution that the harness to be used on that horse should be imported free. I am sure my hon. friend must have forgotten the discussions that have taken place with regard to the National Policy in this House during the last ten years, or he would have known that what we contended on this side of the House was that by the adoption of the National Policy we would keep in Canada the manufacture of those articles that were consumed in Canada, and that the wages that would otherwise go to employees in the United States would be paid in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that my point was this: Hon gentlemen on that side of the House say that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States, but they say that reciprocity in natural products would not have that effect; and I was pointing out that while the free admission of a horse from the United States would not injure the constitution, the free admission of harness from the United States would overturn the constitution and put an end to our autonomy.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would just say, in regard to that, that I am actuated to some considerable extent, I confess quite freely, in regard to the vote I shall give on the question before the House, by what those gentlemen are pleased to call sentiment. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has said that it would injure the constitution and would make annexation imminent if we were to allow manufactured goods to come to Canada, while the constitution would be in danger if natural products were allowed to come in Canada to free. Let me point out what I conceive to be the distinction between those two things. These hon. gentlemen have told us, time and again, during the course of this discussion, that we have already discriminated against Great Britain in our tariff. I say that proposition cannot be sustained. I say that our tariff is the same against Great Britain as against all the other countries in the world. But what do these hon. gentlemen propose now to do? They propose to admit free into Canada from the United States the same class of articles as those on which we charge a duty coming from the mother country. Do we import any horses from the mother country, or any hides? Do we import any natural products from Great Britain? No, it is the manufactured goods of Great Britain that come into this country subject to a duty, which, under this resolution, would not be imposed upon the same goods coming into Canada from a foreign country. It is that which renders it, to my mind, dangerous that we should adopt any such proposition, and which leads me to the conclusion that any policy which would discriminate against the mother country in favor of a foreign country would inevitably lead us to annexation. It is because I believe the inevitable result of the policy the hon. gentleman proposes would be annexation that I am opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us, time and again, during this discussion, of their loyalty and attachment to the crown of Great Britain, and yet we have heard them, at the same time, excuse themselves for supporting the resolution now before the House, on the ground that they love Canada more than Great Britain. I have yet to learn that any subject of Great Britain finds it detrimental to him to be connected with that country or to treat with that country. If I were to believe the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-day, that England was neither able nor willing to

help us in any emergency that might arise, I would at once say that it would be our bounden duty either to become independent or to connect ourselves with the United States; and if I believe it was impossible for us to live on this continent without adopting a policy which would place a foreign country in a better position towards Canada in regard to our trade than the mother country occupies, I would at once say: let us not only have commercial intercourse with that foreign country, but let us adopt a policy that will give us some influence in its political affairs, and not become a mere dependency of it, as we would if the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford were adopted. I hope that the time is far distant, I hope that I shall never live to see the time when it will become necessary for us to adopt any such policy. I believe it is possible for us to maintain our autonomy, and that we need not become a dependency of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed out that from the adoption of the reciprocity treaty in 1854 down to its abrogation in 1866, our trade with the United States increased very materially. Well, taking the articles that were included in that treaty and looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, of which Provinces I am now speaking more particularly, I find that whilst our aggregate trade with the United States increased very materially during these years, there were in different years very great variations in the trade between the two countries. For instance, you will find that exports of the forest and the farm to the United States in the first full year under reciprocity amounted to \$20,000,000, and those exports fell three years afterwards to \$11,000,000, and so we will find, going through the whole of the list, which I will not trouble the House with reading, that both during the existence of the reciprocity treaty, from 1854 to 1866, and since its abrogation, the export trade from Canada to United States has very greatly varied. One year it would be very considerable and the next year drop \$5,000,000, \$6,000,000 or \$10,000,000. As I have already stated, I believe it is impossible for us to maintain our autonomy; I believe it is possible for us to exist, and that we ought not to adopt a policy which would make us a dependency of a foreign country, and which would give us no influence in the political affairs of that country while losing control over our own; and it is because of that belief that I propose to vote against the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not propose, considering the length to which this debate has been protracted, to prolong it to any considerable extent. At the same time, considering the importance of the question, I am not prepared to give a silent vote. The subject is one which, I believe, demands from the First Minister of the Crown an expression of opinion on the floor of Parliament. Had the circumstances permitted, I think we should have had an expression of opinion from the hon. the Finance Minister, but when he was unable, through circumstances beyond his control, to give the House and the country the benefit of his views upon this question, it was more than ever incumbent on his seniors in the Cabinet to have placed their views upon record. They have not seen fit to do so. But three members of the Cabinet, at different stages of the debate, ventured to commit themselves. The last Minister of the Cabinet who spoke, the Secretary of State, made a most extraordinary statement, one that does not commend itself, at all events, to my mind. He took the position that, no matter what the facts were, no matter what the statistics established, no matter what the arguments proved, no matter what interests were involved, they all counted for nothing if the sentiment of the country was with him. What he had in view was the votes of the people and not the interests of the people, and he delivered what he considered

an infallible judgment at once, when he said: the people are not with you on this occasion. Where, he asked, are the petitioners? Where are the expressions of opinion for or against the proposition? He got one of his answers to-day, when Prince Edward county spoke. Could there be a better evidence of the will of the people than the verdict rendered at the polls, and should this debate continue a few days longer, another would be given in the person of the representative of Missisquoi, who was recently elected on this very issue in a constituency that a few months ago gave at the polls a Conservative majority, and which to-day rendered a verdict in favor of this proposition by some hundreds of a majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the majority?

Mr. MITCHELL. Two hundred and six.

Mr. MULOCK. I saw it stated in the press that the majority was something over 200. I have not seen the official returns. We had another election the other day in L'Assomption, which had been carried by a Liberal, at the general election, by a majority of twenty-one. I am told that this trade question was the leading issue in that contest, and that it turned entirely upon it, and the result was that the people of that county, by 400 or 500 per cent. over the previous majority, returned a member in favor of the proposition which is now before the House. Surely, in face of these facts, the Secretary of State need not assert that there is no evidence before the House of the feeling of the country on this question. We had the benefit of the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, who is always ready to fill a gap; who is always ready to take charge of any question; who has a certain number of good stock speeches on hand that can be brought out on all occasions, whether they fill the bill or not, and I think he drew on some of his old supplies on this occasion. I think I have often read that speech which he delivered, thought he had burnished it up a little, but it was not new to us. I believe he only delivered it forty times in the Province during the last electoral contest, and he delivered it well, seeing how few opportunities he had had to practise it. What argument did he advance against this proposition? He admitted the right of Canada to do what it is proposed to do. He admitted that it might be to the interest of Canada to do what this resolution proposes shall be done, but he took the ground that we should not be mean enough to legislate in a way that might not conserve the interests of England. Then we had the benefit of the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and what was his argument against this proposition? His argument was that there was no such thing as a natural market, that markets could be made by the expenditure of money and of energy, and that no natural markets were to be found on the earth, that markets were artificial creations, and he pointed to the United States, and said that, even if we did get free trade with the United States, they were producers of the very things that we would produce, and therefore we would find no market there. It is too late for one to indulge in mere opinion, but I will trouble the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with some brief statistics, which I think will convince him, or which ought to convince him, that trade does find a natural level, in spite of many obstructions, artificial and natural. He referred to the trade of Europe, and I have turned up the trade returns of the leading countries in Europe, those on the west and those in the centre. I did not get the trade of Russia simply because there are no trade returns from that country to be found. If you take the trade of Spain for the year 1886, you will find that one-third of the whole volume of the trade of that country was with one of its neighbors, France, although France, as my hon. friend knows, produces many of the very same

Mr. MULOCK.

articles that Spain exported to France. If you turn to Germany, you find that last year Germany did 48 per cent. of the whole volume of her trade with her actual neighbors, with those countries which are in actual contiguity with her, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria and Denmark. If you turn to Norway, the same story is told. Norway did 48 per cent. of her whole trade with her three neighbors, Sweden, Denmark and Great Britain. I claim that Great Britain may be treated as a neighbor of Norway, although there is a narrow strip of water between the countries. Italy transacted 56 per cent. of her whole trade with France, Algeria, Austria and Switzerland. France transacted 56 per cent. of her trade with England, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. Portugal transacted 58 per cent. of her trade last year with three countries, Spain, France and Great Britain. Belgium had 66 per cent. of her trade with France, the Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain. The Netherlands did 72 per cent. of their whole trade with Prussia, Belgium and Great Britain. Austria transacted over 80 per cent. of her whole trade last year with her neighbors, Germany, Russia, Italy, Roumania, Switzerland and Great Britain. When you come to this continent, if you take the Republic of Mexico, you find that over 60 per cent. of its whole trade was with one neighbor, the United States of America. If you take the trade of Canada for 1887, you find that over 40 per cent. of our whole trade was with our neighbor, the United States. We sold last year to the United States over \$37,000,000 worth of the products of Canada, notwithstanding the obstructions in the way of that trade by reason of the high tariff existing in the United States. Had that tariff not prevailed, I think we may fairly assume that our trade with the United States would have been vastly more during the past year than it was. These illustrations, which I have furnished from the trade of Europe, it is to be borne in mind, are in regard to countries which are separated from each other by many differences—differences of language, in some cases tariffs, prejudices and other obstructions to the free flow and interchange of trade. I think, therefore, that, with these illustrations from Europe and from this continent as well I have clearly established the proposition that there is such a thing on the earth as a natural market, and that that natural market is the nearest market geographically to the country that is seeking to trade. If you look at the trade which Canada has done with the whole world during the past year, you find that, with all the efforts we have been putting out, having established connections with all parts of the civilised world, we have only been only able to sell \$7,000,000 worth of the products of Canada to all the nations of the earth with the exception of the United States and Great Britain. We sold last year to the United States five times as much in value of our products as we sold to all other countries in the world, Great Britain alone excepted. Does not that teach us a lesson? Can we not draw inferences from those facts? Will any philosophy enable us to say in a sensible, truthful way, that trade does not assert itself on geographical lines, and follow as nearly as possible the natural directions indicated? If not, how comes it that all these nations I have referred to confine so much of their trade to their near neighbors? I think there can be but one deduction drawn from it, and that is, that if we do not interpose obstacles, trade does naturally seek the nearest market. In Canada what is the nearest market? We sell, first of all, to ourselves,—we have our domestic trade. The vast bulk of the trade of this country is at home amongst the people, and the surplus, following the principle of selling in the nearest market, if it is the best, finds the nearest market, which is always the best, and that, in our own case, in the market of the United States. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says there is no natural market in the United

States for anything that we have. He says that the United States are producers of the very articles that Canada produces, and therefore it is idle to seek to obtain access to the United States market; it is bringing coals to Newcastle, that is the burden of his argument. I have looked through the list of imports in the United States in the past year and what do they disclose? I may not have made out a complete list of all products of Canada which have been imported into the United States; if not my argument is so much the weaker; but I find that the United States last year received from foreign countries \$61,711,024 worth of products, every one of which could have been produced in the Dominion of Canada. On those products the United States customs houses collected \$19,318,181. These articles are as follows: Animals, barley, bituminous coal, copper ore, fish, hemp, furs, hay, hops, iron ore, pig iron, lead, leather of various kinds, spirits, cheese, salt, potatoes, lumber, wooden ware and wool. All of these articles are producible by the people of Canada, and all of them were purchased by the United States last year to the extent of over \$60,000,000, in spite of the tariff imposed. Can any hon. gentleman say now that there is no possible market in the United States for what the people of Canada can produce? Sir, to say so is to trifle with the facts. The volume of trade under these circumstances would, I think, be vastly increased were we to have free access to the markets of the United States. My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) touched very lightly upon the effect of the reciprocity treaty. If we examine the imports and exports of the old Provinces of Canada during the continuance of the reciprocity treaty, they will tell us whether a high tariff is a hindrance to trade or not. In the year 1851, we sold to the people of the United States \$2,162,250 worth of products; in the succeeding year, our products entered the United States free, and the amount of exports immediately jumped up to the sum of \$4,184,319, or very nearly double the amount of the preceding year. I may say in this connection that as our exports to the United States in succeeding years went up, those of England went down. What did that prove? That proved that for our surplus products, in the year 1854, when there was a duty upon them going into the United States, we had to seek a comparatively unprofitable market in Great Britain, but in the succeeding years, when they went into the United States duty free, we sold in the best market, the United States. During the continuance of that treaty the volume of our exports to the United States increased by leaps and bounds, so that in the year 1866, when the treaty was repealed, we exported to the United States the enormous sum of \$34,770,261 of the products of the old Provinces of Canada. Now, I would call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this point. In the year 1866, the last year of reciprocity, the Provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, exported products to the value of \$40,127,266. That year the American people imposed a high duty upon our products and the effect since then has been that in the year 1887, the last year for which we have complete returns, we only exported to the United States 37 million odd; in other words, whereas 22 years ago these four Provinces, under free trade with the United States, sent to them over 40 million dollars worth of goods, to-day, although we have become more powerful, although our population has considerably increased, our trade has fallen off with the United States to the extent of nearly three millions of dollars. So I think that so far as natural products are concerned, there is no possible argument against the proposition, that if we remove the barriers imposed by the custom houses, our trade with the United States in natural products would vastly increase. But it is said by the friends of the manufacturers that this policy would destroy our own manufacturers. I would deplore such a result with any man. I do

not desire to see any industry in Canada sacrificed, I desire to see what is best for the whole of Canada adopted by Parliament and by the country, and being of that wish, and believing, as I do, that evidence is producible to show that our manufactures would not suffer, I am firmly of the opinion that we will not endanger our manufactures by enabling them to obtain access to the United States markets, even by giving access in Canada to the manufactures of the United States. Perhaps I might just refer by way of example to what has happened in the case of the Southern States. Hon. gentlemen all know that at the close of the great American war the Southern States were essentially an agricultural country. They had a few manufacturing industries, but agriculture was their leading industry. They came out of that war in a condition scarcely fitting them, I think, to compete with old established countries, they came out of that war with ruin all around; public credit was gone, private credit was gone, private fortune were swept away, the labor market was demoralised, everything was in chaos. What was the condition of the Americans in the north at that time? The old established manufactures in New England, though disturbed a little by the troubles of the war, were still in existence. They had grown up under the fostering care of the tariff, they had been supplying the great Western States with clothing, while the Western States supplied food to the East. You would think it would be absolutely impossible for manufacturing interests, I will not say to thrive, but obtain a foothold in the Southern States against such unfavorable conditions. But what has been the result? If you turn to an authority upon the subject, I refer to Mr. Hillyard in the *New South*, you will find he tells of the progress made in manufacturing in the Southern States within the last few years. Moreover, I would say that the manufactures that have sprung up in the Southern States during this period are not manufactures having any special advantage from their being in the Southern States. I do not refer merely to cotton or tobacco factories, but to the ordinary industries such as exist in Canada to-day, to the small factories. Mr. Hillyard, on page 29, says:—

"In building up the lumber mills of all kinds"—

And this I commend to the attention of the hon. member for North Renfrew.

"In the building of lumber mills of all kinds, from the small portable saw mill to the mill costing \$50,000 to \$100,000, the erection of ice factories, flour mills, &c., there is great activity. In fact, while the iron interests have attracted the greatest attention, the growth of manufactures covers a wide range of industries, including foundries, machine shops, steel works, cotton and woollen mills, cotton-seed oil mills, cotton compresses, fruit canning factories, carriage and waggon factories, agricultural implement factories, flour mills, grist mills, saw mills, planing mills, sash, door and blind factories, shuttle factories, handle and spoke factories, barrel factories, shingle mills, furniture factories, &c. It is a healthy growth. Instead of all interest being centered in the establishment of a few enterprises, the South has realised the importance of the small factory and workshop, and so we see springing up everywhere small factories, requiring but few hands, and but little capital, for producing the many articles of manufacture needed everywhere. Finding at first a local market for their goods, these factories will gradually extend their facilities and widen the scope of their trade, until they develop by a natural process into an extensive enterprise."

Not only have factories in the Southern States developed, but there has been development in what is the best of evidence as to what is the growth of a country, railway building. He goes on to say:

"Although the mineral resources of the South and her vast forests have attracted much consideration and large investment, in no regard has she so much enlisted the attention of the nation and of Europe as in building railroads. This is the most commanding theatre of capital, and strikes the eye of the world, not only for its colossal combinations of money, but the prestige of its participants."

He goes on further to say:

"It were a vain task to attempt to keep pace with the southern railroad projects. It seems as though almost every day brings a revelation of some new railroad scheme. It is quite certain that railroads are pro-

jected, surveys being made, 'ground' being 'broke,' under the auspices of such wealthy corporations as to confirm public confidence in the seriousness and good faith of their operations and intentions. But to assume nothing as the amount of capital to be invested in roads not actually built, the South can make an exhibit which is 'both a pledge and prophecy' of her progress."

Then follows a statement showing the enormous extent of railway construction within the last few years. In the summary Mr. Hillyard states that within the last six and a half years the Southern States have constructed over 14,000 miles of railway—far more than there is in the whole Dominion of Canada to-day. Further on he speaks of the saw mills. Those hon. gentlemen who are interested in lumbering need fear nothing from comparison with the United States in this regard, because we know that the Northern States will absorb all the lumber we can spare. At this hour I will not read further from this work, but I will simply ask hon. gentlemen to apply the lesson that is furnished by the growth of the Southern States, and ask whether Canada, if admitted to the markets of the United States, would not be able to have such a record as that after a reasonable period of time. Is there anything in Canada, is there anything in the Canadian people to warrant us in saying that they cannot accomplish what the people of the Southern States have accomplished, given the same conditions? Are our people less energetic, are they less capable? Those hon. gentlemen who say so declare want of confidence in the people of Canada. They do not mean it. They are afraid of the competition. They are afraid of making an honest trial. They are afraid to give up what they call a certainty for what may, to their minds, prove an uncertainty; but in the light of facts and in the light of history, which should teach us and from which we should learn, I cannot see how Canada can fail in any arena in which the American people have succeeded. Why, the hon. member for Central Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the other night furnished us with a little argument upon this point. He said in his glowing language that he knew something of the Southern States, that he came from them, or had something to do with them. He stated that within the last eight months there had been invested in business there over \$100,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the conditions of the Southern States are such that having the whole of the market of the United States, they put their capital of \$100,000,000 in eight months to build up industries, would he not apply the same reasoning to what would follow in Canada if we had access to that great market?

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a short explanation? I did say \$100,000,000 were invested in the Southern States within eight months, but I was careful to draw attention to the fact that the Northern States were at the end of the war and remain still, one Confederation or one Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, we are talking business. I refer the hon. gentleman to the *Spectator* of the other day, which in speaking of the "fad," as it called it, of Imperial Federation, said, "We don't want any Imperial Federation, we don't want any sentiment, business is business." We mean business and the people of Canada want business, and the people of the United States, wanted business and when they invested \$100,000,000 during the last eight months it was for business. It was because they saw there was a market in the United States for what they would produce, and because they expected a return, that they invested that capital. Whether we are under one flag or a dozen flags it does not make any difference in the amount of money we are making, if we can get the customers under the same conditions. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Interior argued in favor of the loyalty cry. That is a favorite trick in order to take the attention of the public away from the issue involved. If this proposition is sound on business principles it is sound in its entirety. If this proposition

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.)

can be defended as one likely to produce comfort, to supply wants, to make the value of labor more than it is, that is loyal, and that it is a proposition which ought to be commended to the people. But I am willing to take the hon. gentleman at his own words. I am willing to test him by the record of his friends to see whether they really are sincere when they try to cause this loyalty cry to be raised in order to prevent the people from debating this proposition, or whether the cry is merely raised as a device in order to humbug the country. Now, in 1854, hon. gentlemen or some at least in this House, will remember that in the old Legislative Assembly of the Provinces of Canada this very question came up, and although no final decision was arrived at, yet on the 26th May, 1854, a resolution was adopted by the Committee of the House at that time in the following words:

"That the principle of reciprocity with the United States be extended to the production of manufactures, and to the registration of Canadian and United States built ships, and to the shipping and coasting trade in the same manner as to the production of agriculture."

That resolution, so far as I have been able to discover, and I speak subject to correction, was not opposed by any member of the Conservative party. It was introduced into the House but I do not find that it made any further progress. But looking at the members who constituted the committee that reported upon it I find that they represent pretty fairly the Conservative element of that day. The chairman of the committee was a gentleman who I believe had no very decisive political views—the Hon. Hamilton Merritt—at the time. I do not know that he had any particular political views. At all events that resolution was then offered to the House and no protest was raised against the principle involved in it. It was not then declared to the country that it was disloyal. The Conservative party did not then declare it was disloyal. They were not nearly so loyal then as they are now, and it was not very long before that they were taking a very different view of the whole political relations of Canada. It was only about five years before that a number of the leading lights declared that the only salvation for Canada was political annexation to the United States. I do not know that the Conservative party ever treated with any great cruelty some of the prominent men that took part in that movement. I believe that one of them has recently been promoted to a high position in the Cabinet of the hon. gentleman opposite. In fact they have all at times come in for favors, sometimes from the Government and in many cases from Her Majesty, by being decorated in testimony of their extreme loyalty and worthy citizenship. At the particular time this resolution was brought in the Conservative party then in the country were not as they are to-day, so sensitive upon this question. They were prepared at all events to discuss any question involving the best interests of the country. Mr. Speaker, in 1878 the Conservative party proposed what they called their National Policy and we have several times had the resolution proposed at that time brought before the attention of the House. That resolution told the people of Canada that this National Policy that they were proposing was simply the means to an end, and that end was to be what we are seeking to-day, reciprocity. Not only did they tell us that so but they emphasised it in their resolution in order that there should be no possible difference of opinion on the question. That resolution says, after referring to some other things:

"Would encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

What does "eventually" mean? Does it mean a time so remote as is indicated by the member for North Simcoe

(Mr. McCarthy) when he proposes eventually to benefit the farmers of Canada by his Imperial Federation scheme, and when he succeeds in inducing English statesmen to tax breadstuffs so as to raise the price of wheat from seventy-five cents to one dollar for the Canadian farmer. That is the relief proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Is that "eventually"? Did the First Minister mean when he put the word in the resolution that it was to be at a remote period or did he mean that that word was to be accepted in the ordinary plain language in which it was expressed, that "eventually" meant just as soon as such a treaty could be obtained. That was the view presented to the people on the hustings, that is the proper reading of this article and that is the right view to take of the hon. gentleman at that time. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the present Finance Minister asserted that this National Policy would produce this highly desirable result of reciprocity within three years, so that "eventually" has really expired now. Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was not nearly so loyal then as he is now. He was then trying to get into office and he is now there and trying to hang on. He was very much concerned at that time about putting money into the pockets of the people, and British connection had not much to do with it. Whatever enriched the people of Canada was the first law unto him at that time; and so, when he came to move his resolution in 1878 he was prepared to throw overboard Great Britain. In the course of his speech in support of his National Policy, after depicting all the benefits that would flow from it, he said (*Hansard*, page 861):

"We shall then grow up rapidly a good, steady and mature trade between the Provinces, rendering us independent of foreign trade, and not, as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia formerly did, look to the United States or to England for trade, but look to Ontario and Quebec."

He was prepared then, for the sake of the Canadian people, if necessary, to shut out the whole trade of England, and I presume he felt that he was doing his duty. The doctrine he laid down then bore fruit, because he was followed shortly after in the debate by a supporter of his, the Hon. Mr. Masson, who gave his view of what the duty of Canadians was under such circumstances. He said (page 893 of *Hansard*):—

"He might tell the hon. gentleman that the Conservatives of Lower Canada were as loyal to England as they always had been, but he would add the words of Lafontaine: 'Mais avant tout soyons Canadiens'—('But before all let us be Canadians'). This was Lafontaine's doctrine, and they followed it. The Imperial Government in its relations and connections with the colonies had never been exempt from those rather selfish motives, if such motives could be so called, by which the mother country wished to aggrandise herself at the expense of the colonies; the whole colonial system was based upon this principle that the mother country took these colonies so as to have from them raw material for her own manufactures. That was the object of every central government in every country in the world with respect to their colonies, and, if England claimed a right at times to be selfish in its desires with regard to this colony, they would not go so far in that course, but defend the rights of Canada. The Imperial Government having given us the right of self-government, had also conferred upon us the right to regulate our fiscal duties as we wished. The Conservatives of Lower Canada did not wish to act against the interests of England, but they had the right, if they wished, to regulate the duties, irrespective of England if it were Canada's interest to do so."

I am not aware that the hon. gentleman who used these words lost standing with the Conservative party by reason of them. On the contrary, I believe he was duly rewarded at a later period with high honors at the hands of the Administration. I am not aware that the First Minister either has suffered by reason of his assertion that he believed in Canada for the Canadians against England, even if it injured British connection. I do not believe Her Majesty felt any objection against him on that account, because a few months afterwards he was decorated. Therefore utterances of that kind do not appear to be regarded as disloyal by Her Majesty herself. Again, the doctrine that Canada's interest must be considered first was echoed by another hon. gentle-

man supporting the Government, the present member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who, in the course of his speech, on 26th March, 1879, said:

"There was nothing we could do which would be more likely to bring about a renewal of reciprocity, than taking a stand upon a tariff which might be carried out in the interests of the Canadian people."

Another supporter of the Government, Mr. Houde, laid down this proposition:

"Let every Government legislate the best in the interest of its own people and for the welfare of its own people. That was the surest way of promoting human progress or general prosperity."

The then member for Centre Wellington (Dr. Orton), expressed himself as follows:—

"He had always thought, the inauguration of a National Policy in Canada should be merely a means to an end, and that end the obtaining of favorable commercial relations with other countries. He hoped in a short time we would be in a position to compete favorably even with our more formidable neighbor across the border, and they would see it to their interests to give us fair trade relations and open up their ports to us in return for our admitting their products on favorable terms."

This National Policy he regarded as a means to an end, the goal aimed at being what we are seeking for to-day. Another supporter of the Administration, Mr. J. S. Ross, of Dundas, expressed himself as follows:—

"If England chose to open her markets to all peoples and treat us no better than others we had to do the best we could for ourselves, consequently Canada must adopt such a fiscal policy as commended itself to their own judgment and which was in the interests of their own people. Unless they did this they must fail to accomplish what was expected of them as a free and progressing people."

I understand that that hon. gentleman, after expressing this view, received a position of emolument from the Conservative Administration. Then, I am obliged to refer to the utterances on that occasion of the present Speaker who was prepared to advance the interests of Canada even against those of England. He is reported in *Hansard* as having used these words:

"It had been stated in a threatening way that England would not approve of a tariff that seemed contrary to her interests, but where was the Englishman that could seriously refuse to Canada the right of legislating in her own interests?"

Further on he says:

"When responsible government had been granted to Canada by the British North America Act, had she not been conceded the right to frame her tariff as she saw fit? Canada had the right of governing herself, and if this right was now refused to her, she would be well able to demand it."

Then, speaking of the vote he was about to cast in favor of the National Policy, which was to lead to reciprocity, he said:

"It would be a vote given in favor of the constitutional and commercial liberty of Canada. It would be a vote that would assert the existence of Canada as a nation distinct not only from England, but the United States."

Hon. gentlemen, I have no doubt, are quite familiar with the memorandum directed by Sir Alexander Galt, then Mr. Galt, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, setting forth what ought to be the true attitude of Canada in regard to its fiscal affairs. I could, if time permitted, give numerous extracts from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, all taking the ground that in matters of trade the Parliament of Canada had first to consider the interests of the people of Canada. I say that not only do the people of Canada demand that position from us, but the sentiment of England is in harmony with the sentiments I have quoted. The hon. gentleman who formerly represented the constituency which I have the honor to represent, a keen observer—I refer to Dr. Strange—spoke to this House on this question. He is an Englishman, and an able and talented gentleman. He expressed himself on this question in a way, I think, that did not meet with the disapproval of his constituents in North York. On the contrary, I believe that his constituents again desire him to represent their riding. They

bore no malice to him for having uttered on the floor of Parliament the words which I am about to quote, taken from *Hansard* 21st March, 1879. He addresses this House as an Englishman. He was a Canadian by adoption, but an Englishman by spirit. As far as he was able to ascertain the spirit of the English people, they were anxious and willing to say:

"He addressed this House as an Englishman. He was a Canadian by adoption, but an Englishman in spirit. As far as he was able to ascertain the spirit of the English people they were anxious and willing to see this vast colony of which they were justly proud succeed even if we had in our own interests to put a stop to purchasing our goods from England. No English Government would venture to prevent the adoption of this tariff on the ground of its injuring England. The English people, without exception, took great interests in our success and with the exception of a few manufacturers would bid us god-speed on the royal road to wealth."

That is the sentiment of an Englishman expressing what he conceived to be the opinion of England with regard to the affairs of Canada. What did the Right Hon. John Bright, recently tell us at a banquet given to Mr. Chamberlain? I do not endorse all that Mr. Bright said that night, but I wish to show that he took strong grounds in favor of Canada being entitled to arrange her own tariff as she pleased and to conduct her own affairs in her own interest with regard to the commerce of the mother country. He went on to express a sentiment I do not endorse, but hon. gentlemen opposite can hardly repudiate John Bright as a true friend of the Empire at present, in view of the attitude which he has taken on certain political questions in England, which attitude, no doubt, commends itself to the favor of the Conservative party both in England and Canada. We have a very distinguished Englishman in Canada, Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose name has been referred to in this assembly during this debate, and not in the most courteous manner. The time was when what he said was accepted with favor by the Conservative party. He is a loyal citizen to England. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite cannot controvert that. We all know his record, we all know the part he thought it was his duty to take to preserve the Empire, some few months ago, and we know that he to-day is a loyal British subject, anxious to see the welfare of England promoted. Do they denounce him as a traitor to England?

An hon. MEMBER. They do.

Mr. MULOCK. Since when? I think he is a truer man to England than the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) was to the people of Ireland, when he allowed some of his compatriots to be turned out of office because they would not be coerced into voting for him.

Mr. CURRAN. I beg leave to state that the assertion made by the hon. gentleman is entirely devoid of truth, and the newspapers which published that statement against me, apologised in the most humble manner for having done so.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the hon. member for Montreal Centre will not admit that his influence with this Cabinet is so small that he could not secure their retention in office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not take it back.

Mr. CURRAN. I contradict that statement most flatly.

Mr. MULOCK. I say that the hon. gentleman will not admit on the floor of this House, and if he does I doubt whether any one is so credulous as to accept his admission, that his influence with the Cabinet is so weak that he could not prevent the removal from office of three poor Irishmen who had been for years in the employ of the Government, and who were removed simply because they would not come down and vote for him when he had voted against the best interests of Ireland.

Mr. CURRAN. What the hon. gentleman states is positively untrue.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member would do better to abandon that part of his remarks.

Mr. RYKERT. Make an apology.

Mr. MULOCK. I give as another reason why we are not obliged, in making trade relations with the United States, to consider first the interests of England, the fact that England does not act in this way with regard to the colonies. There are trade treaties between England and other great nations, giving benefits to England from which the colonies are excluded. There are new treaties on foot between England and China, and Japan, and Siam, and France, and Spain, and the Netherlands, and the United States, which are not applicable to the colonies. If England, in the exercise of her constitutional rights, considering the highest interests of her people, arranges, as I conceive she has the right to do, her own customs treaties for her own benefit and not for that of the people of Canada, a corresponding right exists with us. Does not the Confederation Act, under which we are here to-night, say that the constitution of the people of Canada shall be the same in principle as the constitution of the people of England? Our constitution is based on the principles of the English constitution, and unless the loyal gentlemen opposite can prove that England is not loyal to us in her conduct with regard to commercial treaties, they cannot say that Canada would be acting disloyally if, first of all, we consider our own interests in any particular trade relations we may enter into. We have further evidence to prove this contention. There is uncontrovertible evidence, having the sanction of the British Parliament, that the duty of Canada is to arrange her trade treaties in her own interest and without considering the interests of England. How will I prove that proposition? When the right hon. the First Minister, who is smiling now, caused the Customs Act of 1879 to be introduced, it was, before it became law, communicated to the Imperial Government. It was a tariff considered highly detrimental to the interests of the English manufacturers, who rose up in arms against it, protesting that Canada was raising a tariff to exclude English goods, and was not, therefore, loyal to England. They asked, therefore, that the Act be disallowed by the Imperial authorities. John Bright brought the matter before Parliament on the twentieth of March, 1879, and put this question to the Colonial Secretary on the floor of the House:

"In case of any proposal to enact differential duties on the part of Canada, would the Bill be submitted to the Government before it was adopted?"

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, then Secretary for the Colonies, replies:

"The best answer I can give to it is to read the telegram I sent to Canada, which received the sanction of the Government. It was in these terms.

"They deemed the fiscal policy of Canada rested, subject to treaty obligations, with the Dominion Parliament."

The Dominion Parliament was recognised on the floor of the Imperial Parliament as being entitled to impose differential duties if necessary, without it being considered right or proper or constitutional for the Government of England to disallow that Act. What further evidence is there? Hon. gentlemen all know that every Colonial Governor, when entering upon the duties of his office, receives certain instructions. The time was when all the instructions to Colonial Governors contained the instruction forbidding the Governor to sanction the imposition of differential duties, and that instruction is still to be found in the instructions to every Colonial Governor with the exception of the Governor General of Canada. In 1878, for the first time, that instruction was eliminated from the instructions given to the Governor General of Canada. Thus you see that the Crown recognised the fact that Canada, occupying a peculiar geographical position on the earth, cannot have her trade

affairs regulated in the same way as other colonies of Great Britain, which are more or less insular or peculiarly situated; so the Government of England recognised fully that Canada, by reason of her importance, by reason of her position, and by reason of her constitution, cannot be trampled and ought not to be trampled in the interests of the people of Canada, or for that matter in the interests of the Empire, even if, for her own sake, she should impose differential duties. On that point, I cannot offer to the House, I think, any better evidence of the feeling of the people of Great Britain at the present time than an extract from the late Mr. Todd, who was a keen observer of current events, in his work on Parliamentary Government in British Colonies. At page 181, he summarises the position of Canada in regard to her trade rights, in these words:

"But, on account of the growing importance of Canada, as well before as since Confederation, exceptional privileges have been conceded to her, from time to time, in respect to fiscal and commercial matters wherein the interests of Canada were concerned, with freedom to adopt whatever policy might be approved by the Local Legislature, irrespective of the opinions or policy of the Imperial Parliament."

Such is the inference drawn by Mr. Todd from the current opinion and the authorities in Great Britain. I think I have established that the hon. gentlemen opposite at one time took a different view of this question; I think I have established that England does not wish Canada to injure herself even in the interests of the mother country, and though hon. gentlemen opposite have been practically asserting that English opinion of Canada simply depends upon the Canadian accounts in British ledgers, I do not think that our people will be so childish as to consider the business interests of people across the Atlantic to the prejudice of their own domestic interests. There is a good reason why England desires us to be on friendly terms with the United States. The United States are the largest customers of Great Britain. More than one-third, nearly a half, of the volume of trade of Great Britain is with the United States. Last year, the volume of trade between Great Britain and the United States amounted to between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000, and England desires that we should be on good terms with the United States, so that there may be no disturbance of her interests in that connection. If it is brought down to that ground, we are promoting the best interests of the people of Great Britain by having friendly intercourse with the United States, so that there may be no interference with the flow of trade between those countries. I shall not delay the House longer on this subject. We are loyal to the people of Canada if we vote on this question with a view to their benefit, on a proposition which is calculated to find a natural market for our products, to stimulate the manufactures of this country, to encourage labor and to make Canada attractive to the population and to the wealth of older lands, that will be a trade policy that will operate equitably throughout the whole length and breadth of the Dominion, that will enable us to solidify this Dominion, and to extend and carry out the very principle which established this Dominion, the extension of our trade markets. As interprovincial trade was held up in order to induce the Provinces to come together and form a confederacy and to have the domestic trade of four millions of people, that principle must be equally good if you give them the trade of sixty millions of people. Therefore, if it was right to bind us together by the scheme of Confederation for the purpose of establishing interprovincial trade—and I believe it was—it is still better to extend this principle and to obtain ultimately entirely free trade throughout this great American continent. Therefore, I have great pleasure in recording my vote and giving my voice in favor of this principle, believing as I do that it will be to the advantage of Canada and will place our relations with England on a sure and firm foundation, and that we will be bound to England by a feeling of love

and regard, not a feeling that we have to pay for, not one wrung from the people by a system of indirect taxation, but one of relation between colony and empire where there are no disturbing causes between the two.

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa). I have listened very earnestly to the arguments which have been submitted to the House on this important question. I have paid particular attention to the grounds taken by the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House in arguing for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have felt especially gratified at the regard which has been expressed for the lumber trade, although it comes from the wrong side of the House, but from all these arguments, even from the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, I understand, is a practical lumberman, I have not heard any account of the lumber interest that I am able to verify by any reports either from the United States or from Canada. Those statements are all, in my view—and facts go to substantiate it—made for a particular purpose, to endeavor to obtain the interest of the lumber trade, but I think they are made on an extravagant, unjustifiable and unwarrantable basis. I have gone to the trouble of making an accurate statement of the lumber export interest of this country for the last year. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that practically one-half of the exports of the lumber trade went to the United States, subject to duties which the producers in this country had to pay. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) took similar ground upon the matter of exports, and he claimed that the producers of this country had to pay a duty upon whole products of the forests. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford stated that \$9,353,000 of the products of the forest went into the United States upon which a duty was collected, and upon the basis of their argument, the producers in Canada had to pay it. Now, the whole exports of the forest product for the year ending June, 1887, were \$20,484,746; the amount sent to Great Britain and other countries was \$11,131,240. The amount free of duty, according to our own returns, that went out, chiefly to the United States, was \$1,873,412; the balance which went to the United States, subject to duty, was \$748,094. That was a proportion of 36 per cent. of the whole products of the forest which were subject to duty, and 64 per cent. free of duty. Now, as a matter of fact, all the products from the forest that have been heretofore subject to duty since the abrogation of the Treaty of 1854, as every hon. gentleman in this House knows, it is proposed to admit into the United States, under a Bill introduced into Congress, providing for the removal of the duty upon the products of the forests. Now, in view of this fact I am unable to see upon what ground the hon. members who have been arguing on this resolution for the last two or three weeks, could take up the interest of the lumber trade at all. It was expected that the Bill I have mentioned would pass through Congress, if not at this session at an early period afterwards; consequently I, as a practical lumberman, must take the ground that I am unable to see any reason or propriety why hon. gentlemen opposite should have taken up the question at the present time. I must say I consider it an interference and an intrusion upon the negotiations which were pending between the United States and Canada, and which, I have no doubt, have been seriously interfered with by it. Now I speak upon business principles upon this matter. As every one here knows I am not a politician, but I am a lumberman of long standing in this country. Now, if I were in negotiation for my firm or for myself in relation to important transactions, and some of my neighbors or some of my family interfered and tried to show to the parties with whom I was negotiating that their interests were of much greater importance to some

body else than they were to me, I should conclude that it was an unjustifiable and unwarrantable interference, subject to the most severe censure of every reasonable fair minded man. I am particularly surprised at the hon. member for North Norfolk taking the ground that he did. Himself, a practical lumberman, he takes the ground that the duties must be paid by the producer on this side of the line. Now, if that is followed out, I see no propriety in the hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of a rise in the duties upon material imported into this country. They leave it for the producer to pay, from whom we get these goods, upon the principle that they have to pay the duties and not us. Now, if that principle is correct, it is certainly not reasonable to contend that we also have to pay duties upon what we import. It is a rule that cannot work both ways, and if we pay the duties upon what we export, it is fair to conclude that those who export to us also have to pay the duties. I am sorry the hon. member for North Norfolk is not in his place, but I have no hesitation in stating to him that he could not find any experienced lumberman upon the Ottawa valley or its tributaries who would agree with him. Now, that hon. gentleman went further, and contended that unrestricted reciprocity would increase the value of the timber limits of this Dominion by at least 50 per cent. I cannot understand upon what grounds he made that assertion. In my opinion it is simply absurd to say so. It is well known that the Governments of Quebec and Ontario have increased the Crown dues very largely during the last year. We contended that they were unwarranted in making such a large increase, and I think I can show that so far as trade is concerned in the Ottawa valley, there was no reason for increasing the Crown charges as they have done, except in anticipation of the removal of the duties upon the products of the forests going into the United States. I have taken that ground in my own party. That must have been the ground upon which they made that increase, and they were perfectly justified in their views that the United States would at an early day do that which was to their interest, and remove the duties from the forest products of this country. Now, as a practical lumberman, I may state here that as a matter of fact, according to the condition of the lumber trade in the Ottawa valley, those charges cannot be paid by the lumbermen at the present time unless the duties are removed upon lumber going into the United States. It is a well known fact to all practical lumbermen and sawmill men, that a low grade of lumber as produced now cannot be exported to the United States under that system of duties, without a loss to the sawmill men who saw the logs. That is a positive fact, and the only advantage, I contend, which we can obtain from the removal of those duties, is to enable us to cut and saw an inferior quality of logs, and perhaps, in many cases, trees that have been burnt and killed a long time ago might be cut and used for boxes, and so on, which might be worked here and exported to the United States, if there were no duties to pay. On that ground, and on that ground alone, I contend that there is no reason for anyone taking the position that lumbermen here can handle that lumber, unless the duties are removed. I make that statement as a matter of fact from my experience of lumbering, and I challenge any man who is accustomed to the manufacturing and sawing of lumber, to contradict or controvert it. There is another matter in connection with the lumber business that has not been stated here, or referred to in any way, and that is the enormous increase for home consumption which has taken place since 1880. Hon. gentlemen opposite have either purposely or carelessly avoided mentioning anything of that kind as being a benefit to our producers here. That, I contend, is one of the essential points that should be considered in any transaction or measure of this kind. It has

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa).

been strongly argued from the United States point of view in this House that the enormous internal interstate trade of the United States has increased to a wonderful degree year after year, which we all know is the fact, upon which the prosperity and advancement of this country have very largely depended, and which the success of the United States may be attributed, especially since the abolition of American slavery. The interstate trade of that nation has been enormous and unequalled in the world. I contend that we can cultivate and develop an interprovincial trade in Canada, and in order to show the reason why I hold this to be the fact, I will cite the statistics of the increase of the sales of lumber in Montreal for local consumption since the adoption of this protective policy. The estimated consumption for 1880 was from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 feet, while in 1887 it ran up to 120,500,000 feet. I look upon this as one of the important elements of the prosperity and success which this National Policy so-called, has given to this country. And if we were able to obtain the statistics of other cities, I am sure we would be able to show the people and hon. gentlemen opposite, who are contending that we should throw overboard everything we have achieved, that upon that basis we have developed our trade and given our own people employment in the manufacturing interest. That is not all, but it furnishes a home market for much of the products of the forest within our own country. That home market, I contend, is the best market in any country. In order to show the benefit of that trade, and in order to make it more clear to the comprehension of hon. members who are not accustomed to the lumber trade, I would say that the amount consumed in the city of Montreal in 1887 amounted to 20 per cent. of the cut of all the mills in Ottawa and its immediate neighborhood. That this progress has been accomplished from 1880 to 1887 furnishes remarkable evidence of the effects of the National Policy, and it cannot be questioned that it has benefited this section of country. I contend that this same principle will apply all through Ontario and Quebec, not only in regard to the products of the forest, but in the products of the farm, and everything we can raise and consume or of which we have a surplus to export to another country. Upon that basis I claim that there can be no question of the success of the National Policy so far as we have gone, and I contend that the advancement has been far more than perhaps might have been expected under the circumstances. When we consider the sparseness of our population from ocean to ocean, that when this policy was adopted we had limited means of transport from one section of the country to the other, it is remarkable that within this period of time we have attained such results. When we consider that it is only within the last year or a little more that we have had means of communication with the extremity of the Dominion on the Pacific Ocean, when we consider that at the present time our means of communication are in course of construction to the other extremity of the Dominion, we may congratulate ourselves on the real success we have achieved in the interchange of products. I regret to say that means do not seem to be available to arrive at a correct conclusion in regard to the interprovincial trade, which we have already developed and which we now enjoy, and although meagre, it would be quite surprising to many people who are attacking it and endeavoring to make us believe that there is no such thing as interprovincial trade, that we have not arrived at that stage of development in our progress as a Dominion to have developed that trade to any degree. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we can get over this attempt to disturb the progress and development of this country, and if the hon. gentlemen who represent the constituents in this House would take some other means of criticising the action of the governing party, that we would do far

better and get along more successfully in developing the resources of the country. It seems to me that this feeling of enmity against the successful party and this complaining has been going on since I have known anything about Parliament and this raising of the cry that we are going to ruin, are I believe calculated to retard the progress of the country and to embarrass the Government from carrying on measures for its welfare. I may be criticised for expressing my views on this point being a young member of the House, but I must say that I consider this resolution uncalled for in any sense of the word so far as the lumber trade is concerned, and I can see no ground upon which they can justify themselves in introducing a resolution of that kind. So far as I am concerned I have no hesitation in saying that the lumber trade does not need any such resolution. I think it is very unfair that the arrangements pending between this country and the United States and which we have every reason to believe would result in an immense benefit to the country should be embarrassed by such a proceeding. We have seen in this House during the last 24 hours that already measures to interchange our natural products are being arranged between the United States Government and this Government. I contend that we may consider the United States people a sensible people and we claim at least to be a sensible people here, and when they see as they have seen that it was a mistake to continue the duty on lumber, we may readily conclude that they will come to the same conclusion about potatoes, and barley, and other things and in due time they will see it is to the detriment of their own interest to continue it. I consider that those Governments have achieved remarkable results in the fishery negotiations, results which we ought to all feel proud of in this country and which tend to the settlement of that long vexed question. As a native of the United States, I have had much intercourse with its people during all these years, perhaps more than any other member of this House. The great contention I have met with among the mass of the people on the other side of the line is that they believe they have the right to fish where they liked, but the more sensible portion of the people with whom I have talked recognised the obligation of the treaty of 1818. We can depend upon the sensible portion of the people of the United States, and I am happy to congratulate the members of this Government, especially the Minister of Finance upon the success which he obtained for Canada at the Washington conference. I am quite satisfied that it will lead to a better understanding between the authorities of both countries, and, as I said before, I have no doubt that reasonable arrangements will be made for a fair interchange of the products of the two countries in due time. In the course of the debate upon the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it has been said that we will open our market to 60,000,000 of people. I contend that we only open our markets to the 5,000,000 with whom we come in contact along the border on the other side of the line. So far as we are concerned, are not the farmers along the line producers of the same articles as we produce? We immediately come into contact with them and we open our markets to a country highly developed and to a people better prepared to produce than we are. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know what advantage we would have in sending our products to compete with the same products in the United States? From a business point of view I cannot see that we are going to obtain any advantage. On the contrary, I contend that we are opening our markets to the manufacturers of the United States; that those manufactures are highly developed, they make almost everything that is needed for the people, and when we open our markets to those manufacturers we become confronted with the great facilities and advantages they have gained after many years of establishment, and I contend we are not

prepared in our young country to meet such a state of things. I contend that our country would be overrun with the manufactures of the United States, and we would not be able to contend against the best kind of machinery and manufacturing skill they have in that country. Upon that ground, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that we will gain any advantage by unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, which is the same thing, or by annexation. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) said:

"I have no accurate statistics as to the value of the lumber interests, but I find that we exported up to the 15th June, 1887, for the year prior to that, the immense value of \$3,165,987 upon which as I will explain in a moment, my constituents, at all events, pay the enormous amount of over \$500,000."

Now, the facts show as nearly as possible that from the Province of Ontario the total amount of forest products which were subject to United States duty for the year ending June, 1887, amounted to about \$6,000,000, and that it is not at all likely that the whole duty thereon could have exceeded from \$500,000 to \$700,000, showing clearly that the hon. member was perfectly justified in stating that he had no accurate statistics, and that his statement regarding the amount of duties paid by his constituents was without foundation in fact. I submit that no member of this House is justified in placing before his constituents any statements that rest on a false basis. Now, with regard to the question, who pays the duty on the lumber we export to the United States, I do not know that there is any settled principle; but the dealers in lumber and manufacturers in the United States, without any exception, contend that they pay the duty. They come here and buy lumber free on board, and pay the duty on it. I do not intend to argue the question, but I will state my experience in the application of the treaty of 1854, and leave the hon. members to draw their own conclusion as to which contention is right. Notice for the abrogation of the treaty of 1854 was given in 1864, and the abrogation took place on the 1st of July, 1866, when a duty of 20 per cent. was imposed on pine lumber. At that time my firm was engaged in the sawing of lumber and at the time this resolution was introduced my impression was that we did not experience any difference in the price of our lumber from the imposition of that duty. But to verify my impression I had an examination made of the books of my firm, and I found that from 1864 to 1867 there was no perceptible change in the price of our products. If anything, the prices increased in the latter years to some extent. But this instance goes to show conclusively that at that time we certainly did not pay the duty that was imposed on lumber by the United States. After all, we have valuable resources in our forests that would be much improved by the removal of the United States customs duties—not in the sense of such increased value as my hon. friend from North Norfolk estimates, but more particularly as I contend in the sense of enabling the holders and workers of these timber lands to appropriate and market low grades of growth—possibly vast numbers of trees from burned districts which it is impossible for them to handle under the Crown charges now resting upon such products, but which might then be worked up in this country into marketable exports for the United States. It may thus be clearly seen that the mere earnings to the laboring classes and payment of crown dues, with only a very small profit to the mill men, would be a great boon for this country to get from such timber, and I contend that this is the main advantages which this country would gain by the removal of the United States duties on lumber. At the inauguration of our present fiscal policy, it was contended, on what we considered reasonable grounds, that that trade would have to suffer, under the National Policy, for the benefit of other industries. It was contended by some member of my own firm and by my neighbors that we would have to pay increased prices for the different articles

we consumed. I took the opposite view, and held that we would get these articles from our own manufacturers at rates fully as low as those we would have to pay the foreign manufacturer. What was the fact? The articles of clothing and the vast amount of goods that enter into shanty supplies were never advanced in price, and to-day we can get them cheaper than ever we could get them before. That is the true principle of protection. Protection is not a new thing to me. Before I came to this country I was a protectionist, and I have always been firmly of the opinion that no new country can get on without a protective policy. I am sanguine that with our resources, which under the National Policy, are being rapidly developed, we will in time become a nation of great importance. We need only take the glowing accounts of Mr. Erastus Wiman and his supporters to realise more clearly than we otherwise might the vast resources that we possess in our unlimited wheat producing and stock raising lands, the richness of our mineral deposits, our forests, rivers and water powers. We need only consider these advantages to appreciate properly the heritage we now possess and to become inspired to the exercise of every effort to work out the great destiny before us. The hon. member for South Brant has alluded to evidence before a commission of this House on depression in the year 1876, in which he gives the statement of W. G. Perley, lumber merchant, whom he supposes to be the present member for Ottawa. I wish to remove all doubt from the mind of that hon. gentleman by a full declaration to this House that I am the same W. G. Perley to whom he alluded as having given evidence on that occasion. I thank the hon. member most sincerely for reporting my evidence on that occasion, viz., that we were all anxious to have the privilege of sending lumber into the United States without duty, if we could have it on fair terms. I feel able to congratulate myself upon the record that my hon. friend has brought down to this House, and further to congratulate myself on having been a uniform and steadfast supporter of the view all the time from that date to this, that reciprocity with the United States on fair terms would be a boon to us as well as to the United States. But that does not in my view offer any inducement for a sacrifice or absolute surrender on our part such as I consider the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford, and I shall therefore vote against the amendment to the amendment and against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I hope that such an expression of opinion against both will be given by this House as to leave no room for encouragement in the minds of those who might desire to bring forward this resolution again. I thank you, Sir, for the patient hearing you have given me, and I hope the House will pardon me, if, being a new member and therefore lacking parliamentary experience, my remarks have not been as well put as they might have been, but I have done, as I always intend to do, the best I could for my country.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have listened to all the speeches that have been made on this very important question, the most important perhaps that has ever been presented to Parliament since Confederation, and I would not now take up the time of the House were it not that my hon. friend the senior member for St John (Mr. Weldon) is not able to take part in this debate on account of physical difficulties. Only one of our delegation from the Province of New Brunswick has spoken in the discussion, and therefore I feel it is my duty to make my voice heard on this question. Anyone who knows my views on trade questions knows that I will vote for any measure which will remove the obstacles to trade, either partially or completely. I am from honest conviction a free trader. In 1854, when the treaty of partial reciprocity was introduced into New Brunswick, I was a member of the Parliament of that day and I voted to ratify the arrangement thirty-four years

Mr. PERLEY, (Ottawa.)

ago. So that you see, Sir, I am not a very young man. That was the commencement of my political life, and I have been in politics ever since. If this resolution should be adopted now, at the close of my career, if I can assist in the humblest manner in bringing about this result, it will be a happy ending to my political career. I have listened to all the speeches that have been made on this subject, and, although I have always been associated with the Liberal party, I do not think I am an extreme partisan; I think I can look at questions fairly, and, according to my light, can judge fairly of arguments. I know that this question has been ably discussed, though I think there has been much said which has not helped us to come to a correct conclusion. When this question was first mooted in the country, I had hopes that it might be discussed to a large extent free from party feelings and with a disposition to arrive at what was best for the country. I cannot suppose that the majority in this House are not anxious for the advancement and prosperity of the country. I have no doubt that they are anxious that their policy shall succeed, and that they have made the best efforts they can to that end, but, in my humble opinion, no country can succeed under a policy of protection. Surround it as much as you may with fallacies and sophistries, I am so grounded in my belief that protection cannot succeed that these sophistries and fallacies cannot affect me. I do not know how much time I may occupy in what I have to say, but I promise that I shall not endeavor to dig up dry bones and dead issues of the past. Those dead issues cannot help us to come to a proper conclusion on this question. The question is large enough to be discussed on its merits, and what this gentleman on this side or that gentleman on the other side said years ago, under different circumstances, speaking on different questions, has no relation to the question now before us, and can have no effect upon it. We are face to face now with an issue which is worthy of the best consideration and the best judgment we can bring to bear upon it. The question now is, without regard to other matters, without regard even to the question whether Canada is prosperous or not, whether it is the best for the interest of Canada to adopt the resolution now before us, and to endeavor to obtain unrestricted free trade with our neighbors to the south of us. That is the question, and I shall endeavor to give the reasons why I think that is the best policy. This question is so plain that it does not require a very intelligent man to understand it. It is so plain that I do not think it can be blinded up with sophistries and fallacies. I think it is a question that is being considered by more electors, by more people throughout the Dominion of Canada, than any question which was ever propounded before in so short a time as we have had this question before us. I believe the people of this country will give it a fair and intelligent consideration, and will come to an honest decision in the matter. Of course I do not expect that anything that will be said here will change a vote in Parliament. This is said to be a deliberative body, but party feeling has become so strong, and I may say so rotten, that we cannot look at things here through a clear medium, or at least we do not seem to be able to do so. I do not wish to judge hon. members. I think they have presented their objections to this resolution to the best of their ability. I think they have done the best they could, but they have failed, as everybody must fail who attempts to prove that protection is a correct principle and is the best for the country. They have spoken fluently and brought their arguments to bear on the question, and, while I do not wish to underrate their speeches, for they are not responsible to me, or to this House, but to their constituents, I think they have failed to make out a case. I was once at a meeting. A colored man was preaching, and before he commenced his services he gave out a hymn, and the choir commenced to sing, but they pitched too high, and then they stopped. Then they began

again, but they pitched too low. They made another effort and failed again, and after several trials, they sat down, and did not succeed in singing because they could not, and my hon. friends, I think, have not succeeded simply because they could not. The preacher said: "I thank you, gentlemen, though you did not succeed, because you have done the best you could." So those hon. gentlemen have done the best they could, but they have failed to convince me; there has been no music in it to me. In dealing with trade questions, it is usually supposed that it is only the manufacturers and the wholesale and retail dealers and a few others who constitute the trading public, that they are the only ones who trade, and that therefore we should look to them as the traders of the country. My idea is that everyone is a trader who buys or sells anything and this question is important because it reaches every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada, who are able to produce and to dispose of their products, whether it is their labor or anything else which they may desire to sell or to buy. This is a question which appeals to everyone. We are a hive of traders. We are endeavoring, all of us, to get something which we may sell again in order to obtain what we wish to consume for our comfort. However desirous one might be to regard this question without looking at party, it is only necessary to reflect for a moment to see that the proposed resolution is a direct attack upon the principle of protection. Therefore, I could not expect that this question would be discussed without having the National Policy discussed from beginning to end, with its effects upon the country from its inception up to the present time. I have been unable all through these years to understand exactly what the policy of the Government was upon this question. It has never been very clearly defined. They started out with the proposal that we must have reciprocity of trade or we must have reciprocity of tariffs. I did not know what they really wanted, or what they thought was best for the country, but it seems as though they had two strings to their bow, and they have continued to have two strings to their bow all the way through. They have found that the National Policy has worked well for them as a party, and I confess they have been very successful. I never expected that they would be so successful in introducing such a policy at this age of the world, but they have been successful, and, when this discussion was opened, I made up my mind that the policy of the Government was clearly defined. When the amendment to the resolution was moved, I thought we had a clear and distinct issue, I thought that the Government were disposed to hold to the policy of protection as a principle to be fixed upon this country. But the declarations of the Government seems to have left me again in doubt as to their policy. I do not know now what they mean. From the declarations of the Prime Minister the other day, I supposed that their colors were nailed to the mast, I understood him to mean that they were decided not to have reciprocity in either natural or in manufactured products. Their amendment declared that they had proved the National Policy, that the people had approved of it on three occasions and as having protected and fostered their industries, and therefore I supposed the Government had made up their minds to fight it out on that line. I find now that is altogether changed, that they are beginning to yield, and that this pet of theirs, the National Policy, is receiving but little attention in some respects. I find that in this first engagement with the United States in the war of tariffs, they have made a retreat, and this bantling of the hon. gentlemen opposite, this idol which they have elected and worshipped so long a time, is now suffering injury. Are not the fruit growers an industry in Canada? Are not those who grow shrubs, and plants, and trees, and put them into the market, men who have a right to be protected under the National

Policy? It seems not just now. That is one of the interests of this country that does not seem to be taken under the fostering care of the National Policy. And so I do not know how much they are going to yield, or exactly what they contemplate. I thought this amendment was the policy of the Government. I understood by it that all these industries and interests in the Dominion of Canada, having been so fostered and having proved so successful, were to continue to receive the benefits of the National Policy; but I cannot tell now whether that is going to be done or not. I have noticed that all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question from the Government side, have declared at the beginning or at the conclusion of their speeches, that they were willing to have reciprocity. After arguing with great ability that free trade would injure the interest of the farmer, the miner, the lumberman, and every other interest, at the conclusion of their speeches they wound up by saying: We are willing to have reciprocity of some kind or another. This proves to my mind that they have a lingering fear that the people of this country are in favor of unrestricted trade with our neighbors across the border. It all convinces me that some how or other, they believe there is a feeling abroad that the people want to have the shackles of trade removed, at least in reference to the United States, and I fancy that they are right. I believe that the people desire unrestricted trade with our neighbors, and for that reason I shall help them so far as I am able. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a hard battle to be fought before we can obtain it. We have had a good many elections, and you know the result, Mr. Speaker, and I know the result, and our party knows the result. In three elections we have been beaten. But that is no reason why we should compromise our principles, that is no reason why we should not contend for what we think is to the advantage of this country. Any hon. member who thinks it is going to be an easy matter to beat the present Government, with the influences they have at their command, and know so well how to use, is greatly mistaken. Any hon. gentleman who remembers that this Government with their experience, with \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 to spend every year, and know how well to apply it, how well to use it for their purposes, must know that it is a hard matter to overcome that influence. In addition to that, we have got to meet the influence of all the combines, of all the rings and the monopolies that have been fostered and encouraged by the present policy, and they form a very important element in carrying an election. Then, there is the manufacturing interests, which have a very strong influence, and in the main I fear they may be against us. Then we have in this Dominion a great many office holders, many of them men of honor, many of them men of ability, and many of them doing service to their country. But beside and above all these, there is a host of hangers on, the rag-tag and bob-tail, who want to get a living without work—we are going to have that vote against us, and then, Mr. Speaker, in addition to them, there are a great many honest men, a great many men who are good citizens, but whose party feelings are so strong that we cannot approach them, and they will vote for their party. Then we have an army of contractors, who have made great wealth out of the public works of this country; we have the sub-contractors and all who depend upon them, who have made vast means out of the public works of this country, and all these will be against us. The Government know the power of contractors, they have a little experience of them down in Glengarry, they know what they can do, when they put themselves to work, and they have not got them all on their side. Take these altogether, all who have been in office and who are looking for office, all those who follow the Government ship in order to live on the offal that is thrown overboard, and you have got a host.

to contend with. But still I feel that our cause is just, and I believe that to-day, there is a larger majority than ever in Canada in favor of unrestricted free trade with the United States. Feeling that, I have no fear, but the work has got to be attended to. Now, there is a great difference of opinion in the House as to whether Canada is prosperous at the present time. I do not think Canada is at all what she ought to be considering her resources and her opportunities; but this idea of prosperity is a relative term, and what one might consider prosperity another might not consider prosperity, and you can prove your position by taking one locality and another locality that may be fairly and truthfully said to be prosperous at the present time. Taking Canada as a whole it cannot be said to be prosperous. The expectations held out when the National Policy was inaugurated have entirely failed to be fulfilled, and whatever prosperity there may be of a general nature, it is not the result of protection. You might as well expect to gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles as to expect any general prosperity in any country by restricting and impeding trade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What about the United States?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are the greatest free traders in the world.

Mr. GILLMOR. I admit the United States is a great country, but I do not admit that her prosperity is the result of her protective policy; she is not prosperous because she has protection any more than because she has got Mormonism. The United States is a rich country by nature, it is a country with vast natural resources and with an energetic people. It possesses a great variety of climate where any immigrant from Europe can find a genial climate. They have a cold climate where any person from the colder countries of Europe can come and find a climate suited to him. They have a greater variety of climate than any other country, and I contend that the condition of the United States is not at all due to her protective policy, but in spite of it. That is my honest conviction, and that opinion is shared I believe to-day by a majority of the electors in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes, I believe so. An evidence of this is found in the proposals for a reduction of their tariff. They have already free trade between the different States. Hon. gentlemen opposite offset that by stating that we have free trade here between the Provinces. Many of the most able men in the United States now believe that the present protective policy is not in the interests of the country, and they are fighting that battle out there, and this is an opportune time for Canada to raise her voice in support of this measure. Men there believe that for trade purposes this country is intended to unite with the United States, and that it is for our joint interest that we should unite. A very good evidence that a country is not prosperous is when its real estate is declining in value. I know there may be differences of opinion on that point, but in my opinion one of the best evidences that a country is not prosperous is when real estate is at a low price. With regard to my own county I could not consistently with my convictions say that we are in a depressed condition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLMOR. I cannot say so fairly, although I could go to some parts of my county and pick out small communities and small localities where property is very low. Just now I understand there is quite a "boom" in the price of real estate in the shire town of my county. I am exceedingly pleased with the fact, and I take this opportunity to state the fact that real estate, which has been much

Mr. GILLMOR.

depressed for thirty years, is now quite in demand, and that much property has changed hands at a very marked increase over the price of the last quarter of a century. I am glad of it, and I give the Government the benefit of it. What has caused it I do not know. I do not believe it is the National Policy—I do not know exactly what it is. It may be that this town is expected to become the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and that this may be the cause of the advance in real estate. It may be owing to the circumstance that this is a very pleasant summer resort, and perhaps on that account Americans have come and invested there. Whether it is due to the expectation of its being the terminus of a great railway system on the Atlantic coast, or of a popular summer resort, it is equally the same to us; it is a benefit to those who have property to sell and a benefit to the county where the transactions are going on. But I could go to another part of the county, where I live myself, and point out real estate that is not worth half as much as it was thirty years ago, I could point out large districts where real estate is really of little or no value, where there are no purchasers for it. That, of course, is another view of the case. The present condition of things is due to the exodus from the country. No country like Canada can lose in a few years nearly 1,000,000 of men and women who were its pride and strength without suffering very materially in all its best interests. I am not disposed to blame any one for what I could not do better myself. I know how anxious hon. gentlemen on Government benches and those who support them were to prevent this exodus. I am aware they had made every effort in their power to stop this out-going from the Dominion; I am also aware they have made every effort to bring immigrants to this country, and I am glad they have concluded that the plan has not been successful and has not been worth the expenditure. Hon. gentlemen promised, and I have sat and listened to all their speeches on the subject, that the National Policy would prevent this exodus; the First Minister stated both in the House and the country that he could do it and would do it. They have most signally failed, their National Policy has entirely failed; there can be no doubt the exodus has been as large and larger than it was before the National Policy was introduced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. The First Minister dissents from that proposition, but in my honest opinion they have failed entirely. Unrestricted free trade would check the exodus I believe, if it did not stop it. If you allow the young men and women to put their labor upon the soil and produce what this country can produce and have a free market with the United States, our young men will stop here more than they do under the National Policy. With regard to the state of trade in other parts of New Brunswick, I have no doubt that New Brunswick is upon the whole in a distressed condition. I know something about St. John as it is convenient to my residence, and therefore I believe that not only has the National Policy not helped St. John but that it has interfered with its progress and has been a great injury to the trade of that city—not alone to its general trade, but a great injury to its manufactures which this National Policy was especially adopted in order to advance. Mr. Speaker, in regard to that city, before the National Policy was introduced we had about seven manufacturers of boots and shoes. To day we have only one manufacturer of boots and shoes left in the city of St. John and I have been informed, truthfully I believe, that that institution upon which some \$17,000 was expended, those holding the mortgages upon it are willing to dispose of their claim for \$4,000. The truth is the "slaughter" process we heard so much about before has been going on since the National Policy was introduced to a larger extent than it ever came from the United States. The "slaughtering" process is coming from Montreal and

Canada and they have "slaughtered" those manufactories out of existence and left the remaining one on its last legs. I do not know whether it is running at all or not. That is the effect of the "slaughtering" process there. We heard a good deal of boasting about cotton manufacturers in Halifax. Before Confederation we had one cotton mill there, small it was, but it was prosperous before we had any connection with Canada under Confederation. I do not know what was invested originally in that mill, but under the stimulus of the National Policy it was increased at a cost of \$384,000, and that manufactory which cost \$384,000 is now in the hands of its creditors at a cost of \$284,000. Here was a clear \$100,000 lost in that undertaking stimulated by the National Policy. Therefore the National Policy cannot be said to have worked very well in the town of St. John. There was another cotton mill started under the fostering care of the National Policy, in which \$230,000 was invested and that was bought, not very long since, for \$75,000. Here was another loss of \$150,000 capital sunk in this concern and lost for ever to Canada. There is a total of \$250,000 lost to the cotton manufacturers of St. John. It is true the mills are working and I hope they may succeed but that cotton mill is now owned by those who work it, at a much less cost than it ever could be built for. One of the mills is owned by one of the most enterprising men in the Lower Provinces, perhaps I may say one of the most enterprising men in the Dominion of Canada—Mr. Gibson. He on his own account undertook to build a great cotton mill and he has succeeded in erecting one of the finest institutions of the kind in the country. He has built the finest mill that has ever been built in Canada and for the least money, but in consequence of the stimulus under the National Policy he comes in competition with the "slaughter" cotton mills of Canada. He is not the cheapest manufacturer in Canada which he ought to be and which he would be if he had any fair competition. I have no doubt of his success; I know the man, I know his energy and I know his independence. I am informed that he is not a member of the combine although the other institutions in St. John are members of the combine, try to make their institutions pay by keeping up the and price of cotton. Mr. Gibson is not a member of that combine, he wants a fair field and no favor, that is what I understand his principles to be. He is not afraid of competition, and a man like him need not be afraid of competition, but all he wants is a fair field, and a large field, and a fair chance for business. Mr. Gibson is not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We have in my own county, perhaps one of the finest mills in the Dominion of Canada, and a large amount of capital has been sunk in it. I believe it is now working successfully, but the first stockholders have lost quite a considerable sum. I was glad to find in the stores here that their cotton was considered of the very best class, and that Mr. Gibson's cotton is to be found in Ottawa too. I am informed, not personally, but through conversation with my friends, that those mills have no fears of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. They feel that if they had opened up to them the markets of the United States with sixty millions of consumers they could hold their own and they are not afraid of not meeting with success. I have heard a great deal said about the resources of Canada. I am a Canadian by birth, and my sympathies are with Canada, and her institutions, and her welfare. Canada, no doubt, has vast resources. We hear our friends on the other side speaking of Canada as starting on the race of nationality 20 years ago. What we see in Canada now is the result of 100 years' effort. It was Canada as much before Confederation as it is now. We are not a nation now but I hope in time we will be, and we should not go back twenty years to show what Canada ought to have been. We have been on the march and making efforts for progress almost

as long as many of the United States at all events, and the result is now that we have less than five millions people in Canada. I think we ought to have made greater progress than this and I think we would have made greater progress if we had adopted free trade with the United States. Our experience of the ten years of the National Policy shows that it has been ten years lost to the country. I think there has been no progress of any extent since that time and I think the National Policy is not at all performing what its promoters promised it would perform. Mr. Speaker, our National Policy was introduced especially to encourage our infant industries and that was the principal argument used at its introduction. I do not think that our industries have been promoted by it. Ten years have passed and I am honestly of opinion that the manufacturing industry of Canada would have been in a healthier state to-day if the National Policy had never been introduced into this country. The argument is that other industries must contribute in order to sustain and increase our infant industries. I read the following incident a short time ago, which I thought might serve to illustrate how long they were to be considered infants:—

"When Senator Broderick was shot by David Terry in San Francisco, a Dublin man wrote to an editor of a paper there claiming to be next of kin. He gave the date of his birth, which showed him to be 47 years of age, and he wound up by asking him to help a poor orphan who had lost both father and mother."

These industries remind me of that poor orphan who was 47 years old, and who wanted this man to help him in his infantile state. The best protectionist writers have come to the conclusion that it takes about three generations to bring these infant industries to maturity so that they can stand alone. If we have to maintain these institutions with the National Policy for three generations, I think it is rather more than we can afford to do in justice to other interests in the country. Now, notwithstanding all the efforts that have been made to prevent our people trading with our neighbors across the border, and notwithstanding a protective tariff in Canada that is very high, and a still more objectionable one on the other side of the line, our necessities have been so great that we have climbed over these barriers and have traded to the extent of \$35,000,000 or \$36,000,000 a year. You cannot prevent our people trading with the United States; you may put on high tariffs, and protect this trade or that one, as you like, but the daily and hourly wants of the people of these two countries will overleap these obstacles. You do not diminish the trade between them, but you make it perplexing, annoying and discouraging by the obstructions you place upon it. You have a frontier of three or four thousand miles extending from the Pacific Ocean to the Bay of Fundy, and you are attempting to guard that frontier with custom house officers; yet you cannot prevent the people trading with each other. You are hunting up markets in other parts of the world, and you are passing by 65,000,000 of the best customers the world can give you. You are sending your commissioners to the South American Republics, to Spain, and even to China and Japan, but the trade will not come. My hon. friend told you that all your trade in the world outside of the United States and England amounted to only \$7,000,000, and you are spending your money and time in vain to obtain customers in those countries. The best customers we have are our neighbors who are of the same kith and kin as ourselves; they are the only customers we have for a large surplus of our natural products. There are many of our products which we cannot send to England or consume at home, and we must find a market for them in the United States. I feel that I am speaking for the majority of the people in my county, and in the interest of the whole county, when I say that we must have that trade there. I do not justify smuggling; but I know the case of a man who went across the border to Eastport and

bought two barrels of flour, took them home and ate them, and two years afterwards the Government fined him \$60, and the vessel that brought the flour \$100, because he did not go nine miles to a custom house and pay the duty on it. I do not justify smuggling, but these people feel such a necessity for free trade that they do not feel they are violating a moral law, but only a law that is against their interest. You have detectives all along the frontier, at salaries of \$600 or \$700 a year, who are pocketing \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year which is taken out of the pockets of our people who trade across the border. Our trade with the United States, in spite of all you have endeavored to do to prevent it, amounts to upwards of \$25,000,000 a year, and if you had unrestricted trade with the United States it would have been to-day \$70,000,000, and many of our young men would have remained at home to till the soil instead of laboring in a foreign country. If you will give us free trade with the United States, you will open up ten thousand channels of trade, you will open up those streams of commerce that you are retarding by your policy, and you will see Canada take a start onward. I do not exactly understand those leaps and bounds to wealth; the natural way to become wealthy is to be industrious and economical, and I have no idea that we shall become immensely wealthy in a few years; but we would be in the way of getting wealth, our people would be growing richer, and the difficulties that are continually in our way would be removed. Talk about a growing trade with all these restrictions put on it. You might as well undertake to grow a strong and vigorous man by putting ligaments around his limbs and stopping the circulation of the blood, as to expect trade to prosper with all these restrictions and impediments in the way, no country ever did or ever will progress or prosper unless it enjoys free and unrestricted trade. It is the same with nations as with individuals. They depend on one another. Suppose the United States were to act upon the principle on which hon. gentlemen opposite desire that we should act, and suppose they would refuse to sell us their raw material, what would become of our industrial establishments? Hon. gentlemen now oppose unrestricted trade with the United States in order to build up our manufactures. Protection has produced here its legitimate and natural fruit. You undertake to tax the people in order to make them buy your goods at higher prices, so as to enrich the few who are engaged in manufacturing, and you have failed even in that. You do not take the money out of the pockets of foreigners, but out of the pockets of Canadians, and thus inflict great injustice on the majority of the people. Nations cannot afford to be independent of each other any more than individuals. This resolution opens up a grand prospect for Canada, and I believe that if the people were appealed to, they would endorse the policy which it embodies. With regard to the legitimate fruits of the National Policy, what do we see now in Canada after a few years of its working? It has produced its natural fruit. We have now combines in all branches for the purpose of keeping up prices. We have been taught to pray to our Heavenly Father for our daily bread, but we have now to pray to a combination of millers who keep up the prices and serve the people in any way they chose. Instead of having to pray to our Heavenly Father, we have to pray to Mr. Drummond for our daily supply of sugar, and we have to pray to another combine for the cotton with which to clothe ourselves. And should we engage in strike, and wish to shuffle off this mortal coil, we have to get on our knees and beg Mr. Connel, or some other man in the rope business, to give us a few yards to hang ourselves with. If hon. gentlemen will look to England for an example in trade matters instead of the United States they would find out an example worthy of imitation. If you want to find out the effects of protection go to England and see what protection did for her. She suffered all the horrors and degradation protection could produce; her ships went idle at anchor in their harbors, her manufactures were idle, her looms were still and her spindles were resting. But she had men for the occasion who fought the battle of free trade nobly, and England to-day is the brightest example we can follow. England has laid the foundation in everything great and good, England has fought out the battle of personal freedom nobly, so that every Englishman is a freeman. I am loyal to the institutions of England. England has fought the battle of constitutional liberty, and every Englishman has a right to his opinion and the liberty of his person consistent with the laws and the good of society. England has fought out another large battle and that is freedom of principle. She is an example to the wide world, and the result her free trade policy is that she has the trade of all nations. I am proud of England. I am not loyal to that which is wrong. England has had upon the throne tyrants and imbeciles, and to those she has always had toadies. They had protection in Queen Elizabeth's time; there were guilds then one hundred years ago which are copied here to-day. Queen Elizabeth was proud of these combines, and said they were the finest flowers in her garden. The Prime Minister has the same system. He has omitted his policy of one hundred years ago, and the favored flowers in his garden are the monopolists and the combines. Those are the flowers in his garden. Those are the sycophants. Yes, they have always had such men, and the poor have been neglected. They have got the ear of the Crown under such circumstances, but the poor have had no one to speak for them. These men have the ear of the Crown now. They had when they introduced the National Policy, but in England the people rose above that. There are men in England who are true to principle, and they fought out this battle, and a hard battle it was, and forty-three years ago I was there, and I became a free trader, and I contributed my mite to the bazaars that were held in every town in England to raise funds to carry on that cause, and they succeeded because they were men of intelligence, men of integrity, men of honesty of character. There have always been men in England to battle for the right and to battle for principles. I am loyal to England, I am loyal to the principles that influence England, and I am loyal to the men who have brought about those grand results; but I am loyal to the people. The poor have few friends. I am not a demagogue. I do not appeal to the people on that account, but I know that the toiling mass are those who suffer. When I was in England as a lad, in my leisure hours, I used to walk about and talk to the men who were using the pickaxe and the shovel and the spade, and I learned from talking to them what their condition was, and I found what their wages were, and that their food was meal and the cheapest kind of food. They told me over and over again that it was a rare thing for them to be able to afford meat once a week for themselves and their families.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Free trade.

Mr. GILLMOR. That was the condition of England under protection. After the battle of free trade was fought England soon began to improve. Her ships found something to do, her looms started again, her spindles went on working, and she went on progressing from that time until this, not of course without dissatisfaction—it is the lot of mankind to have reverses—but her progress has been onward and upward ever since. That is only 43 or 44 years ago, only twice as long as we have been confederated. Up to that time the whole volume of English trade was something over eight hundred millions, while the annual trade of Great Britain is now three and a half billions, including exports and imports, and she is the admiration of the

Mr. GILLMOR.

world, she is carrying her products to every country under the influence of free trade.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. Go on.

Mr. GILLMOR. My friends need not be alarmed about me. Members of Parliament are supposed to be gentlemen, and I have always so endeavored to conduct myself in Parliament. In addition to that, I find by my notes that since that time the increase of England's wealth has been marvellous. I see that she has invested in foreign countries one billion five hundred million pounds sterling, and of that we have some five hundred million dollars in Canada. England has made that out of her free trade policy. Her investments all over the world, in consequence of the wealth she has gained under free trade, are bringing her in some sixty or seventy millions of pounds sterling annually from her investments abroad. The wealth of England is the result of free trade, and any people who want to get wealthy must follow her example and must not expect to get wealthy under a system of protection. Of course, we cannot expect such great results, because our population is sparse, but we have homes here for many millions more. I do not expect to live to see the great increase in our population which I am satisfied would result from the adoption of free trade, the increase in our population and in our wealth which would result from making our trade as free as possible, consistently with the raising of our revenues.

Mr. MADILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if the English manufactures were not built up under the highest protection in the world, before England adopted free trade?

Mr. GILLMOR. That shows very little knowledge of English history. England held to protection until her manufactures were ruined, until her factories were shut down, until her people were out of employment, and there were two millions of paupers in the kingdom without food. Although they are not entirely rid of the poor, the country took a start from the moment she adopted free trade and has gone on until she is the pride of all nations, with a commerce greater than any other nation ever had. There is no doubt that there are some difficulties to be encountered if we succeed in getting this policy adopted. There is the question of revenue, which is all important. We collect on our imports from the United States a little more than seven millions of dollars. That has got to be met. There is some difficulty and there may be some friction in regard to these matters, but, if the people import forty million dollars worth from the United States, and pay \$7,000,000 in duty, they pay \$47,000,000. Will the people be any poorer? Will they not have the \$7,000,000 and will they not be in just as good a position as they were before? There may be some difficulty in regard to the mode of obtaining it, but you will not deny that the whole \$47,000,000 are here, and you have to get the \$7,000,000 out of the people, who will be just as able to pay it as if they paid it in customs revenue. The only difficulty is how to get it. I do not know how that is to be done. I am not going to trouble myself as to that. I want to know what the difficulties are, but, if our contention is right, we will get over the difficulties. I think myself, that the plan suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the best plan. If a part of it or the whole of it can be saved by economy, you will all agree with me that would be the better way. I think we can safely trust him in that respect, because, without making any invidious comparisons, I think he is about the ablest financier that I have seen in Canada since I have been in Parliament. I have no doubt about it. I do not wish to compliment men to their faces, but that is my impression. I have no trouble in that score. The people need have no fear of the bugbear of direct taxation. Taxation is always an unpleasant subject, and I suppose a Tory is just about as reluctant to pay as a Liberal. There are a good many ways of taxing the people,

and of getting a revenue, but the usual way is a revenue tariff. In my humble opinion, of all things in the world that should be free, is trade. I think it is a fair way to get revenue by taxing trade, and that should be as free as the wind that blows, or as the flow of the ocean; and then people will get the money and be able to contribute it for the support of the institutions that civilised life requires. That is the best mode, I think, of raising a revenue. The next best mode is that of a revenue tariff, levied upon such articles as the people use most generally, and levied in such a way that the money should go into the treasury. But the worst tariff that evil-minded men, the worst tariff that the devil ever suggested, is a protective tariff. It takes millions out of the people and puts little into the treasury, but it puts a large amount into the pockets of those who are protected, and instead of paying 30 millions of revenue tax in this country, I do not hesitate to say that the people are paying twice that amount. Now, how long do you suppose the consumers of Canada would put up with a protective tariff if they really understood it? Suppose that instead of collecting your customs duty on the goods before they go into the store, you changed your policy and collected on the goods when they came out of the store. Suppose a customs officer instead of collecting the dues on the imports, would stand in a retail store and collect it there. Well, a customer would come in and he would pay for his pound of sugar, and when he came to leave the customs officer would step up and say, well now you have forgot to pay me so much on the sugar, and so on with all the articles of consumption. Then the people would realise how much they pay, then they will begin to enquire what this all means. But your system now is to pluck the goose, to take all the feathers off, and she don't squeal, she don't make a noise at all, but she stands cold and shivering and don't know who in the deuce took the feathers off her. You let them know how they are being taxed in this country, and your National Policy would vanish like thin air. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of loyalty has been discussed. I think it was a great mistake. I think it is a great mistake to have introduced it into the discussion of this question at all. Now, I have not felt offended at all at anything hon. gentlemen may say. I thought it was silly—I thought it was wishy-washy nonsense. Yes, and I am satisfied that your sensible men on that side of the House thought the same. I think it is not an indication of your loyalty to begin here mouthing it as though it was oozing out from your fingers ends. It is all nonsense to talk about it. I suppose one party in this House is just about as loyal as the other, and you are no more loyal by talking about it than if you were to hold your tongues. I should advise you to hold your tongues about loyalty. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this tariff I had made up my mind not to refer to any speeches on the other side, but there is one gentleman from the county of Annapolis (Mr. Mills), who took a very singular view of this tariff of ours. He had discovered that it was just the tariff for a poor man who need not pay any duties if he did not buy anything. It was a wonderful discovery. But it was equally good to the rich, and if he did not choose to buy anything, he would not have to pay any duty either. I think if any one tried to live in this country on what he could get without paying taxes on it, he would either freeze to death or starve to death in a very short time. I do not know anything that is worth having that is not taxed. When this National Policy was being discussed, I had a daughter at home, and she was reading over the things that were taxed, and she wrote up to me and said: she could not find anything that was not taxed. She said: "Father, our Jersey cow has got a little calf, is that taxed?" I wrote back to quiet her fears, and told her that there was no tax upon a Jersey calf. Yet the hon. member for Annapolis says this is a very good tariff for the poor. He says they need not buy

jewellery, and they need not buy optical instruments, nor perfumery, nor sausage, nor silks, nor jams, nor jellies, nor fancy soaps. He says that the poor man does not want any perfumed soap. They can make their soap out of lye and soap grease, and soft soap is good enough for them. I wonder if he would say that to one of his constituents down in Annapolis if he went to solicit their votes. He would have to use some little soft soap himself before he could convince them they had no right to use perfumed soap if they could get it. He says they do not want any jam or jellies. O, no! He wants a tariff under which they cannot have any jams or jellies. He thinks that molasses is good enough for them. The next item is musical instruments. The poor do not want musical instruments; such is the opinion of the hon. gentleman. Are they to be forever toiling from generation to generation, their children being debarred from learning to sing and play. Is that a good tariff for the poor, one which debars them from the pleasures and gratifications of life? Are they to toil on like cattle to be used by hon. gentlemen and work for them? They are not to have musical instruments. Why? Have not the poor man's children a right, laboring and toiling as they do, to become educated and accomplished if they can do it? It affords me much pleasure in travelling through my county to find a poor family who by industry and prudence have saved from their earnings sufficient to buy a musical instrument. Yet according to the hon. gentleman's theory this is a good tariff for them because they do not need those things and need not buy them? I hope the hon. gentleman's heart is better than his head. If those are his sentiments he is as cruel as the man who would make his ass bear his burdens, and because he could exist on thistles he would turn him out to eat thistles by the wayside. If he would treat the poor in that way, who perform the labor and produce the wealth of the Dominion, it is not worthy of any man in Canada. There is another set of asses called jackasses, who perform no labor. They live on clover, hay and oats, but the ass that toils can live on thistles. Next we come to watches. The poor need not buy watches for they do not need them, and yet the toiling masses are the foundation and source of wealth in Canada. What are our exports from the Dominion? They are the products of hard labor, of the toil of the fisherman, the farmer and the laborer; they produce all that goes out of the country to bring back wealth to support the Government and the lazy fellows who will not work. The working classes all over the world are tethered, they can go just so far, they can eat the length of their rope and see green pastures before them which they cannot reach,—and accordingly they are dissatisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think this is very unfair to the hon. member who does not very often trouble the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order; and I think when I see there so many white chokers there has been too much Rideau Hall business to-night. The hon. member for Charlotte has a right to a hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The members will please keep order. What is the question of order?

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are disturbing the representative from Charlotte, and he has a right to a fair hearing. There has been too much white choker business about it, too much Rideau Hall about it. Go on, you will get a fair hearing.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not complain very much. It is evident hon. gentlemen opposite do not like what I say; I can sit quietly and listen to what they say and they might

Mr. GILLMOR.

return the compliment, I will not speak longer, as I have spoken too long already.

Mr. MITCHELL. Talk as long as you like and you will get a hearing.

Mr. GILLMOR. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said there are fair traders in England, that the country was built up under a protective system and all such nonsense. I admit there is some such movement there, but it will be of short duration.

Mr. SPEAKER, I would ask hon. members to stop throwing papers. It is not a very nice or a very dignified practice, and it is one that should be stopped.

Mr. GILLMOR. I will stop, and then hon. gentlemen will be satisfied.

Mr. MITCHELL. Stop when you are done and not before.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was going to make a remark in regard to the speech delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which, without wishing to make invidious comparisons, I must say was the best delivered on the other side of the House:

"It is the triumph of man to overcome the disabilities which nature throws in his way. It is the triumph of modern science, than which nothing has been more wonderful in the history of the world to overcome geographical difficulties, to overcome the disabilities of distance, to overcome the obstruction of physical difficulties, and to overcome them in the interest of the unity of countries and in the interest of the spread of commerce."

Those are fine sentiments, and with his eloquence he made them appear very fine. It was an excellent argument for a free trader to use, but it was perfectly nonsensical for a protectionist. When you go to work to tunnel the Alps in order to facilitate trade and commerce and overcome natural obstacles between nations it is absurd to place German and Italian artificial obstructions on each side. Such has been the result of all that you have expended to overcome distances and to overcome time and those natural obstacles on which you spent so much money to remove were no more obstacles than the artificial obstacles which you have now. I will not trouble you any longer. I have given you the best of my judgment on this question, and I think it will be to the interest of Canada to have unrestricted reciprocity in the natural products of the United States and also in our manufactures. There are difficulties connected with it but they will be overcome and it will not affect our loyalty in the slightest degree. No man cares about loyalty when he is buying or selling, he cares not for his nationality, he cares not for his creed or color, the simple barter or exchange of one thing for another has nothing to do with those questions. England is just as loyal as she was before she opened her ports to the world. We shall be just as loyal to our religion and our country when we have free trade as we are now. I am satisfied we will not suffer in our patriotism or in our loyalty to Canada or in our loyalty to England. England has fought out many a battle and there is only one blot on her escutcheon. Let her give the right of self government to Ireland and when that is done, England shall be the brightest nation on the face of the earth. With these few remarks I beg to state that I intend to vote for the motion of my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the amendment moved by my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

M. PRÉFONTAINE: A cette heure avancée du matin, je n'ai pas l'intention de retenir cette Chambre bien longtemps. Mais sur une question aussi importante que celle qui nous est maintenant soumise, et qui occupe non-seulement l'attention de la Chambre des Communes du Canada, mais encore de tout le pays, et qui au dire de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat devra faire époque dans l'histoire des

délibérations du parlement du Canada, je crois qu'il est de mon devoir, comme représentant un des comtés les plus importants de la province de Québec, de donner les raisons qui vont motiver mon vote sur cette question.

Je n'ai pas l'intention d'entrer beaucoup dans le mérite de la question; elle a été discutée depuis près de trois semaines, et les chiffres et les statistiques qui ont été donnés, même si je les répétais, n'ajouteraient aucun intérêt à la discussion. Mais ce qui m'a étonné dans les remarques faites par l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, c'est sa manière d'argumenter en voulant mettre l'opposition en contradiction sur cette question. Je crois qu'il ne me sera pas difficile de démontrer que s'il y a eu contradiction sur cette question, ce n'est certainement pas de ce côté-ci de la Chambre. Je pourrais le démontrer au moyen des arguments employés dans la discussion qui a eu lieu depuis que ce débat est commencé devant cette Chambre, mais je vais remonter un peu plus loin et relever certaines assertions que l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat a faites au sujet de la position prise par l'honorable chef de l'opposition et ses amis dans la province de Québec sur la réciprocité, la protection, et le libre-échange, lorsque ces questions sont devenues des questions publiques intéressant l'avenir de la Puissance du Canada.

L'honorable secrétaire d'Etat a voulu faire croire à cette Chambre qu'il a été le premier à parler de protection à nos manufactures dans la province de Québec; que plus tard l'honorable chef de l'opposition l'a suivi sur cette question avec ses amis et qu'ensuite en 1878, l'honorable chef de l'opposition et ses amis ont abandonné cette politique pour adopter celle du libre-échange.

Je crois qu'il est facile de démontrer que cette assertion ne repose pas sur les faits tels qu'ils se sont passés à cette époque. Il me suffira pour le démontrer de lire à la Chambre le rapport des assemblées de la Chambre de commerce du Canada et des assemblées des délégués de la Chambre de commerce du Canada avec les chambres de commerce des Etats-Unis en 1871, 1872 et 1873, où ces questions se sont soulevées pour la première fois. Je cite du "*Négociant Canadien*" à la date du 21 décembre 1871, les remarques suivantes qui ont été faites à une assemblée de la chambre nationale de commerce des Etats-Unis :

Entre les Etats-Unis et les colonies anglaises y adjacentes au nord, les relations commerciales devraient naturellement être aussi intimes et aussi étendues que celles qui existent dans les limites de l'union entre les divers Etats particuliers ou tout groupe particulier d'outre-mer. De fait la liaison naturelle entre le Canada et nos propres Etats du Nord, du Nord-Ouest et de l'Est est telle qu'il en existe d'aussi intime entre très peu d'Etats de notre Union. Plus de la moitié de la ligne de division des deux territoires est formée par un grand débouché naturel de communications commerciales par le plus beau et le plus utile canal maritime de trafic dont la nature ait doté le continent américain. Les lacs qui nous servent de limites nous lient plutôt qu'ils nous séparent du pays étranger qui se trouve de l'autre côté; tandis que de fait le grand fleuve par lequel leurs eaux s'épanchent vers la mer ne fait qu'ajouter à l'intimité de la liaison des deux pays.

La péninsule canadienne entre les lacs est placée comme un coin dans le territoire américain. C'est à travers que se trouve la route la plus courte entre nos Etats du Nord-Ouest et ceux de l'Est. Géographiquement, dans la structure naturelle de cette zone énergique du continent qui se trouve entre le quarantième et le quarante-sixième parallèle, la province d'Ontario occupe relativement au commerce entre l'est et l'ouest, la position de clef de route.

Cet orateur continue à faire des remarques pour expliquer plus en détail la position avantageuse qu'occupe la voie de communication du Saint-Laurent pour les produits de l'ouest des Etats-Unis. Ces paroles étaient prononcées par M. Larned, agent spécial chargé par le Secrétaire du Trésor, en vertu d'une résolution du Congrès, de s'enquérir de l'état et de l'étendue du commerce des Etats-Unis, avec les divers colonies britanniques dans l'Amérique du Nord. Maintenant, voici la résolution définitive qui a été adoptée quelque temps après, à la conférence de Boston :

"Les propositions suivantes furent soumises verbalement par le président aux délégués de la Puissance. Les voici pour l'information de la Chambre et de ses membres :

1. L'introduction en franchise de tous les articles de manufacture et des produits du Canada aux Etats-Unis et *vice versa*.

2. L'adoption des lois uniformes pour les deux pays pour l'imposition des droits d'importation et pour la taxation intérieure, le montant collecté devant être placé dans un trésor commun et divisé entre les deux gouvernements d'une manière équitable.

3. L'admission de vaisseaux canadiens sur registres américains et à tous les privilèges du commerce des côtes américaines et à l'étranger.

4. L'élargissement par la Puissance de ses canaux et l'amélioration de la navigation du St. Laurent, outre l'aide qu'elle devra accorder pour la construction d'un grand chemin de fer international; les Américains devant avoir les mêmes droits que les Canadiens, et ceux-ci, les mêmes droits que les Américains à des ouvrages semblables dans les Etats-Unis."

De sorte que déjà à cette époque, l'on discutait non seulement le renouvellement du traité de réciprocité, mais on discutait l'union commerciale. La proposition qui est maintenant devant cette Chambre ne demande pas du tout l'union commerciale, mais est simplement une expression d'opinion en faveur d'un traité de réciprocité illimitée. C'est précisément la position que prenaient nos délégués canadiens aux différentes assemblées où cette question a été discutée, soit dans les assemblées de la Chambre de Commerce de la Puissance du Canada, soit dans les assemblées des délégués des deux pays.

Maintenant, s'il m'est permis de citer les délibérations de la Chambre de Commerce de la Puissance, qu'y voyons-nous? Mais avant de lire la résolution qui a été adoptée, je dois donner les résultats de l'assemblée et les noms de ceux qui représentaient les différents intérêts du commerce à cette assemblée: Ce sont MM. Fairweather, de St. Jean, N. B.; J. Watson, d'Hamilton; W. H. Howland, de Toronto; John Carruthers, de Kingston; John McLennan, Thomas Rimmer, John Young, et W. J. Patterson, de Montréal. Je trouve dans le *Négociant Canadien*, en date du 25 janvier 1872, le rapport suivant à la séance tenue par la Chambre de Commerce de la Puissance le 17 janvier 1882 :

Le résultat de la réunion de la Chambre nationale de commerce des Etats-Unis fut la résolution d'adresser un mémoire au Congrès pour le prier de nommer une commission chargée de rencontrer des commissaires canadiens et de négocier les bases d'un nouveau traité de réciprocité commerciale. On suggéra que ce traité fût basé sur l'échange libre de produits naturels et manufacturés; l'admission des vaisseaux canadiens à l'enregistrement américain, la liberté du cabotage et l'agrandissement des canaux canadiens, qui sera très profitable aux deux pays.

Cependant nos délégués, désireux de faire revivre l'ancien traité de réciprocité ne purent mettre la possibilité du libre échange des produits manufacturés, avec le haut tarif américain actuel. Voici les résolutions adoptées par la convention de St. Louis:—

Résolu:—Que le Conseil Exécutif reçoive instruction de demander au Congrès de pourvoir à la nomination d'une commission qui rencontrerait des commissaires du Canada si le gouvernement de ce pays se décide à en nommer, dans le but de négocier un traité entre l'Angleterre et les Etats-Unis, pour encourager le commerce entre le Canada et l'union américaine, basé sur les principes suivants ou quelques autres, également larges et bien définis :

10 L'introduction en franchise de tous les articles de manufacture et des produits du Canada aux Etats-Unis et *vice versa*.

20 L'adoption de lois uniformes pour les deux pays pour l'imposition des droits d'importation et pour la taxation intérieure, le montant collecté devant être placé dans un trésor commun et divisé entre les deux gouvernements d'une manière équitable.

Et à la date du 18 janvier 1872 quelle était l'expression d'opinion? Alors les hommes les plus importants du commerce de Montréal—et qu'il me suffise de citer M. Hugh McLennan—faisaient la même objection que celle qui est faite maintenant, c'est-à-dire que si on continuait à vouloir obtenir un traité de réciprocité, cela pouvait nous amener à l'annexion. On pousse le même cri aujourd'hui, et l'on dit que c'est de la déloyauté. Voici ce que M. Hugh McLennan disait, tel que rapporté au *Négociant Canadien* :

M. Hugh McLennan pense que l'objection ne vaut rien et que le Canada est fort en état de se maintenir à côté des Etats-Unis avec l'union douanière. Le cri de loyauté ressemble beaucoup aux sifflements de certaines gens pour soutenir leur courage. La difficulté avec la question de l'union douanière est tout simplement qu'elle n'est pas comprise.

Toutefois on comprend que si des relations commerciales avec les Etats-Unis étaient établies sur une base plus large, plus équitable et plus avantageuse pour les deux pays, la question d'annexion n'avait rien à faire avec cela et ne pouvait être une objection sérieuse.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, je crois avoir démontré assez clairement que dès 1871 et 1872, cette question de réciprocité était discutée par les représentants du commerce de la Puissance et qu'ils essayaient de s'entendre sur ce point avec les représentants du commerce des Etats Unis. Quelle a été, après cette date, la politique—si je puis la qualifier ainsi—ou la conduite du commerce de la Puissance du Canada?

Ecoutons ce que disait le rédacteur du *Négociant Canadien* le 1er février 1872. A la suite d'un long article sur la réciprocité, il terminait ainsi :

Un traité de réciprocité complète basé sur l'uniformité des tarifs.

Cette solution offre tous les avantages sans aucun des inconvénients de l'union douanière et de l'annexion.

Pour notre part nous nous y rallions complètement.

Et si on continue à suivre la marche des faits et des événements, on trouve qu'à la date du 27 juin 1872, à la suite d'une longue discussion sur cette même question, on en est arrivé à la conclusion suivante, mes renseignements sont encore puisés au *Négociant Canadien* :

Il suit donc que dans l'intérêt de l'industrie et de l'agriculture, deux choses sont nécessaires :

La protection d'un côté.

Un marché libre et plus étendu, de l'autre.

Or, toutes ces conditions se trouveraient réunies et tous les intérêts seraient conciliés par un traité de réciprocité basé sur l'uniformité du tarif. Nous avons traité cette question à plusieurs reprises, mais nous ne pouvons nous lasser d'y revenir, tant pour nous la chose est évidente. Nous sommes convaincus qu'un traité de réciprocité est absolument nécessaire à l'agriculture pour la raviver, et lui permettre de faire des affaires profitables. Les industriels nous disent, qu'un tarif plus élevé aurait pour résultat de multiplier les manufactures, d'employer une nombreuse population que l'émigration décime, de mettre la production au niveau de la consommation. Enfin le commerce a tout à gagner à multiplier ses relations avec nos voisins, à voir tomber les lois de navigation qui excluent nos navires des eaux américaines, et aussi la libre navigation des lacs et des canaux américains.

Or, tous ces avantages se trouveraient réunis dans un traité de réciprocité complet, et comme les Etats-Unis ne peuvent évidemment nous l'octroyer que si nous adoptons les mêmes lois fiscales qu'eux, il est évident que nous devrions être prêts à accepter cette solution politique et facile de toutes les difficultés.

Ce que nous demandons donnerait—

1o A l'agriculture le vaste marché américain.

2o A l'industrie la protection qu'elle réclame.

3o Au commerce un vaste champ nouveau, qu'il ne pourrait manquer de développer à son avantage.

Le commerce américain est tellement estimé que le Canada n'hésite pas à dépenser des millions pour l'agrandissement des canaux. S'il est si important tout embarrassé qu'il soit, que serait-il donc s'il était libre? Les amis de la prospérité du Canada prennent donc pour mot d'ordre :—

Conclusion d'un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis, basé sur l'uniformité des tarifs.

—Si cela ne réussit pas, il est évident qu'il faudra que le parlement accueille les suggestions du comité de l'industrie, car un intérêt aussi considérable ne peut rester longtemps en souffrance.

Par conséquent, à cette époque, le but vers lequel tendaient les hommes d'affaires de la Puissance, pour remédier à la stagnation des affaires, était d'obtenir un traité de réciprocité complet avec les Etats-Unis.

On s'est servi de l'expression : "illimitée" dans la motion qui est maintenant devant la Chambre, mais cela ne fait pas de différence, cela signifie la même chose.

Examinons encore la marche des événements, cela est important, malgré que je comprenne qu'une discussion de ce genre, à cette heure avancée, n'ait pas tout l'intérêt qu'elle avait au commencement; mais l'on a fait allusion à la position prise par certains hommes politiques en 1872 sur cette question. Et l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat a fait ressortir d'une manière particulière celle qu'il a prise personnellement; voulant donner à entendre que, le premier, il avait parlé du renouvellement du traité de réciprocité ou d'une politique favorable aux manufactures.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, quels sont les faits? Les voici: En 1871, le parti national fut fondé à Montréal, et un des premiers articles de son programme fut le renouvellement du traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis, c'était la protection incidente accordée à nos manufactures. Quelle fut la position prise par l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat et ses amis dans les élections qui eurent lieu alors dans le district de

Mr. PRÉFONTEINE.

Montréal? On se rappelle que Sir George E. Cartier était candidat dans Montréal-Est et que l'honorable John Young était candidat dans Montréal-Ouest, ce dernier supporté par le parti national et par l'opposition d'alors. On se rappelle aussi que M. L. A. Jetté était candidat dans Montréal-Est contre Sir George E. Cartier.

Voici, la circulaire qui fut adressée à l'honorable John Young par M. John J. McLaren, secrétaire de l'Association industrielle de Montréal :—

MONTRÉAL, 30 juillet 1872.

MONSIEUR,—A une réunion du conseil de l'Association industrielle, qui a eu lieu le 27 courant, la résolution suivante a été adoptée :

Que MM. Henry Lyman, E. K. Greene, W. Rodden, A. W. O'Gilvie et H. R. Ives forment, avec le secrétaire, un comité chargé de correspondre avec les candidats parlementaires en cette ville pour s'assurer jusqu'à quel point, chacun d'eux, s'il est élu, est disposé à coopérer à la réalisation du but de cette association, qui est l'encouragement des intérêts industriels de ce pays.

Cette association se compose de la presque totalité des grands manufacturiers et entrepreneurs de cette ville unis dans le but mentionné dans sa constitution, dont une copie nous est transmise.

Croyant qu'il est essentiel au progrès et à la grandeur du pays que cet objet soit atteint, ses membres désirent connaître les opinions de ceux qui briguent leurs suffrages, à savoir si dans le cas de leur élection ils seraient disposés à promouvoir telle législation qui encouragera notre industrie et conséquemment fournira un travail plus constant et plus rémunérateur aux ouvriers, assurera le marché national à la production nationale et augmentera la population et la richesse de la Puissance.

C'est pourquoi j'ai reçu instruction du comité ci-dessus nommé de vous prier de nous dire d'une manière aussi claire que possible et pour l'information de l'association, votre opinion sur les trois points suivants :

1. Jusqu'à quel point approuvez-vous les principes de la protection en tant qu'applicables à ce pays et opposés à ceux du libre-échange?

2. Jusqu'à quel point seriez-vous disposés à aider à l'obtention du but de cette association pour le développement des intérêts industriels du Canada et

3. Quelles mesures législatives recommanderiez-vous en parlant de ces principes

Une prompt réponse obligerait beaucoup

Votre, etc.,

JOHN J. McLAREN,

Sec. Ass. Indust. de Montréal.

Voici la réponse de l'honorable John Young. Je citerai un des traits saillants de cette réponse :

Ce qu'il faut cependant au Canada pour le développement de son industrie manufacturière est un marché plus étendu, et nous pouvons l'obtenir par un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis.

L'union des diverses provinces sous le contrôle d'un seul gouvernement central garantissant l'introduction libre des produits de chacune a produit et produira d'excellents résultats, mais il est indubitable qu'ils ne feront que suivre le progrès de notre population.

C'est pourquoi en ne négligeant rien de ce qui pourrait promouvoir les intérêts manufacturiers, j'espère que mes efforts passés dans ce but seront une garantie pour l'avenir, et que j'obtiendrai le support et la confiance des membres de votre association comme candidat à la représentation de la division Ouest de Montréal, car ce sera pour moi un plaisir et une satisfaction de faire tout en mon pouvoir dans les intérêts de l'industrie manufacturière.

Eh bien! quelle était la position prise à la même date par M. George A. Drummond, le candidat opposé à l'honorable John Young? M. Drummond ne prenait pas une position aussi définie que M. Young sur cette question, et le résultat de l'élection, malgré qu'il fut supporté alors de toute l'éloquence de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, a été sa défaite par une majorité d'au delà de 800 voix dans une division tory de la cité de Montréal.

Maintenant, si nous voyons la position prise par M. L. A. Jetté, alors candidat contre Sir George E. Cartier, nous trouvons qu'il a donné des réponses tellement satisfaisantes, tellement claires, aux questions qui lui étaient posées par l'Association industrielle, qu'il fut élu par une majorité écrasante dans la division Est de Montréal contre Sir George E. Cartier, qui alors était supporté du talent oratoire de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, mais qui n'avait pas donné de réponses satisfaisantes à l'Association industrielle.

Or, si l'on essaie de faire croire qu'il y a eu contradiction chez les membres du parti auquel j'appartiens, je réponds,—et les faits sont là pour le démontrer,—qu'il n'y a pas eu telle contradiction de notre part, mais qu'au contraire, la contradiction se trouve chez les membres de

l'autre côté de la Chambre qui ont suivi sur cette question une politique d'expédients, et pas autre chose. Ces messieurs n'ont jamais voulu prendre d'engagements formels; ils n'ont jamais voulu définir leur position d'une manière claire, afin de suivre toujours une politique opportuniste et se conduire selon les événements.

Nous arrivons maintenant à 1888. Lorsqu'à la suite de la crise sérieuse qui a sévi non seulement au Canada,—parce que le commerce du Canada n'était pas assez considérable à cette époque pour affecter le monde entier,—mais encore aux Etats-Unis et dans les autres pays de l'Amérique du Nord et de l'Amérique du Sud, notre marché naturel nous étant fermé, nous étions, en 1878, dans une position financière des plus critiques. Le peuple était naturellement prêt à accepter ceux qui venaient lui dire qu'ils avaient un remède pour tous les maux; qu'ils avaient un remède pour favoriser l'agriculture, pour promouvoir les industries, pour donner de l'ouvrage aux ouvriers, enfin, un remède universel qui devait donner satisfaction à tout le monde. Il n'y a rien d'étonnant qu'avec l'excitation qui existait alors et les préjugés que l'on a soulevés, le gouvernement de M. Mackenzie ait été renversé.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, ce remède a été appliqué, et d'année en année, on est venu devant le parlement du Canada demander une augmentation des droits sur ceci ou cela, selon que cela faisait l'affaire de celui-ci ou de celui-là. Et ce soir qu'avons-nous entendu dans les discours qui ont été prononcés de l'autre côté de la Chambre? Nous avons entendu l'honorable député d'Argenteuil (M. Wilson) nous représenter sous des couleurs exceptionnellement avantageuses le système de la protection à outrance; c'est-à-dire l'imposition des droits les plus élevés possibles pour favoriser quelques manufactures particulières. Mais la chose se comprend parfaitement. A venir jusqu'à l'élection du député d'Argenteuil, en 1887, le gouvernement avait négligé de protéger une certaine branche d'industrie particulière qui existait comme industrie naissante: l'industrie de la manufacture du papier de soie et de sacs de papier. Aussitôt après l'élection de l'honorable député, durant la session de l'année dernière, on a vu les droits déjà élevés sur ces objets portés à 35 pour cent. Je comprends parfaitement que l'honorable député veuille nous faire monter sur une montagne bien élevée, pour considérer de là les avantages de la protection à outrance. Mais, M. l'Orateur, nous ne sommes pas dans la même position que l'honorable député d'Argenteuil; nous ne sommes pas intéressés dans une manufacture de papier comme celle qu'il possède et qui est protégée à raison de 35 pour cent pour son bénéfice particulier, et nous ne pouvons pas voir les choses de la même manière; et nous ne voyons, nous, que cette protection à outrance n'a été accordée que pour favoriser certains industriels qui sont en petit nombre au détriment du plus grand nombre.

M. l'Orateur, le commerce général de la Puissance du Canada a pris un intérêt particulier à la question qui est maintenant devant la Chambre: les manufacturiers se sont intéressés à cette question et je puis dire que l'on ne pourrait pas indiquer un seul manufacturier sérieux qui soit opposé à un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. Au contraire, des manufacturiers comme M. Boaz, de Saint-Hyacinthe, M. Thomas Willett, de Chambly, l'un des plus grands manufacturiers de laine et de flanelle dans la Puissance du Canada, ont assez confiance dans leur travail, dans leur industrie, dans leur capacité pour dire: Donnez-nous le marché des Etats-Unis; donnez-nous un marché de 60,000,000 d'âmes et nous serons satisfaits; nous sommes aussi intelligents que les Américains; nous avons la main-d'œuvre à aussi bonnes conditions qu'eux; nous pouvons produire des marchandises à aussi bon marché qu'aux Etats-Unis et nous sommes prêts à soutenir leur concurrence dans les différentes industries que nous exploitons. Mais on trouvera, comme je le comprends parfaitement, certains industriels qui veulent profiter d'un haut tarif afin de s'en-

richir sous le plus court délai possible au détriment du plus grand nombre.

Je dis donc qu'il n'y a pas eu de contradiction de la part des membres de l'opposition sur cette question-là. Nous avons toujours suivi la même ligne de conduite; mais nous n'avons pas voulu suivre nos honorables amis de l'autre côté de la Chambre dans les extrêmes où ils ont voulu nous entraîner, et alors ils ont prétendu que nous étions quand même libre-échangistes.

Eh bien! M. l'Orateur, il est important de comprendre ce que c'est que d'être libre-échangiste. On peut être libre-échangiste en principe? Je considère que c'est la saine doctrine, que c'est la doctrine la plus juste et la plus équitable et celle qui devrait être acceptée. Mais pour être libre-échangiste au Canada, il faudrait que le pays faisant le commerce avec nous soit libre-échangiste aussi. Or, nous ne sommes pas dans des conditions pour établir le libre-échange d'une manière illimitée; il nous faut des revenus pour subvenir aux dépenses, et il nous faut ce qu'on appelle la protection incidente, c'est-à-dire une protection suffisante pour encourager nos manufactures dans une mesure raisonnable de manière à donner à ceux qui investissent leur argent dans ces industries un revenu raisonnable sur le capital ainsi engagé.

Mais il ne s'agit pas de là que l'on doit donner une protection illimitée aux manufacturiers et leur fournir ainsi l'occasion de se combiner ensemble pour réduire leur production ou pour vendre à des prix fixés d'avance et imposer des amendes considérables à ceux d'entre eux qui enfreignent aucun des règlements que ces associations ont décrétés.

La protection telle que l'entendent les honorables députés de la droite, a été expérimentée, et elle n'a pas guéri les plus grands maux dont souffraient le pays. Je crois donc qu'il est raisonnable de se demander si on ne doit pas aller au delà, c'est-à-dire enlever les droits, en faisant un traité de réciprocité, avec un pays voisin, ayant une population de soixante millions d'âmes, et étant notre marché naturel. C'est là la position logique que l'opposition prend sur cette question. Elle est non seulement logique, mais elle est d'accord avec les principes. Et afin de démontrer que, s'il y a contradiction, elle se trouve de l'autre côté de la Chambre, cette position est d'accord avec les idées exprimées par l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat (M. Chapleau), et par l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur (M. White). Et pour établir ce que j'avance, il me suffira de citer un article publié dans le *Montreal Gazette* en date du 12 octobre 1885, journal publié sous les ordres et inspiré par l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur.

"C'est un fait historique que la politique protectionniste n'a reçu l'appui du parti conservateur aux élections de 1878, que parce qu'elle était un moyen de hâter des relations de réciprocité commerciale avec les Etats-Unis. En 1878, pendant que les deux partis favorisaient la réciprocité commerciale, les conservateurs seuls ont adopté une politique de nature à amener ce résultat. A la première occasion qui suivit les élections générales, le gouvernement conservateur voulant montrer ses vives sympathies pour la réciprocité, mit dans nos statuts une invitation au Congrès américain de laisser entrer en franchise nos produits naturels en échange des leurs."

Et le 26 octobre 1885 on a trouvé ceci dans le même journal:

"En attendant, nous ne pouvons que pratiquer la vertu de patience, avec l'espoir de voir prédominer dans le Congrès un sentiment favorable à la réciprocité, et, si cette espérance est déçue, le Canada doit se mettre à l'œuvre pour trouver d'autres moyens de développer son commerce."

Où est la preuve, où est-il constaté, M. l'Orateur, que le gouvernement, dont fait partie l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur (M. White) ait tenté de nous donner un traité de réciprocité, ou même des relations commerciales plus étendues avec les Etats-Unis? On ne l'a pas fait, on ne l'a pas tenté. Et cependant, lorsque la question est prise en mains par l'opposition, dans ce parlement, on vient lui répondre par des arguments comme ceux-ci: On nous accuse de déloyauté et d'annexionnistes.

Dans une discussion aussi sérieuse il n'est pas permis de faire des drôleries. Et les réponses données par nos adversaires ressemblent beaucoup à celle que donnait un individu à qui quelqu'un demandait si son frère savait bien chanter. Il répondit : non, il ne sait pas chanter, mais il court très fort.... Comme si cela pourrait être une réponse à la question qui lui était posée. L'opposition parle de réciprocité, et on lui répond : annexion et déloyauté.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, je crois que le peuple comprendra parfaitement la question à la suite de cette discussion. Il comprendra que le gouvernement, ainsi que ses partisans n'ont pas donné la réponse qu'ils devaient donner, ni par la bouche de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, ni par celle de l'honorable ministre de l'intérieur ; mais il verra qu'au contraire l'honorable ministre des finances, (sir Charles Tupper), s'est chargé, lui, de donner une réponse qui est une approbation de la position que nous prenons maintenant. Il s'est chargé de contre-faire les arguments de certains de ses propres partisans ; et qu'il me suffise de mentionner le discours de l'honorable député de Welland (M. Ferguson), lequel a pris la peine de mentionner certains articles qui ne devaient pas être admis en franchise, parce que cela aurait pour effet de ruiner une branche de commerce considérable qu'il prétendait connaître parfaitement.

Deux jours après, l'honorable ministre des finances venait déclarer à la Chambre que ces mêmes articles allaient être admis en franchise et qu'on allait ouvrir des négociations avec les Etats-Unis pour l'admission d'autres produits, en considération de certains avantages que les Etats-Unis seraient prêts à faire au gouvernement canadien. Par conséquent, s'il y a eu contradiction, ce n'est assurément pas de ce côté de la Chambre.

Comme cette discussion n'est pas faite uniquement dans l'intérêt des députés, mais encore dans l'intérêt des électeurs, il est important que tous les faits soient rapportés, afin de fournir des arguments à ceux qui sont favorables au traité de réciprocité, afin d'éclairer le peuple qui lui est en grande majorité favorable. Car cette question sera soulevée dans toutes élections qui auront lieu d'ici aux élections générales. Elle a été discutée dans deux comtés de la province de Québec ces jours derniers, et l'on ne pourra pas raisonnablement prétendre que la province de Québec ne s'est pas déclarée — autant qu'il était possible de le faire dans les circonstances — entièrement favorable à un traité de réciprocité. Je n'ai pas pris part particulièrement à l'élection qui vient d'avoir lieu dans le comté de Missisquoi, mais l'honorable député de Brome (M. Fisher) y a pris part, et je sais avec quel acharnement on l'a attaqué dans les journaux ministériels à l'égard du discours qu'il a prononcé à West Farnham, discours en faveur du traité de réciprocité.

Et quel a été le résultat de l'élection ? C'est que dans les endroits les plus conservateurs du comté, là où le candidat libéral n'espérait pas avoir une majorité, où il croyait même être battu par des majorités considérables, le nombre de ses partisans a augmenté d'une manière si notable qu'il s'est trouvé, le soir de la votation, à la tête du poll, dans ce comté qui jusque-là avait toujours été un comté tory et qui aux dernières élections n'avait été remporté par notre regretté ami, M. Clayes, que grâce à la division qui existait alors dans les rangs du parti tory.

Mais je ne veux pas parler de cette élection parce que, comme je l'ai dit, je n'y ai pas pris une part active ; je ne suis renseigné que par ce qui a été publié dans les journaux et par ce que l'on m'a rapporté.

Mais une élection a eu lieu mardi dernier dans un comté essentiellement canadien-français, le comté de L'Assomption. Dans ce comté, la question a été posée carrément par le chef de l'opposition entre les adversaires d'un traité de réciprocité et ceux qui étaient favorables à ce traité. L'honorable chef de l'opposition a demandé aux conservateurs du comté de L'Assomption de supporter la candidature de notre ami M. Gauthier parce que les membres de l'oppo-

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

sition étaient favorables à un traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis. La question a été posée carrément à la classe agricole du comté de L'Assomption, et la discussion a été engagée sur ce terrain.

M. GIROUARD: Mon honorable ami me permettra-t-il de l'interrompre. Le jour de la nomination j'étais à L'Assomption et j'ai demandé à M. Gauthier s'il supporterait la résolution de sir Richard Cartwright et il a répondu que n'ayant pas étudié la question, il n'était pas en état de donner une opinion.

M. PREFONTAINE: Vous n'étiez pas là le jour de la votation.

M. GIROUARD: J'y étais le jour de la nomination, et j'ai entendu la réponse de M. Gauthier de mes propres oreilles.

M. PREFONTAINE: Les électeurs qui ont supporté la candidature de M. Gauthier l'ont supportée sur cette question-là. Qu'est-ce que cela peut faire que M. Gauthier ne fût pas prêt de se prononcer sur la question ? Est-ce que l'honorable député de Jacques Cartier (M. Girouard) s'est toujours prononcé de la même façon sur chaque question ? Je dis que le jour de la grande assemblée où le chef de l'opposition a adressé la parole la question de la réciprocité a été posée carrément comme politique avouée par l'opposition, comme étant la plus avantageuse à la classe agricole. La discussion a été acceptée sur ce terrain par les amis du gouvernement ; il y avait là M. Bisailon, M. Joseph Tassé, le propriétaire rédacteur du journal ministériel le plus important de Montréal, M. Desjardins, le député local de Montmorency, le député du comté de Provencher (M. Royal) et tous ont accepté la discussion sur ce terrain, et les arguments qu'ils ont fait valoir à l'encontre de ceux que nous présentions aux électeurs intelligents du comté de L'Assomption étaient les mêmes arguments que l'on a fait valoir dans cette Chambre, c'est-à-dire que le traité de réciprocité avec les Etats-Unis serait déloyal ; c'était déloyal de le demander, c'était prêcher l'annexion, et plus que cela, l'un des orateurs a même été jusqu'au point de répéter l'absurdité qui a été dite ici que, s'il y avait un droit de vingt pour cent sur les chevaux exportés aux Etats-Unis, de dix pour cent sur le beurre, de deux piastres par tonne sur le foin, ce n'était pas le cultivateur canadien exportateur de ces produits qui perdait ces sommes, mais que c'était l'acheteur. Alors nous avons demandé à ces messieurs si c'était en vertu de ce principe que les marchands de foin canadiens étaient actuellement en négociations avec le gouvernement américain pour se faire rembourser le surplus des droits qu'ils avaient payés à la douane américaine pendant cinq ans sur l'exportation de certains produits agricoles. Naturellement ces messieurs n'ont pas pu répondre à cette question, et les électeurs ont bien compris de quel côté était la raison, de quel côté était leur intérêt. Et dans ce comté, où le député en février 1887, M. Gauthier, n'était élu que par 21 voix, le soir du 3 avril au décompte du scrutin, dans les mêmes conditions, dans les mêmes circonstances, mais avec une politique parfaitement définie de la part de l'opposition, ils s'engageaient de le supporter dans la Chambre des Communes, et il était élu par une majorité de près de 100 voix.

Voilà, par conséquent, une preuve évidente que dans la province de Québec au moins, on comprend cette question de la réciprocité ; on l'a toujours comprise et on l'a comprise toujours. On comprend que si nous pouvons avoir avec les Etats-Unis un traité de réciprocité ; si nous pouvons avoir des relations commerciales plus étendues que celles que nous avons maintenant, il n'y a pas un homme raisonnable indépendant qui peut prétendre que cela ne serait pas à l'avantage du commerce canadien. On nous répond que cette proposition ne rencontrera pas les vues de la majorité de la Chambre et qu'elle va être rejetée par une majorité

considérable. Cela ne fait rien, M. l'Orateur. L'opposition met sa politique devant le pays afin que le pays puisse la discuter et la juger. Il tâche de la faire comprendre au peuple afin que lorsque l'occasion se présentera d'aller devant l'électorat, les électeurs puissent décider si nous devons avoir les avantages d'un traité de réciprocité qui a été demandé d'une manière spéciale et avoué non-seulement par les membres du parti libéral, mais par les membres du parti conservateur depuis au delà de vingt ans.

M. l'Orateur, je pourrais continuer à démontrer l'effet que peut avoir cette politique de l'opposition au point de vue de la Puissance du Canada, mais à cette heure avancée de la soirée, je n'ai pas l'intention d'abuser de la patience de cette Chambre. Je ne puis reprendre mon siège cependant sans attirer l'attention de la Chambre sur le fait que pour combattre cette politique on a essayé de tourner en ridicule la position que l'opposition prend sur cette question. On est découragé de voir que l'opposition va maintenant se trouver avec une plate-forme parfaitement définie et que la question va se poser carrément devant les électeurs de la Puissance du Canada entre le parti qui ne veut pas de la réciprocité avec les États-Unis, et le parti qui déclare qu'il est favorable à ce traité; qu'il est favorable à une politique qui donnera au commerce de la Puissance les ressources dont il a besoin pour se relever de l'état de stagnation dans lequel il se trouve, et pour pouvoir progresser comme il devrait le faire.

Mr. McCULLA. I understand that an arrangement had been come to that the debate should have been brought to a close after the speech of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). If that arrangement is to be carried out now, I shall reserve my remarks for another occasion.

Mr. TROW. Our friend who has just taken his seat was not aware of the arrangement made, otherwise he would have been the last man to attempt to violate the rule of the party.

House divided on amendment to the amendment (Mr. Jones):

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Béchar,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),
Casey,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Hale,
Holton,
Innes,
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lang,

McMullen,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Préfontaine,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Scriver,

Casgrain,
Charlton,
Chouinard,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,

Langelier (Montm'cy),
Langelier (Quebec),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),

Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Watson,
Weldon (St. John),
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin).—67.

NAVS:

Messieurs

Andet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Bell,
Bergeron,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brown,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Chisholm,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Corby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Couture,
Curran,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),
Foster,
Freeman,
Gaudet,

Gigault,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guilbault,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hall,
Henderson,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kirkpatrick,
Labelle,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurie,
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McCarthy,
McCulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (C. Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLellan,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moffat,

Montague,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Essex),
Perley (Assiniboia),
Perley (Ottawa),
Porter,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross,
Royal,
Rykert,
Scarth,
Shanly,
Small,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thérien,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Pictou),
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
Ward,
Weldon (Albert),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright.—124.

Amendment to amendment regretted.

Amendment of Mr. Foster agreed to, on same division reversed.

Main motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, as amended, agreed to, on same division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the adjournment of the House and I would state to hon. gentlemen opposite that on Tuesday next if the Finance Minister is well enough to be in his place he will bring up the Bill on the Fishery Treaty.

Motion agreed to; and House then adjourned at 4.40 a. m. (Saturday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, April 9, 1888.

No. 30.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the return of David Bishop Meigs, Esq., for the Electoral District of Missisquoi.

REPORT OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect copies of the report of the Railway Commission? Several weeks have gone by since the blue-book was laid upon the Table, and none of us have received copies yet. I have enquired at the Distribution Office and I found it has not been received there yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall enquire and inform the hon. gentleman later.

THE FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Railways, in the absence of the Minister of Finance. It was announced by the Premier on Friday, before the adjournment, that the hon. the Minister of Finance would probably proceed with the discussion on the Washington Treaty to-morrow. I intended to suggest to the Minister of Finance, if he had been here, the advisability of submitting a chart of the coast, showing the delimitations of the coast, which would render the discussion much more intelligent to those of us who may not very well be able to follow the debate otherwise. I understand the matter very well myself, but I think the House, generally, would understand it much better if a chart were exhibited, showing the delimitation of the coast as proposed under the treaty. I believe that if the Government thinks it advisable there is plenty of time to procure a chart, and it would render the discussion much easier and much more intelligible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall mention this matter to my colleague as soon as he comes in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that not only the line of delimitation as marked under the treaty should

be laid down, but also the line claimed by the Government of Canada prior to the meeting of the commissioners.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) to confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 77) to confirm a certain agreement made between the London and South Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

INDIAN RESERVE, BRANT AND HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether any person has been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. McKinnon, late physician in the Indian Reserve of Brant and Haldimand?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No appointment has been made. Dr. Dee is doing the duty in the meantime.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the number of Judges of the Superior Court for the District of Montreal?

Mr. THOMPSON. That matter is now being considered.

COURT OF APPEAL, QUEBEC.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, that for the two last terms of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec, sitting in Appeal, only four of the Honorable Judges of the said Court have been present? If the answer is in the affirmative, whether it is the intention of the Government to rectify this state of affairs?

Mr. THOMPSON. I have been informed that the Court has been regularly constituted, under the legislation of the Province of Quebec, for the last two terms.

ENGAGEMENT OF HENRY SMYTH.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1st. The date of Henry Smyth's engagement? 2nd. The date at which his services were dispensed with? 3rd. The amount per diem or month paid him for travelling expenses? 4th. The entire sum paid him for travelling or other expenses? 5th. The entire sum paid for services of any kind, and travelling and other expenses from the 1st of January, 1887, to 1st of March, 1888?

Mr. CARLING. Only a few days ago, I think, I answered the same questions as those now made by the hon. member. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to put a motion on the paper, I will endeavor to bring down the necessary papers.

THE THOROLD CANAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to let the water-power on the new canal in the vicinity of Thorold; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not in a position to give an answer now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not as to whether you will let the water-power at all or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not in a position to answer that question now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to be able to answer it in a short time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will renew his question and then I will be in a position to answer. He knows that the Minister of Railways and Canals is unwell, and I have not been able to discuss the matter with him.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PENETANGUISHENE, MIDLAND AND ORILLIA.

Mr. TROW (for Mr Cook) asked, Whether the Government intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates this year a certain sum of money to assist the town of Penetanguishene to build an esplanade in that harbor? Whether the Government intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates this year a sum sufficient to complete the harbor improvements at Midland? Whether the Government intend to place a sum of money in the Supplementary Estimates this year to build a post office in the town of Orillia?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. When the Supplementary Estimates come down they will have to speak for themselves. I cannot give any other answer just now.

FREE LIST BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House, the report of the Minister of Customs, made some time since, on the application of the American Government made through their Consul at Ottawa, asking that certain articles of farm produce be placed on the free list in conformity with the statute of agreement entered into with the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Customs never having made any such report it cannot be laid upon the Table.

RICHARD MERRICK, OF CHATHAM.

Mr. TROW asked, Whether Richard Merrick, of Chatham, was in the employ of the Government during the year 1887, or any part thereof? If so, in what capacity; for what period and at what salary, and how much was he paid? Is he still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity and at what salary?

Mr. CARLING. He was in the employ of the Government a year ago; and if the hon. gentleman would place a motion upon the notice paper I will be glad to bring down the papers.

Mr. McMULLEN.

HALDIMAND DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether Government are aware that one Charles Young, one of the deputy returning officers at the two elections held in the County of Haldimand, in February and November, 1887, and one of the parties at whose polls certain irregularities are alleged to have occurred, has served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the County of Brant, prior to being appointed deputy returning officer as aforesaid?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government are not aware that Chas. Young served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the County of Brant prior to being appointed deputy returning officer. They are informed that he has not. Mr. Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government; but we are informed that he is a respectable man, who has held several offices of trust and honor in the County of Haldimand, and that he was recommended for this office by several persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician. The only charge with regard to irregularities at his polling place was investigated and dismissed.

THE FREE LIST—ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the Order in Council published in Saturday's *Gazette*, which purports to place upon the free list the articles mentioned therein, but only does so in favor of the United States. The concluding operative words of the Order in Council are these:

"That the articles in question may hereafter, until otherwise provided, be imported into Canada from the United States free of duty."

That Order in Council recites the Customs Act of 1879, section 6, and when I look at section 6, the impression on my mind is that if that section is to be acted upon, the goods in question must be placed on the free list entirely. The clause, after enumerating the articles that may be so treated, says:

"Any or all of the articles so enumerated may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act."

You will observe that it does not say free of duty merely when they come from the United States, but free of duty when imported into Canada. Then it goes on to say:

"Upon the proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same, under such proclamation, when imported in Canada."

My view of the Act is that the Government must place these goods on the free list entirely in order to comply with the clause of the Act in question. By the interpretation that the Government have placed upon this clause under the Order in Council of Saturday, they appear to hold that they may place these articles on the free list in relation to the United States alone, and may still maintain a tariff upon them as against Great Britain or any other nation in the world. I commend the Government for their desire to consider the interest of Canada first, and, if is not to the interest of Canada that these articles, or any other goods, should be admitted free from any part of the world, or that they should only be admitted under certain restrictions, I am in favor of the Government considering the interests of Canada first; but I would like to know whether the Government hold—I presume they thought so when they passed this Order in Council—that the Act of 1879 gives them power to pass an Order in Council of this kind, discriminating in favor of the United States, and against Great Britain. It is true that, in regard to the particular articles mentioned in this Order in Council, the

bulk of them do not come from Great Britain, but some of them do. The Trade and Navigation Returns of 1887 show that quite a number of the articles enumerated in that Order in Council have been imported during the past year from Great Britain, but that does not at all effect the matter, because, if, under an Order in Council, you can admit any one article named in section 6 of the Act of 1879 into Canada duty free, and at the same time maintain a duty upon it as against Great Britain, you can do the same in respect to them all. Therefore, in that case, it amounts to this, that in 1879 the House, upon the advice of the present Administration, passed an Act enabling Canada to discriminate against Great Britain, and that has been the construction placed upon the Act of 1879 by the recent Order in Council. I think it is important, therefore, to know if that is the view the Government intend to take of it in the future, and if they have abandoned the attitude they adopted in the recent discussion, when they declared emphatically that in no case would they discriminate against Great Britain. For three weeks, gentlemen opposite advanced that proposition as the great reason why they would not entertain the proposal for reciprocity with the United States, because it would discriminate against Great Britain. If they had abandoned that position, and are going to stand up for Canada first, as this Order in Council seems to suggest, I am glad to see their rapid conversion to a wiser and sounder doctrine. For that purpose, I have taken the earliest opportunity to call the attention of the Government to the Order in Council. Of course, if they have inadvertently framed it in that manner, they will take an early opportunity to correct it, but if they have deliberately come to the conclusion that they can discriminate against the flag, and that is what they have done, let us know whether they propose to adhere to that policy in regard to everything that concerns the welfare of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid, and I think my hon. friend who has just moved this resolution will admit, that we are getting somewhat into an unparliamentary practice of moving the adjournment on every possible occasion when any hon. gentleman wishes to bring any subject which it would be otherwise unparliamentary to do. We all understand the limits which old parliamentary practice would allow in such a case, but I think we are trespassing a good deal on the rule, and it would be very inconvenient if this course should be carried out to any extent. In reference to the question the hon. gentleman has referred to, the Government did not alter their position at all, but this proclamation was issued in consequence of a special application made to this Government by the United States, and it referred to that alone, but the consequence will of necessity be that the Government must open the market to all the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman has not at all met my hon. friend's point. He pointed out that, under the terms of this Order in Council, these goods coming from the United States alone are freed from duty. If they come from other quarters they will remain still subject to duty. That is the contention of the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you discriminate in the clearest manner in favor of the United States and against all other countries, the mother country included.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought the hon. gentleman would understand that we desired, especially in consequence of this being the first application on the subject which we received from the United States, to issue the proclamation which we were bound to issue to meet this case, but of course the consequence will be that there must

be a proclamation issued for the purpose of giving the same to all the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the Act authorise the hon. gentleman to do this by proclamation in relation to any other country? Does he propose to legislate, or depend on the issue of a proclamation? Does he consider that the Act authorises the Government by proclamation to abolish the duties in regard to any other country than the United States?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that the clause under which that proclamation has been issued, authorised only the proclamation that these goods would be imported into Canada free of duty from all the world; it did not say from the United States alone. I think there is no authority in that section 9 of the present Customs Act, in the Revised Statutes, authorising the Government to make a limited proclamation of that kind. It seems to me that, if any English is plain, the Government have acted *ultra vires* when they issued that proclamation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it must be *infra vires*.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems that now they have found that out, and as the First Minister says, they are going to correct that mistake at the first possible opportunity, but, as has occurred before this Session, not until after it was pointed out from this side of the House. I would be glad to think that the Government had taken upon themselves to adopt the policy they seemed to have adopted by that proclamation. I am free to admit that, if the Government adopt that policy of discriminating only in favor of the United States, they have got to face the "favored nation" clause in British treaties, they have to say that Canada will not be bound by the "favored nation" clause in British treaties, so that our hands will not be tied in making commercial arrangements to suit ourselves. I had hoped that that was the case, and I regret that the Government are proposing to back down upon so important a subject as this.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is evident that there will have to be another proclamation issued unless there is to be discrimination. My friend the Minister of Customs will understand that, when an Order in Council is as explicit as this, these articles would certainly not be allowed in free from any other country than the United States. I do not think the Minister is guilty of admitting or directing the admission of anything free into Canada that he is not compelled to, and the language of the Order in Council is very explicit:

"And whereas in the opinion of our Governor in Council, it is expedient that the said articles should be admitted into Canada from the United States free of duty,"—

And it closes after enumerating the different articles, that they

"may hereafter, until otherwise provided, be imported into Canada from the United States free of duty."

It was evidently the intention of the Government that they should be made free coming from the United States and the United States alone, for there was no necessity to insert the words "from the United States" at all if the intention was to admit them free from all countries. I understand the First Minister to say that the Government will now amend the proclamation, and that these articles will be placed on the free list, come from what country they may.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to the remarks made by the First Minister, that he regretted it was necessary to make

this motion, I must refer him to the Minister of Public Works as my excuse. I only intended to call the attention of the Government to the matter, in the first place, for the reason that it appears to me that the present Order in Council is *ultra vires* of the power of the Government, and absolutely void, and therefore would not accomplish what was apparently in the minds of the Government at the time. My object was to induce the Government to put the matter in a legal shape as respects the validity of the Order in Council.

Motion withdrawn.

PRINTING OF DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. EDGAR, in moving for a copy of the contract which now exists between the Government and the contractor for the printing of Dominion notes, said: I find there is a great discrepancy between the amount voted for the purpose of printing the notes, and the amount actually expended for doing so. The amount voted last year was \$25,000 and the amount expended was \$37,556.58, showing an increase over the grant of \$12,556. Now, when a matter in which the Government have had so much experience as in the printing of Dominion notes, is so difficult to estimate, I think we should have before the House the contract under which the work is done, so that we may see its terms, and whether it cannot be improved, and whether it has been closely followed. I would like to add to the motion, with the permission of the House, the words "and further, for all copies of correspondence relating to the awarding thereof."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PRIVATE THOMAS NEELY.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

Copies of all letters, despatches, communications and other papers, in the possession of the Department of Militia and Defence, touching the case of Private Thomas Neely, late of "C" Company, School of Infantry, or of his widow and children, for compensation by reason of his disability and death.

He said: The facts of the case are simply these, as I am informed by the widow of Private Neely. He enlisted in "C" Company of Infantry on the 1st February, 1884; he went to the North-West with his company in March, 1885, for the purpose of aiding in the suppression of the rebellion. His company returned to Toronto on the 28th October, 1885. Shortly after his return home he became ill, and his illness finally developed into insanity. He was placed for a time in the jail in Toronto, and then placed in the Lunatic Asylum, and the military authorities, on the 17th May, 1886, discharged him from the service of Her Majesty on the ground of his insanity. He continued insane until the time of his death on the 21st January, 1887, on which day he died in the Provincial Lunatic Asylum in Toronto, and was buried that day as a pauper, being followed to the grave by his widow and the undertaker only. This is a case for which I bespeak the favorable consideration of the Government. If the House will permit me, I will read an extract from a letter from his widow, who says:

"When he returned he complained of feeling great pain at times in his head. He had 10 days leave of absence from the regiment after his return. I do not remember the date, but he had his holidays in November. After his return he complained frequently of his head. When at home, and on Christmas after coming home, he frequently said that he knew it would be his last Christmas with me, stating that he knew his head would never get better, and at times he got quite delirious and imagined strange things which I would have to convince him was not so; and at other times he would sit and look at us, that is, the children and me, and would say he knew his time with us was not long, as he had strange feelings when in the North-West."

He told her he had these pains in his head and strange feelings while in the North-West:

"Sometimes he thought the sun affected his head, and sometimes he thought it was nervousness."

Mr. MULOCK.

Then she goes on to state:

"There was never any insanity in his family, all being healthy, strong people. When he became insane he was 10 months in the Insane Asylum, and on the 21st of January, 1887, he was buried from the Asylum as a pauper, having no one to follow his remains but myself and the undertaker; since which time I never received a cent from any one."

Now, that discloses the state of affairs. This man served his country in the North-West; he endured, no doubt, the ordinary hardships incidental to that campaign, and he came back home, having at some period in his life—whether in the North-West or not, I am not aware, nor do I think it is possible to ascertain—but still, having at some time contracted the seeds of the disease which ultimately carried him off, he became disabled while in the service. This is not a case of an ordinary volunteer, but more that of one of the regulars, his whole time being devoted to the service. Having become invalided, having become insane, he is discharged from the service, and without having recovered his mental health he dies and leaves a widow and children, whom, I think, should be pensioned upon the country. In this particular case it was impossible to show that the soldier lost his reason while on actual service. If it was a case of physical disability we could trace cause and effect, but it is wholly impossible to do so now, and no enquiry could show, so far as reasoning up the case goes, clearly and beyond all doubt, that his disease was contracted in the service. I make that admission, I think it is right I should do so; but I ask the country to presume in favor of the man and now in favor of his widow and children, to give the presumption in his favor, under the ordinary principle of law. He was in sound health, body and mind, when he went to the North-West, so far as appears. He no doubt complied with the regulations in that behalf, no doubt he was examined and certified as being in good health, and therefore if he was well in body and mind when he went to the North-West, it is clear that he contracted that disease whilst in the North-West or immediately after his return. Insanity is the outcome of mental excitement of various kinds, and I think the circumstance immediately preceding the outbreak of insanity in his case were such as to excite the ordinary mind, and the benefit of the doubt should be given to those whom he left behind. I think the Minister of Militia is very favorably disposed towards this case, but I understand there is merely a technical difficulty that prevents him from making an allowance under the circumstances, namely, that the law did not meet the case. Am I right?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad there is nothing more than a difficulty about the law. I have looked through the Queen's Regulations upon the subject, and I think I can find a clause under which relief can be given. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 934 of the Regulations and Orders of the Militia of the Dominion, he will find the following clause—and I may say that the sections preceding that section provide for compensation according to different scales, and then there is a general sweeping clause to this effect:

"In instances where the regulations do not meet the circumstances of the individual case, they may be especially considered by His Excellency the Governor in Council."

That section, I think, will meet the case. This is the only case, so far as I am aware, of this character, that is the outcome of the campaign in the North-West; we are not likely, therefore, to have the precedent, such as this would be if it were established, abused, and it being the only one I do not think there can be any good reason advanced against an allowance being made in this case. It would meet with the approval of the militia. I have received a great many communications on the subject from men in the

service, and they seem to wonder the case has not been dealt with before. I do not propose to upbraid the Minister on the matter; he is carefully endeavoring to guard the public exchequer and to prevent fraud; but, in view of what has occurred, he will probably be able to see what a grateful country will expect of him in this case, and meet it in the spirit I have suggested, and give the presumption in favor of the unfortunate soldier.

Mr. DENISON. I think this is a case which should be enquired into by the Minister of Militia, so that something may be done. The widow of the soldier called and explained the circumstance to me, and I must say that she made out a very good case. I have no doubt that if this man had become insane when on the North-West expedition his widow would have received something in the way of a pension, and as there is a doubt as to when his insanity came on, whether in the North-West or immediately after his return, the question of pension, of course, is one for the Minister to consider. The widow says that immediately after he came back she noticed something strange in his actions, and she thinks something was wrong with him at that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The papers which have been asked by the hon. gentleman who has spoken on this subject expressed the deep regret which I feel myself in regard to the case of the widow, I shall be only too glad to bring down as soon as it is possible for me to do so. The facts of the case are, I believe, exactly as the hon. gentleman has stated them to be. As reported to me the case of this man is as follows. He enlisted in "C" Company of Infantry, the permanent corps of Toronto, on the 21st February, 1884. He is reported to have done very good service indeed during the troublesome times in the North-West. He followed his corps under orders and he did his duty fully as well as any other man who took part in the troubles, and as well as any other member of that corps which distinguished itself during those times. He returned from the North-West on the 25th October, 1886. On April 10, 1886, he became insane, and he had to be removed from the hospital where he had been admitted on the 28th March, to the insane asylum on the 17th April. When the matter was brought before me as Minister of Militia it became my duty, however great might be my sympathy for this individual case, to investigate the matter. The case was brought before me upon the ground that the insanity from which the unfortunate man suffered was the result of his trip to the North-West. The law, as the hon. gentleman very correctly stated it, did not provide for any case which did not come under the statute giving pensions to those who had taken part in the troubles, and the matter was submitted to the surgeon of his corps, Surgeon Strange, a gentleman whose eminence as a physician is universally admitted, and that officer reported to me that it was impossible for him to trace the disease from which this man suffered to the service which he had done in the North-West. Consequently it became impossible for me as the Minister administering that Department to bring this individual case under the statute granting pensions to those who had been wounded or suffered disability from the service which they had done at the front; and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the law does not provide for any gratuity or any pension to those in the permanent corps or in the militia, except in specified cases, and the specified cases do not meet the case of Neely. I have already taken some little trouble investigating the matter and I intend to submit to the Government a recommendation which, provided it is approved by the Governor in Council, will permit me to do something for the widow. The hon. gentleman must admit that, the case having been submitted to me under the circumstances which I have just referred to, it was impossible, as the law

existed, for me to provide for the case; and in answer to the communication from the widow of Neely, I stated, as it was my duty so to do, the circumstances which prevented me granting her any compensation for services which he had rendered in the North-West. I hope that whatever can be done will be done, because I admit that it is one of the very hardest cases that have come before me for a long time as Minister of Militia.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear that it is the intention of the Minister to do as he has stated, and provide some gratuity for the widow of this poor man. As I understand, the intention of the Minister is to ask the Government for some compensation for the widow. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when he takes this into his consideration he might very well go further. I see no reason in the world why the widow of this man should not be treated in the very same manner as if the man had been shot in battle, or had died during the campaign. So far as I can see it is no very violent presumption to suppose that the disease from which the man died cannot be explained in any other way, than that it was brought on by the hardship of the campaign. We understand very well that if he had not served in the campaign he could not have contracted the disease he died from. Under such circumstances I repeat what I said a moment ago, that it is no violent supposition to suppose that this man was brought to his death by the fact that he served in this campaign. There is no other evidence.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg your pardon, there is other evidence which will be shown when the papers are brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the evidence?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me for interrupting him I will just read to him a very short extract from the report of Surgeon Strange, who it will be remembered was the surgeon of "C" Corps of Infantry to which Neely belonged. Surgeon Strange reports that having gone carefully into his case he is of opinion that Neely's service in the North-West had nothing whatever to do with his insanity. It does not appear, therefore, that this man has any claim for compensation under the statute by which I am allowed to give compensation, for any disability incurred in the North-West, and there are no funds at the disposal of this Department to meet any such case.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the hon. gentleman could not do otherwise than he has done under the statute. The point I wished to make was this,—if no other cause can be assigned for his disease it was no very violent supposition to suppose that death was brought about by the hardship of the campaign. Under such circumstances the Minister must arrive at the conclusion that some compensation should be given to his widow. I suggest that if the law as it stands does not provide for the case, the law can be made by this Parliament to provide for it. If the hon. gentlemen asks for the gratuity, Parliament will be only too happy to grant it. As far as this side of the House is concerned we will not grudge the money, and we will be happy to aid in anything that can be done by the Government in this connection.

Mr. IVES. I would like to add my influence, if I have any, to that of the hon. gentlemen who are urging the Minister to deal liberally with this case. I think the Minister of Militia, though perhaps perfectly just, is not inclined to be quite sufficiently generous. There have been other cases before the present one in which I humbly think he had the law and the right to give some assistance, but which the hon. gentleman has already refused to do. I do not think that the country would begrudge a little assistance in a case of this kind or in any other case of a similar

character when volunteers are injured in actual service. I think there is no disposition in the country to treat the volunteers in a niggardly manner at all. It is generally understood that the pay that they get is not a very large remuneration and that there is nothing in it to recompense them for injuries they may sustain in actual service. I know that the feeling of the country is that when a volunteer is injured in actual service he should be recompensed or indemnified in some way. Of course we cannot expect to imitate the liberal proportion of the pension list of our neighbors to the south. We have not a big surplus at our disposal to do it, but we have enough money to treat our volunteer forces fairly and not stingily. Those claims are founded in equity, and I think the Minister would be supported by both sides of the House if he would give a little more generous interpretation to the law and to his powers in this respect than he has been in the habit of doing.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that the portion of the report of the medical officer read by the Minister of Militia entirely covers the case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I only read an extract.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be. I cannot see that the widow and children would be disentitled to compensation merely because you cannot prove that the disability was brought about by the campaign in the North-West. There is the fact that the man was on duty, and it is immaterial, so far as this question is concerned, whether this infirmity was brought on by service in the North-West or by service elsewhere. He was in the service at the time he was cut down. Therefore his case is entirely one entitling him to consideration at the hands of the country, quite irrespective of whether you can prove that his disease originated in the North-West or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He was entitled only to pay for 30 days. That would not amount to much.

Mr. MULOCK. Here we have a case where a man in the service of the country and actually wearing Her Majesty's uniform at the time is cut down by disease and ultimately dies, and leaves his family at the mercy of the country. Is there any technicality that can be allowed to intervene to prevent the country doing its duty under such circumstances?

Mr. AMYOT. I entirely agree with the request that some help should be given to the widow of this man. The soldiers in that campaign were submitted to great hardship, and I think as a country we should have some gratitude for those who exposed their lives under such circumstances. I hope and I believe that the case should be treated liberally. If we have nothing in the law to enable us to do justice to this widow we should change the law. It is time yet, as it is always time to render justice.

Motion agreed to.

EDIFICES PUBLICS A SAINT-HYACINTHE.

M. DUPONT demande—

Copie de toutes lettres, mémoires et autres documents concernant la construction d'édifices publics dans la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe, tels que le bureau de poste et entrepôt pour la douane, etc.

M. l'Orateur, le district de Saint-Hyacinthe est intéressé à la prospérité de la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe. Non-seulement la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe est le chef-lieu du district de ce nom, mais elle est aussi le centre d'affaires d'une population d'au delà de 100,000 âmes. Saint-Hyacinthe, il est inutile de le remarquer ici, est une des villes qui occupent une des meilleures positions dans la Puissance du Canada sous le rapport de la science et des maisons d'éducation. La cité de Saint-Hyacinthe possède de vastes maisons d'éducation pour

Mr. Ives.

Il est vrai qu'il n'est pas besoin d'édifices publics pour mettre en entrepôt la science ; la science qui est distribuée par les maisons d'éducation de la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe est l'instruction de la jeunesse ; elle est connue sous ce rapport dans tout le pays.

déposée en entrepôt dans les intelligences des jeunes et loyaux sujets de Sa Majesté pour être ensuite utilisée pour le bien du pays. Mais la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe, au point de vue du progrès matériel, de son importance commerciale et industrielle, est au niveau de son importance morale et intellectuelle.

Tout le monde se rappelle encore que cette jeune cité fut incendiée en 1876. Plus heureuse que sa cité sœur de Saint-Jean, N.B., Saint-Hyacinthe, malgré ses désastres, constatait encore une augmentation de population au recensement de 1881. Depuis lors, grâce à la politique de protection que nous avons, la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe s'est développée, je puis dire d'une façon étonnante, et au prochain recensement, aucune ville du pays ne pourra constater, eu égard à sa population, un progrès plus considérable. Je n'hésite pas à dire que la population de la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe et sa richesse seront plus que doublées en 1891.

En 1879, il n'y avait pas 200 ouvriers employés dans l'industrie à Saint-Hyacinthe. Aujourd'hui il y a un capital de près de \$1,000,000 engagé dans les diverses manufactures qui ont surgi depuis cette époque ; le nombre des ouvriers employés dans les différentes usines est de douze à quinze cents, et leurs salaires annuels s'élèvent à près de \$300,000.

M. l'Orateur, la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe doit ce progrès matériel étonnant, depuis 1879, tant à l'intelligence et à l'esprit d'entreprise de ses citoyens qu'à la politique adoptée en 1879 par le gouvernement actuel. Grâce à cette politique le gouvernement a vu ses revenus augmenter considérablement ; et avec de l'argent dans le trésor, il a pu faire de grandes entreprises utiles au pays. Le gouvernement a pu élever surtout dans les villes importantes de la Puissance, des édifices publics qui attestent notre prospérité.

Le district de Saint-Hyacinthe, M. l'Orateur, je me plais à le rappeler à l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics, a contribué largement à l'établissement de cette politique, puisqu'en 1879 il était représenté par trois députés qui appuyaient la politique nationale. Des améliorations considérables ont été faites, sans parler des grandes entreprises de chemin de fer, dans différentes villes du pays. Saint-Hyacinthe n'a pas encore eu son tour malgré son importance que je viens de démontrer. Nous ne sommes pas jaloux des améliorations qui ont été faites ailleurs. Au contraire, pour ma part, je dois en féliciter le gouvernement. Mais il me semble que maintenant le tour du district de Saint-Hyacinthe est arrivé ; je puis dire même qu'il est passé et qu'on l'a donné à d'autres. Cependant, je crois que l'intérêt public exige que l'on ne néglige pas plus longtemps Saint-Hyacinthe, et qu'on lui accorde les édifices publics auxquels réfère la motion que je viens de faire.

J'ai en main une liste des différentes villes où le gouvernement a construit des édifices publics. L'importance des villes sous le rapport de ces constructions doit dépendre naturellement des revenus que ces villes fournissent au trésor public. Or je vois que dans la ville d'Annapolis, on a construit des édifices publics, ou on doit les construire, au coût de \$19,500. La population d'Annapolis est de 2,833, le revenu que son port, son bureau de poste et ses droits d'accise ont donné au trésor public, \$13,211. Sydney-Nord, avec une population de 5,484 âmes a rapporté au trésor un revenu de \$29,216. Sidney-Sud, avec une population de 3,667 âmes a rapporté au trésor par toute sorte de revenu \$4,610. Il y a une foule d'autres villes importantes qui ont des édifices publics et qui donnent un montant moins considérable que la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe. Je vois par exemple la petite ville d'Aylmer qui a une population de 1,781 âmes et qui donne au gouvernement un revenu de \$1,309. Coaticook a une population de 2,682 âmes et donne un revenu de

\$40,232. Je vois dans les estimés un montant de \$16,000 pour un bureau de poste et de douane dans cette ville. Joliette donne un revenu de \$33,181, et il y a dans les estimés une somme de \$10,000 pour des édifices publics dans ce dernier endroit. Fraserville, la ville de l'honorable député de Témiscouata (M. Grandbois), donne un revenu de \$5,450, et je vois qu'il y a dans les estimés \$6,000 pour un bureau de douane et de poste. Saint-Hyacinthe avec une population, en 1881 de 5,321 âmes, population qui est peut-être de 10,000 âmes aujourd'hui et qui atteindra certainement au prochain recensement 12,000 à 13,000 âmes, sans aucuns édifices publics, sans aucune facilité pour permettre les importations dans la ville, sans aucune accommodation quelconque en fait de bureaux publics, rapporte au gouvernement un revenu annuel d'un delà de \$80,000. Et cependant, M. l'Orateur, la ville de Saint-Hyacinthe a été négligée jusqu'à aujourd'hui; le gouvernement n'a pas songé à lui donner les édifices publics que le service public requiert, que l'intérêt public exige. Le commerce de cette jeune et florissante cité ne permet pas de retarder plus longtemps la construction de tels édifices.

Comme je le disais il y a un instant, Saint-Hyacinthe possède de magnifiques établissements pour l'instruction de la jeunesse. La corporation a également construit de magnifiques édifices publics pour ses propres besoins. J'ajouterai même, que la nation américaine a reconnu l'importance de la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe, puisque depuis trois ou quatre ans, les Etats-Unis, dans l'intérêt de leur commerce, y sont représentés par un consul et un vice-consul. Il est vraiment regrettable pour les citoyens de votre district, de voir le drapeau étoilé de la république voisine flotter sur des édifices convenables et qui font honneur à ce drapeau, tandis que le drapeau du Canada flotte sur de misérables édifices, de pauvres remis, qui ne sont pas du tout dignes de la cité de Saint-Hyacinthe, ni de son port d'entrée, ni de l'importance de son bureau du revenu, ou de son bureau de poste.

Je demande donc, M. l'Orateur, au gouvernement, et surtout à l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics (sir Hector Langevin), ainsi qu'à son collègue du district de Montréal, de vouloir bien porter un peu d'attention à ce coin obscur de leur pays, et d'accorder à Saint-Hyacinthe les édifices publics que son importance et les besoins de son commerce requièrent.

Au reste, je considère que le gouvernement, en justice, est tenu de construire ces édifices demandés avec instance. Le bureau de poste se tient, actuellement, presque dans la rue. C'est un local de cinq ou six pieds sur vingt. J'ai été moi-même témoin d'un spectacle regrettable: Une foule nombreuse de citoyens stationnaient dans la rue, en face du bureau de poste, à une époque de l'année où les intempéries de la saison ne permettaient pas de demeurer ainsi au dehors. Il fallait attendre dans la rue que la malle fut délivrée, ou qu'il était impossible de se tenir à l'intérieur de l'édifice.

M. l'Orateur, le gouvernement est un peu complice de l'exiguïté des édifices et de l'état de choses actuel à Saint-Hyacinthe. Sa politique de protection a beaucoup contribué à faire progresser cette ville. Je considère que le gouvernement est tenu d'accorder à Saint-Hyacinthe les édifices demandés, afin d'aider à transiger la somme d'affaires qui s'y fait maintenant. Je puis assurer le gouvernement que toute la population et les hommes d'affaires de cette ville en seront orgueilleux et très reconnaissants.

J'espère que l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics et son honorable collègue du district de Montréal, prouveront aux hommes d'affaires, si entreprenants et si actifs de Saint-Hyacinthe, qu'ils n'ont rien perdu pour attendre et que le gouvernement est disposé, dès maintenant, à construire ces édifices rapidement et de dimensions telles, qu'ils répondront aux besoins de la localité et ne devront pas être recommandés quatre ou cinq ans après leur construction.

M. l'Orateur, on ne peut considérer comme exorbitante la dépense de quarante ou cinquante mille piastres pour doter Saint-Hyacinthe d'édifices publics convenables, quand on sait que le district de Saint-Hyacinthe a donné des millions au trésor public, sans jamais recevoir, en retour, un seul sou en améliorations publiques depuis que la Confédération existe?

Je crois, du reste, que ces améliorations sont autant de l'intérêt du gouvernement que de celui des particuliers; car d'ici à cinq ans, par le surcroît d'affaires qui aura lieu dans le port de Saint-Hyacinthe, si le gouvernement favorise le commerce de cette importante cité, il aura perçu plus de revenus qu'il n'en faudra pour payer cette dépense de cinquante à soixante mille piastres; dépense que l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics, qui s'est toujours montré soucieux de rendre justice à toutes les localités où l'esprit d'entreprise des citoyens ainsi que leur intelligence des affaires se manifestent, fera pour Saint-Hyacinthe comme il l'a fait partout ailleurs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: M. l'Orateur, je dois d'abord féliciter l'honorable député sur la manière habile dont il a présenté la question qu'il a soumise à la considération de la Chambre. Il a surtout intéressé les honorables députés des deux côtés de la Chambre en mettant devant eux la statistique relative au commerce de Saint-Hyacinthe, à l'augmentation de sa population et de ses affaires, et à sa prospérité généralement.

L'honorable député dit que c'est un peu beaucoup la faute du gouvernement si Saint-Hyacinthe jette un cri de détresse au sujet d'édifices publics qu'il n'a pas. L'honorable député dit, avec raison, je crois, que si la construction de ces édifices est devenue nécessaire, cela est due à la politique suivie par le gouvernement—la politique nationale—laquelle a fait accroître considérablement les affaires dans Saint-Hyacinthe, et a fait augmenter sa population aussi rapidement que l'a dit l'honorable député. Cela est parfaitement vrai.

L'automne dernier, j'avais été invité, par le conseil municipal et les citoyens de Saint-Hyacinthe, appartenant aux deux partis politiques, de leur rendre visite afin de constater par moi-même l'état des affaires, l'augmentation de la population et généralement les besoins de la ville. J'avoue, M. l'Orateur, que j'aurais beaucoup désiré voir Saint-Hyacinthe, qui est si prospère, et fait tant d'honneur à notre province par son progrès, mais j'ai préféré ne pas y aller alors; j'ai voulu savoir par les députés de cette localité, par les documents qui m'ont été fournis et les statistiques que j'ai eu en ma possession, ce qui en était.

Si j'étais allé à Saint-Hyacinthe, et qu'après la réception qu'on promettait de me faire, je fusse revenu à Ottawa, demander à mes collègues d'accorder un vote d'argent, et au parlement de sanctionner cette mesure, j'aurais pu être accusé d'avoir un peu voulu payer ma réception là-bas. Mais comme je n'y suis pas allé, et sachant maintenant de mes amis politiques et autres, l'état des affaires de Saint-Hyacinthe et ses besoins, et sachant de plus que les renseignements donnés par l'honorable député de Bagot (M. Dupont) à l'égard des édifices publics sont absolument exacts, je puis assurer l'honorable député que cette question n'avait pas échappé à mon attention; et que maintenant qu'elle est soumise à la Chambre, avec la force avec laquelle il l'a exposée dans sa motion, je me ferai un devoir d'y attirer l'attention du gouvernement, et peut-être que les estimés supplémentaires feront voir quelle a été la décision du gouvernement.

M. LAURIER: M. l'Orateur, j'espère que l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics persistera dans l'intention qu'il exprime maintenant de visiter la ville de Saint-Hyacinthe quelque jour. Je suis parfaitement convaincu que s'il n'y trouve pas autant d'amis politiques qu'il pourrait trou

ver dans d'autres parties du pays, il y trouvera cependant des adversaires qui seront très heureux de le voir dans toutes circonstances. Et quand il fera cette visite, ce ne sera pas, j'espère, pour s'assurer si la ville de Saint-Hyacinthe doit avoir les édifices publics qu'elle réclame depuis longtemps, car d'après les discours que nous venons d'entendre cette question doit être décidée à l'heure qu'il est, au moins dans l'esprit de l'honorable ministre des Travaux publics, mais ce sera pour choisir le site où ils doivent être placés.

Je suis heureux de m'accorder cette fois-ci avec mon honorable ami le ministre des Travaux publics et l'honorable député de Bagot (M. Dupont) au sujet de la nécessité de ces édifices à Saint-Hyacinthe. Mais il y a un point cependant sur lequel je ne m'accorde pas avec eux; c'est que c'est la politique nationale qui a développé la ville de Saint-Hyacinthe. Je dois dire que ce n'est pas du tout l'opinion des habitants de Saint-Hyacinthe. Au contraire, ce que l'on demande maintenant à Saint-Hyacinthe, ce n'est pas la politique nationale mais c'est la réciprocité.

Motion accordée.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence in connection with the land grant to the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, or relating to the construction of said railway; copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence in connection with the land grant to the North-West Central Railway Company, or relating to the construction of the said railway; copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence as to the construction of a railway from a point on the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway via Rapid City westward, by any parties other than the Corporators in the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company; copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence as to the incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company, or relating to any land grant thereto, or to the construction of the line of the said railway or any part thereof.

He said: The papers asked for in these motions relate to the very important line of railway from Brandon to Battleford. This route was in contemplation of adoption by the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Co. That company was changed to the North-West Central Railway Company, which disappeared, and now the line is in possession of the Great North-West Central Railway Co. It is one of the most important lines of railway in the whole North-West, being 450 miles in length, and having a land grant of 2,200,000 acres, second only in importance to the land grant made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Two years ago, in the opinion of this House, the construction of this railway was a matter of extreme urgency. We know the interest that was taken by the House and the country in matters connected with the former charter. An opportunity was given by the House to the owners of that charter to place a deposit in the hands of the Government as evidence of their good faith, and to prevent their charter from lapsing; and the very unusual and special course was taken by this House to give to the Government the power, while the House was not sitting, to charter as a company, any body of persons whom they chose, with full powers to build this railway in case of the default of the then existing company, and they were also given power to award the land grant to the company so to be incorporated. The Minister of Public Works, as chairman of the Committee on Railways, during the Session of 1886, telegraphed, I think, to the Legislature of Manitoba, telling them the Governor in Council would incorporate a good company to build the road. Well, what has happened? The old company made default. The Government without much delay incorporated a company by letters patent, on the 22nd of July, 1886, and gave it the land grant, and as something appears to have been considered wrong or incomplete in the original charter, the applicants asked the Government to

Mr. LAURIER.

amend that charter, which was promptly done by the Government in August of the same year. I do not complain of delay on the part of the Government up to that time; but what has been done since then? We hear that the company have organized and have paid in \$50,000 to the Government as evidence of good faith; but when there was such great urgency as everybody admitted there was in 1886 for the construction of this railway, why has there been delay? It was only recently, when we saw a Bill presented to this House by the Great North-West Company to confirm their letters patent, that we discovered what may perhaps account for the delay. It appears that there was a mistake in the letters patent granted to this company by the Government in July, 1886, the charter not being in conformity with the Act of Parliament which authorised it. That admission was made the other day by the Minister of Justice, when he stated to the Railway Committee that he had suggested to the incorporators that they would require to get legislation. What I complain of is that the Government granted a charter inconsistent with the Act authorising it. If the Act was not what they wished it to be, why did they not come to the House last Session and get the necessary legislation to put it right? There can be no excuse for this delay. It cannot be altogether blamed on the incorporators either, for when the Minister of Justice advised them to get legislation to confirm their charter, I cannot be surprised that they did not or would not go on under the charter as it stood. It does seem to me that a great deal of explanation will be required from the Government as to why they allowed such an important measure of railway construction to lie absolutely dormant for two years. The enterprise is no further ahead now than it was in July, 1886. In fact it was a great deal farther ahead then than it is to-day, because the time of the charter was up, and it was not in accordance with the Act. There is no need of discussing in what way it was not; but I may briefly say that the Act required that the charter should provide for the payment of all the legal obligations of the former company, and the charter undertook to interpret what that meant by defining certain obligations which the new company was to be bound by. I do not know what Parliament would have stated had it been asked to define the obligations more distinctly in the Act; but the Government defined them by letters patent, and they have to admit that that part of the charter requires confirmation by an Act of Parliament. I move for these papers, and I think they will show that the Government are responsible for the delay in the construction of this railway through that rich portion of the North-West. Everything, apparently, was ready for the work two years ago. The Minister of Public Works announced that everything was ready; and yet the Government allowed the whole of last Session to pass without asking this House to rectify matters. Although they have come now for legislation, we do not know that the people of that part of the country may not have to wait two years more before the work of construction is commenced.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY CHAPLAIN, ST. JOHN, P.Q.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and certain residents of St. John's, P.Q., respecting remuneration for the services of Rev. M. Aubry, in attendance on, or as Chaplain to the Military School at St. John's, P.Q.

He said: If the information I have received is correct, the Rev. Mr. Aubry, who has acted as the Chaplain of the school of St. John since the Government has had charge of that school, has never received a cent for his services, and has besides to pay for driving there and back. The Imperial Government used to grant \$300 a year for the same service.

As I understand, the Rev. Mr. Aubry claims \$2 a week, and that amount has been refused to him. I do not know personally the facts of the case, but I state them as they have been given to me; and if they are correct, I think it is unfair to ask for the services of a Chaplain and then to refuse to pay for them. The Chaplain is as well entitled to remuneration as any other individual, and I think the Government should not begrudge the small amount he claims. I hope it will be sufficient to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to this injustice to have it remedied.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it would be very much more convenient to discuss this matter when the papers are brought down. The hon. gentleman has referred to information which was conveyed to him. In the face of that declaration, I should not like to contradict any of the statements he has made, without having the papers, which must speak for themselves, before me. I must, however, draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that under the regulations, which are the law under which the department must act, no provision is made and no authority is given to the department to pay a chaplain. The report made to me is that the School of Infantry at St. John attend the religious exercises in the parish church, like everybody else, and that no extra religious services are rendered, such as were rendered when the Imperial forces were stationed in Quebec. Then there was a special service for the force, and naturally such service was remunerated. This is a matter, however, in which I would have been very happy indeed to have seen my way clear to authorise the payment of remuneration, if, under the law, which is above me as it is above everybody else, I could have given it. When the papers are brought down, the correspondence will disclose the action which the department has taken in the matter.

Mr. AMYOT. I would have had no objection to wait until the papers are brought down, but we never know when they will be brought down. They may take one year or two years to come down. I asked for papers last year; they are not before the House yet. I will only say that if no services have been rendered by the Reverend Mr. Aubry, he is not entitled to remuneration, but if he has rendered services he certainly is entitled to be paid for them; and if the law does not allow it, the hon. the Minister of Militia, who has power to change the by-laws and regulations of the Militia, should have them changed. It is absurd to pass by-laws which work injustice, and then say that the by-laws will not allow justice to be done. Let us make the by-laws in such a way that justice will be done to every one.

EAU POUR SALLE D'EXERCICES MILITAIRES A QUÉBEC.

M. AMYOT: Je demande—

Copie de la correspondance échangée entre le gouvernement et la corporation de Québec, au sujet de l'eau nécessaire à la salle d'exercices militaires (*drill shed*) de la cité de Québec.

M. l'Orateur, il y a quelque temps, j'avais mis sur les ordres du jour une interpellation, et l'honorable ministre de la Milice n'a pas paru comprendre ce que je demandais. Il s'agissait de l'eau nécessaire pour la salle d'exercices de Québec. Il a cru qu'il s'agissait d'une école de navigation. Je voulais parler de l'eau nécessaire aux soldats lorsqu'ils font la parade; ils ont besoin d'eau pour boire de temps en temps,—cela est permis par les règlements en force,—ils ont besoin d'eau aussi pour mouiller le plancher afin d'empêcher que la poussière gâte les habillements des soldats. C'était là l'usage de l'eau dont je parlais. Depuis ce temps-là, les soldats n'ont plus la peine de payer l'eau dont ils ont besoin, le gouvernement a été assez bon de la leur fournir. Ma

motion devient donc inutile et je demanderai la permission de la retirer.

Motion retirée.

DESTITUTION DE GEORGE OLIVIER.

M. RINFRET: Je demande—

Copie de toutes correspondances, requêtes et papiers de toute sorte, concernant la destitution de M. George Olivier comme maître de poste de la paroisse de Saint-Agapit, dans le comté de Lotbinière.

M. l'Orateur, à la dernière session j'ai présenté devant cette Chambre exactement la motion que je présente maintenant, cette motion a été adoptée par la Chambre, mais cependant le retour n'a pas été fait, du moins, s'il a été fait je n'en ai pas eu connaissance.

Si je me permets de ramener cette question devant la Chambre cette année, c'est que la destitution de M. Olivier s'est faite dans des circonstances tout-à-fait particulières. Elle a eu lieu à la suite de l'élection pour la Chambre locale pour le comté de Lotbinière dans laquelle M. Beaudet se présentait contre M. Laliberté. Cette élection a eu lieu presque immédiatement après l'exécution de Riel; et d'après ce qu'on a pu voir, le gouvernement a voulu en faire un *test case*. En effet, malgré que ce fût une élection locale, une foule d'agents et d'amis du gouvernement fédéral ont travaillé dans cette élection, et ils ont employé tous les moyens pour faire triompher le candidat du parti conservateur, M. Beaudet. Ils ont employé non-seulement les questions politiques, mais ont eu recours à l'intimidation la plus effrontée. C'est ainsi que toutes les personnes qui dépendaient d'une manière ou d'une autre du gouvernement fédéral, tels que les gardiens de phares et les personnes employées par la commission du havre de Montréal pour le creusement du Lac Saint Pierre, ont été menacées de destitution s'ils votaient pour M. Laliberté.

Le maître de poste de Saint-Agapit n'appartenait pas au parti conservateur; il était bien connu que ses sympathies étaient en faveur du parti libéral, mais tout de même, c'est un homme qui s'est toujours occupé de politique avec beaucoup de modération tout en travaillant dans une certaine mesure pour son parti. Or, presque immédiatement après l'élection cet homme a été destitué. On a prétendu dans le temps que la raison de cette destitution était que l'on voulait changer de place le bureau de poste de la paroisse de Saint-Agapit. Mais cette raison est futile, surtout si l'on tient compte du fait que le changement ne rencontre pas les vues des habitants de la paroisse. Il est vrai qu'il a été rapproché de l'église de Saint-Agapit, mais il est plus éloigné du centre des affaires, et les citoyens de la paroisse se plaignent de ce changement et de cette destitution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: M. l'Orateur, je croyais que mon collègue, le Maître-général des postes était ici, mais je m'aperçois qu'il n'y est pas. Je ne suis pas en état de répondre à ce que vient de dire l'honorable député; néanmoins, les papiers seront déposés devant la Chambre et je suis convaincu que lorsque l'honorable député les aura examinés, il verra que ce qu'on lui a dit au sujet de cette destitution est exagérée, et que si ce monsieur a été démis de ses fonctions, il a dû l'être pour bonnes causes.

Motion accordée.

FIELD EXERCISE—TRADUCTION EN FRANÇAIS.

M. AMYOT: Je demande—

Copie de la correspondance relative à la traduction en français du *Field Exercise*, à partir du 23 juillet 1879, échangée tant entre le département de la milice, avec le lieutenant-colonel Audet, qu'entre l'un d'eux et le gérant de la Compagnie d'imprimerie canadienne de Montréal, et Benjamin Sulte, écr., et Gebbart-Berthiaume, et tout autre concernant la dite traduction.

Les documents auxquels je fais allusion dans cette motion sont les suivants:

23 juillet 1879—Lettre du député-ministre de la milice à A. Audet, lui offrant, au nom du ministre de la milice, l'entreprise de la traduction du *Field Exercise*.

28 juillet 1879—Réponse de A. Audet acceptant ses conditions.

29 juillet 1879—Lettre du colonel Panet autorisant, au nom du ministre de la milice, A. Audet à commencer immédiatement la traduction.

16 mars 1880—Mémoire du ministre de la milice au colonel Panet, lui enjoignant de faire imprimer la traduction française du *Field Exercise* par la Compagnie d'imprimerie canadienne de Montréal, à de certaines conditions.

20 mars 1880—Lettre du colonel Panet au gérant de la Compagnie d'imprimerie canadienne, lui proposant d'imprimer la traduction du *Field Exercise*.

1er avril 1880—Lettre de M. Thibault, gérant de la Compagnie d'imprimerie canadienne de Montréal, acceptant les conditions proposées par le département pour l'impression du *Field Exercise*.

2 avril 1880—Lettre du département à M. Thibault, l'autorisant à imprimer la traduction et l'informant que M. Audet lui fournira le manuscrit.

25 novembre 1880.—Lettre de M. Thibault au département, disant que la Compagnie d'imprimerie a reçu cinquante pages de la traduction du *Field Exercise*.

10 février 1881.—Lettre de M. Audet au colonel Panet affirmant que la traduction est faite et expédiée depuis la fin de novembre ou les premiers jours de décembre.

26 mars 1881.—Lettre de M. Audet à M. Benjamin Sulte.

29 avril 1881.—Lettre de M. Thibault, au nom de M. Desjardins, M.P.

14 mai 1881.—Lettre de M. Audet à M. Sulte.

24 mai 1881.—Lettre de M. Thibault au département.

10 juin 1881.—Lettre de M. Audet au colonel Panet en réponse à une lettre de ce dernier lui demandant de livrer tout le manuscrit de la traduction.

7 juillet 1881.—Note de M. Benjamin Sulte à l'effet qu'il a corrigé les épreuves du texte français jusqu'au bas de la page 102 de l'anglais.

19 mars 1885.—Lettre de Gebhardt et Berthiaume, successeur de la Compagnie d'imprimerie canadienne.

Ce sont les principaux documents dont j'ai besoin. Il y en a d'autres qui s'intercaleront dans ceux-là, mais j'espère qu'ils seront tous placés sur les bureaux de la Chambre.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON : Je comprends que l'honorable député produit une liste des papiers qu'il désire avoir.

M. AMYOT : J'ai simplement lu les titres des documents afin qu'ils apparaissent dans les *Débats* mais je pourrai en envoyer une copie au département.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON : Parce que je ne sais pas quels sont les papiers qui composent le dossier.

M. AMYOT : J'envverai une liste des documents que je requiers au département.

Motion accordée.

RÉCLAMATION DU DR J. A. MORIN.

M. AMYOT : Je demande—

Copie de la réclamation du Dr J. A. Morin, de Saint-Charles, Bellechasse, pour soins médicaux donnés à Odilon Fournier, serre-frein sur le chemin de fer Intercolonial, blessé à Saint-Charles susdit pendant qu'il remplissait les fonctions de serre-frein, le 28 mars 1885, lesquels soins ont duré jusqu'au 8 juin 1885, et la correspondance échangée à ce sujet.

M. l'Orateur, je fais cette motion pour attirer l'attention du gouvernement sur une injustice assez grave qui se commet actuellement. L'Intercolonial, la propriété du gouvernement fédéral, est souvent la cause de certains accidents. Dans le cas actuel, un des employés de l'Intercolonial a été blessé grièvement à une main ; on a chargé un médecin de l'endroit de le soigner ; les soins ont duré, ainsi que je le dis, M. AMYOT.

dans ma motion, à peu près deux mois et demi. Le médecin a dû faire l'amputation de trois doigts et un pouce dans des circonstances très difficiles ; il a donné des soins prolongés, et pour tout cela on ne lui offre que \$25. Je ne crains pas de dire si les officiers du département—car je n'attribue pas cela au département—étaient sérieux, ils n'agiraient pas ainsi. Ce n'est certainement pas \$100 qui seraient une rémunération suffisante pour les soins donnés par ce médecin.

Voici les faits tels que ce médecin me les rapporte :

L'accident eut lieu le 28 mars 1885. Le nommé Odilon Fournier eut la main broyée dans les roues d'un convoi ; il fallut faire l'amputation du pouce et de trois doigts et traiter le petit doigt pour une fracture composée. Afin de sauver quelques parties utiles de la main, j'ai dû faire l'amputation des doigts dans une partie demi-broyée, et conséquemment, s'exposer à des complications et à un long traitement, chose de peu d'importance si on la compare avec l'utilité que peut avoir un tronçon de doigt pour un homme aussi infirme. De fait, il y a eu de l'inflammation et de la gangrène des lambeaux ; néanmoins, à force de soins, j'ai réussi à lui sauver toutes les parties conservées lors de l'amputation. Le traitement dura jusqu'au 8 juin 1885.

Alors j'envoyai mon compte au montant de \$91.75.

On le renvoya avec leur tarif. Je refis le compte autant que possible suivant l'esprit de ce tarif ; il s'éleva à \$110.50. Mais ce tarif n'accordait que \$5.01 pour chaque amputation de doigt jusqu'à guérison. Alors je ne pouvais accepter ce montant, et on me refusa de me donner plus de \$25.00. Le montant aurait pu suffire pour une amputation dans les chairs saines, mais non dans des chairs meurtries où il a dû se produire des complications sérieuses et longues à guérir. Vous verrez d'après les lettres écrites et les comptes quel montant d'ouvrage j'ai fait. Je prétends que la compagnie n'a pas le droit de m'imposer de tarif. J'ai été demandé pour faire l'ouvrage par les agents du chemin sans condition aucune ; c'est pourquoi on ne peut refuser ce me semble de payer mon compte tel que fait s'il n'est pas extravagant. Je n'aurais certainement pas entrepris de faire de l'ouvrage pour le montant offert aujourd'hui. Mon compte n'est pas exorbitant.

Et il ajoute la raison pour laquelle il croit qu'il n'est pas payé. Je n'ai pas besoin de la dire devant cette Chambre, elle sera probablement devinée. Mais j'attire spécialement l'attention du gouvernement sur ces faits. Je crois que les médecins qui sont employés par le gouvernement devraient recevoir justice, quel que soit l'endroit où ils se trouvent et quelle que soient leurs opinions ; on devrait se demander quels services ils ont rendus et les payer en conséquence. Si le gouvernement refuse de leur rendre justice, il arrivera que les médecins ne voudront plus s'occuper de ces cas-là, et le service public en souffrira.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN : En réponse à l'honorable député je dois dire que les renseignements reçus au sujet de la réclamation mentionnée dans sa motion sont ceux qu'il a donnés lui-même, que le docteur Morin a été appelé à secourir un serre-frein nommé Odilon Fournier qui avait été blessé sur l'Intercolonial le 28 mars 1885 ; que pour ces services, il lui été offert la somme de \$25.00, et on ajoute que cela est conforme au tarif de l'Intercolonial. Je ne sais pas quel est ce tarif ; dans tous les cas, M. Morin demande \$110.50. Il va sans dire que si M. Morin ne peut pas obtenir le montant de son compte, qu'il croit raisonnable, du département, il faudra qu'il fasse comme fait tout le monde en pareil cas, il devra porter sa demande devant les tribunaux. Quant au tarif, je ne puis pas dire s'il est conforme à celui des médecins, ou si c'est un tarif adopté spécialement sur l'Intercolonial. Dans tous les cas, les papiers seront déposés devant la Chambre.

Motion accordée.

BAY FORTUNE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for :

Copie of report of Engineer who recently examined the breakwater at Bay Fortune, King's County, Prince Edward Island, with a view to its extension ; together with copies of all petitions, letters, &c, in relation thereto.

He said : The construction of the breakwater at Bay Fortune is the result of the voluntary exertions and contributions of the people there, and it has not yet received a cent from the public chest. In the summer of 1886, an engineer went down to the locality and examined the work, but there has

been no report of that examination published, as in all similar cases. Why, I do not know. In 1887, last winter, the people of that section of the country sent a large petition to the Department of Public Works asking for aid to finish the breakwater. Their means had all been exhausted, and they thought that, as they had given so much of a voluntary kind, the least the Government could do was to give them a slight amount of assistance. As I understand, at present, for want of the work being constructed out to the bar, the water is digging a false channel, but if they had sufficient means to push the work out to the bar, it would save the harbor and make a complete work of it. In connection with the manner in which the water is acting just now I will read an extract from a letter I received a few days ago, which will more fully explain it. The writer says:

"Were it not for the promises held out to us by the Government party we would never have expended so large an amount of labor upon it, knowing well that it was too heavy an undertaking to accomplish without some assistance from the Government. The great misfortune about it is that, not being able to carry the work out to the bar, as we intended, the current is now cutting a false channel around the outer end of the breastwork, and, if not stopped, will most certainly ruin the harbor, if not already destroyed."

The section of the country is a large agricultural and fishing section. It is a wealthy country, and the people are very far distant from their market. In winter, the roads leading to that market, which is the town of Souris, are extremely bad. With a little assistance from the Government, they could complete the work, which would make the harbor a good one for the exportation of their produce and for fishing purposes. I think the public spirit which has been displayed by these people deserves some consideration from the Government, and I trust the Minister of Public Works in his Supplementary Estimates will not forget the action these people have taken in their own behalf. The work must be of great importance to them or they would never have undertaken it. I trust the Minister will see the necessity of giving these people some slight assistance. It would not take a large amount now to finish the work, seeing that, in the winters of 1886 and 1887, the people by their own voluntary labor constructed no less than 460 feet of it, and a very short addition would make the harbor complete.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the motion of the hon. gentleman, with this exception, that, instead of saying "the report of the engineer who recently examined" this work, it should be the report of the Chief Engineer in connection with it, because the engineers on the works make their reports to the Chief Engineer, who reports to the Government. If the hon. gentleman will consent to that change, without a formal motion, I have no objection to its passing. I may say that the examination was made, and the Chief Engineer reported upon it, but, though there was an expression of opinion or wish in the petition that was sent in, the hope that at no distant date assistance might be obtained from the Government, there was no special application for a grant of money. So the matter has stood there, but now that the hon. gentleman has called my attention to it, I will see what the report says.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SQUATTER'S CLAIM IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

A return containing copies of all letters, correspondence, affidavits, &c., connected with the location and sale or settlement of N. $\frac{1}{2}$, section 16, Township 24, Range 29 West, 4th Meridian, Northwest Territory.

He said: I desire to bring before the notice of the House a matter connected with a piece of property in the North-West, the north half of section 16, township 24, range 29

west of the 4th meridian. It appears that a person named Topping was a squatter on this land, and a person of the name of McLeod bought out the squatter's rights, went into possession of the land, and made some improvements. The land at this time was not in the market for sale. When it came into the market, Mr. McLeod went to make his entry, but to his surprise he found that a man named Walker had made the entry and made some payment on it. He complained to the land agent that Walker had been permitted to make his entry while he was virtually in possession of the property; and I believe, according to the Land Regulations, it became necessary for Walker to file a declaration stating that there was no one in possession and that no improvements had been made before he could be permitted to enter. If Walker made that declaration, it was a very improper declaration for him to make, because it is clear that McLeod was in possession of the lot and had bought the right of the man I have named. Mr. McLeod applied to have Walker's entry cancelled and to have his own name inserted as the owner of the property. The Board refused to do that, and McLeod was virtually cheated out of his property. He had to give up possession and leave the lot. He lived close by for twelve months, and during all that time Walker neither went into possession nor made any improvements. At the end of the twelve months, McLeod made an application to the land agent to be permitted to become the possessor of the property, paid his money and filed the declaration that there was no improvements whatever made by Walker on the property. He waited the full time of twelve months to give Walker all the opportunity he could reasonably expect to make improvements, but Walker made none. McLeod's application was sent forward, but, to his surprise, it was refused, the Land Board would not consent to give him the lot after the twelve months during which he had waited, though Walker had had that time to make the necessary improvements under the statute. These are the statements he made to me; I am not in a position to say whether they are all true or not, but, if they are true, it evidently shows that advantage has been taken of the man for some reason. I cannot say what the reason is, but it is quite clear, if the statements are true—and he puts them in such a shape that I am disposed to think they are true—that, although he was an actual settler on that lot, by some influence, which may have been improper influence, he was removed from that property and it was given to Walker, was was put into possession, but never made any improvements for a year. The reason the Land Board refused to give the right to McLeod was said to be that Walker had stated he had let a contract to a man named Campbell to do some breaking. Mr. Campbell did nothing, however. He had the whole year, but there was not a sod turned. Of course Mr. McLeod expected fully at the end of the year, under those circumstances, that the privileges would be granted to him that were ordinarily granted to any party seeking to become a regular settler. Still, within twenty-four hours, he says, after he had made application to become possessor, there were some four or five teams put on the property for ploughing. Walker pretended to comply with the Land Board regulations. He claimed that he had let this man, Campbell, the contract for breaking, and Campbell had not carried out the contract, and owing to that fact improvements were not made. Well, if a man simply requires to present a statement of this kind in every case, and that excuse is accepted, and the actual settler, the man who has been in possession, according to the statement he has made to me, is virtually turned out although he still offers to preempt and do the work afterwards—I think that is rather a singular state of affairs. Now, we find that all the papers have been sent to the Minister of Interior, and I say if there is any truth in these statements it is a very unfortunate thing that men who are disposed to become

actual settlers should be hustled around in that kind of a way. I think if there is any class in the world who should receive the earnest considerate attention of the Land Board there, or of the Minister here, it is the men who are prepared to go in as actual settlers and perform the improvements. Now, in moving for the papers which I believe are in the possession of the Minister of interior, I may be met with the statement that it would be better to wait until the papers are brought down in this case. Well, I have noticed that in many cases, where orders of this House have been passed, it is very late in the Session, and sometimes not until the following Session, that we get the papers. I felt it my duty to draw the attention of the Minister to this matter now, lest we might not get the papers during the present Session. I therefore beg to move for:

Copies of all letters, correspondence, affidavits, &c., connected with the location and sale or settlement of N. $\frac{1}{2}$ section 16, township 24, range 29 west, 4th meridian, North-West Territory.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no objection to the papers coming down, and I have no objection whatever to the statement the hon. gentleman has made. I think when the papers come down he will find that he has been misinformed on one or two rather important points. As he has put his statement before the House, I may as well state the actual facts as they exist with regard to this lot. Major James Walker obtained entry for this half section as a homestead and pre-emption in the spring of 1886. He was then residing upon the north-west quarter of section 12, in township 24, range 1, west of the 5th meridian, and, being within two miles of his homestead, he obtained the entry under the provisions of sub-clause 6 of clause 38 of the Dominion Lands Act, commonly known as the two miles radius clause. Subsequently, application was made by one J. R. McLeod, on whose behalf, I think, the hon. gentleman makes his motion really worse, as to those three or four acres, than if the prairie had never been broken at all. To obtain homestead and pre-emption entries for the same land, on the ground that in 1884 he had purchased the squatter's claim of one Richard Jaffing, who was alleged to have built a house and done some ploughing on the north-east quarter, McLeod stated that he had himself also done some ploughing. The records of the surveys branch give no indication of these improvements at the time of survey, and an examination of the land by the homestead inspector showed that prior to Walker's entry three and a half acres would appear to have been broken, but by that time, not having been cultivated, the area broken was overgrown with weeds, and the so-called improvements were valueless. The land was open for entry in May, 1885, and between that time and the spring of 1886, when Walker got his entry, a period of nearly 2 years, McLeod neither resided upon the land, nor applied for entry. There was, therefore, neither residence nor cultivation of the land at the time Major Walker got his entry. The land was opened for entry in 1885, and if McLeod desired, as a squatter, to obtain any right, it was his duty under the Act to make his application within three months of the opening of the land for entry; but between that time and the spring of 1886, when Walker got his entry, a period of nearly a year, McLeod neither resided upon the land nor applied for entry. The law requires squatters in advance of survey to apply for entry within six months of the date when the township is open. In the spring of 1887 McLeod applied to cancel Walker's entry on the ground that the latter had failed to break and prepare for crop the prescribed area of the homestead quarter section within the first year. The inquiry instituted by the Land Board showed that Walker had made a contract, just as the hon. gentleman has stated, with one Campbell, to break the land for him in the autumn of 1886, but early frost prevented him from performing it; and although the pre-Mr. McMullen.

scribed area was not actually broken within the year, a greater area than the law required was prepared for crop before the date of inspection, and the Board sustained Walker's entry. The decision was appealed against, but was finally confirmed by the Minister, after consideration of all the evidence. These are the facts which will be shown when the papers come down.

Motion agreed to.

QUARANTAINES DU CANADA.

M. Fiset, en demandant la nomination d'un comité spécial pour s'enquérir de la manière dont le service se fait aux quarantaines du Canada, ainsi que les meilleurs moyens à prendre pour empêcher les maladies contagieuses d'entrer dans le pays, avec pouvoir d'entendre devant le comité des personnes expertes en la matière, le dit comité devant faire rapport, dit:—

M. l'Orateur, la motion que j'ai l'honneur de présenter, est une des plus importantes parmi celles qui se trouvent sur les ordres du jour. En effet, il ne s'agit pas ici d'intérêts pécuniaires; il s'agit des intérêts du peuple: *salus populi suprema lex*, comme on dit en latin.

Je dirai de suite qu'en faisant cette motion, je n'ai pas l'intention de blâmer l'administration des quarantaines, ni le département de l'agriculture; je dirai, au contraire, que notre système de quarantaine est, je crois, le second en Amérique par son efficacité. Mais je dois ajouter toutefois, qu'il est encore loin d'être parfait.

Si j'ai pris sur moi de faire cette motion, c'est parce que des hommes éminents de la profession médicale, des corporations sanitaires, telles que les bureaux de santé des provinces de Québec et d'Ontario, m'ont fortement approuvé dans cette démarche. J'ai ici plusieurs lettres de médecins éminents qui approuvent ce projet, et je demanderai à la Chambre la permission de les lire. Je commencerai par celle du Dr Lachapelle, de Montréal, le président du Conseil provincial d'hygiène:

CONSEIL PROVINCIAL D'HYGIÈNE,
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC.
MONTRÉAL, 14 mars 1888.

DR R. FISET, M. P.,
Ottawa.

CHER MONSIEUR,—J'approuve entièrement l'idée de nommer un comité composé des médecins de la Chambre pour étudier l'importante question de notre quarantaine.

Je suis convaincu que les renseignements qui pourront être ainsi recueillis seront très importants, et je crois que c'est le devoir de la législature de ne rien négliger pour mettre notre système de quarantaine sur un pied d'efficacité aussi parfaite que possible. L'expérience fournie par la quarantaine de New-York l'automne dernier, doit suffire pour nous faire apprécier l'importance de cette question.

Votre bien dévoué serviteur,

E. P. LACHAPELLE,
Président.

En effet, M. l'Orateur, qu'on se rappelle que l'automne dernier, alors que l'on était sous l'impression que les maladies contagieuses pouvaient nous venir par voie de New-York, Boston ou Portland, le choléra a éclaté à New-York; —il avait été apporté par des steamers,—et nous avons été grandement trompés, puisque nous étions sous l'impression que leur service de quarantaine était efficace, pendant qu'il a révélé un désordre complet; la quarantaine de New-York était loin d'être aussi effective que la nôtre.

Je lirai maintenant la lettre d'un médecin distingué de Québec, le Dr. Catellier, et qui en fait de quarantaine possède beaucoup d'expérience:

QUÉBEC, 24 mars 1888.

MON CHER DOCTEUR,

Je ne puis qu'applaudir à votre idée d'améliorer dans la mesure du possible notre système de quarantaine. En effet, en présence des dangers qui nous menacent, surtout du choléra, il est fort à propos de s'occuper de la santé publique, et de s'enquérir si les maladies contagieuses ne nous viendront pas par la voie du Saint-Laurent, par les steamers qui transportent les passagers et les émigrants. Si votre comité est sé-

rieux, il rendra certainement des services au public, et au gouvernement, toujours désireux de prévenir les maladies contagieuses dans ce pays.

Bien à vous,

L. CATELLIER, M. D.

Je suis heureux de dire ici que le Dr. Catellier est un de ceux qui m'ont donné l'idée de demander la formation de ce comité.

Passons maintenant à la lettre du Dr. Robillard, d'Ottawa, président du bureau de santé de cette ville :

OTTAWA, 20 mars 1888.

Dr A. R. Fiset, M. P.

MON CHER MONSIEUR.—Toute démarche dans le sens de la motion que vous vous proposez de faire, demandant un comité spécial qui devra s'enquérir de notre système de quarantaine et de son administration dans nos ports, doit vous mériter, il me semble, l'approbation de toute personne bien pensante. Une question si importante au point de vue du bien-être de nos populations, et si pleine d'actualité, vu les empiétements graduels du choléra vers nos rivages, requiert une attention spéciale du parlement fédéral, qui devra mettre ces mesures sur un pied tel que personne ne puisse douter de leur efficacité.

Votre dévoué serviteur,

C. A. ROBILLARD, M.D.

J'ai encore la lettre de M. le Dr. Montizambert, médecin de la quarantaine de la Grosse-Ile, homme distingué, qui comprend l'importance de ce comité comme on va le voir. Voici ce qu'il dit :

71, ST. URSULE ST.,
QUEBEC, 23rd March, 1888.

DEAR DR FISET,

Pray accept my grateful acknowledgments for your letter dated the 21st inst. enclosing copy of your notice of motion, and preparing me for a possible summons to appear before the committee.

I need hardly answer you that if so required, it will be a pleasure as well as a duty for me to give such aid as I can to secure the best precautions to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering into the country.

It is a matter, the importance of which can, in my opinion, hardly be over-estimated.

"Salus populi suprema lex."

With kind regards,

Yours ever sincerely,

FREDK MONTIZAMBERT, M.D.
F.R.C.S.

Ce n'est pas tout. Je soumettrai maintenant une résolution passée par le Conseil provincial d'hygiène de la province de Québec, à une réunion tenue le mois dernier :

CONSEIL PROVINCIAL D'HYGIÈNE,
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC,
76, rue Saint-Gabriel,
MONTREAL, 24 mars 1888.

Extrait du procès-verbal de l'assemblée du 24 mars 1888.

Résolu : Que le Conseil Provincial d'Hygiène de Québec, après avoir pris communication d'un avis de motion de M. le Dr Fiset, M.P. pour Rimouski, devant les Communes, pour lundi prochain, relativement à l'importante question des quarantaines du Canada, saisis cette occasion de lui exprimer sa reconnaissance pour cet acte philanthropique, et pour réitérer au gouvernement ce qu'il lui a déjà communiqué, en le priant de vouloir prendre toute action qu'il croira juste pour protéger le plus efficacement possible notre population, après avoir reçu le rapport du comité, qui sera, elle l'espère, nommé à cet effet.

(Certifié,) ELZÉAR PELLETIER,
Secrétaire.

Comme on le voit, M. l'Orateur, cette résolution du Conseil Provincial d'Hygiène de Québec est une approbation complète de la motion qui est maintenant devant la Chambre. Mais il y a plus, le Conseil Provincial d'Hygiène d'Ontario approuve aussi la démarche. Le 27 mars 1888, son secrétaire adressait au président du Conseil Provincial d'Hygiène de Québec, le Dr Lachapelle, la lettre suivante :

PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
TORONTO, ONT., 27th March, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,—You will not have failed to have noticed that at the last meeting of this Board a report from the committee on epidemics was adopted, urging this Board to unite with your Board in pressing upon the Dominion authorities the urgent necessity there is for having Grosse Isle equipped, so that the good regulations of 1887 may be made practicable. I understand that there is danger of there being no grant made this year for a deep water wharf for making the work of disinfection possible; and as this is a *sine qua non* to rapid and effective work, without unnecessary delay, it is desirable that any influence that our united

efforts can bring to bear, will be brought now, before the supplementary estimates are published. Will you have the matter brought before the Chairman and your Board, and let me know by telegraph what you will do, and if a deputation would meet us at Ottawa, and if so, at what date. Trusting that your Board is meeting with encouraging success in its work.

I have, &c.,

PETER H. BRYCE.

L'actif Dr Lachapelle a communiqué la substance de la présente motion à M. Bryce, dès le 29 mars dernier :

CONSEIL PROVINCIAL D'HYGIÈNE,
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC,
76 rue St. Gabriel,
MONTREAL, 29th March, 1888.

PETER H. BRYCE, Esq.,
Provincial Board of Health,
Toronto.

Are you aware of Dr. Fiset's motion, in the House of Commons, for special committee to enquire into quarantine service and best precautions to be taken, with power to examine persons of experience? Will it not be better to wait for action of that committee. Willing to join your efforts.

E. P. LACHAPELLE,
Chairman.

M. Bryce répondit comme suit par télégramme :

TORONTO, 29th March, 1888.

E. P. LACHAPELLE,
Chairman,
Provincial Board of Health,
Montreal.

Delighted at cooperation. Learned to-day of Fiset's motion for committee. Agree that it may be well to wait for a few days for developments.

PETER H. BRYCE.

J'ai encore l'approbation de l'honorable Dr Paquet, sénateur, lequel est aussi membre du Conseil d'Hygiène de la province de Québec. Mais il y a encore plus, cette motion reçoit l'appui des journaux du Dominion. *Le Canadien*, de Québec, renferme un article très fort dans ce sens. J'ai ici le *Toronto Mail*, du 2 avril, et avec la permission de la Chambre, je vais lire cet article qui est un peu long, mais qui est plein d'actualité :

"ST. LAWRENCE QUARANTINE"

"That the protection of the country against the introduction of contagious diseases through emigrants from Europe is a matter of the utmost importance needs no demonstration; and that the people of our ocean ports are fully alive to the great necessity which exists for taking every possible precaution against contagion is shown by the motion of which notice has been given in the House of Commons by Mr. Fiset, M. P. for Rimouski. His motion is as follows: "That a special committee be appointed to enquire into the manner in which the quarantine service of Canada is carried on; and also into the best precautions to be taken to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering the country; with power to examine persons of experience in these matters. The said special committee to report to the House." We are glad that this matter has been brought up in Parliament, and have no doubt that the committee will be granted. It will afford an opportunity for bringing prominently before the House various matters which have been from time to time referred to in the press, and for directing the attention of our legislators to views which in Ontario have been frequently expressed in resolutions of the Provincial Board of Health, and in the neighbouring province in memorials adopted by the Boards of Trade of both Montreal and Quebec.

"The reasons why the people of the West should be as anxious about this matter as those of the St. Lawrence ports are apparent. In these days of "ocean grey-hounds" and short passages, it may very easily happen that a person exposed in some Liverpool lodging house or on shipboard to smallpox, will have reached Manitoba or the Western States before the disease, with its incubative period of two weeks, will have appeared. Our readers will not have forgotten the case referred to in the report of the Provincial Board for 1886, in which one batch of Russian immigrants caused outbreaks of smallpox on the Canadian Pacific steamers, at Sault Sainte-Marie, in Michigan, in Manitoba, and in Dakota, apparently by means of their clothing, which had been exposed on shipboard to the infection from companions left sick at Grosse Isle quarantine. The strong representations made that year to the Department of Agriculture resulted in new quarantine regulations, which were put into force in large measure in 1887. These demand inspection of every vessel entering the St. Lawrence; and the Grosse Isle station, thirty miles below Quebec, is admirably situated for the performance of this work. According to the resolutions passed by the Provincial Board of Ontario at its last meeting, and which appeared in the *Mail* at the time, it would appear, however, that for performing the work of inspection thoroughly, without a long delay of the steamers, it is necessary that the present wharf be extended into water deep enough at low

tide to allow vessels of the largest tonnage to run alongside, instead of as at present, either having to be inspected by means of a steam-launch which runs out to them, or by their anchoring in mid-stream until high tide. This latter delay they cannot be expected to endure, while it appears that grave dangers, as well as difficulties, attend any attempt to fumigate large steamers by the sulphur-blast apparatus as at present operated from the deck of the steam-launch. If the wharf were extended the disinfectant batteries would be stationary upon it, while a rag-disinfectant and Troy laundry for disinfecting baggage and personal effects might be conveniently situated for prompt and effective use. Remembering the lamentable exhibition of want of preparation at the New York quarantine last year when a cholera ship made its appearance—which, had it occurred early in the season instead of in autumn, would almost certainly have resulted in an epidemic in that port and perhaps beyond it—we cannot afford to wait until either small-pox or cholera makes its appearance in the St. Lawrence to test the appliances at Grosse Isle for handling the hundreds of ships which annually come up the river. By all means let the enquiry be held, and, if defects still exist, we trust that, in the interests of national safety, they will be remedied, and every possible precaution taken to protect the cities and towns inland, along the lines of immigrant travel, as well as the Atlantic and St. Lawrence ports, from the introduction of epidemic disease, destructive of life and business alike."

Voici maintenant ce que dit le *Chronicle* de Québec qui, lui, a toujours été pour examen un sévère à la quarantaine :—

"We are glad to see by the telegraphic reports from Ottawa that there is a notice of motion now before the House of Commons for the appointment of a "Special Committee to enquire into the manner in which the Quarantine Service of Canada is carried on; and, also, into the best precautions to be taken to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering into the country; with power to examine persons of experience in these matters. The said Special Committee to report to the House."

"We trust this committee will be accorded. And that they will, amongst other things, report to the House, in favour of the strong recommendations recently made by the Provincial Board of Health of Ontario, which appeared in our columns on the first of last month."

J'aurai l'occasion de lire le rapport du Bureau Provincial d'Hygiène d'Ontario. Il continue :

The Board urges that the Quarantine Station of the St. Lawrence be equipped with the modern appliances now recognized to be essential for the protection of the country. These are, to quote from their report: "Requisite buildings placed at the extreme end of the extended wharf for (a) Fumigating furnace, reservoir and exhaust fan; (b) For locating superheating chamber to 230° Fahr; (c) Boiler and steam connection therewith; (d) Troy laundry for disinfecting bedding, ship linen, mattresses, flags, curtains, carpets, rugs, all personal baggage and wearing apparel, which shall be removed from ships to this building for purposes of thorough disinfection."

Before the Quarantine Station can be equipped with these essential appliances, the wharf must be extended into deep water so as to receive them, and to enable vessels to come to it to discharge their passengers, &c., when necessary, and to be disinfected. The imperative necessity for this extension of the Quarantine wharf to meet the altered requirements of the present we have already urged upon the Government.

"This matter has also been the subject of strong memorials from the Boards of Trade of both Quebec and Montreal, based upon the representations of the shipping interest of those ports, which dreads the extra delay and demurrage from landing everything in ships' boats.

"Cholera is still threatening us from Europe and South America. Its sudden advent to New York last autumn is fresh in the memory of all, and has led to the thorough overhauling of the quarantine station there.

"With all these warnings pressing upon their attention on the Dominion Government will indeed be utterly without excuse if caught unprepared. And we therefore call upon them to place an amount in the supplementary estimates for the extension of the quarantine wharf into deep water, so that as quickly as possible it may be able to receive steamships when necessary and so that those disinfecting appliances may be placed upon it which are so essential for the protection of the country from epidemic disease."

Voilà donc trois journaux importants, le *Canadien*, le *Mail* de Toronto et le *Chronicle* qui tous concourent dans la motion que j'ai l'honneur de présenter.

After Recess.

M. Fiset: M. L'Orateur, lorsque j'ai terminé mes remarques à six heures, j'ai dit que mon intention n'était nullement de blâmer le département de l'agriculture. Je le répète, ce n'est pas une motion de censure que je propose; au contraire. Mais nous croyons, nous les médecins dans cette Chambre, que l'on peut toujours améliorer les choses. Je n'ai pas dit non plus que notre système de quarantaine était mauvais. Bien au contraire, j'ai dit qu'il était le second de l'Amérique; mais il est loin d'être parfait. J'ai cité plusieurs autorités pour démontrer l'importance du

Mr. Fiset.

comité que je demande. Je vais faire encore une citation qui, je crois, achèvera de déterminer le gouvernement à accorder le comité que je sollicite. Voici ce que dit le *Chronicle* du 1er février 1888; il exprime d'abord la nécessité d'être prudent cette année, et il cite des résolutions passées au Bureau d'hygiène d'Ontario. Avant de citer ces résolutions, il dit :

"At the last meeting of the board, Dr. Gowernton, who like our own Dr. Montizambert, at this port, is an authority on sanitation and quarantine, read the report of committee on epidemic, which at this time, has an especial significance for us. The report deals in an ample manner, with the question of additional apparatus required for the more effectual exclusion of epidemic diseases at the gate of our Dominion, viz: Grosse Ile Quarantine Station. As the question is one in which every man, woman and child in our city and province are immediately interested, we republish it here. It reads thus :

Il serait peut-être trop long de lire tout ce rapport et j'en donnerai simplement la conclusion. La voici :

The report was adopted as read, and the following series of resolutions were proposed by Dr. Gowernton and seconded by Dr. Cassidy.

"Whereas the Provincial Board of Health of Ontario have reason for belief that the quarantine station at Grosse Isle would have great additional power in the work of protecting the inhabitants of our Dominion from the entrance of infectious diseases by certain additions to the very admirable provisions already in operation, be it resolved that the following additional enforcements be urged upon the Dominion Government, viz :

"1st. A steam launch or tug boat of sufficient size, strength and horse power for boarding in all weather, day and night, vessels in the offing waiting for clearance.

"2nd. Repair and extension of the western wharf sufficient for permitting vessels, on board of which during the voyage cholera or small-pox had occurred, to ride at anchor at low tide during the process of disinfection of such ships.

"3rd. Requisite buildings be placed at the extreme end of the extended wharf for (a) Fumigating furnace, reservoir and exhaust fan; (b) For locating superheating chamber to 230° Fahrenheit; (c) Boiler and steam connection therewith; (d) Troy laundry for disinfecting bedding, ship linen, mattresses, flags, curtains, carpets, rugs, all personal baggage and wearing apparel, which shall be removed from ships to this building for purposes of thorough disinfection.

4th. That as the present service is a day and night one for eight months in the year, and thus the medical superintendent and his assistant are debarred from practice, the salary of the superintendent should be an adequate one, as also that of his assistant.

5th. That at the meeting of the Association of Executive Health Officers of Ontario, convened for the 5th February next, the Members of this Provincial Board, or a committee thereof, shall bring this subject before said meeting and suggest the propriety of concerted action on this matter of guarding against epidemic disease.

6th. That the Chairman be authorized to appoint a committee from this board to interview the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa during the coming session of the House of Commons regarding the questions involved in the above resolutions, and that the Quebec Provincial Board of Health be invited to join with the committee of this board in the proposed interview.

Ainsi, vous le voyez, M. l'Orateur, ce n'est pas seulement un simple député de cette Chambre qui demande un gouvernement la formation d'un comité pour s'enquérir de la manière dont opèrent nos quarantaines, mais c'est le public en général, ce sont les médecins les plus distingués des provinces de Québec et d'Ontario, qui sollicitent comme moi la formation de ce comité. Il est bien vrai que le gouvernement a sans doute fait son devoir; mais il ne faut pas oublier qu'aujourd'hui nous avons un système bien perfectionné de désinfection. Nous avons des procédés tout nouveaux, et j'aime à croire que le gouvernement est au courant de ces nouvelles méthodes.

Il n'y a pas très longtemps même, au commencement du siècle, en 1825, on n'avait jusqu'à un certain point l'efficacité des quarantaines; je ne suis pas prêt à dire qu'on n'avait pas raison pour alors; on n'avait pas les moyens perfectionnés que nous avons aujourd'hui, et l'en n'en retirait pas les services auxquels on devait s'attendre. Elles ne produisaient pas les résultats désirés. Aujourd'hui, c'est tout-à-fait différent. Le système inauguré par le célèbre Joseph Holt, à la Louisiane, est sans contredit le système le plus parfait qui existe dans le monde entier. Nous savons tous que la Louisiane, et surtout la Nouvelle-Orléans, était regardée comme un endroit que les étrangers ne pouvaient visiter sans y prendre les fièvres jaunes; et depuis que ce système de Jo-

seph Holt a été inauguré, la Nouvelle-Orléans n'est plus un foyer d'épidémie ; et, en effet, depuis cinq ans, il n'y a pas eu de fièvres jaunes dans la ville, ni dans les environs. Cet état sanitaire est dû aux grandes mesures de précautions qu'elle a prises.

Si on me le permet, je m'en vais expliquer le système suivi à la Nouvelle-Orléans.

Le Dr. Holt a établi trois stations de quarantaine : l'une à 110 milles de la Nouvelle-Orléans, l'autre à 103 milles, et la dernière à 70 milles. Lorsqu'un bâtiment arrive dans un port, le médecin qui est en charge de la quarantaine à la première station, se rend à bord, et il examine soigneusement le bâtiment ; s'il n'y trouve pas de maladies contagieuses, ou si le bâtiment ne vient pas d'un port infecté, il lui donne immédiatement son certificat, et le bâtiment remonte jusqu'à la Nouvelle-Orléans.

Si le bâtiment vient d'un port infecté, mais qu'il n'y ait pas de maladie à bord et que son *record* est bon, alors il est envoyé à la première station, c'est-à-dire à celle qui est à 70 milles de la Nouvelle-Orléans ; bien qu'il n'y ait pas de maladie à bord. On retient le bâtiment en quarantaine pendant quelques jours, mais jamais plus de cinq jours, et pendant ce temps on lui fait subir toutes les opérations de la désinfection.

Si, au contraire, le bâtiment est infecté, alors on télégraphie immédiatement à la station supérieure, et de là on envoie un vaisseau prendre ce bâtiment et le conduire à la station qui est à 103 milles ; et là, on lui fait subir une désinfection complète. Ce n'est pas tout, on sépare les malades des gens qui sont en santé, et on les envoie à la station voisine, c'est-à-dire à celle qui se trouve à 70 milles de la Nouvelle-Orléans. Là, encore, on leur fait subir une nouvelle désinfection, sans toutefois les retenir longtemps, et enfin on leur donne un certificat qui leur permet de remonter le Mississippi. Grâce à ces précautions, la Nouvelle-Orléans est aujourd'hui une ville très salubre, il y a moins de maladie que dans nos villes du Canada.

On remarquera, M. l'Orateur, que toutes ces dépenses de quarantaine, — qui doivent être considérables, — sont supportées par un Etat seul, par la Louisiane. Ici, c'est bien différent, nos quarantaines sont entretenues aux frais du Dominion, et c'est ce qui leur donne leur supériorité sur celles des Etats-Unis. Le gouvernement du Canada est chargé des quarantaines de toutes les provinces, les dépenses étant supportées par toutes les provinces, la charge est bien moins lourde pour chacune d'elles et moins considérable en son entier.

Je dois dire de suite, à la louange du personnel de la quarantaine de la Grosse-Isle, et surtout de celui qui en est à la tête, — lequel est un ami personnel, un homme que j'estime beaucoup, — qu'ils sont tous des officiers supérieurs.

Je crois que le directeur de la quarantaine à la Grosse-Isle serait heureux de partager la responsabilité qui lui incombe avec un bureau de santé.

Déjà, les provinces de Québec et d'Ontario ont leur bureau de santé respectifs. Pourquoi le Dominion n'aurait-il pas son bureau de santé qui partagerait la responsabilité avec le médecin de la Grosse-Isle ? Est-il juste de laisser peser sur ses épaules toute la responsabilité de l'entrée des épidémies dans le Dominion ? Je suis convaincu que le Dr Montizambert verrait avec plaisir la formation d'un tel bureau.

M. l'Orateur, je sais parfaitement que les steamers portant les malles sont obligés d'arrêter à Rimouski pour y subir une première inspection. S'il y a quelque maladie contagieuse à bord, on les envoie à la quarantaine ; mais je vous prie de remarquer qu'il n'y a que les steamers qui portent la malle. Eh bien ! à Rimouski, avons-nous les garanties suffisantes ? je ne le crois pas. Nous avons bien un inspecteur, mais il est seul. Il va, à bord de son petit *tug boat*, à la rencontre des steamers qui viennent d'Angleterre chargés d'émigrants, — comme de raison, il n'en arrive pas dans ce moment-ci, mais il en arrive à New-York en plus grand

nombre que jamais, — il fait son inspection. Mais cet homme-là est bien obligé de revenir à terre, et avec le faible salaire qu'il reçoit, peut-il faire son travail comme il faut ? De plus, quand même il le voudrait, il n'a pas, à Rimouski, les moyens de désinfection. Voilà donc encore un point sur lequel j'attire l'attention du gouvernement car, qu'on le remarque bien, il n'y a pas seulement les steamers qui portent la malle, il y a plusieurs lignes de steamers sur le Saint-Laurent.

Maintenant si comme à la Louisiane, nous avions, non pas trois stations, mais deux, nous aurions un système beaucoup plus parfait. Il est vrai que cela entraînerait des dépenses, mais quand il s'agit de la santé publique, cela vaut bien la peine que l'on fasse des dépenses pour organiser un système de quarantaine aussi complet que possible.

J'ai été informé que cette année le gouvernement se proposait de faire quelques dépenses pour améliorer le système de quarantaine. Quant à faire des dépenses, pourquoi ne pas organiser parfaitement de suite notre service. J'ignore encore si le gouvernement partage mes vues. J'ignore s'il va accorder ma motion. Dans tous les cas j'aurai fait mon devoir, et je dis que si le gouvernement se substitue au comité que nous demandons, je crois qu'il a tort. Après tout, puisque les Etats Américains et les gouvernements provinciaux prennent la peine de se décharger d'une telle responsabilité, en l'imposant à un bureau de santé dans chaque province, pourquoi le gouvernement fédéral refuserait-il les lumières de gens expérimentés qui pourraient être entendus devant le comité. Ce n'est pas une question de dépenses qui doit effrayer le gouvernement. Il n'y aura pas un grand nombre de personnes entendues devant le comité, mais le public et cette Chambre n'ont-ils pas le droit d'être renseignés sur les garanties que nous offre notre quarantaine pour empêcher l'introduction des maladies contagieuses dans le pays ? Le public n'a-t-il pas le droit d'être renseigné sur les moyens dont on se sert pour le protéger ? Quand le public sera parfaitement rassuré, quand il saura que le gouvernement fait tout en son pouvoir, qu'il prend toutes les mesures nécessaires pour prévenir l'introduction des maladies épidémiques dans le Dominion, ce sera la moitié de gagné. Un patient qui a confiance en son médecin est à moitié sauvé.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, pour ces raisons j'espère que le gouvernement considérant mes bonnes intentions, considérant le bien que le public en retirera, accordera la motion que je propose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has introduced the subject in a very proper way before this House, and I have no doubt he has presented a good deal of information to hon. members as well as to the Minister of Agriculture. I think the hon. gentleman should rest satisfied with the statement he has made and withdraw the motion, because the proposition is really casting a censure upon the quarantine system which now prevails. I think the hon. gentleman does not pretend to find special fault in regard to the quarantine system as it now obtains in Canada. I believe it is very well managed, very skilfully managed and carefully looked after, and the immunity from disease has resulted from the watchful manner in which it has been carried out and shows that the system has worked well. Like every human organisation it may be improved, and the Government, especially the Minister at the head of this branch, will consider well the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and perhaps it may be that some of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman will, on full examination, meet the approbation and thanks of the government and the head of that special department. If this should be the case the Government will, of course, adopt them. In the meantime I ask the hon. gentleman to be satisfied with the statement he has made, and with having submitted information to the House and to the

Government and the country, and not press his motion further.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure my hon friend has no intention of censuring the Government by making this motion or in any statements he has made; but if he has done nothing more than draw the attention of the Government to this very important subject, the House will be indebted to him for the statements he has made. I must, with justice to the Minister of Agriculture, say that he is doing his very best, I am sure, to discharge the important duties of this branch of his department, but at the same time the system is perhaps capable of improvement, as my hon. friend has already stated. I agree with the First Minister that perhaps my hon friend will allow the matter to rest here and leave the matter with the Government, and if there is any responsibility the Government must assume it.

Motion withdrawn.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Copy of report of engineers and surveyors appointed to survey the Straits of Northumberland from Carleton Point, Prince Edward Island, to Cape Jourimain, New Brunswick, during the summer of 1887, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of building a subway across the Straits.

He said: I desire to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this question has been brought before Parliament on previous occasions, I am sorry to say with the same results each time, and that is the adoption of a doing-nothing policy. Nothing tangible has yet been done, and no attempt has yet been made to carry out the arrangement made between Canada and Prince Edward Island, at the time of Confederation. It is well known that years ago this question engaged the attention of the Local Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and as far back as two years ago a deputation composed of the leading members of the Island Government were sent to England with these complaints, and with an address to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty would interfere and compel the terms entered into at Confederation to be carried out by Canada. Nothing so far has been done. Yet the summer following, I believe, surveys were made for a subway from Cape Traverse on the island side to Cape Tormentine, and the report of the surveyors and engineers is rather favorable to the practicability of building a subway across the straits. From my place last Session I had the privilege of asking the Government if it was their intention to cause further surveys to be made, and the First Minister who leads this House answered simply no, that it was not the intention to cause any further survey. This question was asked in view of the letter which the right hon. gentleman had written about a week and a half before the general election to Senator Howlan, of Prince Edward Island, no doubt with a view to influence the elections at that time. The hon. gentleman in his place stated that he really wrote that letter in answer to a letter from Senator Howlan, but the face of the letter itself conveys a contradictory view, because it is in answer to our conversation. I believed the hon. gentleman at the time when he wrote that letter was in earnest, but I now find he is not in earnest, that he has no fixed policy with regard to carrying out the terms of Confederation with the island any more than the Government of the day have in regard to reciprocity between Canada and the United States. At one time the right hon. gentleman said we shall not have further surveys made, and yet last summer we were told there were surveys made from Carleton Point on the island, about two miles west of Cape Traverse, to Cape Jourimain, in New Brunswick, about one and three-quarters or two miles west of Cape Tormentine. I am told that this report is a very favorable one. I have not

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

seen it, but I have seen a sketch of it in the Conservative press, in the *Summerside Journal* and the *Daily Examiner* of Charlottetown, papers which are no doubt in the confidence of the Government and papers which support the Government. But nothing has yet been done; the Government have not decided in the matter. On going a little further into this question I find that the delegation sent from Prince Edward Island to Her Majesty had to face the opposition of the hon. Finance Minister, at that time Canada's High Commissioner in England. He gave the delegate of the island all the opposition that his eloquence could give on that occasion. But, Sir, I think he is bound down by his own statement of the policy with regard to this subway and that he is bound to carry it out. Now, Sir, here are the words of the hon. gentleman on that occasion :

"Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson admit in a subsequent paragraph that the island has prospered as they put it 'notwithstanding the inaction of the Dominion Government.' This statement, in view of what has already been stated, may be left to take care of itself; but the object of their representation appears to be to secure the laying of a metallic subway across the straits of Northumberland, through which the railway communication could be effected, 'the cost of which undertaking,' Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson say, 'would not exceed a sum which it would not be unreasonable to ask the Government of Canada to expend.' If it can be shown that such a work is practicable, that it can be constructed for a reasonable outlay and maintained without a large expense, the matter seems to be one that may fairly be placed before the Canadian Government for consideration."

I do say that the island has prospered notwithstanding all the obstacles thrown in the way of its prosperity by the Dominion Government not carrying out the agreement. I am not here prepared to say that the island did not prosper. We do not come here to beg from the Government, but we simply want what is due the people of our Province and what the Government by solemn contract has promised. I suppose they are waiting for the island people to threaten rebellion and I suppose it is the only practical way we can get our rights. Are we to have instances of this kind from day to day and from week to week? Here in this extract which I have read we have the High Commissioner binding himself and binding the Government of the day to carry out their promise and I want the Government to pronounce upon this question. Now I would like to ask the Government how far they have gone in the consideration of this matter? I suppose they will tell us that they had a survey in 1886, that they have had another survey in 1887 and that they had an Act before Parliament two years ago incorporating a company to build this subway. I am told, and I have reason to know that a Company has offered the Government to build that subway provided the Government gives them a certain amount of subsidy. That subsidy is asked for Prince Edward Island in order to enable the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation, but yet we are told that Prince Edward Island has no subsidy to get. When a subsidy is required in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec or Ontario, there is any amount of money to be got for subsidies in these Provinces, but there is nothing for Prince Edward Island, even though it is to enable the Government to carry out a sacred compact made with the people of Prince Edward Island at the time of Confederation. They tell us, when we ask our just rights, that there is no money for a work of great magnitude that is necessary to enable the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation with that Province. We heard a great deal about loyalty the other day, and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and let me tell this House, and let me tell the Government more particularly, that the people of Prince Edward Island are loyal subjects to Her Majesty Queen Victoria. They are loyal subjects, but I am sorry to say I would not vouch much for their loyalty to the present Government until they carry out the promises made at Confederation. Sit in another little corner of this document, when the High

Commissioner on that occasion is introducing the delegates from Prince Edward Island to Earl Granville, he says:

"Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson conclude their rejoinder by saying: 'With regard to the claim for compensation by reason of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation the undersigned submit that a review of the facts adduced will conclusively show that the island has suffered great loss, and is therefore entitled to indemnity.' In the first place it is incorrect to say that the terms of Confederation have not been complied with."

I would like to ask this House if the terms of Confederation have been complied with in this case? Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, says that the terms of Confederation have been applied in every other case. That is doubtful. It is an assertion which may admit of argument, but the fact remains that the terms of Confederation have not been complied with so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and that the Government has not made even a decent effort to carry out the terms of Confederation with that Province is an established fact. It is a fact that since 1873 the terms of Confederation have not been fulfilled on the part of the Government of Canada to the people of Prince Edward Island. Sir, I contend that the people of Prince Edward Island are not in a position to keep up with the progress of the rest of the Dominion; that they are not in direct communication with the Dominion, that we are now for three months without having steam communication from the island to the mainland, and we have to drag our bodies the best way we can in those open boats. The Government have not half the requirements necessary to carry passengers across the straits and we have to use half a dozen boats exclusive of the Government boats in order to carry those passengers from one side to the other. Is that what the people of that Province ought to expect? Is that what the people of New Brunswick ought to expect from the Government which renders it impossible for them to visit their neighbors across the straits of Northumberland? Is that what the travelling agents of the manufacturers of Ontario ought to expect from the Government that they are not able to cross the straits and offer their samples to their good customers of Prince Edward Island? Is this the way the Government intend to redeem and carry out their solemn pledge to the people of Prince Edward Island? If there was one thing more than another that induced the people of the island to enter Confederation it was upon the solemn promise that the Government had their right hand held out to assist them. They entered Confederation because they relied upon the promise made by the Government that they were to have continuous communication between the island and the mainland. This was the promise that induced them particularly to join Confederation. What has the result been? Up to this day the people of the island have been neglected and the promises made them have not been carried out. Up to this day when they ask the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation they are told "we have no money." I am here to state to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to the Government, and particularly to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and no one knows better than he does, if he knows anything at all—that the terms of Confederation have not been carried out, and that not even an attempt has been made in this direction. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries appears to know very little about the navigation between the island and the mainland. He appears to not even know how many trips the steamers make there in the year. When I found fault with the Government for having paid a large amount of money to the steamer *Neptune*, and when I asked them about the matter in Parliament last year that gentleman defended the action of the Government and stated that the steamer *Neptune* had plied across the straits two and a-half months. What does the return of his own Department show? It shows that that steamer commenced to cross on the 28th December and made her first trip, and that she

30-1888-3

made her last trip on the 4th of February. Yet the hon. gentleman said that the steamer crossed for two months and a-half. Does he call that two months and a-half? His words are in black and white in the *Hansard*. It is a good thing we have a *Hansard* in this Parliament in order to hold the hon. gentleman to his words. This shows all the hon. gentleman knows about his department, but I suppose he will not deny his own return, which shows that his statement was not correct, but that he was astray a month and a-half. Well, Sir, the Earl of Granville was aware that the people of the island desired to induce the Dominion Government to carry out the terms with Prince Edward Island. On that subject Earl Granville said:

"I explained to them that the Queen had no power, either by statute or otherwise under the Constitution of Canada, to give any direction in this matter, and that, therefore, I should not be able to advise Her Majesty (who has been pleased to receive the Address very graciously) to take any action upon it, but that it would give me much satisfaction if, by the exercise of any friendly offices which I could tender, I should be able to contribute to the settlement of a question in which the Provincial Government were so much interested. I added that I had confidence in the friendly spirit in which the matter at issue would be dealt with on both sides, and this led me to hope that some acceptable arrangement might be come to."

I would like to ask the Government if they have made one decent attempt to carry out these suggestions? Earl Granville winds up by saying:

"It would reflect great credit on the Dominion Government if, after connecting British Columbia with the Eastern Provinces by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it should now be able to complete its system of railway communication by an extension to Prince Edward Island."

But, Sir, all these good offices on the part of Earl Granville have been disregarded by the present Government. I suppose we may be told that they will do something to-morrow; but to-morrow never comes with these gentlemen so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I am afraid it is not going to come for some years yet. Now, if the Dominion Government intend to carry out the terms of Confederation, I hope they will take steps to do so without any further delay. They have had two surveys across the straits, and we know that an effort has been made by a company to build that subway provided a subsidy is given. During the last Parliament one of the Senators, I think Senator Howlan, stated in the Senate Chamber that not a member from the island had said anything in his place in favor of that subway. I am here to contradict that statement. The *Hansard* will prove that every member from Prince Edward Island who spoke on the question spoke forcibly in favor of the terms being carried out by the building of the subway if it was practicable. It say that was a wrong statement to make; it was done, I suppose, with the view of making it appear that the members from Prince Edward Island, because they belonged to the Grit party, were not favorable to the welfare of the island. We find that on nomination day the hon. Minister of Finance telegraphed to Hon. Donald Ferguson, who was a candidate in the interest of the Government, to say that the Government were desirous of carrying out the work of the subway. What does that mean? Does it mean anything or nothing? There was one thing it meant, that was, to defeat the Liberal candidate. It had not the effect of doing that, but it had the effect of showing that the Government failed to carry out the solemn promises they had made. The hon. Minister of Finance further telegraphed to Mr. Ferguson as follows:—

"On the platform on nomination day I came out very strongly in support of connecting Prince Edward Island with the rest of the Dominion."

I suppose he meant by steam. He left out the word steam, but I do not see any other way of making the connection. The climax was his last telegram, as follows:—

"It is necessary, in the interest of the Government, that the island should send a united phalanx to support the Government."

No doubt, in the interest of the Government, but not in the interest of Prince Edward Island. Taking all these things into consideration, I think the people of Prince Edward Island had a right to expect that the Government were sincere and were determined to carry out the terms of Confederation with respect to the island. No doubt they are very comfortable on the Treasury benches, because they are not so unfortunate as the poor farmers and the poor fishermen, because they get their \$8,000 a year without having to pay a single cent of taxation. I can tell them that if they expect the people of the island to be contented and happy, and to consider themselves as part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, they must carry out the terms of Confederation. The people of Prince Edward Island, although they are only few in numbers, are not to be despised. They are British subjects; they are descendants of people who have fought for their rights and liberty; they are descendants of people who have exterminated the landlords who had no right to the soil; and the Government are almost tempting the people of the island to go back to their previous position. I am here to state what the people of the island have a right to get and what they have not got, and I state it above board. I hope the Government will lose no time in laying upon the Table this report of the surveyors, commissioners and engineers, and I believe it will warrant the Government to commence operations, and subsidise that company to build the subway with as little delay as possible. I am told that a company is now exploring the straits between West Point, P. E. I., and Richibucto Head, with a view of establishing continuous steam navigation there. Is the Government not cognisant of this fact? Are they so ignorant of the condition and welfare of the people of Prince Edward Island as not to know that this is going on? I suppose I will be answered one of those days that they know nothing about it and care just as little. But, as I said before, I hope the Government will take warning; I hope that they will go to work and that there will be no to-morrow policy in this matter, but a policy of immediate advance. I hope they will show by their action that they are in earnest, for they have had sufficient surveys made there to know whether it is possible to build a subway or not; and if the reports are such that the Government will be warranted in building the subway, if the scheme is practicable, and the cost is not beyond a reasonable figure—and according to Messrs. Ferguson and Sullivan the island was entitled years ago to \$5,000,000 for the neglect of the Government in carrying out the terms of Confederation—the Government should not lose any more time. There is nothing now to cross the straits with. The *Northern Light* has been fast in the ice for over three months, and is not fit to make a trip when the ice is in any way strong. The Government know this, and yet they have the audacity to tell us she is the best boat they can get. Years ago, when she was new they ran her down, but now, when she is wrecked like their own policy, she is the best they can get for the work. I suppose we will be told that the people of Prince Edward Island are not entitled to any consideration because they have sent here six men in Opposition. Well, the six men are British subjects and white men, men who have a right to be here, men who were sent here by well-to-do constituents, and constituents who are not of the character which the hon. member for Annapolis gave to his constituents. I was amused to hear him say the other day that to his constituents books and papers were a luxury; and I dare say if they read more than they do, they would send somebody else here to represent them besides that hon. gentleman. The people of the island are a reading people, and what is better they have common sense and a good spirit as to their rights. Their rights they must get, if not from this Government, I hope from the next, and I

Mr. PERRY.

trust the time will not be long before we have another Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought the hon. Minister of Public Works might have taken advantage of the occasion to state to the House and the country whether any other arrangements have been made for carrying on the construction of a public wharf at Cape Tormentine, a contract for which the hon. gentleman entered into some years ago. The hon. gentleman knows that three or four years ago a sum of money was voted for the construction of a railway from Cape Traverse to connect with the main trunk line on the island, with the object of building a very long pier or wharf there, and another on the New Brunswick side, in order finally to have a steam ferry there in the summer months, and, when possible, in the winter months, the wharf was built on the island side. I dare say the hon. gentleman has some report on the work and is aware it requires completion. On the New Brunswick side a contract was entered into some years ago, and the work was commenced, but after a hundred yards was partially constructed the contractors abandoned the work altogether, and it is now lying in a dilapidated condition which is really pitiable and humiliating. Is it the intention of the Government to prosecute vigorously that work the coming summer, or have they made up their minds to abandon it altogether? I thought it was possible, in view of the important promises which the hon. the Minister of Finance made just previous to the last elections, that he would consider most favorably the construction of a subway, and in view of the letter which the leader of the Government wrote to the people, saying that a survey would be made of the straits to ascertain whether the construction of a subway was practicable, that the hon. gentleman might have abandoned the construction of this pier for the larger scheme. Of course, if he has, from information that the work is impracticable, come to that conclusion, I will only be too glad to support him, but if not, I will be glad to learn that the old scheme is to be carried out and prosecuted vigorously. I can only express my regret that the hon. the Minister of Marine is not in his place, because I would like very much, after the speech of my hon. friend with reference to the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, to have heard from him what action the department has taken with the view of constructing another boat to supplement the *Northern Light*. I heard it casually stated that they were going to spend a large sum of money on the steamer *Alert*, and was very glad to hear that contradicted by somebody who professes to know, because I wish to express as strongly as I can my disapprobation of such a course. I have heard it rumored since that the department are about to call for tenders for the construction of a larger and better boat to supplement the *Northern Light*. I hope that rumor is true. I was in hopes we would have had an official statement made to night by the hon. the Minister of Marine, because after the plain, practical and convincing statements made by my hon. friend, based as they are upon historical facts and upon the declaration made by the High Commissioner to Earl Granville as to the intention of the Government, and upon the suggestion which Earl Granville made to this Government, I hoped we would have heard to-night what the policy of the Government is. I think my hon. friend has made out a complete case, and has put the House in full possession of the facts, and I do think our long-suffering people are entitled to have their grievances in this very serious matter removed. We have been year after year pressing this matter, and I am sure the House does not want me to go over the old story, and I am not going to do it again to-night, because my hon. friend has anticipated me and has put the points better than I could, but I do hope to have some assurance from the Min-

ister in reference to that wharf, and, if he can give it in the absence of the Minister of Marine, some information as to the action of the Department of Marine in reference to the construction of another steamboat.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was about to rise just now, when I saw the hon. gentleman wished to say a few words, and I thought it better he should speak first so that I might answer both gentlemen—the mover of the resolution (Mr. Perry) and the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—at the same time. In answer to the last question of the hon. gentleman, I may say that the contract for the wharf or pier at Cape Tormentine was broken by the Government because the contractor did not proceed with the work quickly and evidently could not go on. Under those circumstances we called for new tenders, and have given a new contract. The contract has been signed, and I understand that the contractors are men who are quite able to perform the work, which will be proceeded with with all due vigor.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Will the hon. gentleman state who they are?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember now. When the Estimates comes on, I shall be able to give the names. As to the boat, I cannot positively say, but, as far as I recollect, the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to provide a new boat. In reference to the remarks of the mover of the motion, I may say, first, that there will be no objection to bring down the papers, and second, that the survey made in 1886 was communicated to the House and hon. gentlemen know what was the result of that survey. The hon. gentleman complains that no work has been done in the direction of constructing a subway. I do not suppose he expected that we would proceed in that way. He knew, and I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last stated, that the Minister of Finance had made a statement that we would give our attention to that work, and that we would have new explorations made to see whether the work was a feasible one or not. Well, I am glad to say that the last survey, which was made in July and August, 1887, has given a much better result than the first survey of 1886, and, if we go on in that way, improving all the time, we shall find the distance very small.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By the next election.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman says so, and I am glad to hear him fix a date, because the Government of course will thus know the wishes of hon. gentlemen on the other side. The engineer in the month of August took a series of borings in a line from Carleton Point to a point in New Brunswick, I think Munsey Point. The greatest depth of water found is ninety-one feet, the bottom is more favorable than on the line of soundings taken in 1886, and the distance is six and a half miles, which is one and a half miles less than on the line of borings taken in 1886. That shows that, as I said, if we go on in that way, we shall find the distance very small, and I think that in any case this result is much more favorable and must please hon. gentlemen so far, at all events, as far as the survey goes, as it shows that, if the matter has been left over for a year to obtain new soundings and new measurements, the time has not been lost in vain, that we have obtained a much better line by this survey than we had in 1886. I have no objection to the granting of the motion.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman whether the result of the survey has been so satisfactory as to induce him to believe it to be right and proper that he should propose a subsidy or a vote to the House to carry the work out, either by means of a company or by Government contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that is a question which I cannot answer immediately. I think it is one of those questions that must be left to the consideration of the Government, and the hon. gentleman may be sure, after the surveys which we have made, that the Government will give to the matter their best consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I fear we cannot hope for anything in the supplementaries?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a pleasure left for the hon. gentleman to discover.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Have the Government any offers from any company to build a subway for any particular sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware. There may have been some offer of that kind in the Railway Department, but I am not in a position to answer that definitely.

Motion agreed to.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland concerning the admission of Newfoundland into the Confederation.

He said: I have no intention to comment on the subject at this moment. My only object is to have as soon as possible before the House the papers on that important question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist upon his motion after what I shall say. This matter is now engaging the attention of the Government, and, as the hon. gentleman will see from the newspapers that a delegation is coming to Canada about this matter, we think the public interest would not allow us to lay this correspondence now before Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand from the hon. gentleman that the correspondence is still going on, that it is not yet in a fit condition to be published, I will not press my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister, I suppose, has no objections to inform us when he expects the delegation to arrive, and perhaps he might give us the names of the gentlemen, if he has been made acquainted with them in advance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give the names of the gentlemen who will form the delegation, nor the precise date of their coming to Canada, but I suppose it will be about the end of this month.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us whether the Parliament of Newfoundland has authorised the delegation, or whether their Parliament has given any authority to a delegation to come here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give that information.

Motion withdrawn.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the Roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

DAVID BISHOP MEIGS, member for the Electoral District of Missisquoi, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fisher.

ASSISTANCE TO WRECKING VESSELS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers, &c., with reference to— 1. The refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist Canadian vessels while in distress in United States waters. 2. The refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow United States wrecking vessels and machinery to assist United States vessels while in distress in Canadian waters.

He said: There is a Bill before the House standing, I think, for its second reading, introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), which relates closely to this subject, and I sincerely hope the hon. member will press his Bill, and that it will receive the support of both sides of this House. His Bill is to permit maritime vessels to aid vessels which are wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. I suppose that that Bill would not have been introduced by that hon. gentleman unless the Canadian authorities had hitherto prevented American vessels from aiding wrecked or disabled vessels in Canadian waters. I have no doubt, however, that the reason why the Canadian authorities took this exceeding harsh line was because the American Government prevented Canadian vessels from assisting vessels which were wrecked in American waters. I think it will be of considerable advantage to this House, in the consideration of the Bill to which I have referred, if these papers are brought down, so much, at least, as the Government feel at liberty to bring down, and I hope they will bring them all down. The motion refers not only to correspondence and Departmental Orders in Council with reference to the refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist vessels in American waters, but also for the refusal of the Canadian authorities to do so, so that we will have both features of the case before us when we have these papers. I have no doubt, as I said before, that the Canadian authorities could not have adopted the harsh measures which they have in this matter, and which are to be cured by this Bill, unless the Americans had done the same, but I find in the United States Congress they do not take exactly that view of the case. They seem to think that the Canadian Government has acted much more harshly towards them than they have acted towards the Canadian Government. However, the papers will show how that is. But in order to show the House the view that is taken of the matter on the other side, I will refer to a resolution which was introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. Nutting, early in the month of February. In that resolution it is recited:

"Whereas, it is alleged that the Canadian authorities for years have refused, and now refuse to allow American wrecking vessels and machinery to assist American vessels while in distress in Canadian canals and waters."

So far, I take it, he must be correct, or else the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac would not be necessary. He then goes on to make his allegation, which I confess, I very much doubt, but he says:

"And it is alleged further that Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery have been, and now are allowed to come into American waters and assist any vessel there in distress."

Now, whether that is so or not, we will perhaps find out when this correspondence is brought down. But he quotes a couple of letters from American vessel owners and captains which show certainly the great hardship to them of the practice of the two Governments. One is a letter from Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, by Mr. John K. Pope. He says:

"On or about the 30th day of September, 1881, I, being controlling owner of steam-barge *Thompson Kingsford*, was notified that she was ashore at Wellington, Ont., and immediate assistance was needed. I informed our wrecker, Mr. Allan, who expressed himself ready to start, providing the Canadian authorities would give him permission to work in their waters. I therefore applied by wire to the hon. Minister of Marine at Ottawa, and after a long delay was informed that the assistance needed could be procured at Kingston, and the application was

Sir HECTOR Langevin.

denied. I thought the treatment was severe, especially as my tugs were all ready to go, and we could have got the barge out of danger in 24 hours. As it was, during the delay, or rather by the delay, in waiting for an answer, she was subjected to a severe gale, causing great damage and eventually costing us about \$1,200 more than it would if we could have done the work ourselves. Again, about the 19th day of August, 1882, the same barge was sunk in the Bay of Quinté by collision, and I again made application to go to her relief with my own appliances, and was again refused."

Then another letter was quoted by Mr. Nutting, which was sent to him by Albert Quonce, also of Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, in which Mr. Quonce stated:

"At the suggestion of Mr. Allan I make the following statement: On or about the 3rd day of November, 1882, the schooner *Camanche*, of which I was controlling owner, was sunk in the Welland Canal, near Port Colborne. Although Buffalo was but twenty miles from her and assistance could have been secured in six hours, we were told that American assistance would not be permitted, although at that moment the steam pumps were loaded and ready to come. The result was we had to wait for assistance from Amherstburg, nearly three hundred miles distant, and causing a delay of three days. Owing to the delay the vessel's cargo swelled and sprung her entire deck up, and almost ruined the vessel."

These statements will show the view taken on the other side, of our harsh law, and I am sure if we can do anything to secure an improvement for the sake of common humanity as well as for the sake of commercial friendship with the United States, the Government will hasten to bring down these returns so that, if possible, we may have them before us when considering the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that in the first paragraph the words "not already brought down," be inserted after the words "departmental orders." Some years ago a large amount of correspondence was laid before the House, and I do not suppose it is necessary to duplicate the return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the return printed?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was; I know it was, because I have a copy of the printed return on the table in my office.

Mr. EDGAR. When was the return made.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure, I cannot say the year, but I can furnish the information. However, all the correspondence and orders made in regard to this subject will be brought down, other than those which have already been laid before the House. I might state in connection with this subject that much of the complaint made by hon. gentlemen in Congress and also made in the American newspapers by those engaged in the wrecking and tugging business in the United States, is not based altogether upon facts. I may add in addition that the first order that was issued refusing to allow American tugs and wreckers to operate in our waters was issued by my predecessor when Mr. Mackenzie was leading the Government of the country; and further that instead of the present Government having adopted, in the language of the hon. gentlemen opposite, harsh and almost inhuman measures and enforced them, the orders have been materially modified since I have had the honor of being at the head of the Customs Department, and in no case in my recollection where a vessel has been what is termed in actual distress have American vessels or American appliances, whether pumps, tugs or wrecking appliances, been refused, and it has been done only in cases where there have been absolute wrecks, such as those referred to by the hon. gentleman and by Mr. Pope, of Oswego, where a vessel has actually sunk and very little damage would accrue to the hull or any portion of it until Canadian assistance could be procured. Take for instance the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred and to which Mr. Pope, of Oswego, referred. That case was one in which the appliances, which were ready to go to the aid of that crew from Kingston, could have reached the vessel just as

soon as appliances which were in Oswego, and in fact much sooner, because the vessel was on our shore; but the fact was that the vessel that had been wrecked belonged to parties in Oswego who have their own appliances and who wished to save the expense attending the employment of a Canadian wrecker. Whether reciprocity in wrecking shall be adopted is a subject which will come more pertinently before the House when the Bill presented by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is under discussion. If the hon. gentleman who has taken the trouble to read the charges made against the Canadian Government had read the correspondence which was lately laid before Congress, which occurred between the authorities there and the owners of the *Algoma*, which was wrecked on Isle Royale, at the head of Lake Superior, he would then have ascertained clearly what the policy and what the conduct of the American Government were when application was made by Canadians to use their own wrecking appliances in order to save life and property. It would place quite a different view upon the statements made by the hon. gentleman who spoke in Congress on the subject lately. I do not desire at present to go into this matter any further. The papers will be brought down, and it will be found that wherever applications have been made on behalf of American owners of vessels in distress where there perhaps was a probability by the immediate use of American appliances of saving either life or property or of preventing the wreck of a vessel on shore going to pieces, they have inevitably been granted, and in no instance where application has been made has any other answer been given than that if Canadians appliances cannot be procured, then American appliances may be used. I am sorry to say the same course has not been pursued in all cases by the American Government towards this country. I might mention further that the Americans after the issue of the Order in Council preventing Americans from wrecking and tugging in connection with wrecked vessels in Canada by the late Government, a few years after when it was enforced by the present Government the United States passed an Act offering reciprocity in wrecking and tugging so far as wrecking is concerned in Canadian waters. That, I frankly state, has not been accepted up to the present day; whether it should be accepted now is a question for the House to decide when the subject is brought before it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is one feature of this matter that has been to some extent lost sight of. I am speaking subject to correction, because I have not looked the point up for some time, but my recollection is that under the Treaty of 1842, fixing the boundary between Canada and the United States, at the lakes, each country has the right to navigate the waters of the other, that is from shore to shore. I think that is the provision contained in the treaty, and that being the case, the same rule which applies to the coast waters of the sea should apply to the waters in the lakes. I have no doubt, looking at the decision in the *Franconia* case, the right of navigation is a right possessed under the laws of nations, that each State can exercise that right, even though the waters should be under the sovereignty of another and different community. If I am right in that view, then it is quite clear that legislation either on the part of the Congress of the United States or of the Parliament of Canada is an interference with the right of navigation, and is a violation of the right secured by treaty. Now, the right of navigation also implies the right to relieve a vessel in distress. If an American vessel coming upon the coast of Canada should be stranded upon our coast and has not gone to pieces, she is still in a condition capable of being navigated. It is undoubtedly the right of the people of the United States under the treaty that is subsisting

between the two countries to come to the relief of that vessel because that is the right of navigation, and to assist her from the perilous condition in which she is placed. A like right may pertain to a shipowner in case a vessel belonging to a Canadian was stranded upon the American coast. Of course our country would have the right to regulate the matter of wrecks, but a vessel that is simply stranded is not a wreck, and it seems to me clear from my recollection of the provisions of that treaty that neither the Government of Canada nor the Congress of the United States have any right to interfere or legislate with the freedom of navigation. It is no derogation of the rights secured to each by the treaty, and it is not in the power of the Parliament of Canada to legislate away the right of the people of the United States secured by that treaty, nor is it the power of Congress to legislate away the rights secured to us. If they choose to denounce the treaty and it comes to an end then the question as to how far each shall navigate the portion of the waters within the sovereignty of the other, is in a wholly different position. As long as that treaty exists it seems to me that neither the Congress of the United States nor the Parliament of Canada have any right whatever to legislate in the way they have done by interfering with the rights of shipping.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has raised rather a nice point, and I really cannot supply any information from my own recollection about the terms of the treaty of 1842. I take it in that treaty for the navigation of inland waters and the laying down of the boundary, that in fact inland waters are treated in the same way as if they were on the open sea and that the general principle would apply to those lakes as to the open seas.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Quite so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the right of assisting in saving wrecks at all events in respect to such wreck as would involve the raising of vessels which are wrecked on shore, either nation has authority to legislate. They prevented formally our vessels going to the rescue of Canadian vessels stranded on their shores and we have done the same thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The courts took a different view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events they thought their right to do so was clear and they passed an Act of Congress altering their law in that regard so as to induce us to make the same alteration in our law. If they considered that our right existed to the extent that the hon. gentleman mentioned there would have been no necessity for that Act of Congress, and no necessity for any Act on our part. The hon. gentleman has referred to the matter in a manner which exhibited a great deal of legal acumen. It is a very important question and I shall look into it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister will remember the decision of the courts in the *Franconia* case. Their argument was that the right of navigation was not interfered with by the sovereignty of a country on the sea coast. It is provided in the treaty that we should have the right of the navigation of the lakes from shore to shore. The rule that applies to a wreck does not apply to a stranded vessel that has not yet become a wreck.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how far that may be extended. If articles and other manner of appliances are required for raising the vessel, I should say that it must be done in reference to the law of the land in respect to the customs regulation. I fancy that if a vessel stranded, and that when the tide in the lake rises again she could get off, that that is not a wreck. When a vessel is stranded and artificial means or any such other means

are obliged to be used, that is in the strictest sense of the term a wreck.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy, Mr. Speaker, there are very few precedents for this in the case of our inland waters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. None at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless it might be in the case of the Black Sea and similar European waters, a part of which were held by one power and a part by the other, but I hardly think that this even would fit exactly. I do not think that even in the Black Sea there are many precedents to be found.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are plenty of wrecks there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the treaty makes the water navigable from shore to shore, we stand exactly in the position of a vessel on the high seas.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. When a vessel gets on shore she is not in navigable waters and she is not in the high seas. She is on the shore of the country where she is stranded. It is that fact which requires legislation to enable wrecking vessels and appliances to come to her assistance without reporting at the customs house or without paying duty. Under the treaty of 1842 they have a right to navigate waters on Lake Superior, Lake Ontario and the other lakes. Those are the navigable waters, so if a vessel gets stranded on the beach she is not in the navigable waters. It is a question as to how the treaty would affect her. I think the matter will come more fully before the House when the Bill on this subject is brought before the attention of Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. I differ with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in that view. One vessel may get stranded in a certain place, yet the waters may be navigable for another vessel of less capacity and lighter draft of water, and therefore she is in navigable waters. I differ from the statements made by the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government in relation to his description of a wreck. A vessel may be stranded from a variety of causes. She may be stranded from the fact of the tide falling, or the fact that she is driven ashore by a fierce wind, but she may be quite susceptible of being taken off. It may be possible to lighten that vessel so as to float her off again. Therefore that is not a wreck. There are hundreds of vessels along our coasts and the coasts of other countries that get stranded, but they are taken off again and they are not wrecked. It appears to me, therefore, that this measure has arisen out of a retaliatory Act passed by the Canadian Government. I speak from memory and I think I am correct in saying that some years ago, when the late member for Kent, Mr. Rufus Stevenson, was in this House, I think he instigated the presentation of a Bill which subsequently passed into law to prevent the Americans from sending their wrecking vessels over to operate in our waters. The reason being, as alleged at the time, if my memory serves me right, that the Americans refused to allow Canadian wrecking vessels to operate in American waters. Hence the present law which has led to those remarks in the Congress of the United States. I thought at the time that this law passed that it was not a prudent measure, still it was passed as a work of necessity, and I believe as a work of retaliation. I think the Government should take the matter in hand with a view to getting some common understanding on the wrecking of vessels between the countries, so that each country should be permitted to operate in the waters of the other, on the St. Lawrence and the lakes. It seems to me there ought to be no great difficulty in accomplishing that purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be a nice point to determine the difference between a stranded vessel and a wrecked vessel. Whatever may have been the treaty rights of the Americans with regard to the navigation of the great lakes, it does not seem that they chose to take advantage of those rights or to interpret them as my hon. friend from Bothwell does. The restrictive measures were initiated by the American Government. They passed a regulation or an order from the Treasury Department, prohibiting Canadian vessels from assisting vessels wrecked on the American shores of the great lakes. That order was rigidly enforced, and to my personal knowledge the course taken by the customs authorities in Canada with regard to wrecked vessels has been much more liberal and humane than the course taken by the American authorities. The American authorities have found when their order was put into operation, that while the greater part of the tonnage of the great lakes was under the American flag, the majority of the wrecks were on the Canadian coasts, and the order they passed worked to their own disadvantage. It is on that account that they are so anxious now to have a humane system adopted. If they were deriving the greatest advantage from the present system, I do not suppose we should hear of any agitation in Congress for a change. It would be to the advantage of American vessel owners to employ their own appliances for recovering wrecked vessels, and were the demand of the American Government acceded to by Canada, the result would be that the entire wrecking business would pass into American hands; and unless the arrangement can be made to extend further, unless our tugs can get the privilege of the American coasting trade by our extending to their tugs the same privilege on our side, I think the American demand is one that the Parliament of Canada should not listen to. We are simply following the policy the Americans themselves inaugurated. That policy is working to their disadvantage, and I do not know but it would be wise to let it remain as it is. I can testify to the truth of what the hon. Minister of Customs has said, that in all cases where property or life is endangered, the customs authorities of Canada do grant permits; but where circumstances of that kind do not govern the case, they naturally look after the interests of our own wrecking companies, and in the operation of the regulations of the Department, great care, I believe, has been taken to give proper attention to the exigencies of the case, where the exigencies have arisen. I repeat that the Americans have inaugurated this system, and as it would be to their advantage and not ours, I think we should refuse them reciprocity in the wrecking business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Would it not be a breach of faith?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think so. At all events, this question will come up under the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), then I think it will be seen that the demand of the American Government does not rest on as good ground as it seems to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the hon. leader of the Government get the Minister of Justice to make a report on the subject, and, if the question is a question of right under the treaty, that our right should be raised by correspondence with the authorities at Washington.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if there is a right to navigate the waters, there is a right to an easement over the whole water to the shore, and it must follow that the vessel of either nation can help the other in distress, no matter what coast it may be upon. When a vessel is stranded, in the mere sense of being beached, from the lowness of the water or other cause, so that it can be taken off, either by the exertion of its own crew, or by relief, that is one thing; but

where the vessel is sunk, so that it cannot be raised again and brought to the top of the water and made a living thing without artificial aid, that is a downright wreck, and must be governed by other principles than those applicable to stranded vessels.

Mr. EDGAR. Whatever may be the refinements of the definitions relating to treaty rights on this subject, the Parliament of Canada has taken a pretty clear ground on the subject of dealing with wrecks, outside of the three-mile limit and anywhere in the waters of Canada. By the Wrecks and Salvage Act it is provided that receivers of wrecks may be appointed by the Governor in Council, and that when any British or foreign vessel is wrecked or stranded or in distress at any place within the limits of Canada, the receiver shall take possession of it, and hold possession of it for a time, and if anyone ventures to dispute his authority he is subject to severe penalties. I take it that the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac, if it passes, will be read along with this old Act, and will apply to all cases covered by the Wrecks and Salvage Act, that is, to all cases of wrecks or of stranded or distressed vessels in any part of Canada within the central lines of the lakes. I suppose that is the view the hon. member will take of it.

Motion agreed to.

SUPERVISION OF BANKS.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved :

That it is expedient to provide for a better supervision by the Government of all the banks of the Dominion.

He said : I desire to invite the attention of the House, and particularly the Government, to a question that appears to me to be rather an important one, that is, the desirability of a better supervision of all the banks of the Dominion. It is a matter of notoriety that during the past few years a number of the banks in the Dominion have fallen into litigation or bankruptcy. There must be some cause for that state of things. Perhaps it is their mismanagement, perhaps it is due to the trade policy of the Dominion or it may be due to other causes, but one preventive, I think, would be a better supervision of these banks by the Government. It is true, at present the banks furnish monthly returns to the Government, but I am sorry to say that in some instances these returns are not altogether reliable. If they were made in such a way as to be perfectly accurate, the public confidence in the banks would be better maintained. I hold in my hand a return, partly taken from the Government blue book, and partly obtained from the Department of Finance, from which it appears that no less than ten banks have become bankrupt within the last few years. They are the Mechanics' Bank, the Consolidated Bank, the Metropolitan Bank, the Bank of Upper Canada, the Merchants Bank of Prince Edward Island, the Liverpool Bank of Nova Scotia, the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of Prince Edward Island, the Exchange Bank, the Acadian Bank of Nova Scotia. Out of all our banks, there are ten which, of late years, have become insolvent. It may be said that these banks are private institutions, and I will grant that they are, in so far as their shareholders and directors are concerned. But they partake more of the character of public institutions towards the state. They get their charters from the State, they do business and attract the confidence of the people under the provisions of their charters, they invite depositors to make deposits, they invite public confidence in their stock, and they must be considered more as public than as private institutions. It is in their character of public institutions that the Government have made certain regulations forcing the banks to make returns to the Government. If these returns were made so as to prevent the public from forming false impressions, I would consider them sufficient, but they

are not sufficient. If one would compare the returns of these banks which suspended payments with the last returns they made to the Government, you would certainly not have much confidence in the statements made by the directors. I consider it, therefore, my duty to bring before the House this question, in which a great number of the people of this Dominion take an interest. So many people have dealings constantly with the banks that this is a question which interests the public at large. One reason why the Government should proceed in this matter, is that they have already proceeded in regulating, to a certain extent, the management of banks. Take what is done with regard to insurance companies. The Government have appointed a superintendent of insurance, whose duty it is to ascertain the value of the assets of insurance companies and decide whether they are sufficient to meet the liabilities or not. There is a perfect analogy between the two. If, in the case of the insurance companies, the Government has thought fit to appoint a superintendent, it ought certainly to appoint one in the case of the bank. I can see very well the objection that can be raised to the appointment of a bank superintendent. The objection will be that, considering the banks to be private institutions, we have no business to enquire into the management of their affairs which should be left exclusively in the hands of the shareholders and directors. But this is not a sufficient reason for depriving the Government of some direct control over the management of the banks, so that the public confidence in them will not be misplaced. I, therefore, am of opinion that this is a wise suggestion, though I do not believe that, coming as it does, from this side of the House, the Government will adopt it. I hope the Government will take it into their serious consideration. I make it in view of the sad list of insolvent banks which we have had within the past ten or fifteen years. Not only have I upon this list the number of banks that have fallen into bankruptcy but also the number of banks which have been obliged to reduce their capital, whether from mismanagement, or misfortune, or bad supervision. But it is clear that the shareholders have very little to do in supervising the action of their directors. The supervision is done about once a year, and the shareholders cannot go to the vaults of the bank and count the specie or look at the different assets. Now, the banks that have reduced their capital are twelve in number, and it will be seen that the dates of their misfortunes are not very far back. They are the Standard Bank, the Ontario Bank, the Jacques Cartier, the Banque du Peuple, the Banque de Ville Marie, the Union Bank of Lower Canada, the Maritime Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of Nova Scotia, the Bank of Yarmouth and the Union Bank of Halifax, and the Banque Nationale is now coming before this House and asking for a reduction of capital. I hope the Banque Nationale will be the last of the number. Besides these banks that have reduced their capital, there are many other banks which have not for some years paid dividends. They are the Banque de St. Jean, the St. Hyacinthe, the Union Bank of Lower Canada, La Banque Nationale, La Banque du Peuple, the Union Bank of Halifax and the Maritime Bank of New Brunswick. These eight banks for a long time paid no dividends. It appears to me that at particular periods the bank superintendents should be empowered to ascertain the results of the operations of each bank, and that is all the public care for. By appointing a proper and trustworthy person who would be intended not to dive into the private affairs of the bank for the mere pleasure of looking into them and trying to find out the private business of B. C. or D., but a trustworthy, discreet, reliable and honest person, we should have an officer of the utmost utility to the public, and many of the shareholders of the banks would be grateful to the Government for creating such an office, which would certainly pre-

vent a good deal of bad management; and the mere fact of having a superintendent over these banks who go at a moment's notice to examine their affairs would put these men on their guard, and they would be always ready to give a true and faithful account to the public of what was going on behind their counter. I would suggest that, in addition to the returns made by the bank to the Government, there ought to be a special return made showing how far the directors become liable to the banks on their private accounts and how far some of the directors in some of the banks go to accommodate their friends, not as mere trustees of the bank but as themselves doing the banking business on their own account, that is to say, endorsing as directors for their friends and getting a little *douceur* for doing it. That is one of the causes of the troubles in many instances into which the banks fall. It would be well also to discover whether the directors borrow much more from the banks than the value of their stocks. I think, if a director has any status in trade, he ought not to be allowed to borrow from the bank of which he is director to any large extent. If he has any credit, he should go to another bank and borrow, but should not borrow of the bank of which he is a mere trustee. There is one point also in regard to which the superintendent would be very useful, and that is to ascertain the real assets of the bank. These assets are very often made at a much greater valuation than they ought to be, and we see every-day that, when a bank goes into liquidation, the assets of the bank, which have been said to be of a good amount, have dwindled to about one-third of their supposed value. Therefore, if this valuation was made and was well known, the Government and the public would not be deceived as to the real assets of the bank. The responsibility of the directors of the bank ought to be better determined by the law. In the Province of Quebec it is true they are considered merely as *mandataires* and they have that responsibility alone, but they ought to be considered as having a much greater responsibility. They have the responsibility, for instance, of the stock of poor widows and orphans. In that light, they should be considered as much responsible as tutors and curators are. They are to take care that the property of those widows and orphans is protected against false speculation and they should be responsible for its management so far. It is very certain that, if the Government or the public had been informed two, three or four months before these banks whose names I have given fell into bankruptcy, if the Government had had a correct statement of the affairs of these banks, certainly some of these banks would have suspended before they did. These banks would not, up to the last moment, have had the confidence of the people because of the returns of the Government, and therefore I say that, under these circumstances, the appointment of a superintendent and good complete returns made to the Government would give security to the public and also more satisfaction to the shareholders. With this in view, and being moved only in the interests of the people of this Dominion, I move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. INNES. I willingly second the motion just proposed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), because I consider the subject one of very great importance indeed and worthy the attention of the House and of the Government. I do not intend to go into the matter at any length, but simply to refer to one or two cases which I think will afford very strong reasons indeed for some action being taken by the Government on this question. I think the Committee on Banking and Commerce to-day recommended the passing of an Act for the winding up of the Federal Bank. We know that that institution, by injudicious management, was very greatly weakened some time ago, so much so indeed that it has been forced to wind up.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

But its position so far is very good, because I believe that not only the depositors but the shareholders will receive nearly everything they have put in. How very different it will be in the case of the Central Bank. I would recall to the attention of the House some facts in connection with the history of that short-lived institution—short-lived indeed, but, during the time it was in existence, characterised, I suppose, by worse management and more rascality than we ever knew in the history of any banking institution in Canada. I think it was during the Session of 1884 that the charter was granted to this bank. It commenced business in the spring of 1835, and in two and a half short years it had collapsed, on the 15th of November last. Scarcely any one interested in the institution, except those who were guilty of wrecking it, knew anything of its actual position. In fact, one or two or more of the directors did not really know its actual position till within a day or so of the time it closed its doors. How then could the general public, the shareholders throughout the country and the large number of depositors know anything of its actual condition? It was impossible that they could do so if the directors, who should have been interested, who ought to have known the actual position of the bank, were ignorant of that position. Why, the return made by the bank on the 31st October shows it to be in a healthy position. It is of interest just to give the figures to show how they were afterwards falsified. In that return that was made to the Government, I may premise that the capital of the bank was one million dollars and that there was half a million paid up. The following statement shows the affairs of the bank to 31st October, 1887:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Reserve fund..... | \$ 45,000 |
| Notes in circulation..... | 492,855 |
| Other deposits payable on demand..... | 977,506 |
| Other deposits payable after notice..... | 1,147,534 |
| Due to other banks..... | 18,482 |
| Total liabilities..... | \$2,631,378 |
| Specie on hand..... | \$ 54,073 |
| Dominion notes..... | 120,068 |
| Notes and cheques of other banks..... | 138,454 |
| Balances due from other banks..... | 23,382 |
| Balance due from agencies..... | 9,278 |
| Government debentures or stock..... | 29,710 |
| Loans or discounts secured by bonds, debentures or other securities..... | 73,967 |
| Loans to municipalities..... | 3,949 |
| Loans or deposits unsecured in other banks..... | 21,449 |
| Current loans, discounts and advances to the public..... | 2,636,053 |
| Notes or bills discounted and not specially secured..... | 15,078 |
| Notes or bills overdue and secured by mortgage, &c..... | 23,799 |
| Other assets not included in above..... | 18,058 |
| Total assets..... | \$3,231,518 |
| Total liabilities..... | 2,631,378 |
| | \$ 600,140 |

Remember that this return was made to the Government and sworn to, I suppose, by the president and cashier on the 31st October, 15 days before the bank closed its doors. Not only that, but early in the month the board of directors met and declared the usual dividend of 6 per cent. Now, what was the actual position of the bank at that time? We find from the report of the liquidator, four months afterwards, that the actual position, at the very time the false returns were made, sworn to and sent to Ottawa, was this: claims proved against the bank, \$1,362,420; claims not proved, \$351,420; filed since 28th February, \$84,824; amounts unclaimed, \$57,155; making the liabilities of the bank, \$1,856,319. As one of the liquidators remarked, the bank had been wrecked to the amount of about \$1,000,000, the actual capital for which it was chartered. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, in the same return, the amount that the directors had borrowed, either by themselves or for their firms or partnership, is placed at \$73,690. This return was also sworn to, of course, in accordance

with the Act. But we find that the actual state of affairs was very different indeed, for the Master in Chancery, after he got fairly into the investigation of the affairs of the bank, found they had actually exceeded that sum, and had deliberately broken the law in borrowing more than the law allowed; and in addition, they had issued \$70,000 of notes in direct contravention of the statute. It was found in evidence before the Master that the president, by himself, had borrowed \$16,000, that he, in company with one of the directors, had borrowed \$21,000, making \$37,000; and that this director, J. Mitchell Macdonald, for himself owed the bank \$138,000; that another director owed \$3,000, another \$24,000, and still another \$6,000, in all \$202,000, in addition to the \$73,000 which were returned and sworn to by the bank on October the 31st. When the statement was laid before the Master in Chancery, about the time that he commended his investigation, on the 22nd January, he said :

"He had duly certified the return made by the said Central Bank, of 9th November, six days before the suspension, in which it was reported to the Government that on the 31st October, there was not only a surplus of \$600,000, actually over and above all liabilities, but sufficient securities on current loans to cover all liabilities. He took this statement as true, and the directors and officials of the bank would be required to give an account of what disposition of this large surplus they made between the 31st October and 16th November, when the bank suspended. The law called on them, as custodians of the trust placed in their hands, to give a rigid account to the last cent. The criminal law held them accountable if the returns were fictitious. Under the provisions of the Winding-up Act, not only the shareholders but the creditors had the right to examine minutely all directors and officials, and to scrutinise their dealings. If false returns were made, the officials making such returns were criminally liable; they might be imprisoned, and compelled to pay all deficient amounts with interest. Presidents, and directors, and officials of banks should know, and the sooner they realised their responsibility, the more it will be to their advantage, that they could not shelter themselves under a mere pretence. The returns they make must be true in figure and in fact, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He would call upon the liquidators to make most minute searching investigation. The tribunal possessed large inquisitorial powers; they would have to exercise these to the utmost, and it was a duty that they owed to public justice and to those whose property and means of livelihood were imperilled."

Such was the opinion given by the Master in Chancery at that time. It was supposed when this announcement was made that the parties who were thought to be guilty, would be brought up for examination, but we find that they very soon made themselves scarce. The first one that left, whose extraordinary transactions with the bank, I suppose, have been unparalleled in the history of any bank—I refer to Cox, the broker—he was the first one who left, considering, I suppose, that it was unsafe for him to remain. The next one who left was the cashier. He also owed the bank from \$30,000 to \$50,000. Then followed the director whom I mentioned. He owed \$138,000 to the bank. Then the president, partly on account of ill health, and no doubt afraid that he would be subjected to a rigid examination or, perhaps, something worse, found it convenient to go across to the other side. The result has been that not one single individual connected with this institution, not one of the parties who had anything to do in wrecking the bank, has yet been arrested. The shareholders and the depositors have placed their money in the institution; the shareholders will be called upon for the double liability, and the depositors will have to lose a share of their hard earned money. This is the actual state of affairs. I do not think it necessary for me to go into details in connection with some of the transactions. How it was that this man Cox obtained his connection with the bank, how he was able to get so much out of the bank, the amount due by him being \$170,000; how it was that D. Mitchell Macdonald obtained such a large sum out of the bank,—it is not necessary for me now to explain, as the whole matter has been ventilated through the newspapers during the course of the investigation. It is not necessary to call attention as to how Mr. Barnett obtained about \$130,000 on the mere security of some trumpery diamonds

or what were said to be diamonds; it is not necessary to refer to Baxter's connection with the bank or the case of Allen, the cashier and manager, who was doubly responsible, being entrusted with the management of the bank, but who left it a debtor to the extent of from \$30,000 to \$50,000. These men, or at least the directors and the cashier, were directly responsible to the shareholders, and they were untrue to their trust; and not only so but they rendered themselves liable under the law, if they had been arrested, to imprisonment and punishment. It is calculated that these directors and the parties I have mentioned are directly responsible to the bank for about \$500,000 of the actual amount that was paid up as capital. Any one knowing these facts can readily realise the amount of suffering and privation that will be caused throughout the country wherever there was a branch of the institution. I suppose that Toronto, where the head office was situated, suffered to the largest extent; I think the city in the riding which I have the honor to represent perhaps suffered next. The inhabitants of Guelph, business men and depositors in the city and throughout the riding, had deposits in the bank to the extent of \$382,000, and I believe there was from \$60,000 to \$70,000 in stock. Such a large sum being locked up one would think would be apt to cripple business. I am very happy to say that it was scarcely felt to any appreciable extent and business men and others were able to tide over the temporary difficulty, and there was scarcely any difference noticeable financially from so much money being locked up. But, no doubt, there were cases of privation and of suffering not only there but also in other places, and even if the amount expected shall be realised the depositors will lose about 25 per cent. of their hard earned savings, and some people had their all deposited in the institution. There is no doubt that the shareholders will be called on for their double liability. No wonder Chancellor Boyd, in removing one of liquidators, stated in giving his opinion concerning the bank as follows:—

"The revelations of the bank's transactions showed an alarming state of affairs. When we consider the history of this bank, the position of the men in connection with it, and the total terrific wreck which has occurred, one is obliged to say that there has not only been gross incompetency, but I might almost say idiotic mismanagement and dishonesty in the conduct of its affairs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we have such a revelation, surely it is high time for the Government to take hold of this matter and so amend the Banking Act as will secure us better satisfaction than seems to be given at present by the existing Act. The directors should be compelled to make a clear and full statement of the bank's affairs. That is one clause of the Banking Act as it stands at present; but we know and I have shown to you that the directors and cashier are capable of making false returns and are capable of swearing to them. The Banking Act provides that no dividend shall be declared which will impair the capital of the bank. We have seen that this clause of the Act was also infringed on. The Act provides a penalty for the over-issue of bills. In the case of the Central Bank there was an over-issue of bills; but the bills have been destroyed, and strange to say and unaccountable as it seems to me, the authorities that should take hold of these matters have not brought the directors to task for a direct infringement of the Act. But the law is in some respects deficient, and in one principal respect it is defective. The provisions of the law are inadequate to secure the evidence of bank officers. The law provides for the examination by the court into the conduct of the officers who are supposed to have been guilty of a breach of trust, but a liquidator can do this only under the authority of the court. It is provided that notice must be given to the directors or the officers, and that simply serves as a notice and warning to them. In that respect I think the Banking Act requires amendment, for there should be more stringent provisions and a better and quicker process

of bringing defaulting directors and officers to justice than we have at present. Then there is a lack of proper inspection. There should be a provision for better security for the depositors. We want a more stringent enforcement of the provision for the punishment of directors borrowing money from the bank, we want heavier penalties for making false returns, and there are many other amendments which might be suggested and incorporated in a Bill when the subject is before the Committee on Banking and Commerce when they take the whole question into consideration, and I trust we shall ere long have a measure which will define more clearly the duties of the directors, which will make them more responsible in every respect in regard to the management of the banks, and which will secure more effectually the depositors and those who entrust their money to the bank, and also the shareholders who give their money to start the institution. A measure of that kind which would accomplish that object would, I am sure, secure the cordial support and confidence of both sides of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I shall only trouble the House for a few moments on this very important question which my hon. friend has brought before the attention of the Government and the House. There can be no doubt that the recent disastrous and disgraceful bank failures which have taken place within the last few years in this country will force the Government to take some action for the purpose of protecting those interested in the banks as well as the billholders. I have given this question some little investigation, and I think I can safely say that there is no country in the world to-day that has a worse banking system than we have in Canada. By the Act under which these banks are acting they have a right to issue bills to the amount of the paid up capital. I hold that no Government should give a bank power to issue anything to circulate as money; our bills should be issued by the Government of the country through banks upon proper security furnished by the bank. So far as the banks of this country are concerned, there is absolutely no security whatever for the billholders or any person interested in the bank, except the honesty of the officials of those banks, and it is to be regretted that during the last few years the public have learned that so far as honesty is concerned there is little, if any, security. There are many reasons why the bills should not be issued by the banks but should be issued by the Government itself. You take the whole Dominion of Canada, and we all know that bills issued in one Province are not current in another, except on discount. This is not as it ought to be. The bills issued by a bank in this country should be current all over the Dominion. If you go to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, the bills issued in the Province of Ontario or the Province of Quebec are not taken as current money, and the people holding those bills are obliged to submit to a discount, although the bills themselves may be beyond question. There is a want of confidence in the banks of the country, and we know that runs upon banks are caused by people holding bills in small sums. They become timid, and their timidity extends to other persons who hold the bills, and the consequence is a run upon the banks, although the bank may be perfectly solvent and able to meet its liabilities in full. Now, Sir, I think there is no system of banking so completely successful or so completely sure to every person interested as the American system. The national banking system of the United States to my mind is the most perfect system of banking in the world. It is a system that has been taken up and largely adopted now by the several nations of the world and this country possesses unusual facilities for introducing that system of banking. Why Sir, we have to-day a debt of something like

Mr. INNES.

\$300,000,000 and we are paying interest to the English people upon our money. That debt can be paid off if the system adopted by the United States is adopted here. The interest could be paid to our own people by compelling the banks to accept from the Government, bank bills secured by the bonds of the Government. In that way the money received for that issue may be applied in payment of the debt which we owe to foreign countries and the interest which we pay to those people might be paid to our own people. As my hon. friend who has just spoken, properly stated, there is no proper system of bank inspection in this country. As I said a few moments ago it depends upon the honesty of the officials who have the management of the banks, and the experience of the past few years has been such as to prove to us conclusively that this is not much security for people interested in those banks. In the United States they have a complete system of inspection. There is a Government inspector of the United States whose duty it is upon the slightest complaint made of irregularities in the management of a bank to at once take complete possession and control of the bank. He takes the keys of the institution and he makes a thorough and complete investigation, and if it is found that the directors are borrowing beyond what the law allows, or that there are any irregularities in the management of the bank, that has to be accounted for and made right before the work can proceed. The result of that has been, Sir, in the United States, to make their system a completely successful system. In looking over the returns from the Financial Department at Washington it is remarkable to see the very small percentage of the National Banks in the United States that have failed and what large dividends have been paid to the creditors of those banks in cases where they have failed. There is another thing I think that the Government should take into consideration—because the time will shortly come when they will have to consider this question and when it will be necessary to introduce a new Banking Act as the one which now exists will expire in a couple of years—and that is as to the question of allowing banking institutions to commence business with a smaller capital than they now do. Our banks now start with a large capital, they have a head office in some of the cities of the country and then branch out into the smaller towns. They are merely receptacles for the purpose of receiving the surplus earnings of the people, and that money is sent to the money centres and is used for the purpose of speculating in stocks and so on. There is no community in this country that has not over half a million or two million dollars in surplus cash, and that money finds investment in the agencies established in those different points. It can find investments in the building associations started in the different towns throughout the country, but whatever money is invested or deposited with the chartered banks of the country is, as I said before, not used for the purpose of helping on the business men of the particular community, but it is sent to those large money centres, and there it is used for speculating purposes. I think I am safe in saying that not more than half the deposits throughout this country are used for the purpose of accommodating the business men of the particular section in which it is deposited. Now, Sir, the building associations of the country have proved to be a marvellous success. Wherever they have been started they have been successful. They have been the means of giving the people, who had surplus money in particular communities, an opportunity of investing that money, and I say that this is the best evidence that if the Government would permit, banks to be established with smaller capital throughout the country, it would destroy, to some extent, the system of banks and agencies which now exist, and local banks would take the place of those large institutions. By doing this the surplus money of the community would be

invested by people who understood the business wants of the several communities. The investment would be perfectly safe and the public would run no risk whatever, if the Government undertook the duty of issuing the money themselves. It is said that this system would not be sufficiently elastic and in times when money was required to be plentiful it might not supply the demand. The experience of the United States has negated any such statement as that, money has been sufficiently plentiful there for all the commercial wants of that great country, and I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in this country upon that score. The Government, as I stated a moment ago, should be in a better position as regards the debt of the country. All that it would require was to change the creditors from bondholders in England to the Canadian people themselves. A scheme of that kind would give complete security to billholders, it would save this constant run upon banks, because as I said those who start a run upon the banks of the country are those who are holding the bills and when a failure takes place it is generally found that the people who suffered most are the poorer classes of the community who are the holders of those bills. In the case of a failure they have to wait months and sometimes years before those bills are redeemed, or the holders of them have to pass them away at a very heavy discount, and at a very great loss to themselves. As my hon. friend says, they sometimes lose them altogether. Mr. Speaker, this is a question on which some action should be taken by this Parliament. It is a question which the people and the press of the country have been agitating for some time. It has been urged upon the Government by the press, and we all know that it is incumbent upon the Government to do something to give better security to the people than has been the case in the past. At present there is no difficulty whatever for a dishonest bank manager to completely wreck a bank before the public are aware of it. That is not as it should be. If it is not thought that the system which is in force in the United States would not suit the wants of this country, at all events we have a right to ask the Government to have a complete system of investigation and inspection, so that as far as it is possible the billholders and people interested in the banks of the country should have proper security. As the matter stands now our system is the very loosest one that can be found in any of the commercial countries of the world. It is old fashioned, it has passed its day. The function of issuing money belongs exclusively to the Government and if that is secured by Government bonds bought by the bank, then, Sir, it is of little consequence whether the bank under such circumstances has failed or not. Everyone knows that the bills will be redeemed when they are presented at the Receiver General's office or at such other place as may be appointed, just as is the case in the United States. There one never thinks of examining a bill to see whether the bank has failed or not. It is sufficient to know that it is a National Bank bill, and that on presentation at Washington it will be redeemed. This is an important question, and I hope it will engage the attention of the Government at no distant day.

Mr. CASEY. I did not expect that this motion would be reached this evening or that the discussion would take the wide range it has done, or I would have been better prepared to speak on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ELLIS, I would like to make a remark with a reference to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who made this motion. He has included in the list of wrecked

banks the Bank of New Brunswick. That is a mistake, because that bank is not in the position of the others at all. It is quite true, it has reduced its capital, but it has done that to return it to its shareholders because it was not able to use the capital so returned. At present its stock is selling above par.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick which I stated had failed. The statement I read from is an official statement coming from the Department of Finance.

Mr. LOVITT. The hon. gentlemen mentioned that the Bank of Yarmouth had reduced its capital. It did that because it had more money than it could lend out to advantage, and it asked Parliament to grant permission to pay it back to its shareholders, which was done. I consider that an evidence of good management, and not of bad management.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I wish also to state that the bank of which I have the honor to be president, has been mentioned in the same category, but no bank is in a better position in this country.

Motion to adjourn debate agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the instructions given to the Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Labor, and of all correspondence between the Government and the Chairman or any member of the said Commission.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

Copies of the petition of the Reverend Charles Hallé, Priest, and several other citizens of St. Pierre, on the Island of Orleans, County of Montmorency, dated the 18th October, 1887, asking the Minister of Militia and Defence to take care that they be protected from harm during the artillery practice which is carried on each year at the end of the Island of Orleans.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Governments of the Dominion and Ontario in reference to a claim of the Six Nation Indians for compensation for lands flooded by the construction of a dam across the Grand River, at Dunnville, by the Welland Canal Company, in or about the year 1833; also, all Orders in Council and Departmental reports bearing upon such claim or the payment thereof.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return showing the time the steamer *Northern Light* commenced running between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia for the winter of 1887-88; the number of trips made; the number of passengers crossed; the date of last trip made up to date.—(Mr. Perry.)

Correspondence exchanged with the Imperial Government concerning the disallowance of the Railway Acts of Manitoba.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. leader of the Government if he is in a position to say whether the health of the hon. Minister of Finance will permit him to go on with the Fishery Treaty to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am happy to be able to say that it is quite sufficient.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to invite Parliament to pass an address to the Imperial Government asking for legislation to confirm the boundaries of Ontario as defined by the arbitrators in 1878 and the Privy Council in 1884.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman give notice of a motion?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I intend to put it in another way—on going into Supply.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p. m.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, April 10, 1888.

No. 31.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th April, 1888.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States. He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I desire to say that if I had not on so many past occasions experienced the kind indulgence of both sides of the House, I should hesitate to undertake, in the present state of my health, bringing forward the very important subject that it now becomes my duty to lay before the House. I am glad to know, Sir, that the question of the protection of our fisheries, and of the results that have followed the course that was adopted by the Government and Parliament of Canada, has not been a party question. I am glad to know, Sir, that in approaching the very important subject that I am now submitting to the House, I can rely on the patriotic consideration of this question by gentlemen on both sides of the House to whom it is thoroughly familiar, and who on various occasions and in various capacities have been called on in the past to deal with it. For more than a hundred years this question has been a source of irritation between the Imperial Government of Great Britain, the Government of the United States, and the people and Governments of British North America. So long ago as 1783 a treaty was made between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States at Paris in relation to the fisheries. Article 3 of that treaty provided:

"It is agreed that the people of the United States shall continue to enjoy, unmolested, the right to take fish of every kind on the Grand Bank, and on all the other banks of Newfoundland; also in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and at all other places in the sea where the inhabitants of both countries used at any time heretofore to fish; and also, that the inhabitants of the United States shall have the liberty to take fish of every kind on such part of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen shall use (but not to dry or cure the same on that Island), and also on the coasts, bays and creeks of all other of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America; and that the American fishermen shall have liberty to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors and creeks of Nova Scotia, Magdalen Islands and Labrador, so long as the same shall remain unsettled; but so soon as the same, or either of them, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such settlement, without a previous agreement for that purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors or possessors of the ground."

Now, I need not say to the House that the concession made to the people of the United States to enjoy in common with the people of Great Britain the fisheries of this country, was a treaty of a very extraordinary and abnormal character. I need not remind the House that the Treaty of Ghent, which was made between Great Britain and the United States at the termination of the War of 1812, is found to be entirely silent upon this subject, for the reason that the Government of Great Britain had arrived at the conclusion that it was impossible to permit the continuance of such an unwarranted interference with the rights of the people of British North America as had been enjoyed by the people of the United States under the Treaty of 1793. The Government of the United States took the ground that the treaty was not affected by the war. That position, however, was strongly controverted by Her Majesty's Government, and as the representatives of the United States Government had been instructed not to concede on the question of the fisheries, and the Government of Great Britain were equally inexorable on that point, the only course that could be adopted was to give the question the entire go by. It therefore found no place in the Treaty of 1812. The Government of Great Britain, however, acting upon the principle that they had maintained—the principle which has come to be recognised throughout the world—that a war abrogates all treaties, and especially treaties of that character, asserted their rights in these territorial waters of British North America, and proceeded to seize fishermen of the United States for trespassing in these waters. The result of that difficulty was the Treaty of 1818, in which this question was again considered by the two Governments, and I may call attention to the terms of the principal article of that treaty, so far as the fisheries are concerned:

"Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States for the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall have, forever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Ramea Islands, on the western and northern coast of Newfoundland; from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands; on the shores of the Magdalen Islands; and also on the coasts, bays, harbors and creeks, from Mount Joli, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Bellefleur, and thence northward, indefinitely, along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company; and that the American fishermen shall also have liberty, forever, to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks of the southern part of the coast of Newfoundland hereabove described, and of the coast of Labrador; but so soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such portion so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground; and the United States hereby renounce, forever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above mentioned limits: *Provided, however*, That the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbors for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatever abusing the privileges hereby reserved to them."

Now, Sir, that treaty which was made between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United

States, seventy years ago, has been the cause of constant recurring irritation and difficulty between the two countries; and I need not remind the House that no portions of Her Majesty's dominions have been so vitally and deeply interested in that question as what are now known as the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Newfoundland. This treaty is very striking in two particulars. It gives the same territorial advantages, but to a very limited extent, over a certain portion of the Island of Newfoundland and what is now known as Canada, to the Government of the United States, as were given under the Treaty of 1793, and in return for that—I believe it is perhaps an unparalleled concession by any Government of one country to another—was secured the formal renunciation on the part of the Government of the United States of the liberty of their fishermen to enter any other portion of the jurisdictional waters of what was then known as British North America, except for four specified purposes. Even the privileges enjoyed under those four specified purposes were distinctly declared to be subject to their being used in such a manner as in no way to abuse the privileges thus granted. The adoption of this treaty was followed by the passage of laws on the part of the Imperial Parliament and also of the British North America Provinces for the purpose of giving it effect. Of course, although the treaty distinctly laid down the International law as between the two countries, special legislation was requisite in order to provide a means for carrying that treaty out and for enforcing its provisions on the part of Great Britain and on the part of British North America. The exclusion of the United States fishermen from the fishing grounds of British North America led again to collision and difficulty. Seizures were made, the old difficulties that had existed before the formation of the treaty were again called into activity by the presence of the United States fishermen in our waters, and by the measures which were taken, especially by Great Britain, for the purpose of protecting the rights of the inhabitants of British North America. The result of these difficulties was the Reciprocity Treaty. The firm stand taken by Her Majesty's Government, the firm position taken to protect the undoubted rights of her subjects in British North America, led to the adoption, in 1854, of what is known as the Reciprocity Treaty, a treaty which for twelve years removed all difficulties in connection with this question. On that occasion there was no attempt to limit, define, or interpret the points that had been raised in the controversy between the two countries, but they received their quietus, and all these difficulties were removed by the adoption of a policy of giving to them Provinces of British North America and Newfoundland certain commercial privileges by which the trade between this country and the United States was extended. I may say that I took the opportunity, when delivering my speech on the financial condition of the country a year ago, to draw the attention of the House to the results of that treaty, and I will just call the attention of the House again for one moment to a single extract in that speech, in which I referred to the trade results of what is known as the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. It will be found that the United States, during those twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, exported to British North America home products to the extent of \$300,808,370 and foreign products to the extent of \$62,379,718, the total exports to British North America being \$363,188,088. The imports from the British Provinces into the United States during that period amounted to \$267,612,131, showing a balance during the twelve years in favor of the United States of \$95,575,957. That is to say, that they sent under the operation of that treaty into the British North American Provinces over 95,000,000 more than we sent into that country. I have often been at a loss to know how any person in the United States, and much less how any person

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

in Canada could disparage that treaty, or could speak of the effect of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as having been a one-sided treaty, altogether in favor of British North America, and not equally in favor of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would not the excess include goods passing through the country in bond and in transit, such as the exportation of wheat through the western canals?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. I think the hon. gentleman will find that these are the legitimate figures connected with the trade of the two countries, and I noticed, shortly after the delivery of this speech, that the Hon. T. W. Bayard, the Secretary of State of the United States, was interviewed in relation to this question, and, so far as the account of that interview went, I understood him to confirm the accuracy of the figures which I had used on that occasion. I say I have been greatly at a loss to know how, under the circumstances, any person can be found, especially in this country, to treat this as a one-sided measure in the interests of Canada. So far as what is known as Canada is concerned, we know that the trade of our country took a very great bound, and that the result of the Reciprocity Treaty was to give a very vast and sudden and great and still-continued impetus to our trade with the United States; but, as I said before, the result was to give a still greater expansion of trade to the United States in relation to British North America. I am glad, after spending some three months in Washington, to be able to say that I had very intimate intercourse with gentlemen of different politics holding high positions in the Senate and House of Representatives, that I have taken many opportunities of discussing this question with them, and that the result is that I did not find one statesman in the United States who expressed his satisfaction at the termination of that treaty having taken place. I believe the general expression in that country is that commercially it was a mistake to have terminated that treaty, and that it would have been infinitely better for the United States and for Canada if that treaty had been continued. That treaty was not abrogated on commercial grounds. It was not in consequence of any commercial reasons that the abrogation took place, but it was, as is well known, in consequence of an unhappy sentiment which grew up in the United States, that, during the time of the Civil War which rent that country asunder, the sympathies of the British North American Provinces were very strongly with the South. I think there is very great reason to question the soundness of that opinion, but, although from the nature and the position of our country, being neutral territory, advantage was taken of it by the Southerners, by those who were engaged in carrying on that war from the South, to make it a basis of operations, the Government of Canada never showed the slightest favor, but took every means in their power to prevent British North America being made use of in that struggle. I think, if the records of the United States were examined, it would be found that ten Canadians, or ten British North Americans, fought in the ranks of the Northern side for every one who fought on the Southern side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Twenty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to think that my right hon. friend is nearer the mark than I am when he says they were twenty to one. I scarcely know of any aid or any allowance which might be proof of this, being given to any of the soldiers who fought for the South, while we know that at this moment the Government of the United States are paying a large sum of money to persons who were British subjects then and are British subjects now, in Canada, for their services during that war. Taking that as the best test that the country can show as to where

its sympathies were, as far as the substantial and most important kind of aid could be found, it will be seen that British North America rendered a great deal more support and assistance to the North than to the South. Now, I may say that the Treaty of 1854 removed for twelve years all these difficulties, but, unfortunately, from the causes to which I have alluded, I believe to a large extent that a misapprehension of the true facts of the case led to that treaty being abrogated. Both parties in this country, both parties in the various Provinces—because it was before the Union of Canada—regretted that the abrogation took place. I believe there was not a Province in what is now the Dominion of Canada that did not make every exertion first of all to avoid the abrogation of that treaty, and, after it was abrogated, to endeavor to have it or something equivalent to it restored at as early a period as possible. But those efforts were unsuccessful, and then, and while these efforts were being continued, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, Canada resorted to a system of licenses to prevent a sharp interference with the practiced habits of United States fishermen of fishing in the waters of British North America. We adopted a mode of endeavoring to prevent collision and difficulty. While there might be no hope of our being able to settle this question by a recurrence to something like the Treaty of 1854, every effort was made by the adoption of licenses to remove irritation and prevent collision of every kind, in order to favor, as far as possible, the solution of the question in that way; but ultimately we were obliged to fall back on the principle of protecting our fisheries, we were obliged to adopt such measures as the fishermen had a right to expect at our hands; being excluded from the American market by high duties, having their calling very seriously interfered with, they had a right to demand at the hands of the Government and the Parliament of Canada that measures should be taken for the protection of the rights which they undoubtedly enjoyed and which, under the Treaty of 1818, had been settled in what one would suppose was as clear and concise and emphatic a manner as it was possible that any question could be settled. The result was that seizures again occurred, and the American fishermen, encroaching upon the waters of British North America, found themselves again in difficulties. The result of that was, as you all know, that in 1871 a new treaty was made, and I have often thought of the old adage, that "everything comes to him who waits," when I have thought of the manner in which my right hon. friend on my left was attacked in this House and out of it, in connection with the Washington Treaty, and the satisfaction he must have experienced when, after the treaty had been in operation for ten years, there was not a single public man in Canada but was ready to do everything possible to maintain and to continue that very treaty. On that occasion, as hon. gentlemen know, my right hon. friend made the same effort to settle this question upon the lines that had been settled in 1854; the effort was to obtain from the United States, instead of a money payment for the privileges which their fishermen were anxious to enjoy in the waters of Canada, such an expansion of commercial intercourse, and the increase of trade between the two countries, as would meet the wishes of the people of Canada, and be a settlement that would commend itself to the judgment and approval of everybody. That effort, however, was not successful; and when the treaty was presented for consideration to this House—and I remember the occasion well, when hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House felt it their duty to criticise very severely that treaty, and we were compelled, in self-defence, to say something in its support—I remember very well appealing to hon. gentlemen opposite, as I shall appeal to them to-day, not to press the Government unduly to show to Parliament and to show to the country the advantages

that were obtained by the Washington Treaty of 1871. One of the conditions of the treaty was that an international arbitration should take place at Halifax for the purpose of ascertaining the increased value of the fisheries of Canada to the people of the United States over and above the omission of the duty on fish and the corresponding right to fish in their waters, that the balance of advantages should be examined by an international arbitration for the purpose of arriving at the amount that should be paid by the United States to Canada. I appealed to hon. gentlemen opposite on that occasion not to compel us, in self-defence, to show that the treaty which had been signed was one advantageous to Canada, not to compel us to take such strong grounds as would be used against us when that arbitration, at a subsequent time, should take place. Well, Sir, I am sorry to say that my appeal on that occasion was not as successful as I trust it will be on this occasion; I am sorry to say that we were forced to make some very strong and very clear statements to the House in justification of my right hon. friend for putting his name to the Washington Treaty of 1871. Well, just as I expected, and nobody knows better than the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who sits opposite—for this arbitration took place in the city where he lives—no person knows better than himself, that one main element of the United States case was the production of the very speeches which we had been compelled to make on the floor of this House in defence of that treaty. Every word that we stated on that occasion was used to our disadvantage and to our detriment—I will not say that it was very successfully used, because I do not think that Canada has any great right to complain of the amount that was awarded on that occasion, \$5,500,000 for the period during which the treaty was to last, for the benefits derived by the people of the United States over and above those which were conceded by giving free fish. Of course, we know that the treaty was abrogated. Many persons have said, Sir, that we were not only successful in that arbitration, but that we were too successful, that, in fact, the award that was made was the main reason why the United States took the earliest possible moment to denounce that treaty and to terminate it. I do not believe, myself, that the award was too successful, I believe it is almost impossible to over-estimate the advantages of enjoying the fisheries that, fortunately for us, are contained in the jurisdictional waters of Canada. But, as I said before, unfortunately that treaty was abrogated. And, Sir, I must, in passing, pay my tribute to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who at that period led the Government of this country. It is well known that that hon. gentleman, in the discharge of what he conceived to be, and what undoubtedly was, the high duty that we owe to Canada in the high position he occupied, adopted measures to prevent that question of money ever being considered. The hon. gentleman sent one of his colleagues, or if not one of his colleagues at the time, a gentleman belonging to his party, of great ability and of great attainments, the late Hon. George Brown,—he sent him to Washington to co-operate with the British Minister at Washington, and once more he made a strenuous effort to settle this question of increased value of our fisheries over those of the United States, and over the advantages to be derived from having an opportunity of entering our fish free in the American market; I say, he obtained the appointment by Her Majesty's Government of the Hon. George Brown as commissioner, and that gentleman exhausted every effort in his power to carry out the views of the hon. member for East York, to again revive the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. As that treaty had been refused on a former occasion, he went further than the lines of that treaty, and by introducing a certain number of articles to be passed free between the two countries, as well

as the natural products of the two countries, he endeavored to enlarge and expand what had been obtained by the Treaty of 1854. I believe there was not a single item that was free under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, that the Hon. Mr. Brown did not embody in the treaty which he signed as to be made free between Canada and the United States, under the Treaty of 1874, which last treaty was arrived at between the two Governments. As I said before, and as I said the other day, I feel it is only right in passing to say, that the efforts to obtain the freest possible commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, consistent with the rights and interests of the two Governments, is a policy that does not only belong to one party, but it is the property of both parties in this country. The hon. member for East York showed his hearty appreciation of the value of such a policy, when he was leading his Administration, just as much as my right hon. friend showed it on the occasion of going to Washington in 1871, and on all and every occasion when that question has come up for consideration. But the Senate rejected that treaty, or, at all events, did not take it up, and consequently we were thrown back upon arbitration; and I think it is a matter of sincere gratification, and always will be to the people of Canada, to know that after the most careful and painstaking examination, after taking all the sworn testimony that could be adduced on the side of the United States, and by Canada, and after the most careful consideration of that testimony, and the fullest consideration of the whole question, that international commission awarded no less than \$5,500,000, or something approaching \$500,000 per annum, as the value of the fisheries of Canada over and above those of the United States, and the additional advantage of having a free market in the United States for the fish of Canada. Now, Sir, under the circumstances, that Treaty of 1871 was abrogated on 1st July, 1885. But I must do the Government of the United States the credit to say that they seemed to be equally impressed with the Government of Canada as to the importance of avoiding the difficulties and collisions that were likely to arise out of the abrogation of that treaty, and as those difficulties were likely to again present themselves a measure was arranged jointly between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, on behalf of the Government of Canada, for the purpose of endeavoring to avoid those difficulties again presenting themselves. Past experience had shown both countries how exceedingly undesirable it was to have men like the fishermen of the two countries, who were away from home, who were not under such easy control as persons on land are, carrying out measures the end of which it might be very difficult to foresee; and at the suggestion of the British Minister, Mr. Bayard, the then distinguished and now equally distinguished Secretary of State of the United States, entered into a temporary arrangement whereby American fishermen were allowed the privileges of the treaty during the remainder of the season—that is, the season of 1885—with the understanding that the President should bring the question before Congress at its next session, and recommend a joint commission by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to consider the question in the interest of good neighborhood and friendly intercourse between the two countries, thus affording a prospect of negotiating for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America. I use Mr. Bayard's words. The Government of Canada most readily assented to this view, and true to the policy that had been invariably pursued on both sides of this House, that of doing everything possible to promote trade relations between the two countries and to remove difficulties connected with the fisheries, the Government at once agreed that if the President would send to Congress a recommendation of the appointment of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

a commission having such object in view, they would allow the American fishermen to have free access to the fisheries of Canada, the same as they had enjoyed during the continuance of the treaty. President Cleveland, keeping good faith with the Government of Great Britain and Canada, sent a message to Congress on 5th December, 1885, premising that:

"In the interests of good neighborhood and of the commercial intercourse of an adjacent community, the question of the North American fisheries is one of much importance."

He recommended a commission:

"Charged with the consideration and settlement, upon a just, equitable and honorable basis, of the entire question of the fishing rights of the two Governments."

Unfortunately, the Senate did not approve the recommendation. The fishermen of Gloucester, who, naturally, I suppose, confined their attention to their own interests, and regardless of the effects of the course they proposed to pursue, at once petitioned Congress in the most earnest manner against any such proposal. They declared they did not want to have anything to do with the fishing grounds or waters of Canada, and they induced the Senate to reject the proposal by a vote of thirty to ten, and the proposal was rejected accordingly. We were then thrown back, necessarily, upon the only means of protecting the rights and interests of Canada. I may say that a very mistaken apprehension has arisen from the continuous exertions of all parties and classes in this country to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the United States. The policy of obtaining the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries, the products of the sea, of the forest, of the farm and of the mine, as I have said, has been continuously the policy of both parties in this country, and they have pressed that in season and out of season upon our great neighbors to the south of us. And that, unfortunately, has led to a very erroneous impression. When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was compelled to adopt the same policy that had been adopted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who organised that department with great ability and who filled the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries with equally great ability during a considerable time; I say when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries fell back upon the same policy his predecessor had adopted under like circumstances and took such measures as were absolutely necessary and indispensable for the protection of the rights and interests of the fishermen of Canada, the United States complained bitterly. Difficulties again took place. Fishermen, perhaps, are the most intractable and uncontrollable people in the world, and when a fisherman gets on board his little smack he thinks he is monarch of all he surveys, and he can go where he pleases, and do what he pleases. The result was that, as before, collisions occurred. Those parties brought themselves under the operation of the law, and it was absolutely necessary, as I have said, in the defence of Canadian fishermen, to make examples of those parties who showed that disregard for law. The result was, an entirely erroneous impression grew up throughout the United States. It was shared by the Government—by the Senate, by the House of Representatives. It was accepted by the great body of the people; and the press and the people of the United States, almost without exception, came to the conclusion, without a particle of ground to justify it, that Canada was enforcing a most harsh, ungenerous and unwarrantable construction of the terms of the Treaty of 1818, for the purpose of forcing reciprocal trade relations upon the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that this became a universal sentiment in that country. One can understand the mass of the people in the United States sharing such an impression. People say, and at the outset it seems a reasonable proposition: "Why is it that the fishermen of the United States

of America cannot obtain the same consideration in a United States port that a Canadian fisherman obtains in the United States port?" Well, Sir, the answer is obvious. The American Government renounced the right to enter our waters, as England and Canada never did renounce the right to enter the waters of the United States of America. The United States, in consideration of certain territorial rights over a portion of our country, in a part of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Magdalen Islands, and in consideration of obtaining such territorial rights as I believe are unparalleled in the world in any other country, renounced forever the rights of their fishing vessels of any kind whatever to come into the jurisdictional waters of Canada or British North America, as it was then called, except for specified purposes, and then under such terms and conditions as would forever prevent their abusing those privileges which we allow them to enjoy. The press of the United States has conceded this, but you cannot make the mass of the people understand it, and it is astonishing how many men of standing and position in the United States never seem to have grasped that question that the fishermen of the United States occupy entirely a different position in the waters of Canada from that which the fishermen of Canada occupy in the waters of the United States. This was not done by an Act of the Government of this country, but one can see, Sir, how easy it is that the mass of the people, not understanding those terms, not understanding the character of this treaty, and not understanding the obligations which the Government of the United States had taken in regard to this question, should be misled. Then, Sir, another difficulty arose, and that was with reference to the rights that those fishing vessels should enjoy when in our waters. It was claimed by the Government of the United States, in 1818, that no commercial vessel could come into the waters of British North America from the United States, that there was no intercourse, that those were privileges given to the fishing vessels by that treaty beyond anything that was enjoyed by any other class of vessels. And when a changed condition of things came about; when the commercial arrangements of 1830 had entirely changed the status of their fishing vessels in our waters, under that commercial arrangement it was provided, that the trading vessels could enter freely the ports of British North America and the United States trading vessels could enter our ports. As there was no exemption or exclusion of fishing vessels, they claimed that rights had been acquired by the fishing vessels that entirely took them out of the category of the Treaty of 1818, under which they were restricted from going into our waters for any but the four purposes. I think, Sir, that that contention, upon examination, proves to be entirely unfounded. I do not think it would be possible for any constitutional lawyer to maintain that proposition for a single moment. The arrangement of 1830 was a commercial arrangement, founded upon an Act of Congress, on the one side, authorising the Government of the United States whenever the King in Council would admit United States vessels to the Bermudas, the Caicos, the British West Indies and the ports of British North America, including Newfoundland; that whenever the King in Council would, by proclamation, admit their vessels to our ports, they would admit our vessels in the same way to theirs. It was, therefore, a bilateral arrangement entered into and based upon an Act of Congress upon the proposition made by the President and upon the Order in Council made by the King. Now, Sir, the treaty is a superior instrument to that Order in Council, and that Order in Council is silent as to fishing vessels. The treaty solemnly declared that the people of the United States renounced forever the right to claim for a fishing vessel any such commercial privileges whatever. And under those circumstances it is a principle in law,

constitutional as well as general law, and I believe accepted by all countries, that you cannot repeal and change and alter a specific provision by a general one unless some arrangement had been subsequently provided as to such specific provision. The general terms as to vessels in the commercial arrangement of 1830 and the absence of any reference to fishing vessels, left fishing vessels exactly in the same position as they were before. But, Sir, that was not the only ground. It was also claimed that under the clause of the Washington Treaty of 1871, to which my right hon. friend was a party, there was a bonding clause in that, and that this bonding clause provided that the United States vessels were authorised to tranship their cargoes in bond in the same way that Canadian vessels were allowed to tranship their cargoes in bond through the United States. But again, Sir, not only was there no reference made to fishing vessels being relieved from the renunciations of the Government of the United States under the Treaty of 1818, but there was the fact—as hon. gentlemen opposite, many of whom watched this matter at Halifax, well know—that when this question was raised and the representative of Canada said: "You are enjoying privileges here in the transhipment of fish under the treaty, and you are enjoying the advantage of buying bait and supplies of all kinds for your fishermen and under this treaty, you must consider what is due to the Government of Canada for those privileges which you enjoy." I say, Sir, that Mr. Foster, acting as the Agent of the Government of the United States, moved a resolution declaring that under the Washington Treaty, the Government of the United States had no such right and no such privilege to tranship a cargo of fish or buy bait or supplies of any kind whatever. Although during the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 it had been freely permitted by the Government of Canada during the 12 years that the Washington Treaty was in force, they declared that under clause 29, as it stands there to-day, and under which this right is claimed, that they had no such privileges before the fishery clause was removed from that treaty, as it was by its abrogation. Therefore I say that when this matter comes to be examined, the House will see the position we occupy, the House will also see the difficult position we were in when we had the public mind of the United States inflamed by a misapprehension on this question. When we had the Government and Congress of the United States acting as one man in relation to this question, it will be at once appreciated how difficult and how serious this matter had become. Although we were not giving an ungenerous, nor not giving an extreme interpretation to the treaty at all, but that we were simply doing that which my hon. friend opposite found it necessary to do as his successor, that is to defend the just rights of the fishermen of Canada—and no Government would be worthy of the name of Government who would shrink for a single moment from that duty—the result was that because we took this action the sentiment of public men in the United States became inflamed, and instead of anything like increased freedom of commercial intercourse or of anything that was calculated to be of advantage or benefit to the two countries, they had recourse to the passage of what was called a Retaliatory Act. It was not a Retaliatory Act, but it was a Non-intercourse Act based upon an entire misapprehension of the position of the two countries and of the questions in relation to them. And as I said a year ago when standing here, it was an Act that was entirely uncalled for. Well, Sir, I took the opportunity of drawing the attention of this House at some little length to the position in which I stood in relation to that Non-intercourse Act. I said that it was the only cloud on the commercial horizon of Canada, and I pointed out the unwarrantable character, as I considered it, of the Act. I pointed out that it seemed to be founded on an entire misapprehension of

what the position of Canada was in relation to this question. I was very severely criticised—if not by hon. gentlemen opposite, who are always extremely indulgent to me—by the press representing them, for that speech. It was stated to be a very offensive speech, and to have a tone that was calculated to be extremely irritating to the Government of the United States, and two or three leading and prominent newspapers in this country have from that day to this asserted that here in my place in Parliament I declared that non-intercourse would be a very good thing for Canada. Well, Sir, as I dare say you know, I do not often correct statements made in the press, however much they may misrepresent what I say or do; but I may here take the opportunity of saying that no man can read the speech I delivered on that occasion and find any foundation whatever for any such statement. I did state that it would become the imperative duty of the Government of Canada, in vindication of the rights of our fishermen, to adopt the policy of protecting our fisheries. I stated that there was no warrant for such an Act as had been passed in the United States; and as the best means of protecting ourselves against the effects of a policy so unjust and so injurious to everybody—so detrimental to the interests both of the United States and Canada—I pointed out that, fortunately for Canada, we had attained a position that did not leave us so entirely at the mercy of our neighbors to the south of us as we should otherwise have been. I pointed out that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had given the people of Canada means for the free intercourse of one Province and one part of our people with another, without their being forced to go through the United States of America. I used language as strong, I think, as could be used to show the opinion I had of such an Act, when I said:

“Deeply as we would deplore so mad and so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our own lines of communication and have the most complete means of communication from the furthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea.”

I think, Sir, that that was calculated to show that we had to a certain extent protected ourselves from the ruinous position we should have been placed in if we had not those means of inter-communication; and I do not think that was inviting non-intercourse or intimating that it was a policy of which I approved. I said further:

“Now, intercourse would not be an unmixed evil. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if the policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves.”

In another place I said:

“While I most earnestly hope no such policy will be adopted.”

I thus call attention for a moment in passing to the language I then used in order to show that I was not guilty of the supreme folly that I would have been guilty of if I had spoken of non-intercourse between 60,000,000 of people of the United States of America and 5,000,000 on this side of the line as anything but what every intelligent Canadian would deplore, as I think every intelligent American ought to deplore it. But, Sir, I will just say that this speech does not seem to have been attended with the very unpleasant results that some people in this country feared, who thought it was pitched in too defiant a tone for a small people like the people of Canada, and was calculated to exasperate our neighbors and bring about those unfortunate results. All I can say is that those remarks received a very considerable amount of attention in the press of the United States. Some portions of them appeared in leading journals in the United States; and the result was, Sir, that instead

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of having any reason to suppose that I had been guilty of an indiscreet act in making the references which I felt, as a member of this House, I was bound to make in dealing with the position in which the country stood, the only result, so far as I am aware, was this. I do not know that the speech had any connection with it; but I know this, that a mutual friend—I have no objection to mentioning that it was Mr. Wiman—at an early day after this speech was delivered, intimated to me that he had had a long conversation with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bayard, and that that gentleman had said that he would be very glad to have an opportunity of discussing the mutual relations of Canada and the United States with either my right hon. friend the Premier of Canada or your humble servant. I brought that statement under the notice of His Excellency the Governor-General and my right hon. friend; and as it was quite impossible for him to leave his place in Parliament at that time, I took advantage of the Easter holidays to accept this informal invitation. I went down to Washington, and was presented to Mr. Bayard by Her Majesty's Minister there. Our conversation on that occasion, as you are aware, was personal and private, but the House will be able to gather what the effect of that conversation was, when I refer to the result. It was on the 21st of May that I had that interview with Mr. Bayard, and I can only say that it was a very gratifying one in every possible respect. That distinguished gentleman seemed fully to appreciate what he owed to the great country in which he filled the high function of Secretary of State, and he showed also his appreciation of the importance of maintaining the most friendly commercial relations with Canada. I am relieved, however, from any violation of secrecy in regard to that interview in view of the correspondence which occurred. Mr. Bayard told me that he would repeat our conversation to the President of the United States, and would communicate to me the result at an early day. On the 31st of May, I received a letter with which hon. gentlemen are all familiar. I will not trouble the House with reading the whole of it; but it is necessary, in order to give a proper view of the basis of the conference from which this treaty has resulted, that I should draw the attention of the House to some of the remarks made by Mr. Bayard in that letter. In his letter to me he said:

“The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questioned* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country.”

I am glad to know that Mr. Bayard had too much respect for the people of Canada, and he has since learned, in the most conclusive manner, that his views were well founded, to come to any other conclusion than that no Canadian would ever consent to be legislated for by any country in the world.

“When you were here I prepared to send my reply to the ‘observations’ upon my proposal for the settlement (of November 15 last), which were communicated to Mr. Phelps by Lord Salisbury on March 24, and also to express my views of his lordship's alternative proposition. Your visit and invitation to negotiate here was entirely welcome, and of this I endeavored to impress you. Conversation with the President has confirmed these views and now it remains to give them practical effect. Great Britain being the only treaty-making party to deal with the United States, the envoys of that Government alone are authorised to speak in her behalf and create her obligations. I presume you will be personally constituted a Plenipotentiary of Great Britain to arrange here, with whomsoever may be selected to repre-

sent the United States' terms of agreement, for a *modus vivendi* to meet the present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all future disputes. It appears to me that as matters now stand the colony of Newfoundland ought to be represented and included, for a single arrangement should suffice to regulate all the joint and several interests involved. I should, therefore, be informed speedily through the proper channel as to the authorisation and appointment by the Imperial Government of such representatives.

"The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demand entire frankness. I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other, a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which I am sure no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence."

I replied on the 10th June to Mr. Bayard in the following terms. I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of the letter, but only such parts that will show the basis of this conference:

"MY DEAR MR. BAYARD,—I had great pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31, evincing as it does the importance which you attach to an amicable adjustment of the fisheries question and the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up. I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I note particularly your suggestions that as the interests of Canada are so immediately concerned, Her Majesty's Government should be invited to depute a Canadian statesman to negotiate with you a '*modus vivendi*' to meet present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all disputes,' and I feel no doubt that a negotiation thus undertaken would greatly increase the prospects of a satisfactory solution."

I concluded by saying:

"I have thought it my duty and also the most effectual manner of giving effect to your suggestion, to make known to Lord Lansdowne the purport of my correspondence with you. He is strongly desirous of facilitating a settlement, and will at once bring the matter before the Secretary of State, with an expression of his hope that no time will be lost in taking steps for establishing, by means of personal communications with your Government, a *modus vivendi* such as you have described, and also for arriving at an understanding in regard to a lasting adjustment of our commercial relations."

The result you know. I will read, in order to place the House in full possession of the exact state of affairs, an extract from Mr. Bayard's letter to Mr. Phelps, the American Minister in London:

"The visit here of Sir Charles Tupper, on behalf of the Canadian Government, was received with cordiality, and expressions were exchanged of a mutual desire for the settlement of all existing difficulties, and for the increased freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada. In consequence of the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper on the occasion referred to, I wrote him a personal and unofficial letter on 31st May, and received on 10th June his reply, and copies of this correspondence were duly sent to you. Yesterday, Sir Lionel West handed me, without comment, the following copy of a telegram to him from Lord Salisbury:

"If the Secretary of State will formally propose the appointment of a Commission as suggested by him in his correspondence with Sir Charles Tupper, Her Majesty's Government will agree with great pleasure."

'SALISBURY.'

"And I have just telegraphed you to the following effect:—

"PHELPS, Minister, London.

"Sir Lionel West handed me yesterday a telegram from Lord Salisbury agreeing to the negotiation suggested by him informally in correspondence with Sir Charles Tupper after his visit to this capital, and requesting me to make a formal proposal which will be forwarded to you at once."

'BAYARD.'

I intend to read but two other extracts as the only other parts of this correspondence which are pertinent to the subject:

"The number of plenipotentiaries to be employed on either side does not seem to be immaterial to the object in view. The Treaty of 1854 comprehended the same class of questions substantially, and as I have before remarked in my correspondence with you, was negotiated by the Earl of Elgin, at that time Governor General of Canada, and Mr. Wm. L. Marcy, then the Secretary of State for the United States. By referring also to our prior treaties with Great Britain, it will be found that

the number of plenipotentiaries employed on either side varied, and was frequently unequal."

He further said:

"It is regarded by the President as of the highest importance that a distinct and friendly understanding should without delay be arrived at between the United States and Great Britain touching the question of the rights which belong respectively to the citizens of the United States and the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty in relation to the fisheries on the coasts of the British possessions in North America, and as to any other questions which affect the trade and commercial relations between the United States and those possessions. You are, therefore, instructed to propose to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the appointment of an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, to meet in the city of Washington a Minister Plenipotentiary of the Government of the United States, duly authorized by the respective Governments to treat and discuss the mode of settling all questions which have arisen out of the fisheries on the coasts of British North America, and all other questions affecting the relations between the United States and Her Britannic Majesty's possessions in British North America."

The House having heard those extracts, will at once understand the circumstances under which this conference was brought about and plenipotentiaries appointed on both sides. Her Majesty's Government appointed the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain as leader of the conference on the British side; they appointed Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, Sir Lionel Sackville West, as the second plenipotentiary. The Colonial Minister sent a despatch to Lord Lansdowne, the Governor General of Canada, to say that the British Government wished the Government of Canada to say who would be acceptable as representing the Government of Canada at this conference, and it is only right to my right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) that I should say that they intimated, as it was very naturally to be expected they would, that the appointment to that position of the same distinguished gentleman, who had acted as a Joint High Commissioner in 1871 with such ability and success, would be entirely acceptable to Her Majesty's Government. I came out to Canada without the slightest idea whatever that I would be appointed in connection with this commission. I returned here after having discharged the duties which were incumbent on me and which I had been called upon to perform. Immediately, my right hon. friend told me that he was anxious that I should go to Washington as the third plenipotentiary. Lord Lansdowne was good enough to join in expressing his desire that I should fill that position. I daresay, if the truth were known, my right hon. friend here thought that having had so much to do with the negotiation of this conference, and representing, as I had the honor of representing in the Government of Canada, the interests of one of the most important of the Maritime Provinces, the Province of Nova Scotia, there was a certain fitness in my being called upon to discharge this duty. I thought that, under the circumstances, I could not decline, but I made it a condition that I should have the able and invaluable assistance of my colleague, the Minister of Justice, as the legal adviser of the British side at this conference, as I knew that matters of the greatest importance would arise in which the opinions and the advice and the knowledge of that hon. gentleman, his legal and constitutional knowledge, would be invaluable. With the utmost readiness, that hon. gentleman at once consented to associate himself with the Commission in that capacity; and I must at the same time tender my heartfelt thanks to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose province I was to a certain extent apparently invading, for the very zealous and hearty and valuable co-operation which his intimate knowledge of that subject enabled him to give us. I take this opportunity of saying that a statement which has been made by leading public journals in this country in reference to my own position on that occasion is erroneous. A good deal of sympathy has been expressed for me. I have already mentioned the great kindness which I have received even from my opponents in this country, but an amount of sympathy has been extended to me which I must

disavow any occasion for. A great deal has been said and a great deal of sympathy has been expressed, as to the unfortunate position in which Sir Charles Tupper found himself in Washington in battling on the one side for the rights of Canada, and finding the pressure of Her Majesty's Government on the other side; and that in fact I was compelled, by the strong line which was taken by Her Majesty's representative, Mr. Chamberlain, to yield and surrender what it must have cost me a great deal of pain and suffering to do. I would be unworthy of the position I occupy in this House if I did not at once disavow anything of the kind. I do not think it would have been possible for Her Majesty's Government to make a better and a more judicious selection than they did in Mr. Chamberlain, as the leader of the British side in that conference. That hon. gentleman is one of the foremost statesmen in England; that right hon. gentleman, as the House very well knows, as the leader of the Radical party in Great Britain, was perhaps especially qualified, by the position he occupied in Imperial politics, to be an acceptable envoy to the United States of America; and, after three months of very intimate intercourse and association in the city of Washington, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe it would have been possible for Her Majesty's Government to select any gentleman who would have been more acceptable to all classes of people in that great capital. In regard to my own position in that conference, I have already shown the House how largely I am responsible for what has taken place. The conference was initiated from the interview which took place between myself and Mr. Bayard. I was subsequently asked to serve as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries on that important mission; but I am bound to say that if, instead of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Lionel Sackville West, I had had as my colleagues two of the foremost statesmen of Canada, taken from either side of the House, it would have been impossible to have had the contentions of Canada more uniformly supported than they were from the beginning to the end. If there is any mistake, if this treaty is not what Canada had a right to expect it should be, I am bound to say that there is no man more responsible for that than myself. These hon. gentlemen, from the beginning to the end, stood by the interests of Canada in the most unflinching way. I have heard, in this House and out of this House, that it was desirable that the time should come when Canada could appoint her own plenipotentiaries and envoys to deal with the negotiation of treaties, but I speak from experience and from a knowledge of the facts when I say that a greater mistake it would be impossible to conceive. In the position which Canada occupies, great and important as it is, and with the great future we have undoubtedly before us in the development of the enormous resources of this country, while the time may come when we will be in a position which will enable us to go into an international conference with that power and influence which alone will qualify a plenipotentiary to negotiate with other countries, until that time comes, it is impossible to overrate the value of having the Empire of Great Britain behind us. A plenipotentiary is able to command just that amount of respect when he is fighting a keen and hard battle for his country, just that amount of influence and power which that country commands among the States of the world; and I say that, until we obtain that influence and that power, nothing would be more idle or detrimental or suicidal to the best interests of Canada than to divest ourselves or to be relieved from the potent influence of standing under the ægis of the mightiest Empire in the world. Now, I must say a single word with reference to my colleagues representing the Government of the United States. I have already given you a tolerable insight into the views of Mr. Bayard. That hon. gentleman, as the House knows, is the worthy

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

representative of a long line of the most eminent statesmen in the United States, and no person in the Government of that country commands more uniformly or more deservedly the respect and confidence of the United States than the Hon. T. W. Bayard, the Secretary of State. In the Hon. W. L. Putnam, we had opposed to us a gentleman occupying so distinguished a legal position in New England that his name has been frequently heard within the last fortnight as the successor of that eminent jurist, the late Hon. Chief Justice of the United States; we had in him a gentleman more intimately acquainted with the fishing interests of the United States than almost any other gentleman who could be suggested, and whose legal standing and position are calculated to obtain the confidence and respect of all who know him. In the third plenipotentiary representing the United States, we had Mr. Angell, President of the Michigan University at Ann Arbor, a gentleman who, although a supporter of the Republican party, was selected in consequence of his great professional knowledge of international law, and the fact that he had been selected by a Republican Government in the United States to discharge most important duties as a Commissioner to China, in the arrangement of a treaty. I do not believe, Sir, that it would be possible for any Government in the United States to select three gentlemen more eminently patriotic, more heartily devoted to the interests of their country, than the three gentlemen I have named; and after sitting face to face with them for three months in keen and sharp controversy, the only result of our communication has been to leave upon my mind the very highest respect for the character, standing and ability of those gentlemen, and a desire not only of continuing the acquaintance which I had the pleasure of making with them, but that it should perpetuate a genuine and thorough friendship. I can only say, Sir, that when I came to meet them in conference, I was greatly surprised, and you will not be surprised to learn that such was the case after hearing the papers I have read with reference to commercial intercourse, after the statement of the President of the United States in his Message of 1885, asking for a commission, after the letters which passed between Mr. Bayard and myself, you will readily understand that I went there expecting and looking forward to a settlement of this question on very much the same lines as those upon which it had been settled in 1854, and to some extent, in 1871. I am right in saying that the instructions with which I was charged by this Government were to obtain, if it was possible, as near an approach to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as I could obtain, that is, the policy of carrying out free exchange in the natural products of the two countries, I was to urge that policy, and I think you will have no doubt as to the course pursued by me after reading the proposition that I made in the conference on the 3rd December, 1887:

"Sir Charles Tupper begged leave to submit a note containing the following proposal from the British plenipotentiaries. That with a view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Newfoundland."

It has been suggested that this is very vague. Well, I confess I am unable to see it. I considered that in formulating that proposal, I was bound to ascertain if the Government of the United States were prepared to accept any greater freedom of commercial intercourse, to ascertain to what extent they were prepared to meet Canada in order to secure for their fishermen the enjoyment of the advantage which they had under the Treaty of 1854, and under the Treaty of 1871. If that proposal does not formulate as broad and as general an invitation to the Government of the United States, as could be made, provided they were

willing to deal upon a commercial basis at all, I should be very happy if any hon. gentleman will point out to me wherein the proposition is wanting. And what did Mr. Angell say?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The offer is unrestricted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says the offer is unrestricted, and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity of stating just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocal trade with Canada. I knew, Sir, that the air was full of stories of commercial union, full of stories of unrestricted intercourse, and I thought I could not do a better service to Canada, under these circumstances, than to ascertain at the very outset what was the position of the United States as to that question. I do not hesitate to tell you what that position is. Although I do not intend to make reference to a past debate, in which I regret very deeply I was not able to participate, although a large number of gentlemen dealt with that question on both sides of the House—and I think you were rather fortunate in not having another speech inflicted upon you on that occasion by myself—I shall make no reference to this; but I am bound to take this opportunity of saying that you may go to Washington, as I did, you may mingle for three months, as I did, with the leading men of all parties and all classes, you may go through the House of Representatives from beginning to end, and canvass every man, and you may go to the Senate of the United States and canvass every man, and I say you will not find a single man who will talk to you on the subject of unrestricted reciprocity, as I did not find at the time when public attention was being turned to it in this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are two Bills before Congress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was it not desirable that we should know what the views and sentiments of the United States were upon the subject? Talk to them, Sir, of commercial union—I tell you that I did not meet a man of any party, I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada. Why, Sir? Because he knows that it would give Canada to the United States, he knows that you would occupy the degrading position of having a neighboring country make your tariff, and impose the taxes upon you. I say, Sir, that it is a condition of things from which the most craven Canadian would recoil. This proposition of unrestricted reciprocity, of free trade with the United States, with liberty to make our own tariff with the rest of the world, I say I did not meet a man—I discussed this question fully and freely from day to day with scores of leading public men in the United States—I did not meet a man with an intelligent head on his shoulders, that would talk about such a thing for a single moment. Why, Sir, they treated the very proposition with scorn. They said: "Do you suppose that we intend to make a free trade arrangement with Canada, to adopt free trade with England, and destroy the position that we occupy in relation to all the vast industries of this country? I say, Sir, that under these circumstances I did a service to Canada. And you have got the answer. You did not get from Mr. Bayard the statement: "If you will go the whole length of unrestricted reciprocity with us, if you will make everything free, then we will talk with you." Nothing of the kind. Here is the answer, coming from the leader of the Administration of the United States, which conclusively shows that—I was going to say, but I won't say it, after the interesting and animated discussion we had in this House, I will not say that it was a waste of time to take up a fortnight of the time of Parliament in discussing that which it is just as

rational as to have been discussing how to construct a railway from Canada to the moon. The answer is here:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 20th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd instant as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

I will give the hon. gentlemen something further that will be still more conclusive:

"Nor could the American plenipotentiaries admit that such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing on an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties and remove the present causes of complaint to which end they are now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Mr. Bayard gives a further illustration of the position in his letter to the Senate. It is dated Washington, 22nd March, and in it he says:

"In conformity with the invariable course pursued in previous negotiations, when the conference met it was agreed that an honorable confidence should be maintained in its deliberations, and that only results should be announced and such other matters as the joint protocolists should sign under the direction of the plenipotentiaries. With this understanding, which was strictly kept, the discussions of the conference proceeded, through its numerous and prolonged session, with that freedom and informality in the exchange of views which the nature of the negotiations required and without which its progress would have been materially hampered and any agreement rendered very difficult of attainment."

"Upon the conclusion of the treaty some members of the conference at once left the city under the pressure of other duties, and it is thus possible that some statements were excluded that otherwise might have been placed in the joint protocols."

I have explained to the House my great surprise at finding they did not give what I assumed that the purely formal protocols to which I assented would give, that is to say, all the proposals made, and the counter-proposals and the replies on both sides. I assumed that the protocols would contain those. Mr. Bayard has explained how it was that this was done.

"After the conference had finally adjourned and Sir Charles Tupper had returned to Ottawa, a request was received through the British Minister that assent be given to the publication of a certain proposal which had been submitted by the British plenipotentiaries and decided by the Americans. The consent as desired was given, and I enclose herewith a copy of the papers so referred to. Every point submitted to the conference is covered by the papers now in the possession of the Senate."

I wish the House to note that. Although we have not given any proposals and counter-proposals, here is the statement, which I confirm as being thoroughly and entirely accurate, that the papers submitted to the Senate, as the papers submitted to you give all the information necessary for the consideration of this question.

"Excepting the question of damages sustained by our fishermen, which, being met by the counter-claim for damages to British vessels in Behring's Sea, was left for future settlement."

President Angell, who was one of the commissioners, after he returned home, made the following observations:—

"We were a long time getting down to the real work of the commission, all the parties interested were so varied. The British and Canadian commissioners were especially anxious to make a reciprocal free trade treaty a part of the treaty before they would settle on the fishery question. More than one-half the time was occupied in this manner. The real work has been done within the last month. We told them over and over that the tariff was a matter which must be settled by Congress, and that we could do nothing about it. I must say, if this treaty is not ratified by the Senate they will make a great mistake."

I give you President Angell's statement, and I will now give the House a still more authoritative statement, bear-

ing on the same subject. I have here the report of the Judicial Committee of the House of Representatives, to whom was referred the question as to the power of the President to negotiate treaties with foreign governments. This report is No. 2680, 43 Congress, 2nd Session :

"Mr. Tucker, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report :

"The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution of the House of Representatives embodied in this report, respectfully submit their report thereon."

"The resolution is in these words :

"Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee be directed to report to the House whether the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, can negotiate treaties with foreign Governments by which the duties levied by Congress on importations can be changed or abrogated."

"The question thus referred to the Committee is one of great importance in its relations to our foreign intercourse and our internal Government."

"Your Committee have thus considered the question on the true interpretation of the language of the constitution; upon the construction of the Government itself; on the historic developments of the constitution from its British original through the articles of Confederation to its present form; on analogy to the British prototype; on precedents and the authority; and have come to the conclusion expressed in the following resolution, which, though the discussion has taken a wider range, is confined to the question submitted by the resolution referred to the committee :

"Resolved, that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, cannot negotiate treaties with foreign Governments by which the duties levied by Congress can be changed or abrogated, and such treaties to be operative as law must have the sanction of an Act of Congress."

I have therefore shown the grounds on which the United States plenipotentiaries are refused in the most positive manner, as they have stated in their reply over and over again, to take up the question of trade relations. You may ask me then what Mr. Bayard meant by using the words "these commercial questions and this commercial intercourse between the two countries." I confess I was misled. I confess frankly I took the same view as hon. gentlemen would take, I think, on reading his letter to me and my letter to him and his instructions to Mr. Phelps, and I was not prepared to be met by an absolute refusal on the part of the United States plenipotentiaries to take up and consider the question of commercial intercourse at all. But the explanation was this, and I think it is right and fair that in his absence I should give it. Mr. Bayard states now, and has stated throughout, his great desire to have the freest commercial intercourse between the two countries consistent with the position and interest of the two countries. He says, if you want to see the policy of the Government of the United States you have it in the President's Message to Congress; there is our policy. Our policy is to meet this enormous surplus of revenue in the United States, not by a reduction which will strike at the labor and capital of the country by reducing the duty on manufactured articles simply and purely, but it is to meet it by two courses—by making everything that operatives use cheap, by making it free, by making the natural products of the two countries free; in other words, by removing the duties from the food and things that are used by operatives, and by removing the duties from raw materials, which instead of directly aiding the manufacturing industries is a protective policy. I say, Sir, that after studying the policy of the United States, the Democratic—the free trade party of the United States as they are very improperly called, for there is no free trade party in the United States, they have got beyond that long ago—after examining their policy, after reading the President's message, after reading the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, after reading the speech of Mr. Carlisle, the Speaker of the House of Representatives on taking the chair, I have come to the conclusion that their policy is just as close to the policy of the Government of Canada as any two things possibly can be. Our policy is to make natural products free, our policy is to make raw materials free, our policy is to make the country as cheap a country as we can for the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

artisan, and at the same time to give his labor such a return, by such protection of the manufacturing industries of the country, as will build up those manufactures and give employment to the people. Now, Sir, that is our policy. Mr. Bayard and those other gentlemen said that "there is only one way to reach this (for Congress alone can take the duty off any article), and on account of the exasperation that has been excited in this country by those fishery difficulties you have seen the result, you have got an unanimous Bill passed by the House of Representatives and passed by the Senate and assented to by the President, you have got a Bill to meet what they hold was the inhospitable conduct, (they used good deal stronger terms in some of their State papers I am very sorry to say), of Canada in reference to the treatment of their fishermen, our representatives have said that they would never purchase from Canada any immunity for their fishermen by reciprocal trade arrangements" imbued (and improperly imbued), as their minds were, with the idea that we had adopted that policy to force reciprocity upon them. They imagined we did it for this purpose instead of doing it as we did it to protect our rights. While we were ready to have the freest commercial intercourse in the natural products of the two countries we never attempted to use that as a means or as a lever by which to coerce the people of the United States. We were simply and wholly animated by a desire to protect as we were bound to do the fishermen of this country who are engaged in one of our greatest and most important industries. Well, Sir, what was this Bill? It not only provided for shutting Canadian fishing vessels of all descriptions out of their ports but it contained a provision against all interchange of trade. Here is one of the provisions :

"That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that American fishermen are visiting or being in the waters or at any ports or places of the British Dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law, or are or they lately have been unjustly vexed or harassed in the enjoyment of such rights, or subjected to unreasonable restrictions, regulations or requirements in respect to such rights; or otherwise unjustly vexed or harassed in said waters, ports or places, or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any such fishing vessels or fishermen having a permit under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places, in the British Dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places, in the same manner and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most favored nations, or shall be unjustly vexed or harassed in respect thereof, or otherwise be unjustly vexed or harassed therein, or shall be prevented from purchasing such supplies as may there be lawfully sold to trading vessels of the most favored nation; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews so arriving at or being in such British waters or ports or places in the British Dominions of North America are or then lately have been denied any of the privilege therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews of the most favored nation or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either or all of such cases it shall be lawful and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion, by proclamation to that effect, to deny vessels, their masters and crews of the British Dominions of North America, any entrance into the waters, ports or places of or within the United States (with such exceptions in regard to vessels in distress, stress of weather or needing supplies as to the President shall seem proper) whether such vessels shall have come directly from said dominions on such destined voyage or by way of some port or place in such destined voyage elsewhere;—"

And this point covering complete non-intercourse with the entire country.

—"and also to deny entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish or any other product of said dominions or other goods coming from said dominions to the United States."

That was the law placed upon the Statute-book of the United States by the unanimous vote I believe of both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. If there was a "no" at all it was a single one. That expressed the sentiments and the feeling in the United States of America, and our friends the plenipotentiaries represent-

ing the United States, said: "If we make a treaty with you, however small the inducement, you might be willing to accept and consent to it, is certain of absolute rejection by the Senate, because the Congress of the United States have stated their position firmly, and they will not permit any interference on the part of the Administration of the United States by treaty, with anything that involves a change in the fiscal laws of the United States. They said secondly that not only was that the case but such was the expression of public men in regard to Canada and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen, that if to-morrow any relaxation of the commerce of the United States was made by an Act of Congress it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operations so as to deny us its advantage. But they say our policy is proclaimed on the house tops, you will read it in the President's speech, you will see it everywhere, our policy is as far as we can to make the natural products that come into the country free and what lies in the way of that policy is this irritation connected with the fishery question. If we can solve that, if we can take that out of the way you will find at once that our own independent policy; the policy of the United States on this question of commercial intercourse will be such as to produce the most intimate commercial relations again with the Dominion of Canada." And, Sir, under those circumstances, denied as we were the free consideration of the question, of which fact I have given you abundant evidence, we turned our attention to the only means by which we could avert what everybody would feel would be the greatest disaster that could befall this country. We turned our attention to the means by which it could be averted and those were the removal of those causes of irritation between the United States and Canada (for it was Canada rather than Great Britain that was referred to) and by removing those causes of irritation, and giving free scope to this policy to which they were committed, we believe that it would at a very early day give us everything that we could desire in the way of greater freedom of commercial intercourse. Now, Sir, I am in somewhat a similar position in explaining this treaty, which I have now reached, to that in which I was in 1871 when defending the treaty of my right hon. friend under somewhat different circumstances. Then I said: "Every word that you force us to say in support of this treaty will be used against us at Halifax in diminution of the payment that we are entitled to for the greater value of our fisheries." To-day I am in a somewhat similar position. For every word that I say in defence of the treaty to which I have put my hand and to which I ask the sanction of this House with the utmost confidence, every word that I say in support of it may be used to-morrow in the Senate of the United States, where support to the treaty may be more difficult to obtain than it is in the House of Commons of Canada. The House will, therefore, understand that on this occasion it cannot be expected from me that I shall point out very elaborately the great advantages accruing to Canada under the treaty to which we have placed our hands. What I say is this—I say, Sir, that the course that has been adopted in reference to this treaty has been adopted with a view to secure in the way that was found practicable, the best interests of Canada. I am told, in fact I received a message, that the hon. leader of the Opposition wished me to lay on the Table of the House a map showing what Canada claimed under the Treaty of 1818 in regard to the headland question, and another map to show what the result of this treaty was—how much we had surrendered, or how much we had secured. I can only say that I am not able to respond to that invitation, for this reason, that this treaty provides, in regard to the delimitation, that the work shall be done by commissioners, two appointed on each side, eminent men of high qualifications, who shall mark on British admiralty charts the lines as they are laid down and agreed to in the

treaty. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will at once see that it would not do for me to anticipate the action of that court of delimitation, or to undertake in advance to set aside the important work with which they are charged, and give exactly my view of it.

Mr. LAURIER. I have seen it done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He has seen it done, and he has seen it done in this very case. I have seen in the *New York Herald*—I do not know who gave it to them—the delimitation marked; and I have seen in the *Globe* newspaper that very enterprising journal which gives so much attention to these important questions—this question of delimitation dealt with, and a map published showing the results of the delimitation, both as to Newfoundland and as to Canada. Now, I do not intend to endorse the letter-press of this article, which declares that there has been a complete surrender of Canadian interests by your humble servant; but I will say this much, that this is a very good effort on the part of an enterprising journal to put before the country the results of the delimitation as described in the treaty. It is very specifically described in the treaty, and those who study this map attentively, will, I think, be able to form a very fair idea of the results—quite as good as they would from any unauthorised map which I could have constructed, and which I would have no right to lay before the House. I do not think it was a complete surrender, and I will briefly tell the House why. But before proceeding to that matter, I may say that there was one subject on which I was glad to find that the American plenipotentiaries, and myself especially were entirely as one. They expressed no wish to acquire the right to fish in the jurisdictional waters of Canada. With that expression of opinion on their part I heartily concurred. I believe, Sir, it would have been difficult to obtain any possible treaty that could repay Canada for having her inestimable fishing grounds thrown open again to United States fishermen. With the recent modes of catching fish by means of purse seines, my fear would be that if our fishing grounds were thrown open to our neighbors to the south of us, in ten or fifteen years we should have very little more fisheries than they have. I believe such an event would lead to their destruction, and, therefore, I was very glad to find that there was no desire in the part of the United States to acquire the right to fish in the inshore grounds of Canada; and I want it to be kept steadily in view that in all the arrangements provided by this treaty, Canada holds for Canadians her fishing grounds for their own exclusive use and benefit; and, Sir, with the intelligence, the industry, and the enterprise of our people, I am quite certain that they will be able under the provisions of this treaty to hold their own anywhere. I will now, Sir, proceed to deal with the subject of the treaty itself, and I take up first the most important question, that of delimitation. I need not tell you that that is a question which for seventy years has been an open sore. It is a question, which from the day the Treaty of 1818 was signed down to the present hour, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) knows, has been a most fertile cause of discussion between the United States and Great Britain and Canada. The Americans have maintained from the very outset that what we termed our exclusive right to shut them out of all bays was not well founded in the treaty. They have maintained for seventy years that they had an indefeasible right under that treaty to approach within three miles of the shore of any bay or indentation. My hon. friend shakes his head; but I hold in my hand authorities, and I could give them to him by the score, in which they have again and again maintained that position, and demanded that right.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did not Great Britain for forty years enforce her construction of that Treaty of 1818?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that nobody knows better than my hon. friend that Great Britain induced him to recall his regulations and instructions, after he had issued them, and restricted his jurisdiction to within three miles of the shore.

Mr. MITCHELL. And why? Because Great Britain could control the Government of this country, and I had to do it; that is why.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never mind. My hon. friend's enquiry was as to the position of Great Britain, and I give it to him. Great Britain has always contended, and has rightly contended, for technical exclusion from any bay, and the Crown officers of England have sustained that contention. But my hon. friend knows that it is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman let me put one question to him? He states that Great Britain has held a technical construction of the Treaty of 1818. I would say that Great Britain has actually enforced her technical construction for forty years. And with reference to what the hon. gentleman says about exclusion from bays, the first decision was given in reference to the Bay of Fundy, where the headland on one side was American and the headland on the other was Canadian or Nova Scotian. That was the first give-away of our treaty rights.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend then means that for the first forty years Great Britain held a particular view which she has abandoned for the last forty years.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not mean that. I will say what I mean if the hon. gentleman will let me. I say that for the first forty years Great Britain legitimately enforced that contention and the Americans recognised it. Under the decision in the case of the Bay of Fundy, one side of which was American and the other side Nova Scotian, it was held that that bay was not exclusively an English bay, and upon the decision in that case our rights were given away and suspended by England, and were not enforced as strictly as they had been before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion by my hon. friend, because I do not question very much his statement; but I want to ask him whether he thinks a right which is technically claimed but practically abandoned for forty years, is gaining in strength. I take a different view. But perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to proceed, and reserve his remarks for a future period. On the 17th September, 1841, Lord Stanley wrote to Lord Falkland—

"Her Majesty's Government have attentively considered the representations contained in your despatches, respecting the policy of granting permission to the fishermen of the United States to fish in the Bay of Chaleurs, and other large bays of a similar character on the coast of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; and apprehending, from your statement, that any such general concession would be injurious to the interests of the British North American Provinces, we have abandoned the intention we had entertained on the subject, and shall adhere to the strict letter of the treaties which exist between Great Britain and the United States, relative to the fisheries in North America, except in so far as they may relate to the Bay of Fundy, which has been thrown open to the North Americans under certain restrictions."

So that Lord Stanley, intimated practically that what was done in the bay of Fundy was to be the rule.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The very opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He says in so many words that this was what they had intended but that they had abandoned the idea upon representation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let the hon. gentleman read it again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER:—

"Mr. Everett thought that the negotiations were now in a most favorable state —"

That is, after the Bay of Fundy was given up.

"—for a full and satisfactory adjustment of the dispute.

He had the fullest assurance that the British Government contemplated a further extension of the same policy by the adoption of a general regulation that American fishermen should be allowed freely to enter all bays of which the mouths were not more than six miles in width."

In May, 1845, Lord Stanley communicated this intention to Lord Falkland, who immediately replied. Then Nova Scotia came forward, and Canada came forward, and the result of their firm remonstrances, based on this constitutional right, was that he receded from the intention to allow the Americans to go within three miles of the shore, and decided to maintain the original contention.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what I said exactly. I come to this question, and, as I said before, no public officer, in my judgment, no Minister, ever exhibited more zeal or ability in the management of his department than did my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Never mind that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the time it was organised under his charge he showed the greatest possible determination to hold on to all that he had, and to get as much as he could in the interests of Canada. Now, I will draw the attention of my hon. friend and the House to the fact that, actuated by that motive, in 1870, he sent out the following instructions:

"In such capacity your jurisdiction must be strictly confined within the limit of three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of Canada, with respect to any action you may take against American fishing vessels and the United States citizens engaged in fishing."

Mr. MITCHELL. Under instructions from England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. This is before the pressure, as the hon. gentleman will see, but he went on trying to get in the thin end of another wedge, and I commend his attempt. He said:

"Where any of the bays, creeks, or harbors, shall not exceed ten geographical miles in width, you will consider that the line of demarcation extends from headland to headland, either at the entrance of such bay, creek, or harbor, or from and between given points on both sides thereof, at any place nearest the mouth, where the shores are less than ten miles apart; and may exclude foreign fishermen and fishing vessels therefrom, or seize, if found within three marine miles of the coast."

Then he went on to give the jurisdiction and the action that should be taken under it; and the bays from which he instructed his officers to exclude American fishing vessels are those ten miles in width. What since? We have a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General:

"Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing except within three miles from land or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth."

That is the answer to the instructions. My hon. friend, I grant you, was under compulsion; he was, I grant you, under pressure from Her Majesty's Government; but that only makes the case stronger from my standpoint, and my standpoint is that in the position we occupy, dependent upon Her Majesty's Government for that right arm, and strength, and power, which will enforce a regard for the interests of the people of this country, we must have some deference for Her Majesty's Government. Considering that fostering care which Her Majesty's Government have at all times given the interests of Canada, we are bound to reciprocate by meeting any just claim for consideration from the party which is mainly involved in our contentions. Therefore, I say my hon. friend was right, but he did withdraw that instruction, and he issued in its place the following instructions, as contained in a report of Council:—

"The Council is aware that when the British Government in 1845 opened the Bay of Fundy to American fishermen, as an amicable relaxation of treaty rights, the act was officially regarded as a practical abandonment by American authorities of the British construction of the Convention of 1818. It was immediately followed by a demand for general application to all intends exceeding six miles in width."

So that I say to my hon. friend that I gave in his own terms, as sustaining the statement that I made of the demand of the Government of the United States to have access to our waters within three miles of the shore, whether in bays or out of bays.

Mr. MITCHELL. I promised not to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I will not; but I will simply say that I have a complete answer to that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is so ingenious that he could answer himself over and over again.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is so careful in his public capacity that he can do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no fault to find with my hon. friend in his public capacity. I have a great deal more fault to find with him in his private capacity, as sitting on the other side of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you think there is much difference between us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Here is a despatch from Downing Street, dated 6th June 1870:

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no step should be taken which should prejudice the question."

I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this was not a settled or concluded question, that it was not a question upon which the Governments of Great Britain and the United States had agreed or on which they had arrived at a common interpretation; and I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to the doubt that Her Majesty's Government had upon the subject. What do they say?

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question—what are Canadian waters? Or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within those waters except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818."

But they do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise; and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasions of dispute, so far as this is possible, consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries. With those objects, they think it advisable that United States fishermen should not be excluded from any waters except within three miles from the shore, or in the unusual case of a bay which is less than six miles wide at its mouth but spreads to a greater width within. It will, of course, be understood and explained to the United States Government that this liberty is conceded temporarily and without prejudice to the right of Great Britain to fall back on her treaty rights, if the prospect of an arrangement lessens, or if the concession is found to interfere practically with the protection of the Canadian fisheries. That was also a despatch from Lord Granville. Now, under the pressure of this, as my hon. friend has stated, he changed his instructions in reference to the ten miles and put in six miles, and forbade his officers to interfere with the American fishermen, not as in the first instructions he gave, if they were within three miles of the mouth of the bay, but only if they were within three miles of the shore, and he says:

"Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen unless found within three miles of the shore, or

within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek, which, though in parts more than six miles wide, is less than six geographical miles in width at its mouth. In the case of any other bay, as Baie des Chaleurs, for example —"

The very bay he excluded them from was more than ten miles wide.

—"you will not interfere with any United States fishing vessel or boat or any American fishermen, unless they are found within three miles of the shore."

Mr. MITCHELL. Under positive instructions from England, against my representations and everything else.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I have satisfied my hon. friend that, as far as Her Majesty's Government were concerned, while they maintained the abstract right under the treaty, they were unwilling to raise the question of bays, and the result is, as my hon. friend knows, that for the last thirty-four years, certainly since 1854—and I will not go further back than 1854—there has been no practical interference with American fishing vessels unless they were within three miles of the shore, in bays or elsewhere.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will his honor allow me to ask him one question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to do it now. I was in hopes to finish by 6 o'clock and I am sure the House will sympathise with me in that desire. This Government instead of considering this as a question passed beyond controversy, did what? The hon. gentleman was a member of the Government at the time, and the Government deputed Mr., now Sir Alexander Campbell to go to Lord Kimberley and ask for the appointment of a commission on which England and the United States and Canada would be represented, to settle what was the correct view in reference to the British bays, to settle this very question of delimitation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, no, not that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. For the purpose of maintaining colonial rights to the fisheries as claimed by England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read from a despatch of Lord Kimberley:

"Mr. Campbell brought under my consideration the following subjects:—The first was the protection of the Canadian fisheries from encroachments by foreign fishing vessels. On this point I concur with your Ministers, that it would be desirable that the questions which have been so long in dispute with the United States, as to the geographical limits of the exclusive fishing rights of Canada under the Treaty of 1818, should be settled, by a joint British and American commission, on which the Dominion should be represented. Her Majesty's Government will propose to the United States Government the appointment of such a commission."

I give that to the House as the proof that, so far from this being regarded as a question upon which no question could arise, it was not so treated. Lord Kimberley, in a despatch of the 10th October, 1870, said:

"The object of Her Majesty's Government is, as you will observe, to give effect to the wishes of your Government, by appointing a joint commission, on which Great Britain, the United States and Canada are to be represented, with the object of enquiring what ought to be the geographical limits of the exclusive fisheries of the British North American colonies. In accordance with the understood desire of your advisers, it is proposed that the enquiry should be held in America."

And then there is a memorandum from the Foreign Office giving the reasons for the appointment of that commission, and from that I will read a single sentence:

"The right of Great Britain to exclude American fishermen from waters within three miles of the coast is unambiguous, and, it is believed, uncontested. But there appears to be some doubt what are the waters described as within three miles of bays, creeks, and harbors. When a bay is less than six miles broad, its waters are within the three miles limit, and therefore clearly within the meaning of the treaty; but, when it is more than that breadth, the question arises whether it is a bay of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions."

I hope I have satisfied the House that, so far from the question of delimitation, when we took it up at Washington, being one on which no question could be raised, it was an open question in which Canada and Great Britain on the one side maintained an extreme contention, and the United States Government maintained the very reverse, which was also an extreme contention.

Mr. MITCHELL. Nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I have not made it clear to the hon. gentleman, I am sure I have not been so unfortunate with the rest of the House. Now, what more? The hon. gentleman knows that, in the first place, the Government of Canada had agreed to a commission to ascertain what these rights were. Would we agree to a commission to ascertain whether a foot of land in Canadian territory was ours or belonged to some one else? The hon. gentleman knows that we would not, but we did agree to this commission. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed a little while ago to be somewhat restive as to whether there was any doubt at all on this subject. A great many members in this House will recollect that, when the Treaty of Washington had been arranged, that hon. gentleman moved in this House that, before the Halifax Commission should sit, the doubts respecting our geographical limits should first be settled. I am not saying that I did not agree with him, but I say that at that time the question was not raised properly, and I opposed him, and I gave my reasons for so opposing him. If you look at the debates of that date, you will find, in the statements made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government and those of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, the desire was expressed that these doubts, which undoubtedly did exist, should be set at rest, but we did not think the time opportune before the sitting of that Halifax Commission. When we changed sides, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) sat on this side of the House, with the hon. member who, I regret to know, is no longer able to lead that side of the House, after having pressed upon us the vital importance of having this question settled before the Halifax Commission sat, they forgot all about it. When they had to deal with the responsibilities of office, and to discharge the duties which rest upon Ministers of the Crown, they agreed with us that it was not desirable to raise the question before the sitting of the Halifax Commission, and they have allowed it to sleep until now. I am frank to say that the British plenipotentiaries now have made concessions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but did he ever hear of any two nations, or of any two individuals, who had a difficulty or controversy between them, going into an arrangement to have it amicably settled and adjusted without both sides giving way in some degree or other? I think the very spirit and policy of this omission which was proposed, was to ascertain, to settle and to rule these doubts, and I say, when we met these gentlemen and they proposed to us this ten mile limit, and said: If you give up the extreme contention that no bay, however broad its mouth, can be entered by an American fisherman, we will agree to take the ten mile limit, and when they met us further and said that, in addition to that they would take up and consider the question of any special bays we thought ought not to be open to foreigners, then we took this question up, as we were bound to take it up, and found a solution by mutual concession. Instead of giving them their contention that they could go into the Baie des Chaleurs within three miles of the shore, we made a treaty by which they cannot enter the Baie des Chaleurs at all. And

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the hon. gentleman knows that the Miramichi Bay, the Egmont Bay, and a number of other bays that we consider of vital importance to be kept free from any kind of intrusion, have been conceded to us on the one side. We met them in a spirit of concession. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that when we parted, and long before we parted, we were animated by the conviction that we owed it to the countries we represented, by mutual concessions, as far as could possibly be done, to find such a solution as would settle these questions that have disturbed the intercourse and threatened the peace of the two greatest English-speaking nations of the world, on the best terms that we could possibly find.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman tell us the meaning of article 5?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will possess his soul in patience for a little while, I will try to do so. What is article 5? If the hon. gentleman has it in his hands, perhaps he will read it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).—

"Article V.—Nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters any such interior portions of any bays, creeks, or harbors as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within the three marine miles mentioned in Article I of the Convention of October 20, 1818."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am obliged to my hon. friend for his question, and I will give him a most explicit and, I am quite sure, a satisfactory answer. I hold the delimitation of a bay in my hands. It is imaginary, it is true, but it is none the less just what you may meet with at the mouth of any bay. This bay is fifteen miles from mainland to mainland, and yet under the instructions of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) not to go within three miles of the shore, they could not get into that bay. Why? Because there is an island in the mouth of the bay, and the island carries its three miles of mainland stretched around it, the same as the mainland. I will send it over to my hon. friend to show him just what that article means, and the reason why it was necessary, in order to provide for a possible contingency by which a bay being fifteen miles wide, they could not get into it now. I said: You do not propose by that ten-mile arrangement to enter a bay that you could not enter upon the six-mile arrangement, do you? Certainly not. Then I gave them this delimitation, and that was put in the treaty for the purpose of giving effect to it, and to prevent giving any possible uncertainty. Now, Sir, as I said before, we were met in a broad and liberal spirit, and I think the sentiment that animated us on both sides was that we owed it to each other and to the countries we represented, not to quarrel over points that could be satisfactorily adjusted, and that if it were possible to find a solution that would be equitable to both countries and advantageous to all, it was our duty to find that solution, and to agree upon terms that we could honorably ask Great Britain on the one side, and the United States on the other, and Canada, to accept, as a great improvement upon the existing condition of things. Therefore, as I said, all made the concession, not of any thing that has been enforced practically by Canada, but the technical right to exclude from bays that were more than six miles wide.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before passing away entirely from the subject of delimitation, to which I drew the attention of the House for some time, I would like to say that in addition to the doubts which have been admitted on all sides to exist and required to be set at rest, the Government

of the United States had a very strong standing ground, a very strong position, in the delimitation which was adopted by what was called the North Sea convention, a convention between Her Britannic Majesty, the German Emperor, the King of Prussia, the King of the Belgians, the King of Denmark, the President of the French Republic, and the King of the Netherlands, regulating the North Sea fisheries. This convention was signed at The Hague on the 6th May, 1882; and if, upon a deliberate review of the bays from which foreign vessels should be excluded, the powers adopted the principle of limiting that exclusion to bays that were less than ten miles in width, you can readily see the strong position the Government of the United States would have in claiming that the delimitation should have some regard to the international policy of these great countries that had been dealing with a precisely similar question. Article 2 of the convention says:

"The fishermen of each country shall enjoy the exclusive right to fish within a distance of three miles from low water mark."

"The three marine miles mentioned in Article I of the Convention of October 20, 1818, shall be measured seaward from low water mark; but at every bay, creek or harbor, not otherwise specially provided for in this treaty, such three marine miles shall be measured seaward from a straight line drawn across the bay, creek or harbor in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten marine miles."

As I have said before, to accept the delimitation, to accept as the jurisdictional waters of Canada from which foreigners shall be excluded, the ten-mile limit as proposed by the Government of the United States, was to stand not only upon the ground that a good deal of doubt and hesitation seem to have been exhibited by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Canada in dealing with that subject, but they had in addition the precedent of the Hague convention, where all the great powers to which I have referred, after careful examination and deliberation, decided that the fishermen of all countries should be at liberty to come into any waters where the bay was more than ten miles wide at the mouth. When we accepted this ten mile delimitation, which was all that appears to have been aimed at by any Canadian Government, the extreme limit that any person had proposed as a matter of delimitation, we made it a condition of the acceptance of that restriction that certain bays should be exempted from its operation, and although I have furnished hon. gentlemen opposite with a chart on which those delimitations are marked by myself, as I thought it would hardly do to do that, it will be seen by the examination of such representations as have been given on this subject, that the exceptions which the plenipotentiaries of the United States were willing to concede have left us very small ground for complaint, although I frankly state it was a concession made by the plenipotentiaries of Her Majesty for the purpose of arriving at a common ground on which we could solve the difficulties with which this question was surrounded. Our concessions did not stop there. I am quite ready to admit, and I think it might as well be stated in the outset, that the Canadian Government would find it, I would find it quite as difficult as our friends the plenipotentiaries of the United States would find it, to justify this treaty if it was to be examined in the light of the extreme contentions maintained previously. I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right for the representatives of Government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The ground they took was quite right, they were authorised by the strict terms of the treaty in taking the strong ground they did, they would have failed in their duty to this House and to this country if, called upon to deal with this question as a mat-

ter of diplomatic intercourse and discussion between the Government of the United States and of Canada, they had not taken the extreme contention that the literal terms of the Treaty of 1818 would warrant. They did their duty in adopting that course; but when it came to a question of conference, to a question of international discussion for the purpose of ascertaining whether between the extreme contention on the one side and the extreme contention on the other, any standing ground may be found on which the two parties may meet and settle a dispute of great international difficulty by mutual concession, the case is entirely altered, and the responsibility resting upon the plenipotentiaries of any country would be very great if they refused to consider fair and reasonable concessions on the one side and to meet them by fair and reasonable concessions on the other. So that I have no hesitation in saying that, dealing with this great question in that spirit, dealing with a question that is of vital importance to the British Empire, of vital importance to the Government of Great Britain who were constantly threatened with being embarrassed and brought into serious difficulties and collision with the great country to the south of us, a question too of great magnitude to the United States of America, a question of still greater magnitude, in my judgment, to the people of Canada, one on which we had more at stake and more to lose in a great struggle of that kind than either of the great countries to which I have referred—I say looking at the question in that broad and national spirit, looking at it with a desire to remove the possibility of what I consider would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the civilised world, a collision between the two great English-speaking families, looking at it from that broad standpoint, it would have been criminal on my part and on the part of those who represented Her Majesty's Government and the interests of the people of Canada if they had hesitated, by making fair and reasonable concessions, to endeavor to find a common standing ground that would present a solution of those important and serious questions, that might enable a treaty to be formulated and accepted as a just and equitable settlement upon both sides. As I have said, our concessions did not rest at the delimitation. We come now to the next portion of the treaty, and that is the treatment of American fishermen within our waters. I trust I have explained article 5 to the satisfaction of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and the other articles immediately following refer to the mode of delimitation and do not require any special remarks from me. Article 9 says:

"Nothing in this treaty shall interrupt or affect the free navigation of the Strait of Canso by fishing vessels of the United States."

I may explain to the House that that was not a surrender of British interests or Canadian interests at the dictation or at the request of the plenipotentiaries of the United States. That clause was inserted in the treaty by ourselves, and for this reason: That the rule for the delimitation which was adopted, the ten-mile rule, would have necessarily excluded, if we took in Chedabucto Bay, which we did take in by making the delimitation, as hon. gentlemen will see, not from one side of the main land of the bay to the other, which would have opened it to the United States, but from the island between; by that delimitation the United States would have been shut out altogether from passing through the Strait of Canso because they could not have gone into Chedabucto Bay, and therefore they asked that Chedabucto Bay should be excluded from the delimitation, from being an exclusive bay, in order to prevent their being shut out of the navigation of that Straits of Canso. Well, Sir, under those circumstances we met that by providing nothing new. We provided simply that nothing in this treaty should interrupt the free navigation of the Straits of Canso, as previously enjoyed by fishing vessels to which we confined it, and in that way we avoided making an exception of Cheda-

bucto Bay, which is the entrance from the Atlantic side to the Straits of Canso. Article 10 provides:

"That United States fishing vessels entering the bays or harbors referred to in Article I of this treaty shall conform to harbor regulations common to them and to fishing vessels of Canada or Newfoundland."

I do not think that requires any reference on my part because it speaks for itself, and it simply provides that whatever harbor regulations there are in force the fishing vessels shall be obliged to conform to them. Article 10 further provides:

"They need not report, enter, or clear, when putting into such bays or harbors for shelter or repairing damages, nor when putting into the same, outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or of obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than twenty-four hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein, may be required to report, enter, or clear; and no vessel shall be excused hereby from giving due information to boarding officers."

I may say, Sir, with reference to this, that a great deal was made of the apparent injustice of subjecting vessels obliged to put in for humane purposes, such as vessels in distress and vessels under stress of weather to come under the clause of the treaty that allowed vessels to come in for those four purposes. A great deal was made of the difficulties that were thrown in their way, and the obstructions that were placed apparently by Canada, in the way of their exercising and enjoying those privileges that the Treaty of 1818 clearly and distinctly provided they should enjoy. I think, Sir, that this House and the people of this country will agree with me that it was not undesirable in the interests of good neighborhood, in the interests of the good reputation of Canada for humane and friendly consideration to vessels in distress, obliged to put into our ports for shelter, and especially where they had under the treaty right a right to come in under such circumstances, that we should remove any obstructions or hindrances that lay in their way. It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the commission to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port who had been collector for 9 years was examined and gave his testimony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked:

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?"

His answer was, as I remember:

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

Under those circumstances we felt that we might fairly allow vessels that had no connection with the shore, vessels coming in distress, or vessels coming in under stress of weather to take shelter on our coast, that we might fairly exempt them from reporting for a period of 24 hours provided they did not touch the shore. It was represented that in many cases the previous regulations had involved great hardship and difficulty, that the custom houses were remote from the outlying portions of the harbor where the shelter was obtained, and that to remain long enough to go up to the custom house officer and to make the necessary report would involve a very serious delay and might prevent them getting to sea at all at the time they would desire. I do not conceive that any very great injury to our interests is likely to result where these privileges are only extended

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to vessels which are not permitted at all to communicate with the shore. The moment they have a communication with the shore, that moment it is incumbent upon them to report, or they are liable to the pains and penalties provided by this Act if they do not do so. I think this House will agree with me and I believe the people of this country will agree with me that it was a wise provision to relieve them of what they found to be a great hardship, and so aid in effecting the removal of a very false impression abroad where people did not understand how stringent the necessity was for guarding their shelter.

"They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage."

It was represented that a fisherman coming in by distress or by stress of weather was compelled to take a pilot or was subject to the charge for a pilot and that this was felt to be very onerous while the fact is that our own fishermen were practically free from any such pilotage regulations and it was therefore a concession to remove the pilotage dues. I admit it was a concession to relieve them from the charge of pilotage. It was a case in which in my judgment "the play was not worth the candle," and the money that would be obtained for pilotage was very small, while it would create a most unpleasant impression abroad if it were understood that while giving them the shelter the treaty compelled us to give them, we took the opportunity to force upon them a charge for pilotage that they did not require and which they thought unnecessary.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are not vessels under a certain size exempted from pilotage, Sir Charles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under 80 tons they are exempt. As my hon. friend knows our fishermen are pilots themselves, and they do not require to pay, and this was practically putting their fishermen upon the same footing as our own fishermen in regard to this charge.

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And the same regulation, we were informed, was the practice in the ports of the United States. At all events we believed that that was not a very great concession to make.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is right; it is not much. I think he will quite agree with me it was too small a matter to quarrel over—too small a matter to be a question of a breach between two nations.

Mr. MITCHELL. If you did nothing more than that we would be satisfied.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the same time it was a contention, and it was a concession for the purpose of meeting them half way as far as we were able, and which we were glad to be able to do. The article further says:—

"They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage; nor, when therein for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, shall they be liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues, or other similar dues; but this enumeration shall not permit other charges inconsistent with the enjoyment of the liberties reserved or secured by the Convention of October 20, 1818."

The truth is that although there appears to be a considerable concession in that it does not amount to much from the fact that we have no light dues. In Newfoundland where they have rather heavy light dues it is a much more serious concession than it is in Canada, but Mr. Winter, the able Attorney General of Newfoundland, whose advice and assistance we had throughout these negotiations, felt that that was a concession that the island of Newfoundland would not object to although they would lose something in the way of light dues. Now, Sir, article 11 provides:

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada or of the coasts of

Newfoundland under stress of weather or other casualty may unload, reload, tranship or sell, subject to customs laws and regulations, all fish on board, when such unloading, transshipment, or sale is made necessary as incidental to repairs, and may replenish outfits, provisions and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needful facilities, including the shipping of crews."

I do not think, Sir, I shall have to take much time in satisfying this House that, although this is a very considerable and important concession, and although we were not compelled, in my judgment, under a strict literal interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 to make it, it was a wise and judicious concession to make. What would be thought of Canada if an American, or a United States fishing vessel—I do not like to use the word American, because I think it is a term we have as much right to as our neighbors; I prefer to speak of them as the people of the United States, and ourselves as Canadians, and when I speak of the whole continent of America, I do not hesitate to apply the term American to the people of both Canada and the United States. But what would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States, loaded with mackerel or fish of any other description, were driven by stress of weather, and perhaps in a sinking condition and compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if, instead of allowing her to tranship her cargo or sell it on paying the duty and go to a marine yard for repairs, we said: No, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo, because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you not refuse a vessel that privilege?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that under the Treaty of 1818, we could refuse. Under the strict interpretation of that treaty, they had no right to unload their cargo and tranship or sell it; but what I say is that in making this concession—it is an undoubted concession—we were only acting from the dictates of humanity and with a due regard to the credit and reputation of our country all over the world.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I ask the question, did you not refuse it in one case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not refuse.

Mr. MITCHELL. You would not, I know; you are too warm-hearted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend really wants a frank answer—and he knows how frank I desire to be on all these occasions—I will tell him. I said: Under this treaty you have no right to do it, but we will allow you to do it when the application is made; but, we said it must not be regarded as a precedent, but it is a concession, and in attempting to reach a settlement of these questions there must be concessions on both sides. Article 11 further provides:

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels, having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for resale or traffic."

That was another concession. There is no doubt at all, Sir, that these were rights which under the strict terms of the Treaty of 1818 they could not demand, nor could they insist upon their being granted; but at the same time I think I am within the judgment of the House on both sides, when I say that in the case of a vessel which is homeward bound and requires provisions or needful supplies to take her home, if, for instance, she has some of her rigging carried away, or some of her salt washed overboard, and is obliged to lose

her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit, a provision that she may obtain casual and needful supplies of that kind was demanded in the interests of good neighborhood, and it was not going too far to say that we would allow them to enjoy those advantages. Therefore, Sir, I am glad to believe that article 11 will meet with the hearty approval of the House and the country, and that they will feel that we have only acted with a wise judgment, and with due regard to the best interests of Canada for the sake of removing an international unpleasantness, in putting these provisions into this treaty. Article 12 provides:

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to the United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

I do not pretend that this is accomplishing a great deal, because, as is well known, Canadian fishing vessels do not require to resort to any great extent to the waters of the United States; but at the same time it is a reciprocal arrangement, and it shows that we are not granting anything to the fishermen of the United States that they are not prepared to grant in express terms to the fishermen of Canada. Article 13 provides:

"The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall make regulations providing for the conspicuous exhibition by every United States fishing vessel, of its official number on each bow; and any such vessel, required by law to have an official number, and failing to comply with such regulations, shall not be entitled to the licenses provided for in this treaty. Such regulations shall be communicated to Her Majesty's Government previously to their taking effect."

The object of that is obvious. Under the arrangements of the Government of the United States every vessel has an official number, and it will save a great deal of trouble if that official number is required to be exhibited in such a conspicuous form that the moment you see the vessel you will know that it is an American fishing vessel. That will enable you to investigate her character and position and everything about her. Although I have seen the Government of the United States very severely criticised for subjecting these vessels to such an indignity, I do not regard it in that light at all. It is purely a matter of business between the two countries for the purpose of facilitating the recognition of vessels, and thus making it much easier to deal with any question that may arise in relation to her; and as you will know every vessel to which you have given a license, the moment you see a vessel, you will know whether she has a license or not. This measure gives you an opportunity of identifying a vessel, and protecting your fishing grounds much more effectually than you could do without it. Article 14 provides:

"The penalties for unlawfully fishing in the waters, bays, creeks, and harbors, referred to in article 1 of this treaty, may extend to forfeiture of the boat or vessel and appurtenances, and also of the supplies and cargo aboard when the offence was committed; and for preparing in such waters to unlawfully fish therein, penalties shall be fixed by the court, not to exceed those for unlawfully fishing."

That is to say, if you are able to establish a charge against the vessel of unlawfully fishing or unlawfully preparing to fish, the court may in its judgment forfeit the vessel, but a discretion is left with the court, which it had not before, of imposing a comparatively much lighter penalty than the forfeiture of the vessel. I do not think anybody will question the wisdom of dealing with this question as we have done. We have left the penalty for unlawfully fishing to extend to the forfeiture of the vessel and everything appertaining to her. I think the House will agree with me that the penalty for the lighter offence should be lighter, and that the efficiency of the law is likely to be much greater with the lighter penalty than with the extreme ones that existed before.

"And for any other violation of the laws of Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland relating to the right of fishery in such waters, bays, creeks, or harbors, penalties shall be fixed by the court, not exceeding

in all three dollars for every ton of the boat or vessel concerned. The boat or vessel may be holden for such penalties and forfeitures."

That penalty does not apply to unlawful fishing or preparing to fish, but it applies to the lighter offences, such as attempting to purchase bait or anything of that kind. The penalty is reduced to a reasonable one, \$3.00 a ton, but yet sufficient, in my judgment, to secure probably a more prompt and effective administration of the law than would be secured if you made the penalty a great deal higher.

"The proceedings shall be summary and as inexpensive as practicable."

I do not know that anybody but the judges in the courts of Vice-Admiralty could complain of that. The object of every civilised country should be to have the laws administered in as inexpensive and summary a mode as practicable.

"The trial (except on appeal) shall be at the place of detention, unless the judge shall, on request of the defence, order it to be held at some other place adjudged by him more convenient."

That is to say, it is proposed that instead of bringing these cases to the Court of Vice-Admiralty at Halifax, or St. John, N. B., or Quebec, as the case may be, it is proposed that the judge shall be sent to deal with the case in a summary manner, that the trial shall take place immediately at the place where the witnesses are all present and the facts can be ascertained, and thus save the cost and inconvenience occasioned by laying up a vessel for a year or two while awaiting judgment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Such as occurred in the *Adams* case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There were two sides to that case. The delay did not rest altogether with us, but a very long delay took place at the instance of the owners of the *Adams*.

"Security for costs shall not be required of the defence, except when bail is offered. Reasonable bail shall be accepted. There shall be proper appeals available to the defence only; and the evidence at the trial may be used on appeal."

That is, we do not propose to appeal against the judgments of our own judges, but we allow an appeal to foreigners who are affected by the judgments of our own judges and who have not the same confidence in their judgments that we have. All this is done for the purpose of saving time and costs, thus avoiding endless irritation through delay.

"Judgments of forfeiture shall be reviewed by the Governor General of Canada in Council, or the Governor in Council of Newfoundland, before the same are executed."

Thus in a case in which, for nominally fishing or for nominally preparing to fish, the judge forfeits the vessel, that decision shall not be carried into execution until the Governor General in Council shall have had the opportunity of deliberately examining the evidence upon which that judgment was founded, so as to remedy the judgment if they think there is any ground for the exercise of greater lenity than the judge has felt himself able to use. Article 15 is, of course, a contingent article. As I have already informed the House, the plenipotentiaries of the United States stated they were quite unable to put anything in the treaty that would necessarily touch the fiscal policy of their country. They said that to do so would be simply to invite rejection of the treaty, on the ground that they had infringed the jurisdiction which Congress had taken, the United States Congress having as I have shown the House, adopted, in the most authentic form, the policy not to allow any changes in their tariff except by the act of Congress itself. We therefore put this in the contingent clause, and we provide the concessions that have been made with reference to limitation, and with reference to the treatment of United States fishing vessels, when compelled to resort to our ports in distress or in need of casual supplies or for a homeward voyage. All these were made absolute by the treaty; but when it came to that which is of absolute value to the United States fishermen, when it came to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

that which enables the United States fishermen to make Canada a basis of supplies for the purpose of better competing with our own fishermen, we then felt that we had a right to take our stand, and if Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries have not been able to support the extreme contention of the Canadian Government hon. gentlemen will find that, on the other hand, the plenipotentiaries of the United States, who had, as a matter of diplomatic intercourse, taken a very strong ground as to the indefeasible rights of American fishing vessels to obtain, as commercial vessels, whatever supplies they required for carrying on their fishing in our ports—to be able to purchase bait, to be able to purchase supplies of every kind and to be able to tranship their fish—they will find that our friends on the other side had, in the same way, to concede a great deal as compared to the extraordinary contention that they had made. Here it is provided, as a just and proper security to the interests of the fishermen of Canada, who have the right, while excluded by heavy duties from the markets of the United States, to such protection as the Treaty of 1818 has provided for them, that whenever the question arises as to Canada being made the basis of supply for the American deep sea fishing vessels—because the question of fishing is not in controversy at all, the Americans having given up the right to catch fish in the judicial waters of Canada—that only can be done for a sufficient *quid pro quo*. We have provided in article 15:

"Whenever the United States shall remove the duty from fish-oil, whale-oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds (except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada and of Newfoundland, including Labrador, as well as from the usual and necessary casks, barrels, kegs, cans, and other usual necessary coverings containing the products above mentioned, the like products, being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, as well as the usual and necessary coverings of the same, as above described shall be admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland."

I think that is a measure which will meet with the hearty approval of the House.

"And upon such removal of duties, and while the aforesaid articles are allowed to be brought into the United States by British subjects, without duty being reimposed thereon, the privilege of entering the ports, bays and harbors of the aforesaid coasts of Canada and of Newfoundland shall be accorded to United States fishing vessels by annual licenses, free of charge, for the following purposes, namely:

"1. The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits;

"2. Transhipment of catch, for transport by any means of conveyance;

"3. Shipping of crews.

"Supplies shall not be obtained by barter, but bait may be so obtained.

"The like privileges shall be continued or given to fishing vessels of Canada and of Newfoundland on the Atlantic coasts of the United States."

I think that will be regarded as a fair and reasonable proposition, that, if fishing vessels of the United States are allowed to make Canada a base for obtaining their supplies and furnishing all the materials necessary for the outfit of a shipping voyage, for the transhipment of their catch, and making our harbors and ports the means of carrying on their industry, the fishermen of Canada, with whom they are in that case better able to compete than they could otherwise, are entitled to have their fish entered free in the ports of the United States. While the plenipotentiaries of the United States were not able to make this an absolute provision, I do not hesitate to say that I look confidently to the period in the not remote future when fish will be made free and the fishermen of the United States will be able to obtain all the advantages in our ports which are here given to them. It will be observed that we have made this much larger in its provisions than either the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 or the Washington Treaty of 1871, inasmuch as we have made it cover many articles which were not covered by either of those treaties, and not only that, but we have taken care to guard against what might be called the rather sharp practice, if such a term were admissible in regard to a neighboring country, that, while allowing our fish to come in free, they should

impose a duty upon the cans or tins or coverings in which the fish went in. More than that, we have made this cover all the inland waters of Canada, as well as the sea coast, and have made this provision as to the entry of free fish, provided they take advantage of this clause and make Canada the base of their supplies, apply to the fish of British Columbia, that is, to the whole of Canada, the same as it does to the Atlantic coast. I think I have now dealt with the treaty in its entirety as it stands, and I have only to refer to the *modus vivendi* in Schedule B, which provides that, while this treaty is *sub judice*, before it can be ratified by the Senate of the United States, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland, during two years or pending that ratification, until these privileges to which the American fishermen would be entitled if our fish is made free, those privileges shall be enjoyed by the American fishermen on the payment of \$1.50 per ton. I need not tell you that, on the eve of the ratification of a treaty of this kind by the Senate of the United States, a collision between the fishermen of the two countries or anything which would incite bad blood or become a cause of prejudice would probably prevent the ratification of a treaty which would be otherwise ratified, and to prevent that we offered in this *modus vivendi* for two years the privilege to these American fishermen of obtaining these various benefits which are provided for in the treaty by the payment of \$1.50 per ton. I do not think this will be regarded as an excessive rate, and I think it will greatly conduce to good neighborhood between the United States and Canada. This *modus vivendi* was accepted by the United States plenipotentiaries in the most kindly spirit. They recommended the President to submit it to the Senate for their information, and I think I may say that it carries on the face of it the ratification and approval of the Governments of both countries. Now, having run through the various provisions of the treaty, I am happy to say that I shall have to detain the House but a few minutes longer, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to what has been accomplished by this treaty. I have told you what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America before the initiation of these proceedings. I have told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the Statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it announced much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in a relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. Speaking a year ago, I pointed out in my remarks, with a view to deter the possibility of such an Act going into force, all the advantages that in our present position we could avail ourselves of to protect ourselves against such a suicidal act on the part of the United States. I said then that it would be a mad act. I say so now. No man who knows anything of the intimate commercial relations which exist between Canada and the United States could contemplate such an Act going into operation without feeling that it would tear up from the foundation those intimate social and commercial relations which exist between these two countries, which, in friendly commercial rivalry, are making a rapid progress which has attracted the attention of the civilised world. It would produce a condition of things the end of which no man could foresee. If that Act had been adopted, I thought we had no means of looking to any increased commercial intercourse between that great country and

the Dominion of Canada. Under those circumstances, it behoved the Government of Canada to adopt any means in its power to avert such a disaster, which, great as it would have been to Canada, would have been greater to the United States. But that would be a very poor compensation for the injury which we would sustain, to know that we had a companion in misfortune suffering more than we suffered ourselves. We found Congress putting on the Statute-book a direction to the President that, on the first United States vessel being seized or harassed, or refused the advantages which they said they were entitled to, they called upon him as the Executive of that country to put that Non-intercourse Act into force. That was the condition of things when I went down last Easter to see Mr. Bayard at Washington. If you compare the condition of things to-day with the condition of things that existed then, there is no man, I care not how partisan he may be, how unfriendly to this Government he may be, who can judiciously look at the position of this question then and now, without coming to the conclusion that we have emerged from midnight darkness into the light of day under the auspices of this treaty. It may be said: Suppose that the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate—a not improper contingency—I need not tell the House that one of the advantages we enjoy under British institutions, is that we are saved from the extreme and violent antagonisms of party that every fourth year the Presidential election brings about in the United States. Now any man who knows anything of the politics of the United States, knows that however good a measure is, however valuable, however much it commends itself to the judgment of every intelligent statesman in that country, it is a matter almost of honor on the part of the party in opposition to prevent the Government of the day from doing anything that would give them any credit or strengthen their hands in the country; that on the eve of a Presidential election, it is next to impossible to induce the Republican majority in the Senate to sanction anything that a Democratic Administration has carried through, however valuable that may be. But, Sir, take the very worst contingency, suppose this treaty is rejected by the Senate, and what then? Why, will we be relegated back to the position we stood in a year ago? Not at all. If our efforts, by mutual conciliation, by concessions on both sides to find a common standing ground, that we could present to all the parties to this treaty, as an honorable and equitable agreement that might be fairly accepted if these efforts are to fail, if after three months' negotiations we had broken up with embittered relations, because we found that it was impracticable to get any common grounds of meeting on which the Governments of the two countries could join, there is no question that matters would have stood in a worse position than that in which they stood when we undertook these negotiations. But, Sir, that is not the position. Let the Senate of the United States to-morrow reject this treaty, I trust they will not do so; I have a hope that there is independent statesmanship enough in the great Republican party of the United States who have the power at their disposal to-day in the United States Senate, to allow that sentiment of statesmanship to overweigh the party advantages they hope to obtain by preventing the present Administration from settling this vexed question—but when they remember that for 70 years, these questions have been agitated which are now disposed of, they may see that if they should come into power themselves at any early date it would be an advantage to have this vexed question between the two great English-speaking families of the world set at rest, that there may be no renewal of the difficulties which have existed so long a time. But let me take the very worst contingency, that of the rejection of this treaty, and how do we stand? Why, Sir, let me read

from a letter of the Secretary of State of the United States, written to the citizens of Boston, who invited him to go there to deliver a speech upon the subject. In Mr. Bayard's letter, of 26th March, he says:

"I am convinced that the welfare and true interest of our country and a just and wise treatment of the British American population on our northern frontier alike counsel the adoption of the treaty. In its initiation, negotiation and conclusion I can truly say for my associates, and myself, no views but those of a single minded patriotic intent have been allowed place or expression, nor can a trace or suggestion of partisanship be justly alleged. The sole and difficult question to which the treaty relates, the fishery rights, of one nation in the jurisdictional waters of another, began with the first dawn of our recognised independent existence as a nation and ever since has conspicuously presented itself at intervals exciting bitter controversy, and never been satisfactory or pre-eminently disposed of. Meanwhile the surrounding circumstances have importantly changed in advance with rapid and vast growth. The Treaty of 1818 remains unaffected in its terms by seventy years of such material progress and development on this continent, as we of to-day are the witnesses. Unless the Treaty of 1818 shall be wholly abrogated and recurrence necessarily had to the dangerous status that John Quincy Adams so ably but unavailably discussed with the Earl of Bathurst, in 1815, and which had resisted all efforts of negotiation and at Ghent in the year previous, it is manifest that a joint and equitable construction in consonance with their existing relations and mutual needs must be agreed upon between Great Britain and the United States and this, I affirm, is done by the present treaty."

Again he says:

"Conciliation and mutual neighborly concessions have together done their honorable and honest work in this treaty, paved the way for the relations of enmity and mutual advantage."

Now, Sir, I ask you whether all that we have done, all the time, all the trouble that have been expended in this matter is not amply compensated for by the declaration of the Secretary of State of the United States bearing his tribute and his testimony, to the fair, and honest, and just interpretation of the Treaty of 1818. And what more, Sir? Let me read from the Message of the President of the United States:

"As a result of such negotiations, a treaty has been agreed upon between Her Britannic Majesty and the United States, concluded and signed in this capital, under my direction and authority, on the 15th of this February inst, and which I now have the honor to submit to the Senate, with the recommendation that it shall receive the consent of that body, as provided in the constitution, in order that the ratifications thereof, may be duly exchanged and the treaty carried into effect. The treaty meets my approval, because I believe that it supplies a satisfactory, practical, and final adjustment, upon a basis honorable and just to both parties, of the difficult and vexed question to which it relates. A review of the history of this question will show that all formal attempts to arrive at a common interpretation, satisfactory to both parties, of the first article of the Treaty of October 20, 1818, have been unsuccessful and with the lapse of time the difficulty and obscurity have only increased.

"Negotiations in 1854, and again in 1871, ended in both cases in temporary reciprocal arrangement of the tariffs of Canada and Newfoundland and of the United States, and of the payment of the money award by the United States. Under which the real questions in difference remain unsettled, in abeyance, and ready to present themselves anew just as soon as the conventional arrangements were abrogated.

"The situation, therefore, remained unimproved by the results of the Treaty of 1871, and a grave condition of affairs, presenting almost identically the same features and causes of complaint by the United States against Canadian action and British default in its correction, confronted us in May, 1886, and has continued until the present time.

"The four purposes for which our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818 were allowed to enter the bays and harbors of Canada and Newfoundland within the belt of three marine miles are placed under a fair and liberal construction, and their enjoyment secured without such conditions and restrictions as in the past have embarrassed and obstructed them so seriously.

"The enforcement of penalties for fishing or preparing to fish within the inshore and exclusive waters of Canada and Newfoundland is to be accomplished under safeguards against oppressive or arbitrary action, thus protecting the defendant fisherman from punishment in advance of trial, delays, and inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal.

"These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for the contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State, and by our Minister at London, and by the American negotiators of the present treaty.

"The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantage and convenience are the only permanent foundation of peace

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and friendship between States, and that with the adoption of the treaty now placed before the Senate, a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established so as to procure perpetual peace and harmony.

"In connection with the treaty herewith submitted I deem it is also my duty to transmit to the Senate a written offer or arrangement, in the nature of a *modus vivendi*, tendered on the conclusion of the treaty on the part of the British plenipotentiaries, to secure kindly and peaceful relations during the period that may be required for the consideration of the treaty by the respective Governments and for the enactment of the necessary legislation to carry its provisions into effect if approved.

"This paper, freely and on their own motion, signed by the British conferees, not only extend advantages to our fishermen, pending the ratification of the treaty, but appears to have been dictated by a friendly and amicable spirit."

I ask you to contrast that language with the position we occupied a year ago in regard to the great Republic to the south of us. Let the Senate reject the treaty to-morrow, and I ask what is the changed position of Canada? Yesterday we stood face to face with a Non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying to the south of us. What, I repeat, is our position to-day? If that treaty were rejected by the Senate to-morrow, we have gained this vantage ground, that we stand in the position of having it declared by the Secretary of State of the United States and by the President of the United States that Canada has been ready to make, and Her Majesty's Government on behalf of Canada, through her plenipotentiaries, made an arrangement with the plenipotentiaries of the United States that is fair, just and equitable, and that leaves that country no possible cause of complaint. Why, what is the result? The result is this: that let a fisherman complain to-morrow of our interpretation of the treaty, of the enforcement of our most extreme construction of the treaty, the answer to him is this: Nobody is to blame for the inconvenience you suffer except the Senate of the United States, your President, the Executive of your country; the Democratic party from end to end of the United States declared it was a fair settlement, they represent an undoubted majority, in my judgment, of the people of the United States to-day, and I believe they will represent it to-morrow. We stand in the position that instead of being alone with the whole United States, President, Government and people all against us, all denouncing us as adopting a harsh and barbarous interpretation of an old, antiquated treaty for the purpose of forcing reciprocity upon them, we occupy the vantage ground of having these men out of their own mouths declaring that nothing has been wanting on the part of the Government of Her Majesty, or on the part of the Dominion of Canada to place this question on a fair and equitable basis such as might honorably be accepted by the United States. I hold we have accomplished that without injuring in the slightest degree the fisheries of Canada, without injuring Canadian interests to any extent whatever. We have made concessions, as I have said, but we have made them with the avowed object of placing all our people, not only the fishermen, but the agriculturist, the lumberman, every man in this country in a better relation with the United States than he was before. What is the result? As I have said Mr. Bayard told us, the American plenipotentiaries told us that there was but one way of obtaining what you ask. You want greater freedom of commercial intercourse. You want relaxation in our tariff arrangements with respect to natural products in which you are so rich and abundant. There is but one way to obtain it. Let us by common concession be able to meet on common ground and seek to remove this irritating cause of difficulty between the two countries out of the way, and you will find that the policy of this Government, the policy of the President and of the House of Representatives, the policy of

the great Democratic party of the United States, will at once take an onward course in the direction you propose, and accomplish that which you would desire above everything else is the only way by which it can ever be attained. Those were not empty words, those were the sober utterances of distinguished statesmen, who pointed to the avowed policy of the Government of the United States as the best evidence of the sincerity of what he said. What has happened already? Already we have action by the Finance Minister of the United States, I mean Mr. Mills,—the gentleman who in the United States Congress represents the Government of the day, and stand in the most analogous position in the United States to the Finance Minister in this House, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who propounds the policy of the Administration in the House. How is he selected? He is selected by the Government. The Democratic party sustaining the Government selects a man as Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is in accord with the policy of the Administration for the time being, and Mr. Carlisle, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, nominates the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means and all the members of the committee, and therefore the Chairman of that committee occupies the position of representing the Government in bringing forward such Bills as will represent the views and sentiments of the Democratic party in the United States supporting the Administration. What have we got? The ink is barely dry upon this treaty before he as the representative of the Government and Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means brings forward a measure to do what? Why, to make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, and upon which last year we paid \$1,800,000 of duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask, Sir, if that is nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to insult both the great political parties of this country who have since 1854 and long before maintained that the interests of Canada—the interests of British North America—were intimately bound up in obtaining free intercourse with the United States for our natural products. I do not intend to insult the two great parties in this country by telling them that they are both fools, that they do not know what they are doing. Down to the present hour we have adopted the policy on both sides of the House, and we have pledged ourselves to the people to do everything that lay in our power to obtain a free market for the natural products of our country with the United States, and I say you must answer me the question as to whether that was an act of supreme folly or whether it was wise statesmanship on the part of both parties in this country to adopt that policy, before you ask me such a question as “who pays the duty?” I say that under this Bill which has been introduced and which, I believe, will pass, for it does not require two-thirds of the Senate where the Republican majority is only one in the whole House to pass this inter-national law, it requires a majority of one only and I am very sanguine that this Bill will pass during the present session. Modified it may be, but I am inclined to think the amendments will be still more in the interests of Canada than as the Bill stands to-day. If this is the case I think we may congratulate ourselves upon securing the free admission of our lumber, upon which we paid during the last year no less than \$1,315,450 to get it into the United States. On copper ore made free by the Mills’ Bill we paid, or there was paid to make it meet the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite more correctly, \$96,945. On salt \$21,992 duty was paid. This is rendered free by the Mills’ Bill. I am sorry to find as I hoped would be the case

from the first copy of the Bill that came to me that potatoes were not included amongst vegetables. I am sorry to find there is a doubt, as to whether vegetables not specially enumerated will not exclude potatoes. In grappling with this policy of making the natural products of the two countries free, you do not expect any person who wants to carry a Bill to put a heavier load upon his shoulders than he is able to carry, lest he may break down and do nothing. You expect him to take it in detail, and as I believe, you will find the policy contained in this Bill of making those natural products of Canada free, carried out until you have perfect freedom of intercourse between the natural products of Canada and the United States of America. Of wool we sent last year 1,319,309 lbs. of one kind, and a variety of other kinds, upon which a duty was paid to the extent of \$183,852. Now as I say on articles of prime importance and interest to Canada the removal of duty by the Mills’ Bill amounts to no less than \$1,300,193. You will be glad to hear that I do not intend to detain the House any longer. In discharge of the duties—the very onerous and important duties—of one of Her Majesty’s plenipotentiaries at that conference, I have steadily kept in view what in my heart and judgment I believed were the best interests of Canada. In the measure which I have the honor to submit to this House I believe will be found embodied a Bill which it is of the most vital importance to Canada to pass. As it stands to day the Government of the United States through the plenipotentiaries who represented it have only my humble opinion to sustain the course that has been taken. I was not there as the representative of the Government of Canada, nor can my signature to the Bill necessarily imply the confidence and support of even the Administration. I occupied on that occasion the high position of one of Her Majesty’s plenipotentiaries, charged not only with the responsibility of what I owed to Canada, but also the responsibility of what I owed to the Empire. I can only say, Sir, that I feel I would best discharge my duty to the Empire by steadily keeping in view the interest of Canada. I believe, Sir, that there is no way in which any public man in this country can promote the interests of the great Empire of which we form a part, better, or as well, as by taking such a course of public action as will build up a great British community on this northern portion of the continent of America. I believe, Sir, that we owe it to the Empire as well as to ourselves, steadily to keep in view every measure that will conduce to the rapid progress of Canada, the development of her inexhaustible resources and the building up of a great and powerful British community on this side of the Atlantic. I say, Sir, that in the discharge of the duties I have steadily kept that in view, and I believe the course which has been pursued will not only commend itself to the judgment and the support of the great majority in this House, but that the great majority of the people in this country will feel that in the adoption of this treaty and in asking the House to sanction the treaty I am only taking a step that is calculated to conduce to the progress and greatness and best interests of Canada in as large a degree as any measure that can possibly be brought before it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the Government have had the advantage of having the treaty submitted to this House for ratification, defended by a gentleman who is very well versed in the negotiations by which that treaty was brought about, and the House had the advantage of hearing from an old parliamentary hand in his most eloquent and I may say sophistical manner the reasons which in his opinion would justify it in assenting to this treaty. The hon. gentleman must have been painfully conscious during his speech—which in many parts was more than usually eloquent even for him—that he was not carrying with him the hearty assent of those who are accustomed to

cheer his utterances. The hon. gentleman, Sir, must have painfully felt the absence of those cheers which generally greet the utterance of any policy when propounded by himself, and he must have felt, Sir, that it was only when he indulged in that eloquent peroration which had nothing to do with the treaty whatever, and in which he referred to the consolidation of British power as something antagonistic to the United States that he found a hearty cheer from those behind him. The hon. gentleman's speech may, I think, be fairly divided into four parts. The first part was an historical *resumé* of fishery matters. With a great deal of the history he stated, I have no fault to find; with the omission of a large part of that history I have some fault to find. The second part of his speech, Sir, may be called the laudatory part. The hon. gentlemen paid compliments with a profuse hand to everybody who was associated with him in the construction of this treaty. I have no objection to make to these compliments; I have no reason to doubt that they may have been to a large extent deserved. Even from the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain down to the meanest associate he had with him, he told the House that there never was such a collection of men congregated together at the negotiation of any treaty. Well, Sir, we are not going to join issue with him on that part of his speech. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to the third part of his speech, and that was his confessions. He confessed to the House that the treaty was not what his party might have been led to expect. He confessed that it was one continuous series of concessions from Canada, without one concession made to Canada by the party with which we were treating. After exhausting his confessions, honest confessions I hope they were, the hon. gentleman then, in the fourth part of his speech, made an appeal for absolution to his followers in the House, basing that appeal on the great benefits that were to flow to the Empire from the ratification of this treaty. Well, Sir, I shall have something to say about parts of the treaty. I was amused, Sir, at the hon. gentleman's statement of the only concession that Canada was going to receive as the result of this treaty. The hon. gentleman told us that as a result of this treaty the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at Washington had introduced a Tariff Bill, into Congress, which would have the effect of relieving Canadians from the payment of over a million dollars of duties, which they had been accustomed to pay on their natural products sent to the United States. Sir, there are two statements of fact in that allegation of the hon. gentleman to which I wish to take exception. If he had been in this House during the last three weeks, he would have heard, not one or two, but dozens of his most prominent supporters prove to a demonstration that that duty was not paid by the people of Canada, but by the United States people themselves; and if the arguments that those gentlemen advanced so eloquently and ably are worth anything at all, the result, according to the statement made by the hon. gentleman to-night, is simply to relieve the consumer in the United States from the payment of a million dollars of duties which they have been paying under their tariff. The other exception which I wish to take to in the hon. gentleman's allegation is this: I deny that there is any analogy whatever between the position of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the United States and that of the Minister of Finance in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that the two systems of Government are entirely different. He knows that the Minister of Finance in this country speaks as the mouthpiece of the Cabinet, which is chosen to represent the majority in Parliament; and he knows—no one knows better—that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives may be a gentleman entirely opposed to the policy of the Cabinet; and if the Chairman of that Committee in the present instance supports the policy of

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

the Cleveland Administration, it is an accident, and not a necessity following from their system of Government. But it does not at all follow, because that Tariff Bill has been introduced as a sequence to the treaty, that it is a necessary consequence of the treaty. That tariff was introduced in pursuance of the policy laid down by President Cleveland in his message to Congress, a policy which he adopted in dealing with that enormous surplus which the hon. gentleman stated weighed like an incubus on the people of the United States; and in pursuance of that policy, before the treaty was ever entered into at all, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee introduced that Tariff Bill. Sir, I hope that Bill will pass in a more enlarged sense even than it has been introduced. I hope that the article the hon. gentleman mentioned will also be inserted in that Bill, and that the people of the Maritime Provinces and Ontario may have the advantage of the free admission of their potatoes as well as their other natural products into the markets of the United States. I hope that the policy they have begun will go on until the policy developed on this side of the House and formulated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford is accepted in its entirety, and then the hon. gentleman will be able to use with some effect the eloquent language he used to-day about prosperity and about the Dominion of Canada becoming a strong arm of a united empire. Now, Sir, it must have struck every hon. gentleman who listened to the speech of the hon. Finance Minister, as a most extraordinary thing, if this policy of conciliation, of compromise, of fair play was to produce the tremendous and beneficial results which he predicted it would produce, that that hon. gentleman, as a member of the Government should be here defending it to-day, when we know that for the past two or three years he has been one of the strongest and most eloquent advocates of a policy directly the contrary. Why, Sir, is it not known that the hon. gentleman is the most prominent member of an Administration whose policy was utterly opposed to the policy of conciliation embodied in that treaty—an Administration, Sir, that adopted a policy which, to use his own words, drove a nation of 65,000,000 of people almost to the verge of war with us—a policy which, to use his own words consolidated for the first time in history, 65,000,000 of people and the entire press in opposition to it—a policy which they proclaimed to be cruel and brutal and ungenerous and unchristian? Yet, two years have not elapsed since the hon. gentleman's colleagues—I am not sure whether he himself did not indulge in the same strain announced in this House that such was their love of Canadian interests, and their determination to stand by the flag—which they took off their coats and waved—that they were not going to bend the knee to the United States by adopting a policy of conciliation, but were going to show the United States that this great Canada of ours would bring them down on their marrow bones. The policy of amalgamation of tariffs was carried one step further, and the manner in which they administered the Treaty of 1818, as they construed it, was as openly proclaimed to be a defiance of the United States and a determination on their part to make the people of that country conform to their construction of that treaty, whether they would willingly or not. Sir, the old policy has been disavowed to-night, and we have heard the hon. gentleman say with all his power and ability that he was not able to support to-day the policy of the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Marine. But, Sir, he is responsible for that policy with those hon. gentlemen, and I hold him more responsible than anybody else, and I will tell him why. Because he alone has the power to change the policy of the Government; and if he had chosen one year ago to apply his mind to the work and put down his foot and say that he would not for one be a party to that policy of anti-civilisation, the Government would have been

obliged to change it, as they have done since, and adopt the policy of the hon. gentleman. One year has not passed over our heads since we saw the Government announcing a policy in this House, not of conciliation, but of defiance to the United States, and the hon. gentleman had not returned to his place a day before he made them eat their words and adopt the policy which the Minister of Justice said would be a betrayal of the best interests of Canada. I say if there is a man in the Government who is more responsible than another for this unfortunate policy, which the Government have pursued so persistently for the past two or three years, it is the hon. the Finance Minister himself. Now, the hon. gentleman opened his speech with the expression of the hope that members on this side, in discussing the treaty, would not indulge in any language which might be used by the opponents of the treaty in the United States for the purpose of defeating the Bill. I hope no such language will be used, and, so far as I am concerned, it is not my intention to use such language. But the hon. gentleman himself, under similar circumstances, when it suited his party purposes, did not scruple to use language for which this country suffered very severely afterwards. The hon. gentleman anticipated a charge which he knew would be brought against him, and, referring to the Washington Treaty, he said that when that treaty was passing through this House, he appealed to hon. gentlemen not to make statements which might afterwards be used to our prejudice. But, he said, he was obliged to make such statements, and he did not make them to our prejudice. At that time the treaty contained a provision referring to the commission, which afterwards sat at Halifax, the question of settling what damages should be paid to Canada for the fishery concessions she had made to the United States, and the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety to support for the time a Government measure then before the House, did not scruple to make statements discounting, so far as words could, any chance we might have of obtaining an award from the people of the United States. He declared in so many words that the concessions we had received from the United States ought, without the payment of a dollar of damage, to be considered the equivalent of the concessions we had made. While the hon. gentleman was speaking to-night I turned up the speech which he delivered on that occasion. He was preceded by the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government, and I would ask the House to listen to the language of which these hon. gentlemen made use of when the Washington Treaty was before the House. The right hon. gentleman said:

"In looking at the treaty from a commercial point of view, and looking at the question whether it is right to accept the articles, we have to consider mainly that interest which is most peculiarly affected. Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interests of Nova Scotia, with one or two exceptions for local reasons, are altogether in favor of the treaty. They are so anxious to get free admission for their fish into the American market that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market, and they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry; and I say that, that being the case, if it be to the interest of the fishermen and to the advantage of that branch of the national industry, setting aside all other reasons, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market, and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen—they are made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans; they are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own prices. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value, and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen or American merchants engaged in the trade, and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people."

Sir, the hon. gentleman proved conclusively that the one great desideratum for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces was the remission of the duty, which they were obliged to pay to the United States, and he said if they got

that great concession, everything else did not amount to a row of pins. They should, he said, accept it most willingly and cheerfully, and now the hon. gentleman comes here with a treaty, in which he has not obtained for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces one single concession, a treaty which leaves them bound to continue paying that duty in the future, as they have had to pay it in the past, and he declares this treaty is a wonderful outcome of ability on his part and on the part of his colleagues. On that occasion what did the hon. the Finance Minister say:

"Instead of the treaty surrendering our fishermen and fisheries to the destructive competition of the foreigner, the result would be—"

The hon. gentleman was a prophet then as he is to-night.

"—that the American fishermen who employed their industry in the waters of Canada would become like the American lumbermen who engaged in that trade in the valley of the Ottawa. They would settle upon Canadian soil, bringing with them their character for enterprise and energy, and would become equally good subjects of Her Majesty and give this country the benefits of their talents, and their enterprise and their capital. Was there anybody who could doubt as to the effect of removing the duty which was now levied of \$2 a barrel on mackerel and \$1 on herring, of taking off this enormous bounty in favor of the American fishermen and leaving our fishermen free and unrestricted access to the best market for them in the world? Was there anyone who could doubt the practical result would be to leave the Canadians, in a very short time, almost without any competition at all."

That was the view the hon. gentleman held in 1872, when he asked this House to assent to the Washington Treaty, and he was prepared to go so far then, to advance party interests, that he declared, in so many words, that we had received in the remission of duty more than an equivalent to the concession we had made, and that we were not entitled to a dollar of award. The Americans were not slow to take advantage of these statements made by two of the most prominent members of the Canadian Cabinet, and in their answer put before the Washington Commission, the most prominent statements are those which I have quoted, made by those hon. gentlemen. The American plenipotentiaries said: These gentlemen tell you, on their responsibility as members of the Canadian Government, that you have got already more than you are entitled to, and how, therefore can you ask for more? Unpatriotic as those hon. gentlemen were on that occasion, much as they did to discount the right of the country to receive a large sum in compensation, I trust their want of patriotism on that occasion will not be emulated by any body on this side. I hope we shall be now, as we have tried, whether successfully or not, for years back to be. The hon. gentleman has talked a good deal about a change of policy. Two years ago we had a policy propounded as the one necessary for the salvation of Canada, a policy diametrically opposed to the one proposed to-day. Then their policy was one of defiance; to-day their policy is one of conciliation. I do not object to the change, but I say that when the Government of a great country like this change their policy on one of the most important matters which can come before them their duty, as hon. gentlemen, is to step down from their positions and give them to those who are in favor of the new policy and who pronounced in its favor years ago. That would have been an honorable course for them to take. Then the language of the hon. gentlemen would have been received with credit and respect. The hon. gentleman laughs, and he may well laugh, because he has lived to see within the past fortnight one of his principal Ministers declare that policy to be a betrayal of Canada which was adopted a week later and yet remained in office to endorse its adoption. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a few historical facts which he very carefully omitted from his historical statements. The hon. gentleman gave us a history of the Treaty of 1818, and he stated, and stated very fairly, that the renunciation clause, as it has been called in that treaty, which was signed by the American plenipotentiaries, under which they renounced certain rights or privileges—whichever you like to call them in our waters—was not made without compensa-

tion, that they received ample compensation for that renunciation. I am prepared to agree with him in reference to that. I think his statement of the Treaty of 1818 was not inaccurate, but, after passing over the Washington Treaty of 1871, he stepped down to 1885, when a *modus vivendi* was agreed upon for that year; but he forgot to state that, for years before the *modus vivendi* of 1885 was agreed upon, the attention of his Government had been called by the party with which I have the honor to be connected to the serious results which would come from the cessation of the fishery articles of the Washington Treaty, and that we would be face to face with a state of facts requiring the firmest and the most conciliatory action. In 1883, on the 28th March, when the United States gave a notice abrogating the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, Lord Derby sent a despatch to the Canadian Government advising them that that notice had been given, calling their attention to it, and asking them to formulate their views on the question. On the 3rd May, 1883, Lord Derby wrote another despatch again calling upon them for their views, but no answer was vouchsafed. The hon. gentleman was adopting the policy of "to-morrow." In the face of complications as grave as those which the Finance Minister has pointed out to-day, in the face of the fact that he must have known the gravity of the position, and that he had received a warning from Lord Derby that it was time to make up his mind, the hon. gentleman, true to his policy of never doing to-day what can be done to-morrow, remained silent. Then, on the 30th January, 1884, Lord Derby again called for the policy of this Government. In the despatch which I have referred to just now, dated the 3rd May, Lord Derby says:

"Her Majesty's Government will be glad if your Ministers will favor them with your view in the matter as soon as they may be in a position to do so."

On the 30th January, 1884, nearly twelve months after the notice had been given, and the attention of the Government had been officially called to the state of the facts, Lord Derby writes to the Marquis of Lansdowne:

"My Lord,—With reference to my despatches of the 3rd of May, and of the 28th December last, I have the honor to request that you will move your Government to take an early opportunity of placing me in possession of their views as to the course to be pursued in consequence of the approaching termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington."

His Lordship is getting slightly more nervous and more anxious, and urges Lord Lansdowne to move his Government to make some declaration of their policy in this matter, but the hon. gentleman remained silent. Nothing is done, and nearly a whole year goes by, and on the 4th of December, 1884, nearly two years after the notice has been given by the United States abrogating those fishery articles, Lord Derby is compelled to write another despatch, and at last he evokes an answer. In that despatch he says:

"In view of the fact that the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington will expire on the 1st of July next, I have the honor to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are desirous of obtaining, at as early a date as possible, some expression of the views of the Government of the Dominion of Canada as to the course that they may wish pursued in negotiation with the Government of the United States, with the object of arriving at some satisfactory arrangement with that Government, in order to avoid the risks and complications which might arise from the fishery question being left in an unsettled and undecided state. You will therefore be so good as to lay this despatch before your Ministers, and to request them to favor me, at their earliest convenience, with such an expression of their views upon this important subject, as they may be in a position to supply."

The hon. gentleman had let matters slide for nearly two years, he had done nothing, but he had not only been prompted by Lord Derby, but in this House the Opposition had brought the matter to his attention, and in March, 1884, one year after the notice abrogating the fishery articles had been given, and nine months before Lord Derby wrote the despatch to which I have just referred, the Opposition brought this matter up, and used the arguments, not so ably

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

or so eloquently, it is true, but as well as they were able to use them, in favor of peace and of the promotion of goodwill between the two countries which the Finance Minister has urged to-night in support of his treaty. We urged that, in order to meet the state of facts which we would have to meet when the treaty expired, it was necessary to do something, to enter into negotiation with our friends across the border. The resolution which I had myself the honor to move on that occasion was as follows:—

"In view of the notice of the termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that Treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada, with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that, in any such negotiations, Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government."

We did not lay down any positive line of action that we asked the hon. gentleman to adopt; we did not say, this you must do, and this you ought to do, but we said, you are coming face to face with serious matters, and it is your duty as First Minister of this country to enter into negotiations with the United States, and to see if you cannot agree to some arrangement which will be profitable and honorable to both countries in order to meet those difficulties. There was another reason. Not only was the Foreign Minister of England urging them to do something, but the President of the United States himself had come down in his message to Congress and opened the door for us to enter, had held out, as it were, the right hand of fellowship to us, and in his message to Congress in the December preceding the March when this resolution was moved by the Opposition, the President in his message to Congress said:

"Notice of the termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington was duly given to the British Government, and the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of the treaty will accordingly cease on 1st July, 1885. The fisheries industries, pursued by a numerous class of our citizens on the northern coasts both of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, are worthy of the fostering care of Congress. Whenever brought into competition with the like industries of other countries, our fishermen, as well as our manufactures of fishing appliances and preparers of fish products, have maintained a foremost place. I suggest that Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries, and the means of opening to our citizens, under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The recognition of the worth and value of our fisheries is a recommendation to Congress that steps should be taken for the purpose of opening up those fisheries to American citizens, and an invitation was made to the hon. gentleman, if he was disposed to adopt a policy of conciliation, to hold out his hand to the hand of the President of the United States. But what did the hon. gentleman do? The hon. gentleman treated the invitation of the President, and the urgent request of Lord Derby—I will not say with contempt; he is too much of a diplomatist to do that—but certainly with silence; and when he did come to speak it was too late. Just a few months before the treaty expired he found there was not time to enter upon negotiations at all, and he suggested a *modus vivendi*, that free fish should be given to us, and free fishing to them; but the hon. gentleman accompanied that with the declaration that used to be received with such cheers by hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, that he was not going to bow the knee and ask for any favors from the United States or any other person. In a dispatch written by Lord Lansdowne, no doubt at the hon. gentleman's instance, I read:

"In the face of these circumstances my Government does not consider that it would be consistent with the respect which it owes to itself, to appear as a suitor for concessions at the hands of the United States."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Too high and mighty then. The hon. gentleman does not cheer to day. He was not prepared to ask concessions then, he was not prepared even, so high and mighty was he, to stand upon an even plane with the President of the United States, to grasp the hand of friendship which, metaphorically, had been extended across the border to him. O, no, he says, I cannot demean myself by asking any concessions from this great sixty millions of people, but I would suggest that a *modus vivendi* might be a good policy in that way. Well, Sir, they did not accept the suggestion, but they accepted a modification of it by which they got free fishing and we did not get free fish, and the hon. gentleman accepted that. That was the history of the transaction, and that was the policy which the hon. gentleman pursued. Sir, I denounced that policy before as inimical to the best interests of Canada, as a policy, under the circumstances, not maintaining our dignity, but derogatory to our dignity. I say it would have been much more dignified on our part if, when the President of the greatest Republic on the face of the earth had made a declaration to his Congress that I have just read, we had come forward in a manly way and said: Yes, we recognise the great complications which will ensue when these fishery articles will expire, we recognize the truth of the statement that we possess the richest fishing ground, and the most richly stocked waters in the world, and we are prepared to deal with you as honest men, on an even footing, as one nation with another. But no, Sir, the hon. gentleman lost his opportunity, he let it go by, as he has lost many other opportunities; and to day he is in the humiliating position of having to swallow a treaty not half as favorable as I have no doubt he could then have obtained. Well, then, when the season of 1885 was at end, what did the hon. gentleman do? Sir, we spoke great words in this building at the time. Hon. gentlemen took their coats off, as it were, and the Canadian flag was swung round their heads, and we heard a great deal of talk here, and a great deal of cheering about a vigorous foreign policy. Why, Sir, they entered upon this foreign policy like Olivier, the Prime Minister of Napoleon III, when he went to war with Germany with a light heart. They were prepared to fight the Americans and if the Americans did not give them what they wanted, they would bring them down to their marrow bones. We will get out our navy, we will man our cutters, we will put our captains on board, we will seize American ships and drive American sailors to desperation, we will soon teach them that we are the great Canadian people. The hon. gentleman went on at that time, not standing by the construction of the treaty, which, as I said then, and as I repeat now, in itself might be technically correct, but adopting an amendment of that treaty which was hurtful and harmful in the extreme, a policy which was capricious; at one moment, in 1885, giving them all they wanted, giving them our fisheries for nothing, and the next year not even admitting American fishermen to enter our harbors without being obliged to enter at the custom house and pay fees. Sir, the Americans did not so much complain of the construction we put upon the treaty in 1866 as of the vexatious and harassing and unnecessary conditions that we attached to the execution of that treaty. That was what was stated by them, and I will read soon a short extract from the declaration made by them after the season was over, bitterly complaining and denouncing our policy as inhospitable, as anti-Christian, as opposed to the principles on which the commercial relations of the two countries had been based for years previous. They say now, as they did then, that the construction we put upon the treaty was not a false construction, but that the manner in which we administered that treaty was calculated to irritate the fishermen themselves, and to destroy any confidence

31-1888-4

that the people or Government of the United States might have in the good-will and friendship of the Dominion of Canada. Well, Sir, we were not satisfied with the Treaty of 1818, and with the Imperial Acts, and the Canadian Acts, which were passed to put that treaty in force. The hon. gentleman, in pursuance of his vigorous policy, introduced an amendment to the Fishery Act, declaring that any American fishing vessel that entered within the prohibited ports—mark you, that crossed the lines—was liable to seizure and forfeiture. Mind you, from the year 1818 to the year 1886, we had gone on enforcing that treaty in pursuance of the Imperial and Canadian statutes. The hon. gentleman spoke of the vigorous Administration of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He did not require such an Act as this; he enforced the treaty of 1818 firmly and with vigor; but his Administration was not a capricious one; he laid down certain lines and kept to them. But these gentlemen were not satisfied with the law of the land, and for the purpose—I won't say for the purpose of irritating the Americans still more, because I do not believe that could have been their intention—but carried away with the improper belief in the greatness of this Dominion, in our power to make the great nation to the south of us bend the knee, we passed this Act of 1886, declaring that any vessel that entered into the prohibited waters should be subject to seizure and forfeiture. Well, Sir, that Act did not receive the royal assent at once; it was reserved by the Governor General and received the royal assent on the 26th November, 1886, after the season had closed. And, Sir, we know what the policy of the Government then was. The Finance Minister has taken pains to-night to disavow any sympathy with that policy. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Justice felt very comfortable when he told them to-night that he could not endorse the lines of action they had laid down. He was not responsible except in an indirect way, I suppose, and he wanted to wash his hands clear of it altogether. That policy was one inimical to the maintenance of good relations between the United States and Canada, and the hon. gentleman is now boiling over with love and affection for his American cousins; and, therefore, not even by implication, would he endorse the reports which were afterwards made Minutes of Council, signed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the hon. Minister of Justice. He washes his hands clear of them, he did as has often been done by a leading member of the Cabinet when one of his juniors does not please him—he sat upon them and disavowed the policy altogether. But these hon. gentlemen have got to take it all the same. Let us see what that policy was, because it is very important in determining whether we should accept the new policy of the Administration to find out how far that policy differs from the one they recommended to this House a few years ago, and which they said should twelve months ago be accepted as necessary for the maintenance of our dignity. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a report to Council in which he laid down the policy of the Government. With much of the report I have no fault to find, and I may say in passing that I do not find fault with the construction they put upon the treaty, that I agree very largely, if not altogether, with the legal arguments by which the Minister of Marine, and especially the Minister of Justice, supported the construction they put upon the treaty. I think in the legal controversy the Minister of Justice had with the other side he came out the victor—that is my opinion; but I complain that they were not satisfied with putting a construction upon the treaty and then carrying out that construction in a firm and reasonable way, but they were determined that the customs law of this country should be dragged in to harass, to irritate, to worry and drive to desperation the American fishermen, as it did drive them to desperation. The hon. gentleman in that report says:

"It is not however the case that the convention of 1818 affected only the inshore fisheries of the British Provinces; it was framed with the object of affording a complete and exclusive definition of the rights and liberties which the fishermen of the United States were thenceforth to enjoy in following their vocation as far as these rights would be affected by facilities for access to the shores or waters of the British Provinces or for intercourse with their people. It is therefore no undue expansion of the scope of that convention to interpret strictly those of its provisions by which such access is denied, except to the vessels requiring it for the purposes specifically described.

"Such an undue expansion would, upon the other hand, certainly take place, if under cover of its provisions, or of any agreements relating to general commercial intercourse which may have since been made, permission were accorded to the United States' fishermen to resort habitually to the harbors of the Dominion, not for sake of seeking safety for their vessels or for avoiding risk of human life, but in order to use those harbors as a general base of operations from which to prosecute and organise with greater advantage to themselves the industry in which they are engaged."

The hon. gentleman then thought this would amount to a practical repeal of the treaty; that was his opinion then. But the hon. gentleman comes into court to-day and asks us to accept a treaty in which all of those concessions have been made, in which nearly every claim put forward by the United States Government at that time has substantially, to use the words of President Cleveland, been conceded to United States fishermen. They have told us it would be a practical repeal of the treaty and monstrous to allow such a thing. If the Government had voluntarily then done without compulsion, what they have done now at the point of the bayonet and under compulsion, we would have occupied a very much more honorable position and a much stronger position than we do to-day. Then we had the policy of the Government in this connection laid down by the Minister of Justice. In a report which he made in reply to some complaints furnished by the Minister at St. James, Mr. Phelps, the Minister said:

"But that which Mr. Phelps calls 'literal interpretation' is by no means so preposterous as he suggests, when the purpose and object of the treaty come to be considered. While it was not desired to interfere with ordinary commercial intercourse between the people of the two countries, the deliberate and declared purpose existed on the part of Great Britain, and the willingness existed on the part of the United States to secure, absolutely and free from the possibility of encroachment, the fisheries of the British possessions in America, to the people of those possessions, excepting as to certain localities in respect to which special provisions were made. To effect this it was not merely necessary that there should be a joint declaration of the right which was to be established, but that means should be taken to preserve that right. For this purpose a distinction was necessarily drawn between United States vessels engaged in commerce and those engaged in fishing. While the former had free access to our coasts the latter were placed under a strict prohibition.

"The purpose was to prevent the fisheries from being poached on, and to preserve them to the subjects of His Britannic Majesty in North America not only for the purpose of fishing within the waters adjacent to the coast, which can under the law of nations be done by any country but as a base of supplies for the pursuit of fishing in the deep sea. For this purpose it was necessary to keep out foreign fishing vessels, excepting in cases of dire necessity, no matter under what pretext they might desire to come in. The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbors, to post a letter or send a telegram or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood or pestilence or to buy medicine or to purchase a new rope."

To-day the Minister of Finance comes back from Washington fresh with laurels as assistant to Her Majesty's plenipotentiary and loaded with compliments from that hon. gentleman, he asks us to accept a treaty which concerns everything which he previously said would ruin our fisheries. I think the hon. gentleman might have done this: He might have said that was my policy and I believe in it, and if it turns out that the rest of the Government cannot accept it, I am prepared to step down and out and let another man come in and carry out an opposite policy. I say it is not right for those hon. gentlemen having taken the stand they did, having declared that it was essential for the protection of our fisheries to prevent American fishermen entering our ports even to post a letter or to purchase medicine, now, having adopted a treaty

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

which admits them for all these purposes to change their policy and ask this House to assent to the new policy. Then we had the policy laid down by the Minister of Marine in still stronger language. In a report he made to the Privy Council on 1st February, 1887, he said as follows,—and I wish hon. gentlemen to follow me in the quotations I am making from these reports and to note the fact that these dates are, June, July and 1st February, respectively. The dates will be important in a moment because they will, in connection with the fact I am going to mention, serve to show why these brave gentlemen changed their policy so materially. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says in this Minute, and mark you all those reports were adopted in their entirety by the Government of the hon. gentleman, approved in a Minute of Council and forwarded to the Home Government.

"It is not to be expected that after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights, and upon the respect due by foreign vessels, while in Canadian waters, the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are exuberant, in the absence moreover of any decision of a legal tribunal to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, that the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments withdraw from a position taken up deliberately and by doing so in effect plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity and bad faith, which in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States."

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trusts committed to their charge."

Sir, these are the brave words which the hon. the Minister made use of in the month of February, 1887, but to-night he comes in and he pleads guilty to the charge of oppression, to the charge of inhumanity, and to the charge of bad faith. He surrenders on the part of Canada he abandons the valuable portion of the national inheritance which he said was necessary to our national existence, and the result is if he is a good prophet, he will be visited with just reprobation by those who committed this trust to his hands. Sir, it may be asked what brought about this sudden change of front? Up to February they were hurling defiance at the gentlemen across the border. They said: You tell us that our policy is an inhuman policy, that it is a policy of bad faith, that it is a policy calculated to estrange the two countries. No matter the Minister of Marine says it is a deliberate policy and we would be craven (that is the meaning of his language) if we backed down from the trust which has been committed to our hand and we are going to return that trust unsullied to the hands of those who gave it. Sir, if the hon. gentleman, when he is confronted with a new policy entirely at variance with that which he said was a "deliberate" policy, came before us and said: "I cannot in conscience remain as a member of the Government and I shall let new men carry out that policy—" I would forgive him, I would say it showed a spirit of manly independence. But I cannot conceive how this gentleman, who laid down this policy in the strong language that he embodied in the state paper I have quoted from, should come down and ask us to accept this treaty as a fair and honorable treaty between both parties. Every claim made by the United States has substantially, although not in words, been admitted, and to-day, Sir, the Finance Minister, even with all his ingenuity, was not able to tell this House of one concession—and I watched him from beginning to end—which our American neighbors had made to the great Canadian people. Now, Sir, just at that time, just when the hon. gentleman was nailing his colors to the mast in Canada here, the Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James was formulating in a state paper the complaints which the Americans had against our administration of the law. Sir, I will ask

your attention to that for one moment, because unless we see what they complained of, and what the hon. gentleman refused to remedy, we cannot tell whether by this treaty they have conceded all that the Americans claimed or not. I find, Sir, that Mr. Phelps, in a despatch to the Marquis of Salisbury on the 26th of January, 1887, formulated his complaints against the administration of our fishery laws in these terms:

"The United States Government is not able to concur in the favorable view taken by Lord Iddlesleigh of the efforts of the Canadian Government 'to promote a friendly negotiation.' That the conduct of that Government has been directed to obtaining a revision of the existing treaty is not to be doubted. But its efforts have been of such a character as to preclude the prospect of a successful negotiation so long as they continue, and seriously to endanger the friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain.

"Aside from the question as to the right of American vessels to purchase bait in Canadian ports, such a construction has been given to the treaty between the United States and Great Britain as amounts virtually to a declaration of a most complete non-intercourse with American vessels. The usual courtesy between friendly nations has been refused in their case, and in one instance, at least, the ordinary offices of humanity. The treaty of friendship and amity which in return for the very important concessions by the United States to Great Britain reserve to American vessels certain specified privileges, has been construed to preclude them from all other intercourse common to civilised life and to universal maritime usage among nations not at war, as well as from the right to touch and trade accorded to all vessels.

"And quite aside from any question arising upon construction of the treaty, the provisions of the Custom House Acts and Regulations have been systematically enforced against American ships for alleged petty and technical violations of legal requirements in a manner so unreasonable, unfriendly and so unjust as to render the privileges accorded by the treaty practically nugatory.

"It is not for a moment contended by the United States Government that American vessels should be exempt from those reasonable port and Custom House regulations which are in force in countries where such vessels have occasion to visit. If they choose to violate such requirements, the Government will not attempt to screen them from the just and legal consequence.

"But what the United States Government complain in these cases is that the existing regulations have been construed with a technical strictness, and enforced with a severity, in cases of inadvertent and accidental violation where no harm was done, which is both unusual and unnecessary, whereby the voyages of vessels had been broken up and heavy penalties incurred. That the liberal and reasonable construction of these laws that had prevailed for many years, and to which the fishermen have become accustomed, was changed without any notice given. (On every opportunity of unnecessary interference with the American fishing vessels to the prejudice and destruction of their business has been availed of."

The hon. gentleman will see that while he complained of the construction of the treaty he did not base the main ground of his complaint upon the severe construction of the treaty by the Dominion Government at all, but he based it upon the systematic enforcement, as he termed it, against American ships of alleged petty and technical violations of the custom house regulations and acts. There is no doubt, as was afterwards stated by Mr. Bayard in his despatch, that the petty actions, trivial in themselves, against the American fishing vessels which suffered from the attempt to enforce customs regulations against them in every port, did more than anything else that was done by the Government of the day to irritate the American nation, to irritate the American fishermen and to bring about that state of non-intercourse which the hon. gentleman referred to and the Retaliatory Bill which was passed. But, Sir, just at the very time when these hon. gentlemen were declaring that they could not surrender one iota to the Americans, we find that they agreed to give up the whole case altogether. We find that on the 24th day of February, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in England telegraphed to the Governor General of Canada as follows:—

"Her Majesty's Government, while endeavoring to procure this *ad interim* arrangement, feel it right to intimate to you that they are disposed to think, after much consideration of the entire subject, that the best and simplest settlement of the present difficulties might be arrived at if both parties would agree so as to permit the discussion of the more extended commercial arrangements—to revive, for time at least, if not permanently, the condition of things which existed under the Treaty of Washington, fish and fish productions being again recipro-

cally admitted duty free, and the fishery being once more reciprocally thrown open."

On the 26th February the Government telegraphed in reply:

"Referring to your telegram of the 24th February, Canadian Government is prepared to accept your suggestion of reverting temporarily the condition of things existing under the Treaty of Washington without at present raising the question of indemnity."

Pursuant to their telegram Lord Salisbury made the offer to the American Government, but nothing appears to have come of it. Now, Sir, on the 3rd day of March, just a few weeks after the hon. Minister of Marine had penned the report which I have just read, the United States Government, pressed by the fishermen, and, as the hon. Minister said, by a determined and united people and a united press, and driven to desperation by the way in which Canada had carried out the treaty, introduced the Retaliatory Bill; and that Bill, Sir, altered the whole circumstances of the case. The entire character of our protective service at once changed. Hon. gentlemen then saw that they had been pushing this matter too far. They saw that they could not re-enact in 1887, as they were termed by the United States, the tyrannical acts and the tyrannical construction of the customs laws which they had enforced in 1886. They saw, Sir, that the American Government and people would not submit to dictation. The possible consequences of that Retaliatory Bill were not overdrawn by the hon. Finance Minister when he said it would stop the whole intercourse between the two people, and would be destructive of the trade and commerce of Canada. But while the hon. gentleman put that construction on the Retaliatory Bill to-day, what did he do one short year ago? He was then engaged in backing up the policy of the Minister of Marine which he disavows to-night, and he then told us that that Non-intercourse Bill, as he termed it, would not be an unmixed evil. It would lead, he said, to the development of better intercourse between ourselves. To-day he tells us it would produce a commercial disaster in Canada the end of which no one could foresee. Sir, he was prepared with a light heart to go into the war a year ago; to-day he tells us, and tells us I believe truly, that that Retaliatory Bill, if it came into force, would paralyse the prosperity of Canada; it would put an end to the prosperous intercourse which prevails between us and our neighbors in the United States; and it would hurl the present Government from power—and that I believe was the motive that compelled these hon. gentlemen to retrace their steps and adopt a policy antagonistic to the policy they pursued a year ago. But, Sir, what are we to say? One year ago I heard the hon. gentleman challenge the Government of the United States to put that Retaliatory Bill into force. We were not afraid of them, he said: [It will not be an unmixed evil;] we will develop intercourse among ourselves, and good will come out of it in the long run; and the 120 gentlemen who sit behind him cheered the sentiment to the echo. To-day he tells the same gentleman that it would be the greatest disaster that could happen to Canada, and they turn around and cheer that sentiment. Sir, I do not know any sentiment the hon. gentleman could utter with his grave face that his followers behind him would not cheer. Then, Sir, shortly after the hon. gentlemen made that warlike declaration in the House, he saw fit to change his mind. He had a message from Secretary Bayard, and who was the mediator chosen by these two great nations to carry a communication from the Secretary of the United States to the Finance Minister of Canada? Who was the confidential envoy entrusted with the secret minds of those gentlemen? No less a person than Mr. Erastus Wiman, who has been denounced in this House by dozens of hon. gentlemen opposite as an apostate to his country; who is sneered at by the Conservative press throughout this country as a man having a fad. He is the man who above all others is chosen by the Secretary of

State of the United States to convey a confidential intimation to the Finance Minister of Canada that it would be well for them to meet and have a confidential talk over this matter. Well, Sir, not only was he chosen by the Secretary of State of the United States, but he was accepted by the Finance Minister of Canada, and the Finance Minister has put the sign manual of his approval on him to-night; and I would venture to say that there is not a man sitting on the benches behind him who will ever hereafter speak of Erastus Wiman except with respect—no more “rasses,” and no more “fads.” I did not hear the interruption of the hon. Minister of the Interior. But when the hon. gentleman who leads him, who leads the Government, and who can force his policy on them when he likes, tells them that Mr. Erastus Wiman is a man to be trusted, I think the hon. gentleman will accept the statement. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman went to Washington, and he has given us a frank statement of the interchange of views that took place between him and Secretary Bayard. Sir, I never read in my life with more pleasure than the communications which passed between those two gentlemen; and if the hon. gentleman would to-day step out from the party that is trammelling and keeping him from doing what I believe his own heart tells him should be done—if he would come out to-day and formulate in this House the policy which he favored in that letter, he would not only draw from behind him a larger following, but he would receive from this side of the House a most cordial support.

Mr. HICKEY. That is too thin.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the hon. gentleman, I venture to say, would be one of the first to follow him. Now, Sir, let me refer to a thing which I endorse most cordially. We know that the hon. gentleman's first contention was first advanced by the hon. the Secretary of States. That hon. gentleman, in some extraordinary way, nominated the Finance Minister as the Commissioner for Canada. Well, I am not going to take objection to the nomination of the hon. gentleman. I am going to take objection to the theory he laid down to-night that the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties would be a suicidal policy, if we had it conceded to us, but I am not going to object, after his having been nominated by the Secretary of State, to that nomination having received the cordial approval of Her Gracious Majesty. I wonder if Mr. Wiman had anything to do with suggesting the hon. gentleman's name? What does Mr. Bayard say:

“I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country.”

Well, the hon. the Minister of Finance to-night quoted with approval that sentiment of Mr. Bayard. Mr. Bayard, he believed was sincere, and Mr. Bayard said there was but one way to procure a just and permanent settlement, and that was by a liberal statesmanlike treatment of the entire commercial relations of the two countries, which did not involve, directly or indirectly our political independence. The hon. gentleman said he believed that Mr. Bayard, in so saying, spoke the truth; but what have his followers been stating for the past three weeks? They have been declaring that Mr. Bayard did not tell the truth, and that a settlement upon a broad, liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries necessarily involved the surrender of our political independence. That is what not only one the hon. gentleman's followers said, but it is what many of them repeated over in a parrot like manner. They have had their answer to-night from the First Minister who tells them they are all wrong, and that the proposition of Secretary Bayard, that a statesmanlike

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

settlement, on a broad, generous basis, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries does not involve, directly or indirectly, the surrender of one atom of our political independence. I hope now that hon. gentlemen opposite will cease shouting their senseless cry of disloyalty and accept the construction put upon the proposition by their own leader the First Minister. Well, we had that offer, and I did not catch from the hon. gentleman why it was negotiations were at once entered upon. I did not hear him state why the matter remained over from May last until the following November, but we do know that while no negotiations were entered into, the entire policy of the Government with regard to the carrying out of our fishery laws was remodelled and changed; there were no more seizures, there were no more alleged breaches of custom laws. There were no more vexatious and harassing seizures and detention of American vessels, and although, formally, the instructions remained as they were before, practically and substantially, they had so entirely changed that they were no longer in force. The hon. gentleman said, and I was sorry to hear him say it, that he was proud Canada had not the right to negotiate her own commercial treaties. He was proud, he said, that we had not the nomination of our own commissioners and plenipotentiaries. Sir, I take issue with him. I submit, without fear of contradiction, that the one arbitration which ever has been held between Canada and United States, which resulted honorably to the people of Canada, in which we got a fair meed of justice, was that arbitration in which we appointed our own Minister. When the Halifax Commissioner was being appointed, it was a matter of history that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, who led the Government, was pressed very strongly by the Imperial Government to accept the nomination of an English gentleman to be nominated by them, and it is to his credit that he refused to bow to their dictation in that respect, and insisted upon Canada's right to nominate the gentleman who should be appointed to represent her. It was a lucky day for Canada when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had the pluck and the manliness to assert Canadian dignity and the right of Canada to have a Canadian appointed to represent her on that commission. The hon. gentleman would lead us to imagine that forsooth if this right was conceded to Canada, our interests would be sacrificed, that we would not have the prestige which now attaches to the appointment made by Her Majesty at the dictation of her Minister, whoever he may be. Was that the case in Halifax, when Sir Alexander Galt acted on behalf of the Dominion? Is it not true that every one conceded that the management of the case by the nominee of the Canadian Government reflected the highest credit on his ability, integrity and diplomacy, and on the Government that appointed him? Therefore, the hon. gentleman's statement is not one I can endorse. Before I sit down, I wish to say a few words about the treaty itself. It is a record of surrenders on our part; it is a record of concessions on our part, and I am sorry to say there is no record of any concessions in return on the part of the Americans. Our fishermen have no compensating concessions made to them. The hon. gentleman could not name one. Our fishermen to-day will fish in our waters, access into which has been given the American fishermen, and when the vessels of the two nations bring the results of their season's work to Boston, our fishermen will be handicapped to the extent of two dollars a barrel. I am not going to use on this point my own language, but will quote again the language of the hon. gentleman himself, which I gave in the early part of my remarks, and the language of the First Minister when he said that “under these circumstances Canadian fishermen would become the hewers of wood and drawers of water to the fishermen of the United States.” That is the condition in which the hon. gentleman

has left them to-day. His treaty is a non-conditional surrender on the part of Canada to all that the Americans claim. What is the statement made by the President of the United States himself in respect to this treaty. He says:

"The history of the events in the past two years shows that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of their temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors."

He was not complaining of the construction put upon the treaty, because he admits, and the American Senate consented to admit, that the legal construction put by the Government upon the words of the treaty is correct. But he says:

"You have harassed and injured our fishing vessels by compelling them to make out entries and clearances in your ports."

And this treaty relieves them from all that.

"Such inconvenience is provided against in the proposed treaty and this most frequent and just cause of complaint is removed. The articles permitting our fishermen to obtain provisions and the ordinary supplies of trading vessels on their homeward voyages, and under which they are accorded the further and even more important privilege on all occasions of purchasing such casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels, are of great importance and value. The licenses which are to be granted without charge and on application, in order to enjoy these privileges, are reasonable and proper checks in the hands of local authorities to identify the recipient and prevent abuse, and can form no impediment to those who intend to use them fairly."

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal. These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for which contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State and our Minister at London and by the American negotiators of the present treaty."

If Grover Cleveland is correct in his construction, it has been an unconditional surrender by the Government of Canada to the demands of the people of the United States. I am not, just for the moment, contending that these concessions are unjust in themselves, but I am contending that the men who declared a year ago that they were unjust, and that they could not possibly concede them, and that the concession of them would prove ruinous to Canada, stand to-day in a position the most unenviable that any statesmen can possibly occupy, when they ask us now to accept this treaty, which concedes everything which they said before could not possibly be conceded because it would be ruinous. They should step down and let other men make the concessions. That is their duty, and that is the course any English statesmen would take; but they do not understand that. What does Secretary Bayard say about it? He says:

"The United States have secured practically everything we have been contending for. I do not hesitate to say that, if Canada had conceded to the United States fishermen in 1818, one fourth of the rights that are secured for them by this treaty, there would have been no trouble at all. We would not have heard a single complaint, because no grievance would have been felt. Every difficulty that the American fishermen has had to contend with has been removed by this treaty. Generally it can be stated that no fishing ground of any value whatever to American fishermen has been conceded to Canada by this treaty."

That is the view Secretary Bayard takes of it. That view is correct. We stand here to-day giving our assent to a treaty of unconditional surrender on the part of the Canadian people and the Canadian Government. We boasted of what we could do, we talked about reciprocity of tariffs, we spoke about bringing the Americans on their knees to us, we talked about forcing them to do this and to do that; and to-day we are in the humiliating position that we have to concede at the point of the bayonet what it would have been manly and honorable and better for us to have conceded voluntarily two years ago. Now, I want to call the attention of the House for a moment or two to the treaty itself. The hon. gentleman says that, when he went there to Washington, his instructions were not limited, that he was instructed by the Government to obtain as near an approach to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as he could get,

but it is perfectly evident, from the language he made use of in reply to Secretary Bayard, that he was prepared to go much further than that. What does he tell us to-night? He says, I made an offer to the United States Government on the 30th November:

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

The hon. gentleman did not confine that to natural products. He was challenged by my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and was told, that means unrestricted reciprocity. What was the answer the Finance Minister made? My offer was unrestricted, and I intended that it should be so. Is that correct? If the hon. gentleman made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, as he says he did, he should have been in this House for the past three weeks to hear the denunciations heaped upon his unfortunate head by all his followers, to hear their statements that such an offer was disloyal, that it was striking at the foundation of Canadian liberty and undermining the pillars upon which Canadian independence rested. We hear to-day that we have been forestalled in our traitorous designs of having unrestricted reciprocity with the United States by the Finance Minister himself, and yet the hon. the Premier takes him back to his bosom, disloyal as he is, and is perfectly satisfied with him, as long as he succeeds in maintaining the hon. gentleman in power. That is the sum total of their efforts, apparently. But, although the Finance Minister tells us to-night that the offer was an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, that it was unrestricted in its terms, a fortnight has not gone by since a Minister of the Crown stated in reply to a gentleman on this side who put the same construction upon the offer, that it was a mistake, that it was not so. I think that was the Minister who interrupted me who, on page 542 of *Hansard*, made a declaration that Sir Charles Tupper never made an offer of reciprocity unrestricted in its character, and we have the hon. Minister of Finance to-night stating that it was so and that he intended it should be so. There will be some little curiosity on the part of the House and of the country to see those hon. gentlemen reconcile their statements, but, in view of what we have already seen, I have no doubt which policy is going to govern in the long run, if the hon. Minister remains here. The "boys" of the Cabinet, as they were called a little while ago, will have to accept the policy as he dictates it. He is the real leader to-day and the master of the policy of the Government. That is perfectly evident. Now, the hon. gentleman stated, with reference to the treaty itself, that the delimitation clauses amounted to a concession on the part of Canada to the United States. That is true. They do amount to a concession. We formerly contended for the headland theory, and that has been surrendered by this treaty. I am not going to waste much time on this, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman made the statement he did to-night to the effect that, for the past forty years, Great Britain has withdrawn its contention in that respect. The British Government never withdrew its contention on that point. Down to 1852—

Mr. MITCHELL. 1854.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I am coming to 1854 afterwards, but I am referring to 1852 at present. The British Government down to 1852 consistently and persistently claimed that to be the construction of the treaty, and in 1852 the Secretary of State of the United States, the greatest Secretary they ever had, Webster himself, declared that the contention of the British Government was right and there could be no doubt about it. In a state paper, dated 6th July,

1852, Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, although contending that the wording of the Convention of 1818 was not conformable to the intentions of the United States as one of the contracting parties, says :

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article (first article of the Convention of 1818) fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British Provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea entering from the ocean between capes or headlands, and the term is applied equally to small and large tracts of water thus situated. It is common to speak of Hudson Bay, or the bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water.

"The British authorities insist that England has no right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture every fisherman who may follow their pursuits inside of that line. It was undoubtedly an oversight, in the Convention of 1818, to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets, or recesses of the ocean, ought to be opened to American fishermen as freely as the sea itself, to within three miles of the shore."

The Secretary of States there admits that under the proper construction of the treaty, the contention of the British Government was correct. Senator Butler, the same year, adopted the same construction; Mr. Seward adopted the same, and a large number of others.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Everett the same.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, in connection with Lord Aberdeen's correspondence.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Seward said on that occasion :

"I cannot assent to the force of the argument of the hon. Senator from Louisiana. I am more prepared to go against it, because I think it is getting pretty late in the day to find the Secretary of State wrong in the technical and legal construction of an instrument. Let us test the argument. The hon. Senator says, that where the Government occupies both sides of the coast, and where the strait through which the waters of the bay flows into the Ocean, is not more than six miles wide, then there is dominion over it.

"Now, then, the Gut of Canso is a most indispensable communication for our fishermen from the Atlantic Ocean to the Northumberland Straits, and to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for a reason which any one will very readily see by referring to the map; yet the Gut of Canso is only three-quarters of a mile wide. I should be sorry to adopt an argument which Great Britain might turn against us to exclude us from that important passage."

Again I recall the hon. Senator's argument, viz. :

"Two things unite to give a country dominion over an inland sea. The first is, that the land on both sides must be within the dominion of the Government claiming jurisdiction, and then, that the strait is not more than six miles wide; but that if the strait is more than six miles wide, no such jurisdiction can be claimed."

Upon which he commented :

"Now, Sir, this argument seems to me to prove too much. I think it would divest the United States of the harbor of Boston, all the land around which belongs to Massachusetts or the United States, while the mouth of the bay is six miles wide. It would surrender our dominion over Long Island Sound, a dominion which I think the State of New York and the United States would not willingly give up, it would surrender Delaware Bay, it would surrender, I think, Albermarle Sound, and Chesapeake Bay; and I believe it would surrender the Bay of Monterey, and perhaps the Bay of San Francisco on the Pacific coast."

Sir, not only have we here Her Majesty's Government contending for the extended construction put upon the word "bay," known as the headland's construction, but we have leading men of the United States, such as Mr. Webster and Mr. Seward, assenting to that construction, and enforcing it with arguments which, in the United States Senate, were irresistible, showing that if you do not concede that, they give up their own chief and principal bays. Now the hon. gentleman quoted from a declaration made by the British Government, made in 1866, but he omitted to quote the preceding sentence which entirely modifies the quotation he made. In 1866 the British Government stated :

"Her Majesty's Government are clearly of opinion that by the Convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing, not only within three miles from the Colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a British bay or creek. But the question 'What is a British bay or creek?' is one which has been an occasion of difficulty in former times. It is, therefore, at present, the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

wish of Her Majesty's Government neither to concede, nor for the present, to enforce any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question."

They re-affirmed the doctrine of the headlands in its fullest sense in 1870, but in view of the pending negotiations for the Washington Treaty, they declined to give their consent to their being enforced at that time. They were willing to make temporary concessions in order, if possible, that the Washington Treaty might be consummated, but they never yielded or conceded for one moment that the arguments they had advanced were unsound. I am sorry the hon. gentleman went out of this way for the purpose of putting into the mouth of the British Government an argument which they never used with reference to this question. Now, Sir, I am not disposed to find a great deal of fault with the articles of this treaty, which refer to the delimitation of our waters. They are concessions, as the hon. gentleman says, from us; there are no concessions to us that I am aware of. The hon. gentleman speaks of certain bays which are excepted. The hon. gentleman knows that some of those bays never had a fisherman in them since the Treaty of 1818 was enacted, Take Egmont Bay for instance. My hon. friend from Prince County (Mr. Yeo) comes from that quarter, and he knows it well, and my hon. friend in front of me knows it well, and they know well that in the memory of living man, an American fisherman has never been seen fishing in Egmont Bay. However, I am not here to cavil, I do not wish to make objection merely for the purpose of objecting. So far as the question of delimiting the waters is concerned, I think the compromise is not one which we should refuse to accept—I do not think we ought to, although we do give up, as the hon. gentleman says, a great deal we once contended for; we concede nine-tenths, I dare say, of what our contention was previously, but I am satisfied. In the matter of these bays we must remember that while they may be very valuable one year, they may not be valuable another. Now, the Bay of Chaleurs at one time was the chief resort for the mackerel that came from the Bay of St. Lawrence. But to-day they do not come to the Bay of Chaleurs, and hardly any fishermen enter that bay. But in a year or two the mackerel may return; therefore the exception made here of reserving the Bay of Chaleurs as out of the common waters, may one day prove to be a valuable exception, and I am glad it was made. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that article 9 of the treaty should be accepted in the same way. The treaty says :

"Nothing in this treaty shall interrupt or affect the free navigation of the Straits of Canso by fishing vessels of the United States."

Practically, that amounts to a concession to the United States for all time of the right, mind you, to use the Straits of Canso for fishing purposes. Heretofore they have not enjoyed that right. That is a tremendous concession we have given to them, and when the treaty is once assented to the Straits of Canso become common water to the Americans as well as to the Canadians. I say it is a great and valuable concession which we have made to them, and in return we have got nothing. But, Sir, I want to come to articles 10 and 11. Now, article 10 concedes to the United States that for which we have been contending, and that for which the Minister of Marine and the Government strenuously denied. American fishing vessels can now enter our harbors, they need not report, they need not enter and need not clear in the custom house when they come for shelter or repair, nor when they come in—

"outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than 24 hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein—"

may be required to report, but they shall not be liable for compulsory pilotage nor for any dues. These are the concessions we make to the Americans. The hon. gentleman says they are reasonable concessions; but if they are rea-

sonable concessions, why did the Government not make them a year ago, why did they bring us to the verge of war with our neighbors across the line by withholding those concessions which to day he terms reasonable and which he asks us to approve? Why not have conceded them in a frank, honorable and manly way two years ago? If that had been done, the Government would have stood very much higher in the estimation of the people than to-day, and we would have been much nearer obtaining the boon we all desire, freer commercial relations with the United States. Now we come to article 9, a most important article. That article provides :

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada or of the coasts of Newfoundland under stress of weather or other casualty may unload, reload, tranship or sell, subject to Customs laws and regulations, all fish on board, when such unloading, transhipment, or sale is made necessary as incidental to repairs, and may replenish outfits, provisions and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needful facilities, including the shipping of crews."

The practical construction that will be put upon the article will be this: An American captain can come into port, he can declare that he comes in from stress of weather—he is the judge of the matter, you have to accept his statement. He can come in if he loses a jib-boom, even a rope yarn; he may unload and tranship—the most valuable privilege and that for which the Americans have been contending for years, and which puts them on an equal footing with our fishermen, while our men are handicapped by a duty of \$2 a barrel. Technically you may say that American vessels cannot come in unless under stress of weather or other casualty. How are you to determine it? An American comes in from stress of weather because he has lost a hal-yard, and while it is being repaired he unloads. I do not see how you can prevent it. Practically under this treaty the Americans will ask for and claim and have a right to tranship their fish in the manner they have been demanding for many years. I must confess I fail to apprehend, even after the explanation of the Finance Minister, the meaning of the latter part of the section :

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels, having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but such provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for resale or traffic."

A man who once obtains a license, which he can obtain gratis, has a right on all occasions afterwards, not only for the homeward voyage, but for any other voyage, to be accorded the same facilities for the purpose of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are given to trading vessels. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the construction of that clause was that it applied only to vessels when on the homeward voyage; but that is not the true construction. Having once obtained the license, they are entitled to it on all occasions afterwards. I suppose it was assumed to mean for the same season; but I do not know as to that. An American vessel will ask for the license at the first port at which she arrives, and she will be entitled to obtain it and will be entitled afterwards to the same facilities for purchasing supplies as are granted to merchant vessels. What are supplies? Who is going to put a construction upon supplies? The words are "provisions and supplies." Supplies are not, therefore, provisions, because both words are used. The Americans will say this term embraces bait. You will say it does not embrace bait. The treaty you have interpreted was plain and clearly understood, but the interpretation treaty we have now before us is difficult of interpretation

and there will be trouble in regard to it from the very start. There are sure to be differences of opinion between the captains of merchant vessels as to the right to purchase bait and the Government which does not wish to furnish it. Supplies must mean something, and it is clear they do not mean provisions, and I do not know what a vessel requires except provisions and bait and things of that kind. It will be found that this treaty has not been carefully worded and is open to different interpretations, and if the broader construction that I think the Americans will claim is conceded to them, you will have given up everything that the subsequent clause provides to give the Americans, the right to purchase provisions, bait, ice, seines and transhipment of fish when the duties are removed, will be a dead letter, because they will claim they have a right to all that under article 11. I do not say they have the right, I say the treaty has been so loosely drawn that it will take a dozen Philadelphia lawyers to tell really what it does mean. I have seen half a dozen lawyers considering it, three favoring one interpretation, three another, and I have never yet found two men with the same opinion in regard to it. It is clear that difficulties will arise between Canada and the United States as to the rights to which American fishermen are entitled under section 11. I would say nothing about the *modus vivendi*. If the treaty was good in itself, if it was an honorable and fair treaty, I would object to a *modus vivendi* being agreed upon for two years such as was offered by the Commissioners from Great Britain and is attached to the treaty here. But there are not only the concessions in the treaty, it appears as if the Government were not able to give the Americans enough, and as soon as they had given all they asked, the Government then said that in good fellowship and with a wish to promote good feeling we propose for the next two years for a nominal sum to give you everything you can possibly ask and all that our fishermen enjoy on our shores. The amount of \$1.50 a ton is a nominal sum, meaning as it does only \$1.20 on a fishing vessel of 80 tons. However, I maintain that there will be much difficulty arising from the construction of this treaty and from the interpretation put upon its terms, very much more than on the interpretation of the old treaty. The old treaty was so plain there could hardly be two interpretations placed upon it, and it was its administration that caused complaint to be made in regard to it and the administration of the customs laws to the American fishing vessels which they thought should have not have been applied. The upshot of the whole business is, as I have said, that the Americans got all they wanted, as the President said in his Message, and as Mr. Bayard said in the interview which is published in his organ *The Post*. And we got what? We have listened for three hours to the Minister of Finance. Did he tell us one thing we got, one concession or one promise even from the Americans? We got absolutely nothing and we conceded everything. The hon. gentleman talked about the Americans not wanting to come within the three-mile limit to fish. He knows that, rightly or wrongly, their leading men have been convinced that the fishing privilege within the three-mile limit is valueless. I do not agree with their contention. I noticed to-day in reading a report of the Senate of the United States that upon this point they make a full report to the Senate and to the people of the States. Having examined a large number of witnesses upon the point, they conclude as follows :

"In view of all these facts well known to the great body of the citizens of the United States engaged in fisheries and embracing every variety of interest connected therewith, from the wholesale dealer, vessel owner and outfitter to that portion of the crew who receive the smallest share of the venture, it must be considered as conclusively established that there would be no material value whatever in the grant of the British Government to American fishermen of absolutely free fishing; and in this conclusion it will be seen by a reference to the testimony, that all these interests fully concur."

The reason, therefore, they did not get free fishing was because they did not ask it, and they did not ask it because they thought it was valueless. I think they are mistaken. I think, Sir, and I have always thought after listening to all the evidence given before the Halifax Fishery Commission, that the right to fish within the three-mile limit is a most valuable right in this regard. It may not be so valuable as it once was when the Americans fished with hook and line entirely. They then had to come to the three-mile limit almost entirely to catch fish, but I contend it is valuable still. Why, Sir, if a vessel goes down to the bay of St. Lawrence to catch fish, the exclusion from the three-mile limit may mean the difference between a profitable and an unprofitable voyage. The seventy, or eighty, or a hundred barrels of fish, that might be caught within the three-mile limit, and which by reason of the exclusion they will fail to catch, may mean the profits, and large profits too upon the whole voyage. The cost of going down is the same and those gentlemen may say what they like, but I maintain now and always have maintained that they are wrong in their conclusion and that the fishing privilege within the three-mile limit is still a most valuable one, but as I said before they did not get it because they did not ask for it, and they did not ask for it because after considering the report of the evidence they thought it was not worth it. When they did ask for it in 1854 and when we gave up our right to the Americans we got reciprocal trade with that country in return. In 1871 when we gave up our right under the Washington Treaty we got not only a remission of the duties upon our fish, but Sir, we got five and a half millions of money compensation paid to us for the concessions we made. In 1886 we gave them up the privileges they have been contending for and we got nothing whatever in return. What I complain of is, that we should never have attempted to harass the Americans with those custom regulations which they complained of as so arbitrary. They complained that we denied them their rights and that we not harassed them in the enjoyment of their rights and harassed them by imposing duties upon them that which ought to have been imposed, and that we threw all the difficulties we possibly could throw in the way of the exercise by them as they said of their rights under the treaty. If we had voluntarily ceded to them these concessions which have been wrung from us under this treaty we would to-day be standing in a proud position. But, Sir, they have obtained everything and we have got nothing in return. I condemn the policy of the Government because it has been an arbitrary policy. Arbitrary in so far as it applied to those American fishing vessels in the Customs Acts and regulations of the Dominion which never should have been applied to them. I condemn it as a capricious policy because, while one year you gave them the fisheries in 1885 for nothing, the next year you prosecute and persecute them with all the rigors of the law in the regulations of the custom house and the Marine and Fisheries Department, and now capriciously you turn around and, after telling the people of the country that the concessions they demand from you would prove ruinous to the fishery interest and could never be conceded without the loss of the whole fisheries, you adopt a treaty which conceded every demand to them and which you now ask the House to assent to. Well, Sir, if this does nothing more than to teach us that our highest and best policy is not to irritate our friends by the retaliatory policy which we have adopted in times gone by, if it does nothing more than to teach us to cultivate the friendly relationship which ought to exist between that great nation and this great nation to the north, we will not have paid too dearly for our lesson. I fear that while the hon. gentleman remains in power his policy will consist of the same arbitrary and capricious changes which have characterised his policy in this fishery muddle from beginning to end and who does not deserve any re-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

commendation at the hands of this Parliament. The treaty has been agreed upon, and I for one hope that no action will be taken by this Parliament to throw it out. I am willing, Sir, it should be accepted. The right hon. gentleman smiles. I say that many of the concessions he grants to them by treaty should have been granted to them long ago. They should have been granted voluntarily, and if you had done so, I repeat as I said once or twice already, you would not now stand in the humiliating position you are in, whereby your Minister of Marine and the Government have been obliged to eat the brave words they have spoken for seven years past, and the Minister of Finance himself has been obliged to retract and withdraw the war-like words he spoke in reference to the retaliatory policy enacted by the United States, and he has had to adopt a policy in the very opposite direction to that which he asked the House to adopt only one short year ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am quite unable to agree with anything that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I am quite unable to believe that hon. gentleman has been sincere in one utterance that he has made in the course of the speech he addressed to this House. I am further unable to believe that the hon. gentleman was ingenuous, either in the quotations or the arguments which he presented to this House from the beginning of his speech to the end of it. I am inclined to give the hon. gentleman credit for a large degree of patriotism, but the hon. gentleman is not I am sure speaking to this country at all with regard to this treaty. He knew that this House was so well acquainted with all the negotiations that had taken place with regard to this question, with all the features of the Treaty of 1818, and with all the customs laws, he knew that the country was so familiar with this question at least those portions of the country in which the fishery question is understood at all, that I am sure that he did not intend to insult this House or to insult Canada, by expecting either this House or any portion of Canada to credit the arguments or to believe the statements which he put before this House. But the hon. gentleman evidently had a very patriotic motive and it apparently was this. Since the making of this treaty the hon. gentleman knows that from one end of the United States to the other a cry has gone up not that the United States have been captured by us, but that the interests of the United States have been sacrificed in this treaty. The hon. gentleman knows that from one end of the capitol to the other, where the Congress of the United States is now sitting, that the enemies of the Administration, the enemies of this treaty, the enemies of Canada, have been ringing the changes which he has reversed here to-night and asking that Congress should reject this treaty as being too favorable to the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman entertained us for an hour and a half with a series of arguments and statements not one of which we can credit and not one of which I would insult the hon. gentleman to suppose that he believes himself, but he gave them with a view to furnish arguments to the friends of Canada in the United States who desire to see this treaty adopted and ratified there, and who will be told for the first time from the Parliament of Canada that the interests of Canada have been sacrificed by the treaty which this House is asked to adopt. I do not remember, Sir, any more ludicrous feature in this debate than the hon. gentleman's censure on the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance in vindicating the Treaty of 1871. What did the hon. gentleman say? He said it was exceedingly patriotic of the hon. Finance Minister in 1871 to defend the treaty, to show that British subjects acquired advantageous concessions under that treaty, which were probably equal to those which had been given to the citizens of the United States, thereby, said the hon. gentleman, jeopardizing all our

chances of getting a large money award when we went to the arbitration at Halifax; and the hon. gentleman still thinks that he made a great point on that question; and he has the courage to ridicule and condemn the hon. Minister of Finance for having defended the Treaty of 1871 in this House. That treaty, recognised as it is now from one end of the country to the other as having been a most beneficial and salutary arrangement of this question, and one that we desired to continue on even more liberal terms than we made in 1871, was bitterly opposed by that hon. gentleman's companions, who actually divided this House on the question whether it should be ratified or not; and the hon. Minister of Finance, in defending the Treaty of 1871 on the floor of this House, by every argument he could address to the House, was speaking not only for the life of his Government but for the life of that treaty itself, which these hon. gentlemen have many times condemned us up and down the country for not having solicited the United States to renew after it had expired. Now, Sir, I want to make one comment, before I go into the hon. gentleman's argument, upon a statement which he put into the mouth of the hon. Minister of Finance, and which was as different from the statement the hon. Minister made as night is from day. The hon. Minister of Finance, referring to the arguments and contentions which had been put forward by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself with regard to the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 and with regard to the rights of Canada under that treaty, and referring to what had been adopted eventually as a settlement of the whole question of the treaty, admitted that he had not been able to carry out our full expectations. Who expected that he would? Who ever sat down to make a bargain expecting that he and his adversary would agree to the extreme points they both had made, or expecting to stand by all the arguments that both had put forward? What kind of a treaty would it have been if the strongest contentions of the United States and the strongest contentions of Canada had been struggled for to the bitter end? The hon. Minister of Finance would have come to Canada with no treaty at all, but with that state of hostility which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) professes to deplore, bitterly intensified and every prospect of solving this question, which was producing so much irritation between the two countries, set at rest forever. The hon. Minister of Finance stated frankly that there were concessions on both sides—that he did not profess that by this Treaty we were carrying out our contentions to the fullest extent; and yet the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) half an hour afterwards cited the hon. gentleman again and again as having used these words, that he was not able to support the policy of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House whether that was a fair quotation of the language of the hon. Minister of Finance; I ask any man within these walls if he thinks the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, believes it was. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has done me to the honor to refer two or three times to an expression which I made use of in a debate which casually arose not very long ago; and I must ask the indulgence of the House, notwithstanding the rule, in referring to it for a single moment to correct the hon. gentleman's memory. The hon. gentleman has cited me three times, twice to-night and once a little while ago, as having said that if a certain policy were adopted, a policy which was subsequently adopted it would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. Now, as that subject is germane to the one under discussion, I may perhaps, without further apology be allowed to state what I did say on that occasion, what I adhere to to-night, and what is not in the least degree inconsistent with the action the Government subsequently took. There was a discussion between the hon. member for Queen's and myself across the floor as to the true interpretation

of a clause of the Act relating to the duties of customs. He and I differed as to whether the clause was compulsory and obligatory on the Government, or whether it was merely optional. The statement I made was not that to put green fruits, seeds, bushes, and plants on the free list would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada, but it was this, that the clause was optional, that it vested a discretion in us, and that for us to admit that it did not vest a discretion in us, but bound us to submit to the dictation of another power, friendly or unfriendly, would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman so far misunderstood the quotation, which he has repeated on no less than three occasions, that he referred to it as an evidence that the hon. Finance Minister could, by attending a single day to his duties, sit on the "boys" of the Cabinet, as he called them, and deliberately reverse a policy which we had pledged ourselves so much as to say that the adoption of another policy would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. The House will see from what I did say on that occasion, and what I adhere to now, that there is not the slightest difference of opinion between any member of the Government and myself on that question, or between the opinion I then expressed and the action the Government subsequently took, nor the slightest difference between my opinion on that question then and my opinion on it to-night. Now, the hon. gentleman addressed the House at considerable length for the purpose of showing that in 1884 we should have taken the advice of our friends of the Opposition, and especially that of the hon. gentleman himself; and he went so far as to urge this House to believe that if we had adopted his advice in 1834 and in 1835, we should have obtained a very much better fishery treaty than we have to-night. Now, Sir, I have not been able, as I confess it would have been wise and cautious to do, after the way in which the hon. gentleman has quoted me, to follow him in the record; but I will take his own word. He told us that the motion he made on that occasion was that freedom of fishing and freedom of duties were desirable in the interests of Canada. He seems to think that a treaty on such terms would have been a much better treaty for Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries to send to Canada. For one I do not agree with him. I agree with the statement he made, and the statement the hon. Finance Minister made, that the inshore fisheries of Canada are the most valuable possession which she has to-day. I believe they are not only the most valuable possession she has to-day, but that their wealth is increasing every day that rolls by; and with the increased preservation which we can give to those fisheries, with the increase of population which is taking place on this continent, and with the depreciation of the fisheries along the shores of the United States every day we meet here and every night we rest in our beds, the great possessions of our country are becoming of greater value. But the hon. gentleman's proposition in 1884 was that this possession, which is of so priceless a character, this possession, the value of which after fifty years shall have rolled around it is impossible for the most sanguine to calculate, this possession the hon. gentleman was willing to throw open forever to the United States for one concession only, the entry of free fish into the United States. The policy which it has adopted to-day, the administration of the United States will recommend to Congress, not for the priceless benefits of the fisheries of Canada, but in consideration of the circumstances of their own country, and to reduce their surplus and to reduce their revenue. The hon. the Minister of Finance, it is true, has not come back to Canada to tell us that he has given away this inestimable property, our fisheries, for a mere tariff concession, which in all probability will be made in view of the domestic circumstances of the United States. But he is able to say to us: I have preserved unimpaired the inshore fisheries of

Canada and obtained the assent of the United States to a different valuation of our fishing rights. I have obtained from them the valuation, not that the United States will demand, in return for the admission of our fish free of duty, free fishing on the coasts of Canada, but that free fish may fairly and honorably and properly be conceded by them for the right to tranship cargoes, and the right to go in shore to ship crews and to buy bait and supplies. If that concession on the part of the United States has originated in what the hon. gentleman says it has, the undervaluation by the Gloucester fishermen of the value of our inshore fisheries, so much the better for us. Whatever has led to that opinion, I should much prefer a treaty that proposes to give us, what we have every reason to expect to get in fair bargain with the United States, the concession of free fish for the transshipment of cargoes and the right to purchase bait and supplies to the treaty which the hon. gentleman would have had us make in 1884, when, for that same concession, we were to give up, not only the right to tranship cargoes and to purchase bait and supplies, but free fishing on the coasts of Canada. Now we are told that the Government policy of to-day is a policy of vacillation. Well, if the right hon. the First Minister deserves credit for having put off until to-morrow what could be as well and better done to-morrow, he deserves credit for having declined in 1884 to make the treaty which the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) invited him to make, and for having made the treaty which is upon the Table to-night. What was it that the President of the United States proposed, as the hon. gentleman read his words to-night, we should have? Why, the hon. gentleman pictured in the most allegorical language the president of 60,000,000 people stretching his hand over the border to grasp the hands of 5,000,000? Well, I may confess I am utterly unable to grapple with the hon. gentleman's metaphor, and I see, in the quotation he made, the proposition which the President of the United States then made was different from what is made now, and different in the interests of Canada. The under-valuation, which the hon. gentleman says was made of the inshore fisheries of Canada, was not in the mind of the President of the United States at all, and what the President suggested—not for Canada because he did not stretch his great hands across the border at all, but he sent a message to his own Congress, which was disregarded by his own Congress, and which was not an invitation to the Dominion at all—what the President suggested was this: that it would be a most desirable thing, in exchange for some small tariff concessions which they were going to make anyhow, if they could get access to the rich fishing fields of Canada. I am glad to say it is not too late for us and I hope it will never be too late for us to say that we set too high a price upon the inshore fisheries of Canada to barter them for any trivial trade concession, such as the mere concession of free fish to the United States. They may be overvalued by us and undervalued by the American fishermen; and if the Americans do not want our property, we will have the pleasure of keeping it to ourselves. Now, the hon. gentleman made a very singular statement with regard to what had produced the Retaliatory Bill as he called it; and his whole argument at first was that this wicked National Policy, in which he sees the germ of all the evils past, present and to come, has driven to exasperation 60,000,000 people, and almost forced them into a state of war. The hon. gentleman and his friends have told us time and again that the irritation produced by the National Policy was no greater than the lighting of a fly upon a wheel, that for 5,000,000 to undertake to coerce 60,000,000 was child's play, and yet the hon. gentleman told us to-night, in the most glowing terms, that the adoption of the National Policy by 5,000,000 had goaded these 60,000,000 into a state of war. He had not

Mr. THOMPSON.

progressed very much further with his speech before he undertook to lay the blame on another quarter, and it was the uncivilised administration of the Treaty of 1818 and of the custom laws that had goaded these people into a state of war. Something had done it. It was sure to be our fault, and it did not much matter what particular act of ours was to blame. Now, I should like to contrast that violent statement, dictated by party feeling against the Government in power, with the calm statement made not long ago with regard to this question by Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State, whom the hon. gentleman exalts, and deservedly so, as an eminent statesman. Speaking of the Retaliatory Act, the language of Mr. Bayard, addressed to those who desired to put that Act into force, and who desired that claims for damages should be made against the Government of Canada, was not that the Administration of the Treaty of 1818 by the Dominion of Canada had been uncivilised and had goaded the people into a state of war, but it was this: that the Dominion, having made a fair bargain in 1885 with the President of the United States, one result of which was intended to be the appointment of a commission to consider and settle this whole question, it was the fault of the Senate of the United States, and of the Senate alone, that this question had not received its solution, and that he could no longer lay the blame at the doors of our Government, or lay the blame and attach the responsibility at the doors of their own Government.

"More than one year ago I sought to protect our citizens engaged in fishing from results which might attend any possible misunderstanding between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States as to the measure of their mutual rights and privileges in the territorial waters of British North America. After the determination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in June last, it seemed to me then, and seems to me now, very hard that differences of opinion between the two Governments should cause loss to honest citizens, whose line of obedience might be thus rendered vague and uncertain, and their property be brought into jeopardy. Influenced by this feeling, I procured a temporary arrangement which secured our fishermen full enjoyment of all Canadian fisheries, free from molestation, during a period which would permit discussion of a just international settlement of the whole fishery question; but other counsels prevailed, and my efforts further to protect fishermen from such trouble as you now suffer were unavailing."

Every one knows now that the other counsels which prevailed were not the counsels of my hon. friend beside me and myself. They were contrary to the policy of the Minister of Finance. They were not the counsels of the Government of the Dominion, but they were counsels which frustrated the arrangement entered into between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, in 1885, which to use Mr. Bayard's own expression, was intended to "permit the discussion of a just international settlement of the whole fishery question," but which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., to-night denounces as a vacillating policy, stringent one day and surrendering everything the next. Now, the hon. gentleman, as he went on, made this extraordinary statement, that it was not our construction of the Treaty of 1818, but its administration, that was complained of by the United States. Indeed, he so far forgot his brief as to state that the Treaty of 1818 was so plain that there could be no difference of opinion on the question. Let me say to the House, on the responsibility I must take, knowing that every document on this question is in the hands of the House, that it was upon the construction of the Treaty of 1818 that every struggle has been made between the two Governments for the last twenty-five years. The question always arose upon the administration of the law, of course, because if we do not administer the law nobody could be offended, and the construction of the treaty could not be called in question. But every time we took a step to administer the law, to keep fishermen out of our waters, to prevent them from buying bait and supplies, or to prevent their transshipping cargoes, or anything of that kind, the question came up whether we were justified in that by the

true interpretation of the Treaty of 1818. The House must forgive me if I recapitulate some of the arguments, because, after some of the speeches we have heard, I must suppose that they have faded from the memory of some, that they have faded for an hour or two at all events. We would imagine that the treaty alluded to the mere question of fishing, and had nothing to do with the exclusion of United States fishermen, except when they came in for the purpose of fishing. Every kind of interpretation was put on that. It was contended that it must be interpreted in the light of the circumstances, and a flood of light has been thrown on the condition of trade and intercourse between the two countries in 1818. Then, we were told that the interpretation must bend to the change which has taken place since 1818 and to the modification of the commercial policy of Great Britain, especially in regard to the introduction of the bonded system, and that all the changes which from time to time are weaving these two nations together commercially must modify the interpretation of that Treaty of 1818. But I will not weary the House. I will ask the House to look at the letter of Mr. Phelps, the United States Minister in London, on which I had the honor to make a report to His Excellency. I need not read it to you, because you will remember that the hon. gentleman says: I agree with every statement and every argument contained in the report of the Minister of Justice, and yet that report, which the hon. gentleman says he concurs in from A to Z, was an argument on the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, and on nothing else. The hon. gentleman has also stated to the House that it was most improper that the custom laws should have been enforced against United States fishing vessels, in order to aid in the carrying out of the Treaty of 1818. If you will remember that the hon. gentleman says he concurred with every word in my report, and if you think it worth while to turn up my report, you will find at least two chapters of it devoted to show not only that it is our right but our duty to enforce the customs laws in that respect. The hon. gentleman has said that the particular fault he finds with our administration of the law is that it was capricious, and he went so far, at one stage of his argument, as to call it an anti-civilised policy. I have only this to say, and I say it in the presence of gentlemen who have had more years of experience in the consideration of the question than I have had of life, that the records show that the administration of the Treaty of 1818 and of the Customs laws in connection with it has been steady and consistent from 1818 to 1887, with this exception, that for the last three or four years the treaty has been more leniently and carefully administered than it was in the earlier years of its existence. The hon. gentleman has evidently forgotten his history of the question, but I may be permitted to remind him that in the very year the treaty was adopted, vessels were seized and condemned for entering British American waters, and that year after year,—of course I except from the calculation the years during which the Reciprocity Treaty prevailed, and the Washington Treaty prevailed, and the licensing system prevailed at the instance of the Imperial Government, for those were periods when a different system of law was invoked—at any time when this question was governed by the Treaty of 1818, its administration was quite as severe and quite as exacting as it has been during the last three or four years, and even more so. The hon. gentleman said that we put, out of a pure jingo policy, the amendment of 1886 upon the Statute-book, by which it was provided that the mere entry of fishing vessels of the United States into Canadian waters was to result in the forfeiture of the vessel; and he said that, for 70 years, the treaty had been carried out and administered rigidly enough, and no such law had been required. It was not required, because what we put on the Statute-book in 1886 was simply what had been uniformly

carried out from 1818 to 1886. It was always assumed, even in the courts of law, that the entering of an American fishing vessel in defiance of the treaty would result in the forfeiture of the vessel and the cargo, and we were only putting on the Statute-book in 1886 what had been the view of the law from the earliest times, with the exception that the seizures in earlier times were made by British gunboats and British vessels of war, and that lately they have been made by Canadian revenue cutters. Let me refer the hon. gentleman and those who agree with him as to its being a just matter of complaint that we have enforced the Customs laws against United States vessels, to a consideration of what the Customs laws of the United States are. They require that every vessel entering, whether voluntarily or by stress of weather, the waters of the United States, shall report within 24 hours, and a vessel is liable to a penalty of \$400 if she attempts to depart from those waters without having reported at the Customs. It matters not whether she is a fishing vessel, it matters not whether she has been driven in before a gale, or whether she has been towed in, as an act of mercy, by salvors; she must be reported at the customs, and if she attempts to depart without reporting, she is liable to a penalty of \$400. What will the House think after the criticisms which have been addressed to it with regard to the enforcement of the custom laws, when I tell them that by the decision of the Administration of the United States, within the last few years fishing vessels resorting to United States ports for supplies have been fined in heavy penalties because they had attempted to depart without reporting at the customs? Yet, notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman declares that this policy which Canada undertook to adopt, enforcing the customs laws, which we have no power to mitigate, which are binding just as much upon us as they are upon the humblest man in this country, which it was our solemn duty to administer as long as Parliament choose to leave them upon the Statute-book—he declares that in the administration of those customs laws we were guilty of an anti-civilised policy, whilst the 60,000,000 of freemen to whom he refers were guilty of no such act at all in fining humble fishing smacks that attempted to depart without reporting at the customs, when they came in to purchase supplies. I do not make this contrast for the purpose of condemning that act. The necessity which exists in Canada for the enforcement of the customs laws, to prevent illicit trading by such vessels as were entitled to run into any quay or inlet upon our coast for shelter over night, and for provisions and supplies, for wood and water, the necessity for carrying out the revenue laws strictly with regard to these vessels, is as great in Canada as it is in the United States, and is as fully recognised in the United States in practice as it is in Canada to-day. But it suits the party purposes of a gentleman who wants to make an attack upon the Government, to say that this was an anti-civilised policy calculated to drive 60,000,000 of our neighbors into a state of warfare. Now, the hon. gentleman has declared that all the Americans have contended for has been fully conceded, that this treaty contains not one concession on the part of the United States, and that everything has been conceded on the part of Canada. I venture to disagree with him. I support this treaty, not because it contains no concessions on the part of Canada, but because it contains fair concessions on the part of Canada, and fair and liberal concessions on the part of the United States. Sir, nobody expected, when the Minister of Finance and his fellow plenipotentiaries went to Washington, that he was going to bring back any enormous concessions for the fishermen of Canada. Did any of our fishermen expect it? We were administering the laws strictly in their favor, we were keeping the inshore fisheries for them, we were preventing poaching, we were preventing illicit trading, we were carrying out the law as strictly as we

could; and knowing that, they were resting their right upon the Treaty of 1818. It was a familiar expression among them—I allude to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces—when they saw that they were protected in the enjoyment of their rights to the inshore fisheries, and that consequently they were able to compete on fair terms in the markets of the United States, in spite of the duty, the remark they made, time and again, became almost proverbial, that they wanted no better treaty than they had. The only necessity that existed for a treaty was the fact that our neighbors alongside of us were dissatisfied with the construction which we put upon the Treaty for 1818. They felt that they had a grievance, and it was most desirable, in the interest of harmony, and trade, and peace between the two countries, that this feeling should be at once and forever removed. If we have removed it by making concessions, which have not been injurious to the interests of the fishermen of Canada, I ask if any member of this House will say that the Government was wrong in doing so, or that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries erred. No, Sir, I say that if we were able by sacrificing anything connected either with the administration of the law, or the construction of the law, which would not prejudice the rights or imperil the industries of the fishermen of Canada, we were bound to do it, in the interests of harmony between the two countries, and it was our duty to do it in view of our relations to the Empire of which we form a part. But will the House reflect upon this, that after the hon. gentleman had spoken for two hours, declaring every ten minutes that this was an entire surrender on the part of Canada, that it was a list of concessions on the part of Canada, he sat down without showing one single instance in which the humblest toiler of the sea would be injured in his pursuits by this treaty? Now, Sir, if this question has been removed from the list of irritating grievances which existed between the two countries, if the relations between the two countries have been put upon such fair footing that we have the assurance of the Administration of the United States, expressed on the floor of this House through the Finance Minister, that the time is rapidly approaching when trade concessions such as the fishermen desire with regard to free fish, will be granted to them, and that in the mean time, after having removed the grievances, we have done the fishermen no wrong, they will have no reason to be dissatisfied with the treaty, with the plenipotentiaries who negotiated it, or with the Parliament that will ratify it. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to a report which I had the honor to make to His Excellency upon this connection, in which I ventured to criticise the argument which had been addressed by Mr. Phelps to Her Majesty's Minister, in which I addressed myself to this argument: That our construction of the treaty was an unreasonable one, because it precluded American fishing vessels entering for trivial purposes, such as for a surgeon in case of sickness or injury, to post a letter, to buy a rope, &c.; and I endeavored to meet that by the argument that the treaty might as well be repealed if, upon every pretext, no matter how small and frivolous, one of these vessels had a right to enter our waters, notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the treaty, and that the prohibition contained in the treaty amounted to nothing, that it could be frittered away altogether by any master of a fishing smack pretending that he wanted to post a letter. In reference to this argument the hon. gentleman has declared that this treaty has conceded that which I said might as well result in the repeal of the prohibition contained in the Treaty of 1818. Now, what I was arguing against, as the House will remember, if it remembers the paper at all, was this: That for American fishing vessels that are pursuing their advocations along our coasts, to have the right to come in for any such purposes as those trivial purposes that were mentioned, would fritter away the prohibition of the treaty; and what is con-

Mr. THOMPSON.

ceded in the treaty is not that they shall have the right to come in every time they want a physician, every time they want to post a letter, every time they want to buy a piece of rope, but that they shall have the right to come and purchase supplies when they are upon a homeward voyage, and when they have received a license to purchase the article, which they desire to purchase for the homeward voyage. And yet the hon. gentleman says: Compare the two things that have been conceded by this treaty, which I say might as well result in the repeal of the Treaty of 1818. But, Sir, what is the burden of all his complaint? After declaring that we had surrendered everything and got nothing in return, when the hon. gentleman sought to address himself to the one point that was worthy at all of his attention, if he wanted to discuss the merits of this question, namely, what concession we had given which was injurious to our people, he was compelled to say that the concession we made we ought to have made long ago. Then it comes to this, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, standing upon the floor of this House for nearly two hours in this debate, denounces this Government in unmeasured terms for having made a string of concessions which he thinks we ought to have made long ago. They are not, I admit, the concessions which the hon. gentleman would have made; they are not the concessions which the hon. gentleman rose in this House and asked us to make. No, Sir, the concessions he desired to have made were not those opposed to an anti-civilising policy, but they were for free fishing upon our coasts, these were what he wanted to throw into any negotiation which should be made with the United States. But if after 1835, when by what Mr. Bayard admits in the extract I have read to the House to be the generous action of the Canadian Government, we had thrown open our fisheries upon the promise of the President of the United States that he would recommend to Congress the appointment of a commission to settle this whole question, then the President in good faith made his recommendation to Congress, in terms as broad as promised, and when Congress spurned that recommendation, I should like to know what member of the House would have been able as long and as loudly as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to have denounced the Government and denounced my colleague in the Department of Marine and Fisheries if we had failed to enforce strictly the Treaty of 1818. Why, Sir, strict as it was and rigid as it was, I very much mistake my recollection if the hon. gentleman did not in the very short period during which he addressed the House upon the subject within the last year or two, denounce the protection we had given as not half strict enough and as a sham, and declare time and time again that he would hold the Government responsible for that sham protection we had. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has only one fault to find with us after all, and that is that when we were met by the United States in a conciliatory spirit, when we found they were willing to make concessions and when asked to make concessions ourselves, having been willing to make what the hon. gentleman thinks we should have made long before—that when we were willing later to do so we should have stepped out of office and allowed him and his friends to come in. In this instance, give the hon. gentleman credit for entire candor. I believe the hon. gentleman was making a real objection which exists in his mind; but it did not occur to my hon. friend that if we had changed our minds and had been at last willing to make those concessions, which he thought we should have made long before, he, at least to be patriotic and consistent, should have supported us in making them. Now, the hon. gentleman is particular to ask why it was that no concession on the part of the United States was pointed out. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance put the position very candidly before the House. Ever since this treaty has been negotiated it has certainly not been in the

interest of Canada to declare that it was a great boon to this country. I do not assert to-night that it is a great boon to Canada, I assert simply my belief that it is a fair arrangement between two honorable nations sitting down to make a peaceful, honorable compromise of their rights; and I say the United States plenipotentiaries met us in the same spirit in which Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries met them, and they have made liberal and fair concessions, which I am not to boast of to-night, which we are not to exult over, which it would be folly to exult over, because they are simply concessions which any honorable negotiators would have made in view of the whole question. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the great strife between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain on this question was three or four crucial points? Does he forget that our right to prohibit vessels from coming in to buy bait was challenged? Does he forget that it was denied that we had the right to prevent them coming and transshipping cargoes? Does he forget that it was denied that we had the right to prevent them from shipping crews? Does the hon. gentleman forget that these were the crucial points over which the whole controversy turned and that the result of the action of the Canadian Government, the energetic remonstrances of the Canadian Government and the exposition of the rights of Canada by my colleague who sits behind me was that when this matter and these reports were laid before the Crown officers of England we were so fully sustained that Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies advised us that there were no two opinions in England on the subject of our rights. In the treaty which the hon. gentleman has been denouncing as a disgraceful surrender there is no miserable carping and quibbling over our rights, there is no attempt to depart from the provisions contained in the Treaty of 1818, there is no miserable petifogging attempt to set aside that treaty, which, while it gave liberal terms to the United States fishermen, did not sacrifice the rights of the British American people, equally valuable as their right was, to retain the fisheries for their own use, and instead of denying those rights which I have stated, the right to purchase those articles, the right to tranship cargo and the right to ship a crew, it has been conceded that those rights are rights which are to be negotiated for and which are to be received on fair and equitable terms hereafter by the authorities of the United States. That surely is, if not a concession, at least an adjustment, on terms which are distinctly honorable to the people and the Government of Canada. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to consider whether the principles contained in the delimitation clause are not a fair concession on both sides. I meet his argument as to what our rights in regard to the headlands were by the statement that they were the doctrines which were found in the text books and in the despatches down to 25 years ago. I admit that it was not contended then that we were limited in our territorial waters as regards bays, to bays merely of the width of ten miles. But the hon. gentleman knows that for upwards of thirty years that prohibition has not been carried out; it has been distinctly asserted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) as well as by his successors in that department that in every instance, while asserting that they preserve and reserve the right, they in practice fail to enforce it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Tell me why?

Mr. THOMPSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. When my colleague, the Minister of Finance, made the statement which I am doing but little more than repeating, for the purpose of my argument on that point, the hon. member for Northumberland seems to think that it was intended to cast some imputation on the hon. member in his administration of the Department. Such is not the case.

The reason why the hon. gentleman could not enforce the ten-mile limit was that Her Majesty's Government would not permit the Government of Canada to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not denying our right, but State interests prevented them doing so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Declaring that they reserved the right and that it might be pressed at another time, but at that time refusing to allow it to be enforced. Why? The hon. gentleman says for State reasons. The principal cause was that to enforce that doctrine strictly, to the largest extent, would in all probability involve a collision between either Her Majesty's vessels and the fishing vessels of the United States or our revenue cutters and American fishing vessels. And when the British Government declined and perhaps wisely declined to enforce that doctrine to its fullest extent in the interest of peace and harmony. Of course neither the hon. gentleman himself nor any of his successors can venture to take the responsibility of enforcing seizures outside of the three-mile limit and therefore the statement did not impute blame upon the hon. gentleman nor did it in the least degree derogate from the strength of the argument. This right had never existed in practice as regards the protection of our fisheries for the last twenty-five years. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) referred to a despatch to Mr. Everett in which an expression of words slightly favoring the English doctrine as the headland question.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Mr. Webster, not Everett.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, Mr. Webster. The hon. gentleman cited that from memory to the House in words which I was careful to look after.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I read the quotation.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman did read it and in making his argument upon it he cited it in these words: He said that Mr. Webster had admitted that to be the proper construction of the treaty. Now, what Mr. Webster says was that by a strict and rigid construction of this article that result might follow, but he declared in the concluding paragraph that the construction this put on the treaty is not conformable to the intention of the contracting parties.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I read that. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that the quotation he now makes appears in the first part, that it did not coincide with the intention of the parties and that the intentions of the parties are not expressed as they are intended in that treaty.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall not say whether the hon. gentleman read it or not. I do not pretend to remember that, but I am glad to know that those words, strongly qualifying the opinion, are in the despatch, and I am sure that after what I have said that if the hon. gentleman undertook to repeat it from memory again he would not use those words that Mr. Webster admitted, that that was the proper construction.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Certainly I would.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman says he would I shall not further attempt to argue with him. I said that with regard to this question of the headlands that it was one of the cases in which there was a fair concession upon both sides. We gave up the extreme English contention; correct as I believe it to be, acquiesced in as it is by some eminent American authorities, and we need not quarrel about what Mr. Webster said, for the doctrine is supported by abler jurists than he is, such as Chancellor Kent, Judge Storey and other men of that calibre. We need not quarrel about that. The question is how far the English doctrine was carried out in practice. When the hon. member for

Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was at the head of the Fishery Department he issued instructions and his instructions did not even go as far as the demand of the extreme limit nor was it necessary. There is no necessity in the protection of the fisheries of Canada that our cruisers should sail 30, 40, 50 and 60 miles out to sea molesting American vessels in places where mackerel are not caught or rarely caught at all. The hon. gentleman defines his restriction to bays not more than ten miles wide, and the reason of the contention of Canada even in that particular had subsequently to be modified, and we were instructed only to enforce that as to bays six miles wide. Now the result of this treaty is that the construction which Canada asked, the construction which Canada proposed to put upon that, the instructions which she desired to have issued but was not able to have issued under the administration of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is the construction adopted by the treaty, only they have been enlarged so as to give us bays which are a great deal more than ten miles wide. No one will contend, nor it would not be candid, nor would it be fair to say that we have triumphed over the American negotiators or administration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. I guess not.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was an arrangement perfectly fair and equitable to both sides and when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says: "No, I guess not," he wants the House to understand that if he had only the negotiation of this treaty he would have excluded the American fishing vessels from all bays of heaven knows how wide. Can the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is so wise on this subject, inform me which of the bays in Canada we ought have drawn the line across?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman at the proper time.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a very liberal concession, largely giving to Canada not only as to the closing of bays not more than ten miles wide, but as to the closing of the other enumerated bays. For that concession, we make a concession it is true of Bay St. George, but I should like the hon. gentleman to name at his own sweet will and proper time, in what respect it is that this is an unfair concession on the part of Canada or not a reasonable concession on the part of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) after an hour and a half at least of a complaint against Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries for having made this long list of concessions and given up the headlands and giving up the bays and giving up everything else in Canada to the Americans, it was amusing to hear the hon. gentleman find fault with the plenipotentiaries for having reserved a bay in Prince Edward Island that we did not want at all. He declared that Egmont Bay never had an American fishing vessel in it and that it was preposterous to reserve it. After complaining that we had given up so much it was really a slight consolation to know that there is one thing we had reserved that we ought not have kept. Now, Sir, as regards the argument which the hon. gentleman made in reference to the Strait of Canso, I do not suppose it will be necessary for me to say very much on that point after the explanation on which the Minister of Finance has given. The delimitation which is stipulated for in the first treaty would have had the effect of closing the Strait of Canso. One may reasonably conjecture that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries were faced by this that they might be asked by the United States—for by the delimitation that was proposed by Her Majesty's Government let me remind the

Mr. THOMPSON.

House as long ago as 1866 and repeated once or twice since in view of settling this headland question and removing it from controversy—they might be asked: Do you propose in that fishery delimitation to exclude our fishing vessels for the first time from the Strait of Canso? If Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries were faced with that question it would be reasonable they should insert in the face of the treaty a provision with that delimitation, that nothing else in the treaty should preclude American fishing vessels from entering the Strait of Canso. We have heard the hon. gentleman's opinion that that is a concession of a right for all time to come. I think it is not a concession of a right to American fishing vessels, but it is a reservation of whatever claim they may have, notwithstanding anything contained in this treaty. In respect to the Straits of Canso there are no words of grant, no words of concession at all, it is simply a reservation that that treaty shall affect that question and that is all it amounts to. But when the hon. gentleman puts it, not only that it is a concession of a right for all time to come to American fishing vessels but, to use his own words, to all American vessels—and I presume that it was an unintentional exaggeration—when he made that mistake, I felt inclined to ask him, referring back to the rigorous administration of this treaty in its earlier years, when it was much more rigorous than it is now, going back to the time when there was no Treaty of 1818, but when the war of 1812 was over, and when things were carried with such a high hand against the United States fishing vessels, that they were seized if they came within sixty miles of our coast, what day or hour was the Strait of Canso ever closed against American vessels? The Strait of Canso has always been, and I presume always will be, open to vessels of commerce and vessels of peace, and it is in the interest of Canada that it should be kept so; and while in that respect there is no concession made on the face of the treaty, but simply a declaration that the treaty shall not affect that subject, I should not for one be afraid to commit myself to the larger concession which the hon. gentleman thinks is involved in its being kept open for the passage of fishing vessels for all time to come. But that has not been asked or conceded, for the reason, I presume, that it would only be—to borrow for the moment and only for the moment, for I will give it back to him, the hon. gentleman's own phrase—a policy of anti-civilisation. The hon. gentleman has said that the freedom from reporting at customs, and the exemption from pilotage dues and harbor dues, are concessions. It is admitted they are; does he say they are unreasonable? No, he says those privileges ought to have been given up long ago; and I should have liked the hon. gentleman, after censuring the Government for its undue strictness in carrying out the law, to inform the House what amount of pilotage and harbor dues were collected in Canada under the Treaty of 1818, or under any other treaty or law, from United States fishing vessels during the last ten or fifteen years. Now, the hon. gentleman made a singular objection to one section of the treaty which provides that under certain circumstances and certain conditions American fishing vessels in distress may tranship their cargoes; and the hon. gentleman, although I dare say he had the words of the clause in his mind, and intended to state them correctly, unwittingly stated them very differently from what they were. The hon. gentleman stated that once a person got a license—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise to a word of explanation. The hon. gentleman has three times misquoted me; but this time I wish to say I read the words from the Treaty distinctly from the beginning to end as they are.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not at any time quoted the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, you have three times, and you put a word in my mouth that I never used—anti-civilisation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not quoted the hon. gentleman at all; he interrupted me just as I was about to quote him. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman interrupted me, and claim that I was going to misquote him unless he was conscious that he had unwittingly made a mistake in quoting the clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You distinctly said so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think I did, but it is a matter of no consequence whether the hon. gentleman read the clause or not; that is not the point I was coming to, and the hon. gentleman rose altogether too soon. I was about to give him credit, perhaps, for having read the clause. I said that no doubt he had it distinctly in his mind and intended to state it fairly to the House, but unwittingly had not done so. The hon. gentleman says he read the clause to the House, and I will not contradict it; but the hon. gentleman did base an argument on it afterwards, in which he quoted and did not read the clause, and that is the quotation of which I complain. The quotation and the argument of which I complain is that the language of the treaty is such that if a United States fishing vessel meeting with so small a casualty as the loss, I think the hon. gentleman said of a rope yarn, came into our ports, it could tranship its cargo. I will admit that the hon. gentleman read the clause, because he said he did, although I do not remember it. Let me read it:

"Any United States fishing vessel entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada under stress or weather or in consequence of any casualty, may unload, reload, tranship or sell (subject to Customs laws and regulations) all fish on board—"

Not when they have lost a rope yarn, not when they have only to post a letter, or want a physician, or meet with any trifling accident, such as the loss of a spar.

"—when such unloading, transhipment or sale is necessary as incidental to repairs."

I am sure the hon. gentleman in stating the argument on the question which he did, must have recollected the clause. Now, after this treaty is adopted as I hope it will be, there may be some misconception of the meaning of this clause, and fishermen using rope yarns coming into port and insisting that they have a right to tranship their cargoes, and citing the authority of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman want me to state now? With his usual fair play he has stated that I said that if there was a loss of a rope yarn, the master of the ship would come within the section. In my statement I did not use the word "rope yarn" at all. I said "bowsprit," and an hon. gentleman sitting in front of me suggested "or a rope yarn," and I said "yes, or a rope yarn." He might contend that he was within the section, and he knew nobody who could control his contention, but that was a matter entirely for construction.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman had made the statement before that he has made now, I would not have had so much to say on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Exactly.

Mr. THOMPSON. I repeat exactly; but the only point in which I must modify what I have said is as to the word "rope yarn." It came from his colleague in front of him, and I thought it was from himself. "Bowsprit" will do me just as well; and I have no hesitation in saying to the House that the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, and that

his correction is correct this far, that if an American fishing vessel having lost her bowsprit comes into our ports she has a right to tranship her cargo if transhipment is necessary as incidental to repairs. I shall not pretend to say the circumstances under which the loss of a bowsprit and the tearing away of a part of the vessel might, under those circumstances, justify the transhipment of a cargo. It is sufficient for me that, by the plain words of the treaty, which must be necessarily incidental to repairs, that the vessel has to unload her cargo, before she can have the right to tranship her cargo, and that from the way in which the hon. gentleman put it, at the suggestion of his colleague in front of him, a rope yarn was just as good as his own argument about the bowsprit. In the latter part of the section—I shall not say whether the hon. gentleman read the section or not, because I do not remember—but I do know that he contended that the United States fishing vessels should have the right to contend for the purchase of bait as well as supplies. But the hon. gentleman might have called our attention to the fact that the treaty says:

"Such supplies and provisions as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

And I do not think bait is an article so called in trading vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think you were wrong in your quotation; you will have to read that again.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has declared that nobody is to be a judge as to the cases of necessity. Let me ask the hon. gentleman how a treaty can possibly be framed unless it is possible for somebody to ask who is to decide. Surely, in the language of Mr. Bayard, we look forward to good faith on the part of the two Governments. The United States will certainly expect, and they have the right to expect, that in the administration of this treaty we will be fair and even generous; and that when a vessel really requires to unload a cargo, in order to repair, we shall not exercise any extremely nice discrimination against her as to the nature of her injuries; but when the hon. gentleman tells us that somebody else has to decide, I say it is always so with every treaty. Let me ask him in relation to the Treaty of 1818, which he admires so much, what tribunal was established to interpret its provisions, and whether we have not been quarelling over its interpretation for nearly half a century? I have only one remark more to make besides apologising to the House for the great length of their time I have taken. My last remark will be with reference to the hon. gentleman's statement that had we conceded all these points long ago we would have occupied a better position to-day. Well, I do not want to say anything boastful with respect to the protection of the fisheries, and with respect to the vigilance and care with which my colleague has administered his department in that regard; but I claim that great care, vigilance, caution and strictness are required even in the administration of the treaty and the custom laws, and have been observed, and necessarily so, for a number of years past. We have been dealing with a class of people who, in the pursuit of an innocent vocation, have little regard for the strict territorial rights of their neighbors, people who, in the pursuit of fishing have as little compunction about crossing an imaginary three-mile line as a sportsman has, in the pursuit of his game, in crossing his neighbor's property. Dealing with people like these, who come up to our shores frequently in large fleets, required, in order that the fisheries of Canada be protected, great vigilance and care on the part of the Government. If the Government had not protected the fisheries as they have, with vigilance and even strictness, instead of occupying the proud position we oc-

copy to-day, we would have had no treaty on the Table, we would have no concessions to make, we would have received no concessions in return, our fishermen would not have fared as well as they have during the past few years, our fisheries would not have been as valuable as they are to day, and neither the United States nor any other country would have thought it worth their while to go through the solemnities of negotiating and making a treaty in regard to fisheries which the owners thought so little of that they did not care probably to administer the laws of their own country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.55 a. m. (Wednesday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 11, 1888.

No. 32.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Daly.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although I have given notice of motion of this as being a Government notice of motion, I would move, with the consent of the House, that the Government business should take precedence every Thursday, after Questions put by Members. I think I can appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to assist the Government to carry this resolution. For the last three weeks we have been discussing a very important question, and the Government, in order to expedite the discussion and decision of that question, gave up all their days. I think, therefore, the next six Thursdays might be returned to us as a mere matter of honesty.

Mr. LAURIER. As the last three weeks' discussion has been far more profitable to the Opposition than the Government, we can afford, on that ground, to be generous, and I have no objection to the motion provided it does not apply to to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then you ought to give us next Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. We will not say anything about that now, but deal only with the Thursdays.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved that every Thursday after next Thursday the Government business take precedence, following Questions put by Members.

Motion agreed to.

REFUND OF HAY DUTIES BY THE UNITED STATES.

Mr LAVERGNE asked, Has any action been taken by the Government, or any members thereof, with the view of helping exporters of hay to the United States, to obtain the refund of the duty improperly levied on them by the

Customs authorities of the United States; and if so, has any conclusion been reached?

Mr. THOMPSON. That matter is more particularly under the care of the Minister of Finance, but, in his absence, I may state that action has been taken by the Government and some of its members individually with respect to these claims. Representations were made by the Government officially to the Government of the United States with respect to them, and, when some members of the Government visited Washington in the early part of last winter, the Minister of Finance and myself had an interview with the Secretary of the Treasury, in which we endeavored to the best of our ability to press the reasonableness of these claims on the attention of Mr. Fairchild, but the result was that Mr. Fairchild stated that it was entirely out of the power of the Government of the United States, or any of its Departments, to give the relief applied for, principally because the claimants had not availed themselves of the remedies provided by the law of the United States, and had allowed the time to pass by during which they could obtain redress; and consequently, except by an Act of Congress, he could not give them relief. Consequently, recollecting the lapse of time and the number of cases of a like character which would be pressed upon them, he declined to give us any expectation that an application to Congress would be successful. At any rate, the conclusion is that the application must be made to the Congress of the United States by the individuals who have been aggrieved, for an appropriation.

ACCOMMODATION FOR IMMIGRANTS AT REGINA.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Government is aware that the accommodation for immigrants at Regina is insufficient?

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad indeed to know that a much larger number of immigrants are going into the North-West Territories this spring than anticipated; and as to the question of the hon. member for Assiniboia, I may say that I have caused some enquiries to be made in the matter referred to, and have taken such temporary steps as are likely to be sufficient for present necessities.

POSTMASTER AT ARKONA, LAMBTON COUNTY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has George M. Everest resigned the postmastership at Arkona, in the County of Lambton, or has he been dismissed? If dismissed, what were the reasons for his dismissal? Were such reasons communicated to him before or since his dismissal? Has a successor been appointed? What is his name?

Mr. McLELAN. Everest has been removed from the postmastership of Arkona for the reason that he had established for some considerable time a business at Forest, to which he gave all his attention, attending there the entire week, as was reported by the inspector, and only visiting Arkona on Saturday night and staying over Sunday, leaving the management of the office in the hands of others, who, the inspector reported, did not discharge the

duties very efficiently. Robert Davitt has been appointed in his place.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not answered the last part of the question, "Were such reasons communicated to him before or since his dismissal?"

Mr. McLELAN. They were communicated, I understand, before I took charge of the department. There was a complaint against him.

WINTER STEAM NAVIGATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Government aware that Mr. C. F. Hannington, C.E., of the Central Railway, New Brunswick, is now in Prince Edward Island, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of keeping up winter steam navigation between West Point, P.E.I., and Richibucto, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, I have no knowledge of Mr. Hannington being engaged as intimated.

TIGNISH AND MIMINIGASH BREAKWATERS.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to repair the Tignish and Miminigash Breakwaters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman now. I think he will have to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down.

ALBERTON HARBOR, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to continue, during the season of 1888, the blasting a rock with the view of deepening the harbor at Alberton, P.E.I.?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. I think the hon. gentleman will find the answer in the ordinary Estimates which are before the House.

MAILS BETWEEN FORT MACLEOD AND PINCHER CREEK, N.W.T.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether there is a mail service between Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek, North-West Territory? Is it a daily mail, or what? What is the distance, and who has the contract for carrying the mail? What amount per month or year is paid for the service? Were tenders asked for? In what way, and when published? How many tenders were received? The name of each party tendering, and date of tender?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a mail service between Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek. It is weekly at present, but I have been making enquiries for the last month or two as to the advisability of making it semi-weekly, and perhaps in a short time we may issue advertisements calling for tenders. The distance is 32 miles. Mr. Ives has the contract for carrying the mails at a sum of \$570 a year. Tenders were not asked for, but a temporary arrangement was made by the local inspector without tenders.

RICHARD MONCK.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is Richard Monck in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Mr. CARLING. It is rather difficult to answer the question the hon. gentleman has asked, as there may be a number of Richard Moncks in the employ of the Government. If he would particularise the place, we might be able to answer him.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. LISTER. Of Chatham.

Mr. CARLING. Richard Monck, of Chatham, is not in the employ of the Government.

DISMISSAL OF DEBATES TRANSLATORS.

Mr. LAURIER. I now rise to bring up the question of privilege of which I gave notice a few days ago, in reference to the dismissal by you, Mr. Speaker, of some of the officers of the House. The last time it was brought up by me, it was understood that it would be taken up again after the close of the debate on reciprocity, and I think no more fitting opportunity will offer than this. I desire to bring this question before the House in order to test the action by which you have discharged what you considered to be your duty as Speaker of this House, in dismissing and depriving the House of the services of three of the officers whom the House had appointed for its convenience and service. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret exceedingly that I feel myself obliged, in the discharge of what I conceive to be my duty, as a member of this House, to bring this matter up. Certainly, I think it is the duty of everyone in this House to endeavor to support the Chair in any decision given by the Chair; but if one finds himself obliged conscientiously to differ from the view which the Chair may have taken, it is only right that an opportunity should at once be given to test the question, to see whether the Speaker, under the circumstances, properly or improperly exercised his duty. In this instance, I must say at once that, in my humble judgment, at least, it seems to me that you have taken an erroneous view of the duty with which you were charged in your position as Speaker. I regret it all the more, because it seems to me that the step which you felt it your duty to take was one of extreme hardship to the officers who were dismissed. The officers who were dismissed from the service of the House were Ernest Tremblay, Rémi Tremblay, and A. E. Poirier. All three were translators of the debates of this House. Mr. Ernest Tremblay was appointed by an order of this House, upon a report of the Debates Committee, in the year 1884; Mr. Rémi Tremblay was appointed in the same manner in the month of February, 1884, and Mr. A. E. Poirier—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Eudore Poirier.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend knows him better than I do, perhaps—Mr. Eudore Poirier was appointed in the same manner in the month of April, 1884. As to the competence of these men, I do not believe that a word of complaint can be uttered; I believe that it is the opinion of everybody that in the discharge of these duties they were most efficient officers of this House. In fact the complaint which was made against them is not in reference to their services as officers of this House, but the charge is that they went out of their proper sphere of action and grossly insulted some members of this House. The charge was brought forward by my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, in a letter dated the 22nd May, 1887. I will not read it all, but I will read the gist of the facts of which the hon. gentleman complains. After naming the officers, he says:

"These officials acted with indescribable violence at the last electoral campaign; both on the hustings and in the press wrote and spoke in regard to me, things so offensive and calumnious that I could neither speak to them nor salute them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence within the precincts of this House is for me a nuisance which, it appears to me, no one has a right to subject a member of Parliament."

This charge is corroborated by my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), so far as Mr. Rémi Tremblay is concerned. In a letter a few days later also addressed to you, Mr. Ives made a particular charge against Rémi Tremblay. He states in conclusion:

"His presence is distasteful to me, I cannot have any communication with him, and I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

Upon receipt of these complaints, you, Sir, very properly referred them to the officers themselves for their answer. They sent you their answer, and you afterwards sent the whole correspondence to the chairman of the Debates Committee. The Debates Committee investigated the matter and came to the conclusion that it had better be left in your hands to be dealt with. They reported to the House, but that report never was taken up, it never was even moved in the House. It must be regretted that this report was not considered by the House, because then the whole matter could have been dealt with by the House upon its merits, and the House could have determined at once whether these gentlemen had been guilty of such an offence as warranted their dismissal. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to enter into the merits of the charges which are brought against these officers, except in so far as it may be necessary to the end of the motion which I have placed in your hands, and which simply challenges the jurisdiction which you thought proper to exercise in the matter. This, however, I must say, that the officers are accused of having taken an active part in the electoral campaign. They do not deny that; in their answer they affirm that they did, indeed, take an active part in the election, but they deny that they were guilty of the calumnious language with which they are charged. Now, I must say at once that it seems somewhat singular, and it is, I think, improper, that officers of this House should be allowed to engage actively in politics. I have no hesitation at all in making that statement, but if these gentlemen declare that they took an active part in the political campaign, they also declare that in doing so they had the sanction of this House. They state that the House had appointed the translators of the debates—I am not yet speaking of the other officers of the House, but of the translators only—should be allowed to take part, not only in political campaigns, but in active politics in all circumstances. This matter came up incidentally in 1884. At that time it was stated, without contradiction from any quarter, that the translators of the debates were permitted to be engaged in active journalism, and, therefore, to engage in politics. On that occasion the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was a member of the Debates Committee, spoke. I must say that the matter came up upon the question of increasing the salaries of the translators, and the hon. member for Norfolk stated that he was opposed to an increase of salaries, because the translators were actively engaged as newspaper correspondents. He said:

"I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not."

So it was openly stated on the floor of the House, in 1884, that the translators of the debates, while being officers of this House, were at the same time actively engaged in political work, and writing for the newspapers with which they were connected. On the same occasion the Secretary of State also spoke as follows:—

"We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of *Hansard*. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for *Hansard* are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification."

That was the understood doctrine. It was understood that the translators of the debates, as I shall show hereafter, are engaged for no other purpose but to translate the debates. As soon as the Session is over and they have completed their work, they are free, and it was admitted on that occasion that they could dispose of their time in any manner

they chose to employ it, in politics or otherwise. However, I must say that the translators of the debates have largely availed themselves of this permission. The staff, at the opening of the present Session, was composed of eight members: Mr. Beaulieu, the chief; Messrs. Bouchard, Lasalle, Vanasse, Gélinas, E. Tremblay, R. Tremblay and Poirier, the latter three of whom have been dismissed. In regard to the Messrs. Beaulieu and Gélinas, I cannot say whether they are engaged in politics or not, as I have not the honor of their acquaintance. In regard to the other three, I know them very well, and every one of them is actively engaged in politics not only during the election, but from the commencement to the end of each year. Mr. Bouchard belongs to the staff of the *Journal de Québec*, an active ministerial organ published in Quebec, and he is chief editor of that journal, I am told. Mr. Lasalle is on the editorial staff of *Le Monde*, an active ministerial organ published in Montreal. Mr. Vanasse is engaged as editor of another ministerial organ published at Sorel, *Le Sorelois*. Not only did those gentlemen engage in politics as much as the three translators who have been dismissed, but they have been much more. Those three translators are only charged with having been engaged in politics during the election; the three other translators I have named are engaged in politics from day to day as active editors of newspapers. Moreover, they all actively engaged in politics. Mr. Vanasse took part in the same campaign in which the Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier engaged. I find that on a certain occasion in his own paper, *Le Sorelois*, he reported a meeting in which he had encountered Senator Guévremont, by whom he was attacked for trespassing beyond his duties in taking an active part in politics. But Mr. Vanasse reports in his own paper that at that meeting, held on 20th July, 1886, he had answered the Senator as follows:

"Mr. Vanasse repelled victoriously the disloyal attacks of which he had been the object. He explained that he did not, in any way, depend on the Government, that he had been appointed translator by a Committee of the House of Commons, consisting of Reformers and Conservatives, and that the Government could not deprive him of his position, having no control over the office, but that it could only be done by a vote of the House of Commons."

So that officer of the House declared what was the common opinion entertained at the time, that he was not an officer of the Government but an officer of the House, and that he was at liberty to engage in politics as he was engaged at that time. It seems to me under such circumstances to be beyond doubt that these officers were led to believe, and had every reason to believe, that they could do on the Liberal side of politics what other three translators could do on the Conservative side, and certainly if you are to apply an equal rule you must say that Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier were no more guilty of trespassing against the privileges of this House than were the three translators on the other side of politics who have been retained. But it will be said that, conceding that they could engage in politics, those translators who have been discharged have been guilty of abusive language, and this charge has been brought against them. It may probably be said that we do not find fault with their taking part in politics if they choose to do so, but they must use polite language. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the House of Commons which gave the translators permission to engage in politics, but the House could scarcely be expected to see that they were never guilty of using abusive language. Hon. members must remember that the translators of the debates for three or four months of the year do nothing else but translate the debates of the House; they become saturated with abusive language, and to expect that they would act differently was to suppose they were different flesh and blood from ourselves. I will say this to hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially to the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives),

who seems to have been rather thin skinned on the occasion in question, that if they find fault with the translators who engage in politics for having been guilty of abusive language, I call upon the man without offence to throw the first stone, and I do not expect it will come from the other side at all events, and perhaps not from this side. Such being the case, when that is the only charge that was brought against them, these facts must be taken into consideration in dealing with the question. The moment you permit a man, whether he be an officer of the House or a member of Parliament, to take part in politics, you may take it as a logical consequence of the permission given that they will commit abuses in the heat of discussion. If you do not want the officers of the House to use abusive language towards members of Parliament, we must prevent them from engaging in politics, and I think this is the only reasonable course to be pursued. I think it was a most unfortunate course on the part of the House to allow any of its officers to engage actively in politics, either on the hustings or in the columns of newspapers. Coming as you do, Mr. Speaker, from the Province of Quebec, and being, I presume, a diligent reader of the ministerial press, you are aware that the offence with which the translators are charged is not confined to them, and if we were to scan the columns of the newspapers edited by Messrs. Bouchard, Vanasse and Lasalle, we would find just as much abuse in their columns as could be found in the columns embodied in the complaint of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Bouchard has not been on the *Journal de Québec* for a year.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, he is on *Le Canada*, published in the city of Ottawa, and my hon. friend cannot undertake to say the reverse. At all events, I can say that at the present moment I am led to understand that Bouchard is an active officer of *Le Canada*. He was at that time on the *Journal de Québec* and had been for several years there up to last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the report had come before the House, my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) was prepared with an amendment which would have met the justice of the case. My hon. friend was prepared with an amendment stating that the practice which had prevailed of allowing officers of this House to interfere in politics was not a judicious practice, and that it should be put an end to. This would have at once defined the position and shown that the officers of the House were not expected to interfere at all in politics. I think that position would have been a sound one, and a warning would have been given to those officers which would have amply met the justice of the case. Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, the committee made a report and referred the matter to you. If the report had been adopted by the House, of course the matter would have been at an end, and you would have been perfectly justified in exercising your discretion, but I must say this further, that since you came to the conclusion, whether with authority or without authority, to dismiss those officers, it would have been on your part, a simple act of mercy and justice to dismiss them at once and to inform them at once that their services would not have been required. Instead of that you waited until the 25th of February, that is to say, two days after the opening of the Session, when each of those gentlemen received the following letter:—

"Sir,—The Speaker of the House of Commons has instructed me to tell you that your services as translator of the debates of this House will not be required during the ensuing Session.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"A. MACMAHON,

"Secretary."

As I said a moment ago, I think it would have been an act of mercy, since you made your mind up to dismiss them, to dismiss them immediately after the last Session of Parlia-

Mr. LAURIER.

ment, so that these men might do something else for a living. To my own knowledge, Sir, one or two of those men had no other means of livelihood than the office they occupied in this House. It was, it seems to me, a harsh measure at the opening of the Session, when they had come here to discharge their ordinary duties, to dismiss them in this manner. I do not want now to enter into the merits of the case. The question which I bring before the House is as to whether or not, as Speaker of this House, you have the power which you thought you had, to dismiss them. I understand, as I said already, and this point will not be contradicted, that you could not have acted upon the report of the Debates Committee, since that report never was adopted. As I understand, you think you have the power which you have exercised under section 16, chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, that is the Act referring to the House of Commons and which is as follows:—

"If any complaint or representation is at any time made to the Speaker for the time being of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer, messenger, or other person attendant on the House of Commons, the Speaker may cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it appears to the Speaker that such person has been guilty of misconduct, or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger, or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor General, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

I apprehend that is the section on which you think you had the right. All I have to say with regard to this question is simply this, that the officers of this House who are therein contemplated are not the translators of the debates. The translators of the debates do not come within the purview of this Act. The officers here contemplated are the officers appointed for the services of this House by yourself, and all the officers for the regular service of the House are either appointed by the Crown or by yourself, Mr. Speaker. I conceive it to be in that way. But as far as my knowledge goes, the Clerk of the House is the only officer who is appointed by the Crown. All the other officers, the assistant clerk for instance, are appointed by Mr. Speaker. In England the officers are appointed by the Crown, but this was not always so. It is only since 1856 they are appointed by the Crown, and previous to that they were appointed by the Clerk of the House. In 1856 a Bill was brought in specially with a view of taking that power from the Clerk of the House in the British House of Commons and vesting it in the Crown. Mr. Wilson, who had charge of the Bill in the House of Commons, said:

"He would now move for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate certain offices of the House of Commons. The object of the proposed Bill was: First, to vest in the Crown for the future the appointment of the Assistant and Second Assistant Clerk at the table, instead of having the appointment of those officers vested in the First Clerk, as at present; and secondly, to repeal that clause of the Act which provided that the salary of the Second Assistant Clerk should be charged on the Consolidated Fund."

So that the power was taken by the Crown to appoint those officers who previously had been appointed by the Clerk. I think the power of appointing officers of this House should also have belonged properly to the Clerk, but by a series of measures coming in succession one after the other, all those appointments have been vested in the Speaker, and rule 102 of the House expressly lays it down:

"Before filling any vacancy in the service of the House by the Speaker, enquiry shall be made touching the necessity for the continuance of such office."

So that the Speaker is expressly assured that the power of appointing officers of this House is completely vested in him. I understand very well that under such circumstances the power to appoint is vested in the Speaker, and that the Speaker is responsible to the House of the proper discharge of their duties by those officers. If you have any reason to believe that one of those officers, you yourself have appointed, does not properly discharge his duty, I

apprehend that under such circumstances, and no one will contradict it, that you have the power of removal. The power of appointing always implies the power of removal, but the power of removal cannot be exercised until there is the power to appoint. That is the point I wish to come to. I submit to the House that you have no authority to remove those officers, because they are not officers appointed by yourself. They are officers appointed by the House of Commons for its special convenience. The House has only one officer appointed by the Crown—that is the Clerk, and the officers should be appointed by the Clerk, I think, when we consider the propriety of the case, because he is primarily responsible for the discharge of the business of this House. We have allowed a different practice to prevail, and transferred from the Clerk to the Speaker the power to appoint, and, therefore those officers appointed by the Speaker he has power to remove. As to the Clerk for instance, the Speaker has no power of removal. In the year 1874 we organised a new service for the House, that is to say, the translation of the debates. And we provided certain rules which have always guided us since that time, and which, in my opinion, are of such a nature as to put the question beyond a doubt that these officers are directly amenable to no other authority than the authority of the House, without the interference of the Speaker. In 1874 the House adopted the following resolution:—

"That a Select Standing Committee of not more than five members shall be appointed next Session, and each Session thereafter, to make rules and regulations, and manage generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the *Hansard*."

That is the standing rule, under which the debates of this House have always been taken and translated. In the Session of 1883 the House adopted the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That the contract system for the translation of the official report of the Debates of this House be done away with after this Session, and that four Translators be appointed permanently, to be under the control of the Committee, one to be chief, * * * none of whom shall be employed in any other manner by the House except in connection with the Debates."

These words are pregnant of meaning; the officers to be appointed are to be kept under the control of the Debates Committee of the House, and they are to discharge certain duties and no other duties; they are to be employed in the translating of the debates and nothing else. Now, no one will pretend that these officers are in the same category as the officers you yourself, Sir, choose to appoint. If you appoint an officer, according to the Act, you have the power of removal and suspension; you can take him from one office and put him in another; the officers at the Table of the House you can take from the Table and place in another position; but would it be pretended that you have power to take a translator of the debates, appointed by this House, and give him another position? Evidently no, because the rule expressly says that he shall be employed as a translator of the debates and in no other manner. It seems to me that the point is clear beyond a doubt that the translators belong to a new category of officers, and that they do not come within the precincts of the Act under which you have presumed to act. Let me call attention to clause 17 of that Act:

"The Clerk of the House of Commons shall subscribe and take before the Speaker the oath of allegiance, and all other officers, clerks and messengers of the House of Commons shall subscribe and take before the Clerk of the House of Commons; and the Clerk of the House of Commons shall keep a register of all such oaths."

Now, this is an oath which is required of all officers appointed by you, but this oath is not required from the translators.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What of that?

Mr. LAURIER. Therefore these translators are not subject to this Act, and if they are not, the Speaker had no authority in the matter.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Can the hon. gentleman tell me if the official reporters are bound to take the oath of allegiance?

Mr. LAURIER. The official reporters stand in a completely different position from the official translators, because the reporters have been made permanent officers of the House and they cannot engage in any other work; their services are at the disposal of the Government after the Session, and their appointment expressly says so; but the translators are appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the Session they could engage in any other work they chose to engage in. Therefore there is no parallel between the two classes of officers. I think I have given a good answer to the Prime Minister that since these officers are not obliged to take the oath of allegiance, they do not come within the precincts of this Act. Your power, Mr. Speaker, is a statutory power, and if you have power to remove these officers under the Act, they should also take the oath of allegiance; but if they are not bound to take the oath of allegiance, they do not come within the precincts of the Act for one thing, and they would not come within its precincts for another thing. These reasons, in my judgment at least, make it clear that in acting as you have done, you have trespassed beyond the duties assigned to you by the House. I have endeavored to discuss this question without any acrimony; I have put it simply on the ground that the Speaker has exceeded his powers, and therefore I beg to move:

That in the Session of 1874 this House adopted certain resolutions, providing for the reporting of the Debates of this House, and that it was amongst other things, enacted:

1. "That a Select Standing Committee of not more than (5) five members shall be appointed next Session, and each Session thereafter, to make rules and regulations and manage generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the *Hansard*."

2. That the said Committee, under the authority of the said resolutions, has been regularly appointed ever since, at the beginning of every Session.

3. That the said Committee, with the sanction of the House for all its proceedings, in every instance, has managed generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the Debates.

4. That on the 5th April, 1883, the said Committee reported to this House as follows:—

"Resolved, That the contract system for the translation of the official report of the Debates of this House be done away with after this Session, and that (4) four Translators be appointed permanently, to be under the control of the Committee, one to be chief at a salary of \$1,000, and (3) three at salaries of \$800 each, none of whom shall be employed in any other manner by the House except in connection with the Debates," and that the report was concurred in by this House.

5. That on the 27th April, during the same Session, the said committee made the following report:

(1.) "That in accordance with the terms and conditions of their second report (to wit, the above report) the following gentlemen be appointed Translators of the official reports of the Debates of this House, viz.:—A. Gélinas, as Chief Translator, and N. H. Beaulieu, J. B. Vanasse and Ernest Tremblay, as Assistant Translators."

6. That on the 8th February, 1884, the Committee reported "the appointment of Rémi Tremblay, at a salary of \$800, as Translator from the French language into the English, and from the English language into the French, as may be necessary," and that the said report was concurred in by this House.

7. That on the 1st April, during the same Session, the said Committee made the following report:—

(1.) "That Mr. A. E. Poirier be appointed as an additional Translator, and that his appointment date from the commencement of next Session."

(2.) "That, commencing with next Session, the salaries of the Translators be as follows:—

"A. Gélinas, Chief Translator, \$1,200; N. H. Beaulieu, Assistant Translator; E. Tremblay, Assistant Translator; R. Tremblay, Assistant Translator; J. B. Vanasse, Assistant Translator; J. Bouchard, Assistant Translator; J. Lasalle, Assistant Translator; A. E. Poirier, Assistant Translator, \$1,000 each; and that in addition to the work of translation, the Chief Translator be required to make the Index," and that the said report was concurred in by this House.

8. That at the beginning of the present Session, to wit, on the 23rd February last, Mr. Speaker dismissed the said Rémi Tremblay, E. Tremblay and A. E. Poirier from their offices of Translators of the Debates of this House.

9. Resolved, That while professing great respect for the view which Mr. Speaker has taken of his authority in the premises, this House emphatically records its opinion that the publishing and translating of the Debates, and of everything connected therewith, belong exclusively to the House itself, and that the same is to be exclusively exercised, with the sanction of the House in every instance, through the said Committee; and that under the circumstances the action of Mr. Speaker is an invasion of the undoubted rights and privileges of this House, and is therefore not binding.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure my hon. friend will not charge me with improperly imputing motives to him when I say that his remarks have convinced me that friendship can carry a man very far. Were it not for that feeling, I am sure my hon. friend would, if he did not regret, at all events would not care about having put on record the opinions he has just expressed concerning the discipline and dignity of the House and the dignity of the hon. members of this House. I do not wish to enter at all into the merits of this question. I am one of those who complained to you, Mr. Speaker, of the improper conduct of certain officers of this House, and I asked for their dismissal. I did not do so from any feeling of revenge or spite, because I hardly know two of the gentlemen in question, and the third has given me no reason at all to entertain any resentment or desire for revenge against him. But there is one thing for which I have an immense amount of regard, and that is the dignity of this House, and my own. My opinion is that this House should be regulated, as regards its interior economy, on a different principle from any other House where good company meets, and where discipline, obedience, and a proper sense of respect and decency are required of those in its service. For these reasons I have asked you, Sir, to dismiss these three officers. I shall not repeat the expressions which have been used on the hustings and in the press by those gentlemen. That would be entering into the discussion of a matter to which it is always unpleasant to refer, and I may dispense with doing so, because these gentlemen have not denied that they have said and done what has been reported of them, but have tried to cover themselves under the privilege which my hon. friend has been endeavouring to explain to the House. I am sure the hon. gentleman will gain nothing by his motion. I am sure the expression of opinion has been too often given in this House, on both sides, in cases connected with parties in the service of this House, to allow the principle to prevail that if the conduct with which these officers are reproached is one that deserves punishment, that the punishment should not be dealt out, Mr. Speaker, by you. As the motion is one questioning your jurisdiction, Sir, I shall restrict myself within the limits of that question. My hon. friend has said that it was hardship these three men were not dismissed last Session or at the end of last Session, so as not to force them to come here again at the beginning of this Session, and lose their time as they have been losing it. I must for a moment allude to that. I may say you have been guilty, Sir, indeed of believing that these three men would have the decency to understand their position, and have self-respect enough, after the report which was made by the Committee of *Hansard* last Session, to stay at home this Session, more especially as they stated on the hustings they were ready to do so, and were ready to pay for what they called their patriotism. They stated frequently on the hustings and in the press that they were jeopardizing their position, and exposing themselves to lose the bread they were earning at the hands of this House, but that nevertheless they were ready to make that sacrifice on the altar of their country. Their altar has been very much diminished since they made those declarations in public. You, Sir, presumed perhaps too much in thinking those men would feel it was due to their self-respect to remain at home, and you had to dismiss them at the beginning of the Session. I may say again that the presence of these men parading the corridors has been a cause of annoyance both to myself and to other hon.

Mr. LAURIER.

members of this House, and not only have they been parading the corridors, but they have been exhibiting their sparring qualities besides, because one of them was guilty of committing an assault in the translators' office a day or two ago. These men belong to the press; they know, as my hon. friend says they do, the procedure of the House, and they should know that when there is a debate in the House regarding one of its members, that member has the decency to absent himself during the debate. But while the debate with regard to dismissing them was taking place, these gentlemen had not the decency to absent themselves from the House. It is a strange theory expounded by my hon. friend to say that by statute the action of this House must be regulated according to certain rules. But, according to the statute, you, Mr. Speaker, and the Clerk of this House have entrusted to your care the discipline of the officers of this House; and in cases of misconduct on the part of officers appointed by the Crown, you have the right to suspend them, and in other cases you have the right to dismiss them for misconduct. There is no distinction made, and although my hon. friend has thought proper to make one there can be none. According to his argument, those gentlemen engaged as translators of the *Hansard* would have the privilege which members of this House have not. You have the right to punish members of this House, but, according to the hon. gentleman, you have not the right to punish those translators. More than that, the committee, under whose control my hon. friend pretends those officers were, declared that it was for you, Mr. Speaker, to deal with them. The committee has declared it has no control over the translators, except as regards the work of translation, and that as to their behaviour in or out of the House, that is a matter with which the Speaker of the House must deal. My hon. friend's argument is a very singular one. Because he says, these men are employed only during the Session, outside of the Session they have a right to be as abusive, impertinent and scandalous towards members of this House as they choose. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that a civil servant, whose duty is to attend his office from 9 o'clock to 4.30 in the evening, may, when his work is over, insult or strike a member of the House, and yet that we can have no right to dismiss him? Does the hon. gentleman pretend that once a civil servant has done his duty during office hours, he has the right to be a blackguard after office hours? That contention will not hold water. The statute says that some of the officers can be suspended by you, and that you and the Clerk of the House have the control of the other officers and may dismiss or punish them. You have done it, and you have done it rightly, and I am sure that in doing it you have done a thing that every member of this House will say you were right in doing. I do not think that the Speaker should make any distinction between parties, and I have no hesitation in saying that, if any translator or any other official had met the hon. gentleman on the hustings and had said that he was a thief, a liar, a traitor, the slave of dangerous sects, and so on, and if the hon. gentleman was complaining of it, I would be the first to rise and say: Dismiss that man. Whether the member attacked had the name of Laurier or Chapleau, it would make no difference, and my hon. friends have neither the right to deny or to suspect what I say, and I say it with that deliberation and that frankness which I have when I make such declarations. I do not think I have anything to add on this question. As I stated, we are a Legislative Assembly, and we cannot as a Legislative Assembly take upon ourselves to conduct here the discipline of the officers of the House. That is done by a delegation, which is given by all the precedents, by all the traditions, and by something better than traditions, by good sense and reason, to the chief officer of this House, to the president of this House, to the man who, sitting in the chair, is obliged to take care not only of the officers

outside of the House, but of the members themselves during the sitting; and I say that under the circumstances you have acted rightly. You may have acted late, but you have acted rightly in rendering the decision which you have rendered. There can be no long argument upon this. I think it imposes itself upon the mind and upon the sense of every hon. member that, having in your hands the conduct of the discipline of all officers of the House, you have done the only thing which the Constitution and common sense give you the right to do, in dismissing these men for an offence which is not denied by anybody to be worthy of the punishment you have inflicted in dismissing them. I do not want to look at this from any point of sentiment on my part, but I would not remain in this House while one of the servants of the House was here who would consider he had the right to blackguard me and to act in the most indecent manner with me either in this House or outside of it, and you would have a perfect right to say on my demand to any such officer, if you are guilty of that, you are dismissed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the question which is now under the attention of the House is one of very great importance, and one that the House ought to approach in a judicial spirit. If we are disposed to lay down a rule with regard to conduct of the officers of this House, it is important that the rule should be applied with the utmost fairness and that we should not have one measure of justice for those who happen to be Liberal in their sentiments, and another and a different one for those who belong to the party which has the majority in the House. In the consideration of this question, we have first to consider the nature of the offence, whether it is one that should be brought under the attention of the House at all, and, if so, who or what is the proper party to deal with the offence. In the first place, until the House is prepared to adopt a general rule which it is disposed to apply with perfect impartiality to all those who are engaged as translators, it was as much open, in my opinion, to those parties to engage in political warfare as it was open to those who still remain members of that board of translators. Then, I think it is also obvious that you, Mr. Speaker, had no power to deal with those parties; that if these parties committed any offence which made it proper to dismiss them from the service of this House, a motion should be made by the hon. gentleman or by some other member who thought he had good ground of complaint, in the House, and the dismissal should have come from the House and not from you. It is clear that these translators do not fall within the class of officers placed under your control. They are outside of the officers provided for by the statute. They are appointed by the House of its own motion and of its own inherent authority, and are supposed to remain in the service of the House until they are removed by a resolution of the House. It does not matter what men may say outside of the House. What is said outside of the House is not a matter of privilege that an hon. gentleman can bring before the House, unless it be something said with reference to his conduct as a member of the House. I think that was very clearly laid down when a certain member of the House of Commons in England complained of observations which had been made by another member, Dr. Kenealy, who said:

"Do you think a man would make a good representative who has put a false witness into the box who would give false testimony?"

That was brought to the attention of the House, and Mr. Gladstone said it was not a question with which the House had any right to deal, but it was a question, if any wrong had been committed, which was to be dealt with by the courts. The same view was taken by Mr. Lowe, who said:

"There is no occasion for interference by the House. It is a matter of slander, and the hon. gentleman has his remedy before the ordinary tribunals of the country."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Kenealy was not a servant of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that Dr. Kenealy was a member of the House. I say it does not matter. If the hon. gentleman has any wrong done him, if he has any charge made against him, it is not for the House to anticipate that and say whether it is well or ill-founded. It is for the hon. gentleman to vindicate himself before the ordinary tribunals of the country in the same way as any other party. Mr. Disraeli, speaking on the same subject, went further, and pointed out that the observation applied to the servants of the House as well as to its members:

"It is no part of the business of the House to make such a question a question of privilege. A personal attack must be made in the House and against a member in his capacity as member to justify the House in dealing with the matter at all."

I want to know whether the First Minister takes exception to that rule, and, when these gentlemen dealt with this hon. gentleman, when, not only was he not a member of the House, but when there was no House at all, upon the platform, whether he thinks he has a right to come here and complain of their conduct and snuff them out for saying what several of the hon. gentleman's supporters have said of him. I have in my hand several observations made in reference to the hon. gentleman, not by the translators, but by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who said things of the hon. gentleman and of the First Minister quite as severe as anything said by these translators who were dismissed from office, either with regard to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) or the hon. the Secretary of State. I want to know why the Secretary of State has not brought this up as a matter of privilege, and proposed to the House that the hon. gentleman, having made charges which were atrocious slanders against the First Minister, is unworthy of a seat in this House. I say that he has just as good a right to propose that motion and with just as much propriety, as any observations which the hon. gentleman has made. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman complains "meeting these men in the corridors," he says, "is offensive to me." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has to meet them in the street; are they offensive there? Have they not as good a right to come here as any other citizens of the country? Is the hon. gentleman going to have some extra-judicial tribunal created to try imaginary offences against his sentiments and feelings for which the ordinary law of the country makes no provision? Well, Sir, let me say that the First Minister has put in the Library here a librarian. Did he never say anything offensive to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House? Why, Sir, I remember that from the time I went on the press in 1882, until that gentleman retired from the chief editorial staff of the *Mail*, there were but two or three newspapers of the daily *Mail* that were published, that did not contain a personal attack on myself. There was scarcely a paper that did not contain attacks upon almost every hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has been for any time in Parliament. Did the hon. gentleman consult our feelings? Did he consider whether this party whom he appointed Librarian was or was not agreeable to us? Was that the view the hon. gentleman laid down? Are those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House of finer intellectual and moral fibre, of finer sensibilities, than hon. members on this side of the House? Are they the only parties who have any sentiments or feelings that are to be taken into consideration? We remember what the Senator in Uncle Tom's Cabin is represented as saying of the colored population, "We know that they are not much to be considered in the matter; they are not constituted as we are; they have not the sentiments and feelings which we have, and of course you cannot reason from them to us." And I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that he cannot

reason from the Tory side of the House to the Liberal side, and that what is absolutely necessary to protect the dignity, and the freedom, and the rights of the hon. gentlemen on that side, are wholly inapplicable to hon. gentlemen on this side. That is the position taken by the hon. gentleman, and that is the position taken by his colleague the Secretary of State. Now, Sir, let me read for the edification of the First Minister and the Secretary of State, some observations that have been made by those translators who remain—there are five of them. Have they been less considerate of the feelings of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House than those whom the First Minister and the Secretary of State have called upon you arbitrarily and unconstitutionally to dismiss? I say, Sir, that we find that the whole eight must go, upon the rule laid down by the Secretary of State. Now, let me call attention to some observations which were made in the organ of the Secretary of State, in the *Presse* of November 24, 1885.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to say that the *Presse* was my organ. It has not been, and is not.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec East). Is not now?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman denies that it is his organ. At all events, the observations which I am about to read are worthy of the translators who are still under the ægis of the hon. gentleman's protection.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That paper was the violent adversary of the Government at that time.

Mr. MILLS. It says:

"We hope Sir John does not impersonate the English-speaking people, because it would be very sad for them if it were so. Our English-speaking countrymen would be in a pitiable state if they had no other representative besides this moral ruin."

This moral ruin, the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and those hon. gentlemen on that side. It says:

"For a long time back we have been suffering in silence, in consequence of the tyranny of an old infatuated chief who considers the country as his own property, and who leads us according to his caprices, without ever taking any notice of our desires and of our feelings."

Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman does not seem to have been as sensitive as his colleague, and he is not prepared to measure out to the translators that remain and are now friendly to the Administration, that vengeance, that punishment, which he proposes to measure out to those who were known to belong to the Liberal party. Then it further says:

"We want no more of the old schemer whom we have for a long time considered as a statesman, but who juggles with men and measures as a conjuror juggles with nutmegs."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I tell the hon. gentleman that that paper was then a most violent adversary of the Government, and the extracts which he reads are merely a copy of the speeches of some hon. members on the other side of the House. I tell him that paper was not and is not my organ, and he has no right to say so. He is not in order in saying so, and he is not a gentleman if he does.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman's language shows that he is in very much the same position as these translators. The hon. gentleman's notion of what is gentlemanly, after all, does not exactly accord with the notions of hon. gentlemen on this side of this House. I am inclined to think that if he would practice a little more courtesy, he would have a little better ground to complain of the want of courtesy of those whom he is pursuing with his vengeance, and upon whom he is making Mr. Speaker the instrument for the purpose of wreaking that impotent vengeance which has characterised his conduct in this matter. Then, Sir, on the 26th November, 1885, Mr.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Desjardins is reported in the *Presse* as having said, among other things—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is wandering a little from the scope of the resolution as it appears, and as it was explained by the hon. mover. I think we must—

Mr. MILLS. I am merely saying, Mr. Speaker—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Chair, chair.

Mr. MILLS. I am speaking to the point of order. I am saying that the hon. gentleman's own supporters have used, of himself and his colleagues, language which he complains of in the translators; and if I can show that these hon. gentleman are accepting that support and are cordially with those writers, I think I am showing that they have no case against these translators.

Mr. SPEAKER. The scope of the resolution, as I understand it, applies to jurisdiction. The question is, whether jurisdiction rests in the House or with the Speaker. It is so stated in the resolution, and was so explained, as I understood it, by the hon. mover. I feel it my duty to make a gentle suggestion in the way of checking a debate which will become, if continued, quite discursive, and might be offensive if it involved recrimination.

Mr. MILLS. I do not so understand the resolution as you have it. I understand there are before the House two questions in this resolution, and I ask the liberty to state them. I understand that one proposition is that these gentlemen have committed no offence, therefore they ought not to be removed by anybody. I understand the second proposition is that if they had committed any offence, the Speaker is not the proper party to deal with them. Now, Sir, I think I am at liberty to discuss both those propositions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The course which the hon. gentleman is about to take is one which is clearly out of order, is irrelevant, and has no reference to this motion. The motion is that the Speaker has exceeded his jurisdiction in dismissing the three men. The hon. gentleman holds that the Speaker did exceed his jurisdiction, that he had no right to act as he did act, that his discretion was improperly exercised, because members of Parliament and others, not employees of the House, had used strong language towards others. It is certainly quite irregular, just the same as if a charge was brought against a man for stating that a certain man was a thief and he replied that he did so because other men had called him a thief. It is certainly quite out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. The Secretary of State in the commencement of his speech declared that he took the position he did out of regard to his own dignity and the dignity of this House, and he proceeded, if I understood what he said and if I understand the English language, to denounce the translators, because of their conduct during a certain campaign. Did anyone call the Secretary of State to order then? Did the Speaker call the Secretary of State to order?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Secretary of State was justified in going beyond the mere question of jurisdiction to the real merits of the case, then surely some one on this side of the House is entitled to answer the remarks of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman either did not listen or did not understand what I said. I stated most pointedly, and the House will not have forgotten it, that I would not repeat even a single expression used because I wished to remain within the merits of the case, and I pro-

ceeded to say that Mr. Speaker acted wisely. The hon. gentleman said in his argument that the Speaker had exceeded his privilege in assuming powers that belonged to the House. I refrained from dealing with the question beyond mentioning the conduct of the officers during the last few days. It is unfair for the hon. gentleman to say that I stated the whole case and discussed the whole question; I did not do so, but I restrained myself within the limits.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask the Secretary of State if he did not in, the course of his argument, contend that it was necessary for him to take this particular course in order to show his regard for his own dignity and the dignity of this House? Then did he not make an innuendo against the conduct of those gentlemen? It was not the action of the Speaker of which he was complaining, it was not his action that he was denouncing. The point in his argument in support of the course taken with regard to the conduct of the translators was that he was justified in taking a certain course. He made a certain charge, which it is proposed that we on this side of the House shall not answer.

Mr. LAURIER. There is much more in the language of the Secretary of State when he replied to me than he now admits. What was the upshot of his argument? He passed rather lightly over the question of law. He did not say the Speaker had acted rightly in dismissing the officers; he justified the action of the Speaker on its merits, and he said once or twice that the Speaker had done right. What was the gist of his charge? It was that they were blackguards and he would not submit to the infamy of having to meet blackguards in this House. What does this involve? The hon. gentleman is showing that this House is full of blackguards. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to the mere question of law, I could have understood it. My hon. friend would not then have the privilege now of going into anything outside; but I appeal to the sense of fairness of the House that the Secretary of State having failed to confine himself to the question of jurisdiction, but having entered into the merits of the case and said that he took action because he would not submit to meeting blackguards here, we have a right to reply and discuss the whole question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was about to make an observation on the question of order. The whole speech of the Secretary of State was in justification, not of the legal conduct of the Speaker, but of the merits of the case and the right of the Speaker to dismiss men who had acted so improperly. I was undertaking to show, in the first place, that a number of members of Parliament supporting the Government and on terms of friendship with them had made similar statements, and, in the second place, to show that the five remaining translators used exactly as offensive language as did those whom the hon. gentleman proposed to dismiss. I want to know, and I have a right to know, whether this House is to have one rule of conduct and one measure of punishment for one class of officers, and a different measure for those who are of a different way of political thinking? I think that is perfectly germane to the discussion. This whole case is before the House on the resolution, and I submit, if you undertake to confine the discussion simply to the proposition whether the Speaker has the legal power to dismiss those officers without reference to the propriety of his conduct, a gross injustice will be done by such a ruling. It would be a rule to stifle debate in this House.

Mr. CASEY. A word in regard to the point of order. The Secretary of State said he did not bring before the House the whole case connected with the conduct of the translators. The hon. gentleman did bring it before the House and it is here in printed form on the desk of every

member. The whole question of the conduct of the translators, the language used by them and the complaints made by the Secretary of State and by his very sensitive friend, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), is before every hon. member. The whole case is fully before the House, and if, as it appeared, the case in regard to its merits and its details, has been brought before the House by the Secretary himself, he is the very last man who has a right to complain when we propose to enter into the merits of the case. I think, after the discussion and after calling your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that the whole case is before the House, the very language used as a ground for dismissing them, you will find it your duty to rule that it is as much open to us to discuss the merits of the case, as it was to the Secretary of State.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the point of order is passed upon I desire to call attention to the fact that in addition to the complaints of the Secretary of State having been laid before the House, the reasons which influenced the Speaker in coming to his conclusion have also been presented to the House by the Speaker himself. The papers are now before us, and this is a discussion on the papers and the reasons which influenced the Speaker in his actions. Those papers will be found as an appendix to the Votes and Proceedings, and they commence with a letter by the Secretary of State, in which he charges that those translators were using language which I need not repeat, language offensive to himself and to his dignity and to his honor, and for having used that language he wishes them to be dismissed by the proper authority. The Speaker calls the attention of the translators to the charges, and we have the reply. We have also a letter from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) making complaint against those translators, complaining in regard to certain language used by them on the hustings, and finally we have the following conclusion of the Speaker:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, SPEAKER'S CHAMBERS,
22nd February, 1888.

"At a meeting of the Commissioners of the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons, called for this day at three, were present:—

"The Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B.;

"Hon. Sir Hector Langevin;

"Hon. J. C. Costigan, and

"The Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, Chairman.

"The consideration of the Board is called to the complaints made during last Session by the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, member for Terrebonne, and Mr. Ives, member for Richmond and Wolfe, against Messrs. A. E. Poirier, E. Tremblay and R. Tremblay, the three employed by this Honorable House as translators of the debates. The latter are charged of having, before and during the last general elections used in public prints and on the hustings, towards the former and their friends, very offensive language, and to have made themselves obnoxious by their meddling actively in politics. The letters of Messrs. Chapleau and Ives, and the answers to the same by Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay having been read,

"This Committee have come to the conclusion that it is not in the public interest that the said A. E. Poirier, Ernest Tremblay and Rémi Tremblay should continue to be employed on the staff of the *Hansard*, and urge the Honorable Mr. Speaker to notify these three persons that their employment is at an end.

"And the Committee adjourned to the call of the Speaker.

"J. ALDRIC OUMET, *Speaker*.

"A true copy.

"J. ALDRIC OUMET, *Speaker*."

So that the Speaker has acted upon the complaint made by the hon. the Secretary of State, and that complaint consists simply of the fact that those gentlemen have used expressions at public meetings which he considers to be offensive to himself and to his dignity. He may be right or he may be wrong, but how can we come to a conclusion without discussing it and seeing whether the language which those gentlemen used ought to justify the Speaker in acting as he did. The matter must be discussed in this House or else we must vote blindly on the complaint made by the Secretary of State. There are two points before the House. One, the power of the Speaker under any circumstances to dismiss, and that is a purely legal proposition—the other is

assuming he has the power—and the Secretary of State goes entirely on that supposition—whether he has exercised it properly. My hon. friend is at present engaged in a discussion of that question and he is showing that some associates in the Government, or, I believe, in this House, with whom the Secretary of State is at present in the most cordial relations, have used the same language towards him, the same language which is given as a reason for the dismissal of those men; and the Secretary of State is not obliged to cut in the corridors men who used similar language towards him as those men who have been dismissed. We have the statement of those facts before us and those complaints which have been made. The Speaker has acted on those complaints and has taken action because of language which my hon. friend is proving was used by other members of this House towards the Secretary of State. I think the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is in order and is treating on a matter germane to the subject.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, that the whole record is on the Table of the House, of the complaints, charges and the language which has been made the subject of the resolution. But the question is not what appears in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, but what is contained in the resolution which the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has thought proper to invite the attention of the House to. This resolution is not a resolution containing the two propositions: first, that the Speaker has no authority, and secondly, if he has authority it is not a proper case for its exercise. Let me call the attention of the House to what this resolution is:

"That while professing great respect for the view which Mr. Speaker has taken of his authority in the premises, this House emphatically records its opinion that the publishing and translating of the debates, and of everything connected therewith, belong exclusively to the House itself, and that the same is to be exclusively exercised, with the sanction of the House in every instance, through the said committee; and that under the circumstances the action of Mr. Speaker is an invasion of the undoubted rights and privileges of this House, and is therefore not binding."

Now I submit that while it is true, as the hon. member has said, that on those documents another resolution might have been propounded which would, therefore, have opened up a very much wider discussion, the one point which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has invited us to consider, is whether the Speaker had authority or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me just say this, I intend to close my speech with an amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and I will read it to you:

And that in the opinion of this House the language used was not more violent than that used by the other translators.

I am going on to show that I have a right to move that amendment, and to show it is true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to move that amendment, but when the amendment is brought before the House we will discuss that. The point of order was raised by myself. The question is: Are these men employees in the service of this House in such a degree as to be under the supervision of the Speaker, and whether the Speaker has the authority to dismiss those men as being employees of this House? The hon. gentleman endeavored to show that these men were justified—while being employees and being servants of this House, because other people, who are not servants of this House, but who are members of this House, and other persons connected with the press, who are not servants of this House, have used violent language against the same individual as those employees of the House did. The two cases are not parallel at all, and the argument is not relevant. It may be true that a member of this Parliament has used strong language against another member of this

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Parliament, but that must be between themselves. It may be true that a newspaper has maligned, or at all events attacked, any member of this House, or the whole House; but that is another question. The simple question here is this: Whether these persons, being employees, are subject to the supervision of the Speaker, and, if so, had the Speaker authority to dismiss them? The fact that other people not under this authority possibly used violent language, is no justification for those servants of the House using such language. You, Sir, were quite correct, in my opinion, and you would have been wanting in your duty if you did not stop the hon. gentleman in the line of argument that he told us he was going to pursue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think this much is quite clear, that the remarks made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were directly invited by the language used by the hon. the Secretary of State; and it has always been our custom here when an hon. gentleman opens up a subject, as the Secretary of State did, to allow the gentleman who replies to him equal latitude. If there is any offender in the matter I submit that the Secretary of State was the original offender, and not my hon. friend. Now, Sir, it is perfectly well known to everybody in this House that this debate having commenced, the language used by the other translators in the press is perfectly sure to be introduced. Everyone knows that that will be the case, and the hon. the First Minister knows it very well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a different point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak of the practice and not of the strict rule, and I say it will be utterly impossible to keep that question out of the debate, and therefore it appears to me that there is very little use in spending the time of this House on a point of this kind, especially when, as I say, it was a gentleman on the other side first provoked this discussion, because he undoubtedly did make use of reflections upon those translators. Among other things the Secretary of State asked us "if an employee in his department who did his work well for seven or eight hours was after that time to meet him in common society and insult him, would he be obliged to put up with it?" He has brought the whole question into the arena himself, and that led to the language of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. EDGAR. The point of order was not raised under the motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated in his place in the House that before he sat down he intended to move an amendment which opened up the merits of the question. I submit you cannot ignore the statement of the hon. member, that he proposed to put himself fully and thoroughly in order before he closed his speech which is going on still; for this is merely an intervening discussion. I am not proposing to argue technically how far he can go on the original motion, but when the hon. member stands up in this House and says he proposes to move an amendment that will put him in order, it is the practice of Parliament to accept that statement, and when he goes further and tells the House and the Speaker absolutely the language of that motion which he proposed to move in amendment, I think that ought to settle the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that you, Mr. Speaker, called the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to order, because he proposed to quote language used by members of Parliament against other members of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was about to quote the language of one member of this House against other members of this House, and the fact that the hon. gentleman has made a motion with reference

to the other translators has no reference to the line of argument of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. First Minister did not, I think, follow very closely what I was saying. The hon. Secretary of State declared that these men were blackguards, and he gave his reasons for saying so. I say that the language which has made these men unfit to be in the corridors of this House was matched by language equally violent used against the Government by hon. members of this House whom the hon. gentleman did not dare to characterise as blackguards, and whom he every day meets on grounds of friendship.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no reason to change the opinion which I formerly expressed. The issue before the House is a very restricted one, which by no means opens up the whole question that might have been opened up on the information before the House. But I conceived, and I think properly conceived, that it was not the intention of the mover to open up every question that might be opened up, for he stated in the most distinct words, if I rightly understood him, although I was not at the moment in the Chair, that his intention was to confine his remarks strictly to the bald question which was before the House. My attention was not called to any aspect of the debate that might have been questioned; but I will simply say that unless it is the wish of the hon. members to open up this broad question in its every aspect, I think they would do well to sustain the Chair in endeavoring to restrict it as nearly as possible to the lines laid down by the observations of the mover of the resolution and also by the exact phraseology of the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. While bowing to your ruling, I wish to make this one remark. In opening this discussion I endeavored to avoid everything in the shape of crimination. I wished to confine it to the question of the authority of the Speaker, and nothing else. No one can pretend that the Secretary of State confined himself to that question, because he went on to say that the Speaker was right, that he wanted to vindicate his character, and so forth.

Mr. IVES. I rise to a point of order. This is a discussion of the Speaker's ruling, and is clearly out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LAURIER. Under such circumstances I presume that the range of the question was enlarged by the hon. Secretary of State. But I bow to your ruling.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman forgets one thing. I said that I was the complainant, and I said I was bound to make the complaint for such and such reasons. I quite admit that I went outside of the argument, but I said that due consideration must be given to the person who made the complaint. I said I would not discuss the merits of the decision, but I stated in ending my remarks that the Speaker having the right of discipline of his officers, had rightly done what he had done. I admit that I was not within the argument in saying that, and if I had been called to order I would have said that I only made the remark because I was the complainant in this case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman addressed the House, and he did it without any interruption from the Chair, he said that the language used by these translators was calumnious language, such as no member of this House had a right to be subjected to—language which he would have been quite ready to resent if it had been used against any other member as against the hon. gentleman himself. That was the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman. I undertook to show that the Speaker was not the proper party to deal with these officers, that they did not fall within the class of officers placed under the control of the Speaker by the statute, and further, that

if the House thought the conduct of these officers was improper and such as ought to be taken notice of, the House itself ought to lay down some rule which should apply not merely to these parties, but to all other offenders equally as to them. Now, Sir, I have already informed you that I intended to make a motion, and I shall do that, because it is of the first consequence that neither the Secretary of State nor any other hon. gentleman on that side, simply because they are in a majority, should single out those who are personally offensive to them, and pass by those who have been equally offensive to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that these parties are under the law of the land; they are entitled to the protection of the law; and the hon. Secretary of State has called upon the Speaker, and the Speaker, in my judgment, has improperly yielded to the importunities of the Secretary of State, and subjected these parties to punishment which their colleagues on the translating staff have not been subjected to, although equally offenders with themselves. It is perfectly obvious to every one who has observed the discussions in the press that all those engaged as translators arrayed themselves for a time against the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Those who belong to the party of the hon. gentlemen and whose offence consisted merely of a temporary aberration from the support of the Government are passed by and are retained in the service; and although they have violently attacked in the press hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and subjected them to unfair criticism, they are nevertheless retained in the public service, while those honestly opposed to hon. gentlemen opposite are singled out for vengeance. It is quite enough for the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to use the power they possess for the purpose of punishing those in their immediate service whom they control; but I submit that they have no right to come into this House and subject the officers of this House, who are as much officers of hon. gentlemen in Opposition as they are of those who sit on the Treasury benches, to punishment because they are not political allies of these hon. gentlemen. If these men had calumniated or vilified any hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House, their conduct would not only have been condoned, but in all probability they would have been rewarded. We have a right to think that, Sir, because when a gentleman who was sworn to discharge his duties honestly, neglected his oath of office and failed to gazette those who were returned to Parliament in accordance with the law, he was promoted and rewarded for his infamy with an addition to his salary, while those men who are honest in their convictions are singled out by the Secretary of State for his vengeance and the vengeance of the Government. Now, Sir, when I look at what some of these gentlemen have said in the public press who are still retained in the public service, I can see that subsequent repentance goes a long way with the Secretary of State and the Minister of Militia. One of these translators that are retained has said:

"It is a contest with Orangeism which we must undertake, and it behooves us to find the means of defeating this, the lowest of all clans."

Another has said:

"The Orange monster did not want to miss the mark this time. Like the serpent which crawls in the shade, it has hidden itself under the guise of justice to ensure the attainment of its purpose."

The same person says at a later period:

"A. P. Caron, the Queen's—
I shall not fill the blank."

"and a Canadian renegade, Sir John, the accursed traitor to his friends and faithful to the Orangemen, Chapleau the public thief, brother to the hangman who hanged Riel."

Now, these are the expressions used by the organs of these gentlemen, who the hon. gentleman thinks, are fit associates, who, he thinks, may be retained in the public service, while those gentlemen who have written and spoken courteously are dismissed from the public service because they belonged to this side of the House. Does the hon. gentleman suppose for one moment that he can make anyone believe that he is actuated by those high considerations of public justice which he has been mentioned in his speech? Does he suppose that anyone will believe he wishes to act fairly with regard to the officers of this House, when he retained those who used these expressions and dismissed those who used expressions much more courteous, much less violent than those I have read to the House? The hon. gentleman, as I have said, think it is beneath the dignity of the House to retain such parties in the service; he considers it beneath his dignity to permit them to be retained, if it is possible to secure their removal. If that be his opinion, why does he not extend the proposition for punishment a little further? Why does he retain the other five, after he has dismissed those three, or ask the Speaker to do so, illegally and improperly? Does the hon. gentleman suppose such conduct can be misunderstood? Sir, I am ready, at any moment, to say that those who are engaged in the permanent service of the House shall cease to be connected with the political parties on one side or the other, but I deny altogether the right of the hon. gentleman to decide that no Reformer shall be a translator, but that every Conservative, no matter how vile and abusive, no matter how calumnious he may be in his expressions, shall be retained in the service. Against such a proposition I enter my protest, and when the hon. gentleman comes down with a motion to put the translators on a proper footing in this respect, I will be prepared to support it; but I am not prepared to allow the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to single out those of one political party and subject them to persecution and punishment, while those of the other political party are allowed to go free. I have said that, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman has applied to the wrong party for the punishment of these gentlemen. The statute, which the leader of the Opposition read, refers to two classes of officers which the Speaker controls. Those translators are officers outside of that statute altogether. They are officers appointed for a special purpose, and placed, not under the control of the Speaker or of the Crown, but under the control of this House, and if the hon. gentleman had any complaint to make against them, that complaint should have been made in this House, and a motion should have been made for the removal of those officers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say yes. The whole policy of their appointment, the resolution with regard to them, everything shows they are not under the control of the Speaker, and were not intended to be under his control. That being the case, I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but I would in addition move in amendment that the following words be added:

"And that, even if Mr. Speaker had jurisdiction in this matter, his action was not warranted by the circumstances of the case, and that, in the opinion of this House, the language used by these translators was not more violent than that used by other translators who have not been dismissed."

Mr. IVES. It would seem to me that the motion of the hon. gentleman, who has just resumed his seat, is in the nature of a motion of want of confidence in the hon. gentleman who moved the original motion. The hon. the leader of the Opposition preferred, and, I think, wisely preferred, that the discussion should be restrained within the limits of the legal question as to the jurisdiction of the Speaker. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition evidently

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

had carefully read the report which has been laid upon the Table of the House, and he thought, no doubt, so far as the French translators are concerned, that discretion would be the better part of valor, and that it was not wise to invite a general discussion. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has thought better of it, and has opened up the whole question. I do not propose, however, to refer at any very great length to the facts of this case, as they are sufficiently disclosed by the report which has been printed and is in the hands of all hon. members. I shall, however, make a slight reference to the conduct of one of those gentlemen, namely, Mr. Rémi Tremblay. I propose for a few moments to direct your attention to the law and to a few precedents which we find in the journals on this subject. The hon. gentleman from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) read the statute which the Speaker took as his warranty for his action in this matter, and it seems to me that the words of the statute plainly cover the case. They are as follows:—

"If any complaint or representation is at any time made to the Speaker for the time being of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer or messenger, or other person, attendant of the House of Commons, the Speaker may cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it appears to the Speaker such person has been guilty of misconduct or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor General, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

I ask you, how could language be more general than that: "Any clerk, officer or messenger or other person attendant on the House of Commons." One would certainly presume that if there had been any intention to make a distinction between officers appointed by the Speaker and officers appointed by the Crown and officers appointed by the Committee of the House, that distinction would have been expressed in the statute. I find that Mr. Bourinot, the able and learned clerk of this House, had evidently formed the opinion that this clause in the statute, 31 Vic., cap. 27, sec. 9, applied to a case like this. Because, in the valuable work upon "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice," at page 174 we find this:

"Under the Act providing for the internal economy of the House, the Speaker may, after enquiry, suspend or remove any clerk, officer or messenger who has not been appointed by the Crown; but, in the case of an officer so appointed, he may suspend him and report the fact to the Governor General."

Then we find a note referring us to 31 Vic., chap. 27, sec. 9, which is the very article of the Revised Statutes which I have read. Then, on page 193, continuing the same subject, Mr. Bourinot gives us a case which occurred in 1873, where the Speaker dismissed an officer of the House, Mr. Elie Tassé.

"In 1873, Mr. Elie Tassé, one of the translators in the service of the House—"

Precisely the same sort of officer as the three gentlemen whose cases are now being discussed.

"was brought to the Bar and examined as to his connection with an article in the *Courier d'Outaouais*, reflecting on certain members. He admitted he was the writer, and subsequently the Speaker informed the House that Mr. Tassé was dismissed."

Mr. LAURIER. He was appointed by the Speaker himself.

Mr. IVES. He was not appointed by the Speaker. This was in 1873.

Mr. LAURIER. He was appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. IVES. He was appointed by the Speaker of that date.

"In the same Session the House resolved that an article in the *St. John Freeman*, of which Mr. Anglin, a member, was editor, was a libel on the House and certain members thereof; but no ulterior proceedings were taken as in the O'Connell case of 1838."

Now, on turning to the Journals of 1873, I find that Mr. Tassé, a translator, was called before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A translator?

Mr. IVES. Yes, precisely the same office as this, and, on the notion of the Hon. Mr. Dorion, of Napierville, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Holton, it was

"Ordered, that paragraphs 9 and 11 of an article in the newspaper *Courrier d'Outaouais*, published at Ottawa, on the 4th day of April instant, and headed 'La masque est levé,' be now read by the clerk of the House; and the said paragraphs were read, as follow."

And reference is made to a Mr. Tremblay, who was a member of the House, and Mr. Prévost, who was also a member of the House, and, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Dorion, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, it was:

"Ordered, that the Sergeant-at-Arms having reported that Elie Tassé, of the city of Ottawa, was not to be found within the precincts of the House, Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant, summoning the said Elie Tassé to appear at the Bar of this House at half-past seven o'clock p.m. this day."

On the following page of the Journals, page 134, I find:

"The Order of the House of this day for the attendance at the Bar of this House of Elie Tassé being read, the Sergeant-at-Arms reported that, in obedience to the Order of the House, Mr. Tassé was in attendance."

Mr. Tassé was then examined. He said he was not the proprietor of the newspaper, but he admitted that he was the responsible editor, although he did not admit that he wrote those articles, and as a matter of fact I believe he did not write them, but the fact was proved that he was the responsible editor of the paper. Mr. Tassé was then directed to withdraw. Now, in this case you have a translator, precisely the same officer as those whose case we are considering, performing the same functions to the House in 1873 that these gentlemen performed to the House in 1887, called before the Bar of the House, brought within the jurisdiction of the House, the House itself establishing the fact upon which the Speaker and not the House subsequently acted, and yet, having this translator before them who was performing exactly the same duties and occupying the same position that these men did, the House did not dismiss this man, but simply established the fact, and the Speaker dismissed him. Now, I find, in the 2nd volume of the *Hansard* of 1878, that a discussion occurred in Committee of Supply on the item Miscellaneous Printing, where it was stated that a certain extra clerk in the employment of the House had been guilty of writing an article abusing a member of the House. Several gentlemen spoke with reference to the matter, Mr. Mackenzie said:

"That the Committee (that is the Internal Economy Committee) had nothing to do with the employment of these persons, except to fill up any vacancies that might occur. This was entirely under the control of Mr. Speaker and the clerk of the House. He understood that the Auditor went over all the items of payment."

And Mr. Cartwright said:

"That a sessional clerk had, over his own signature, reflected in a letter on a member of the House, and he was informed that the moment that this fact was brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, he at once dismissed the offending official."

Mr. McDougall of South Renfrew said he thought this was an extremely proper course to take under such circumstances. I find also that in 1876, and this is rather to the point as to the fitness of these men and the propriety of their dismissal, an engagement was made by the chairman of the Debates Committee with a Mr. DeCelles, who is now one of the joint librarians of the House, and was then one of the editors of a newspaper in the Province of Quebec, and employed him to take charge of the translation of the Debates of the House. Mr. DeCelles came to Ottawa to perform the duties of that office, and to his surprise there was a good deal of disturbance created by the hon. gentlemen who then sat on this side of the House. They thought it was not proper that Mr. DeCelles who was a Bleu should have this office, and the point was raised in the House, and Mr. Young

who I think was the chairman of the Debates Committee at that time, said, speaking in answer to Mr. Kirkpatrick:

"I will tell the hon. gentleman. The gentleman in question is an active writer, employed on the staff of a leading French paper, while the feeling existing between political parties in the Province of Quebec is very bitter, and certain members felt that it would not be fair that the translation of the debates of this House should be entrusted to a gentleman who is in such bitter opposition to them. That is the only reason."

That was the only reason why that arrangement was not carried out. As I said in rising, the statute is perfectly general in its terms, and I think the onus of proof would be upon the hon. gentlemen opposite who assert it, when they claim that these translators do not fall within that meaning of the clause of the statute. We find the statute to be general in its terms, we find no provision for the dismissal of these translators or any other translators by the committee. We find that the committee in this case reported they had no authority to act, and we find Mr. Speaker basing his action upon the general and plain terms of the statute, and he acts in accordance with precedents which you find in the Journals of the House, in accordance with the uniform line of precedents; and therefore I say that so far as the legal position is concerned, the motion of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition cannot prevail. The Speaker clearly acted within his legal right in taking the course that he did. Now, we come to the other point. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition says that a different rule should be applied to translators than that which is applied to other public servants. Well, I cannot see the distinction. These men are paid a salary for the whole time. They are paid, certainly, all they can get in any other walk or avocation of life. They are at the call of the Chairman of the Debates Committee at any time, and if called upon would be obliged to come here and devote their time and service to the country. Their whole time is paid for, and whether it is or not, they certainly do not fall under any other rule in their conduct from that which prevails with regard to other civil servants. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that these men ought to be executed, because other translators had entertained the idea that they had a right to abuse a member of Parliament and to say things that they would not be permitted to say if they were other public servants than translators. Sir, it is no argument in favor of these men because others have done wrong, because others have transgressed decency, propriety and law—it is no reason why the Speaker should be condemned for having acted on this statute when he was satisfied that these men had transgressed decency, propriety and law. Why, Sir, if others have done it, they have not been complained of; and the Speaker, under this section of the Act, is not authorised to act except complaint is made. I might fairly add, if this section of the statute referred only to appointees of the Speaker himself, why should it require that in all cases a representation should be made to him by some other person. If the Speaker knows that a civil servant has been guilty of misconduct, surely he might dismiss him without any complaint of any one, but the general terms of the statute, and the fact that representation has to be made in order to bring about an inquiry, establish conclusively, to my mind, that it covers the case of these translators. But hon. gentlemen say that the other five translators have been just as guilty as these three. Have hon. gentlemen opposite taken the responsibility of making any complaint against anyone of these other five? Have they any right to say, until they do so, that the Speaker would not act impartially with reference to any complaint that might be made? Have they any right to say that the Secretary of State, or any other gentleman on this side of the House, who has a responsibility in such matters, would urge the House to take any action upon the question of the Speaker's conduct in this matter, in any other sense from that which they have taken in this case?

Until a complaint is made, until a representation is made, until the matter is called to the attention of the Speaker, until the Speaker is called upon to act, or until hon. gentlemen on this side refuse to sustain the Speaker because he proposes to dismiss a Conservative translator, the arguments of the hon. gentleman have no weight. The hon. gentleman, who last spoke, had a great deal to say about the other translators having been guilty of the same offence, and how did the hon. gentleman prove it? He proved it, not by reading anything that these other translators had written or had said, not by stating anything that these other translators had written or said, but by reading, or he was supposed to read, from *La Presse*, with which not one single translator in the House, so far as I know, had any connection. *La Presse* was not a Government organ, was not the organ of the Secretary of State, but it was most violent in its abuse of the Government, also was *Le Monde*. If the other translators had written the articles of which the hon. gentleman read extracts, that might be a reason why we should be found fault with on this side of the House for not representing their case to the Speaker, because certainly if they were the authors of articles such as that from which extracts were read, they would deserve dismissal. I say there is nothing in the statement of the hon. gentleman, there is nothing in the context of what he read that would lead us to suppose that the translators who are mentioned in this motion, had anything to do with these articles from which he read extracts. Now, the principle is perfectly clear, so far as ordinary civil servants are concerned. I myself, have heard on the floor of this House, an agreement between the leader on this side and the leader on that side, that civil servants deserve dismissal if they took an active part in political discussion; I heard it agreed between Mr. Blake and the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, not more than two or three years ago, I think immediately after the last general election, that all civil servants had a perfect right to vote for either party, or either candidate, freely and without being interfered with, but when they went further than that, when they took it upon themselves actually to canvass, actively to assist in furthering the election of one candidate against another, they were endangering their position, and that if the Government saw fit to dismiss them they would be perfectly justified in doing so. That was Mr. Blake's statement of his view of the position of civil servants, and in that view the leader of the Government concurred. Now, Mr. Speaker, these translators, at least so far as Rémi Tremblay is concerned, went much further than that. In the contest in Richmond and Wolfe, Mr. Rémi Tremblay was one of the delegates to the original convention to choose a candidate to oppose me, and for weeks, and I may say with safety for months, before the polling day, he was actively engaged, not only in his own municipality, but in various parts of the county, holding and addressing meetings, canvassing, and using his influence in organizing an opposition. Why, only to give you an idea of how far his interference in the election went, I may say, that on one occasion, shortly before polling day, he called a meeting at a certain place; I went there with a local member and another friend, thinking that I was going to have the meeting to myself, that I was going to have an opportunity of addressing my friends and my constituents generally; but I found Rémi Tremblay there. He was alone, but Rémi Tremblay was fully equal to the occasion. He presented himself as the representative of my opponent, and he claimed not only the right to speak at my meeting, but to occupy as much time as I and my two friends occupied, he to speak turn and turn about with the three speakers on my side. It so happened that the particular parish where we were at the time was more or less benighted, more or less devoted to the politics of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I thought it wise to concede the point to the translator of

Mr. IVES.

the House, Rémi Tremblay. The result was that I was allowed fifteen minutes, Rémi Tremblay took fifteen minutes, the local member was allowed fifteen minutes, and Rémi Tremblay followed in another fifteen minutes; then my other friend spoke, and Rémi Tremblay spoke again, and as a matter of great favor to me I was allowed five minutes to close my own meeting.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you object to the arrangement then?

Mr. IVES. I can only say I had the pleasure of hearing Rémi Tremblay in these three speeches, and I have moderately stated his language in the complaint I have placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker. There was one thing that particularly struck me upon that occasion in what Rémi Tremblay said. He told the people that Sir Hector Langevin, Hon. Mr. Chapleau and Sir Adolphe Caron were traitors, that they had sold their compatriots, that they had abandoned their religion, and that they had deserted their countrymen for the sake of the salaries they derived as Ministers of the Crown. He said: "Now, look at me; I am a translator, I am employed by this Government, and I will be dismissed for the action I am now taking; but, so warmly do I feel upon this Riel question, so anxious am I to prevent Orangemen from controlling this country, that I am throwing away my position, my bread and butter—and he told us how many children he had and how dependent they were upon him—and it is only my patriotism which impels me to take this course." I thought it was too bad to deprive Rémi Tremblay of the goal to which he had aspired, and if he has aspired to the honors of martyrdom he ought to have them, and I may say I told him I would complain to the Speaker. I think I was justified in taking that course. Rémi Tremblay was an elector in the county; he had a perfect right to vote, and I would not have found any fault if he had made lots of Rouges, in fact he did so—he is a good electioneer and is not to be despised as an opponent: he did well and made me lots of trouble. I would not have found fault if he had confined himself to his own parish, but he held meetings throughout the constituency and took a prominent part and used the language to which I have referred, and I thought I was justified in complaining. If any of the other translators have transgressed, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), who seems to be somewhat excited at the present moment, has only to make complaint, and I believe the Speaker, as the judicial officer of this House, will act fairly and justly in the matter. I have no doubt he would, but it is not proper that we should condemn the Speaker for acting under the plain words of the statute on a case that came within those terms, on the ground that other people have offended in the same direction.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be deplored that in a case like this, where one of the prosecutors is the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), he should have so little regard for the proprieties of this House as to endeavor to clinch the judgment which he says he has secured against a person who is absent from this House. I think the circumstances ought to have suggested to the hon. member that at all events he should have pursued the dignified course of being neutral, and have allowed the House to exercise its own independent judgment. Instead of doing so he comes forward to-day as a witness making allegations of fact, I will not say controvertible or not, but making allegations for the purpose of prejudicing the case or justifying what has been done, claiming an opportunity of making *ex parte* statements to the prejudice of the accused. Is that the generous, the just, the honorable, the gentlemanly course that ought to characterise any hon. gentleman in this House? The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) says that the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition at one time laid

down a policy on this question, that they came to an agreement across the floor that all civil servants who took part in elections did so at the peril of dismissal, and I think he went further—I am not going to say he did if he did not—and said they would earn for themselves dismissal. I think if the leader of the Opposition admitted such a proposition during the last three years, it was the duty of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to have read the identical words of the leader of the Opposition before he made a statement of that kind. However that may be, my own impression about the position of the civil servant is this: I do not approve of a civil servant taking an active part in politics. I do not approve of the language used in this particular case, such language as I see in the record in the Votes and Proceedings—I do not think any reasonable person will approve of that course, but I hold that there is a great difference to be drawn between the case of a civil servant whose whole time is given to the Government and that of a person employed temporarily who receives only a partial remuneration, not sufficient to enable him to live except by making exertions outside. When owing to the limited employment obtained here a person is compelled to seek employment outside, you thereby relegate him to the full status of an ordinary citizen, untrammelled by his temporary or partial employment in this House. I do not propose at this moment to take up the point of law, but to touch on a point referred to by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). He says in his complaint against Rémi Tremblay—and all my remarks will apply to Rémi Tremblay—that his employment in this House is distasteful to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. When did the hon. gentleman come to that conclusion? If I take the evidence supplied by himself I come to the conclusion that it was on 30th May, 1887. The acts complained of took place at the general election in 1887. They were all over on 22nd February, 1887, and for three months, from 22nd February to 30th May, there was not one word of complaint by the hon. gentleman. During the last days of the Session he made complaint, then too late to have the matter laid before the House, to the Speaker privately, and he made complaint at such a late date that any man would assume that if during the three months the hon. gentleman was not offended it was rather late on 30th May to find out and state for the first time that his royal highness has been offended by what took place some months before. What is the hon. gentleman's position? His colleague in the Local House is Mr. Picard. I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. Picard in which he asks Mr. Tremblay to take the very course he did take, in which he asked him to aid by voice, vote and conduct, public and private, to turn out the present Ministry and all their supporters. Mr. Picard, by this document which I hold in my hand, a public document—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not time to read it; but the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe must have known as a public man that Mr. Picard not only invited but declared before Heaven that it was the duty of Rémi Tremblay to take the course he did, and he aided and abetted in the election of Mr. Picard, and Mr. Picard aided and abetted in the election of the member for Richmond and Wolfe. The hon. gentleman is certainly of a very forgiving and christian character. He was indignant at first. After the battle was over and the possible contestation in the court was over he became very fierce, he found he had been insulted some months before and he suddenly changed his views. His principles changed, and if I might paraphrase

"A merciful Providence fashioned him holler,
On purpose he might his principles swaller,"

Mr. Picard speaking to those who were getting up a meeting at Weedon to offer up prayers for the repose of the soul of Louis Riel, says:

"I would have been truly happy to find myself with you and particularly on that day to express my opinion before the people of Weedon who always supported me so loyally, and to show them once more that their representative in the Local House does not fear to blame his leaders when they do wrong, and to even repudiate them when they commit too serious faults. I consider, gentlemen, that the crime of the execution of Louis Riel should be interpreted by all true French Canadians as being an outrage and a humiliation thrown in their face by the Government of Sir John. It is for this reason that the whole of the French Canadian people should rise as one man in a union of heart and action to prove by means of the press and public demonstrations that they resented the injury and the outrage done them by the execution of Riel."

Mr. IVES. Let me ask if that letter was addressed to Tremblay, and if it is in French or in English?

Mr. MULOCK. This letter is in English, it is a translation by Mr. Picard to the electors of Richmond and Wolfe.

Mr. IVES. I understood you to say it is addressed to Rémi Tremblay.

Mr. MULOCK. It is addressed to Rémi Tremblay, but does not the hon. gentleman understand that he is one of the French Canadian people? Is the hon. gentleman so obtuse that he does not understand the status of the French Canadian people, he who is offended by Rémi Tremblay opposing him and who endorses the action of Picard and invites him to promote his election. I say under those circumstances, no man in his senses would have attached any importance whatever to the utterances of any person who would say that the conduct of Mr. Tremblay was offensive to him and his presence in this House distasteful. I will not discuss the question any longer than simply to make those observations. With reference to the legal point, I have no right to touch upon it. If this matter had been stated candidly and impartially, if the member for Richmond and Wolfe had stated: I endorsed Mr. Tremblay's action at one time, now I go back on it, then he would have made a full and candid statement. He did not do so and now he takes the opportunity of an unmanly manner by asking for the dismissal of a man whose conduct he previously endorsed.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm the chapter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 23) to reduce the Capital Stock of "La Banque Nationale."—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 11) to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its Charter and to provide for the winding up of its affairs.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. Macdougald.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Sub-marine Cables.—(Mr. Thompson.)

DISMISSAL OF FRENCH TRANSLATORS.

House resumed the debate on proposed motion of Mr. Laurier.

Mr. MULOCK. Before recess, I called the attention of the House to the conduct of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) in order to show that, in my judgment there was no sincerity in his assertion that he felt in any way aggrieved by the conduct of, at least, one of the translators. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give you the published record which ought to have been known by the hon. member, being a statement of one of the witnesses on whom he relies on this case, namely Mr. Picard, his colleague in the Local Legislature. One of the papers filed by the hon. gentleman with the Speaker, is a statutory declaration by Mr. Picard whom the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe adopts as his witness in this case. The hon. member objects to the utterances of Mr. Tremblay and he takes his place on the platform beside Mr. Picard, he promotes the election of Mr. Picard, and Mr. Picard promotes the election of the present member for Richmond and Wolfe in this House. Now what are the principles of Mr. Picard and those of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives)? The letter I was quoting before the House rose is as follows:

"To the organisers of the religious and patriotic demonstration at Weedon on the occasion of the *requiem* services for the repose of the soul of Louis Riel:

"GENTLEMEN,—I regret exceedingly to find myself on account of sickness in the impossibility to be at Weedon to assist at the *requiem* services which you are having celebrated for the repose of Riel who died a martyr for having loved too much his fellow-countrymen, the Half-breeds of the North-West, and who had labored constitutionally to aid them to obtain the redress of grave injustices which the several Governments at Ottawa since 1884 had allowed to be committed against them."

Those were the views of Mr. Picard, those were the views that the present member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) endorsed, and they were the views expressed by the translator whose conduct is complained of by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. The writer goes on to say:

"In any case, if I am not with you in person, tell the friends who sympathise with the cause of Riel (I am sure all the people of Weedon are unanimous) that I will be with them in heart and spirit. I would have been truly happy to find myself with you, and particularly on that day, to express my opinion before the people of Weedon who always supported me so loyally, and to show them once more that their representative in the Local House does not fear to blame his leaders when they do wrong and to even repudiate them when they commit too serious faults. I consider, gentlemen, that the crime of the execution of Louis Riel should be interpreted by all true hearted French Canadians as being an outrage and a humiliation thrown in their face by the Government of Sir John.

Those were the sentiments the present member endorsed when he wanted to get the votes of the people of Richmond and Wolfe. Those were sentiments repudiated by him when he got installed in his seat. The writer goes on to say:

"It is for this reason that the whole French Canadian people should rise as one man in a union of heart and action to prove by means of the press and public demonstration that they resented the injury and the outrage done them by the execution of Riel."

How is this to be done? This invitation points out the way. The present complainant knows about this invitation. It is to be done as follows:

Mr. MULOCK.

"To succeed effectually in this great National movement, let us be energetic, but also, let us be moderate and prudent, and above all, let us be persevering in following the idea which gave birth to this patriotic movement.

"Let Liberals and Conservatives join together to form in a frank and honest manner a great National party."

What for? To secure the defeat of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe? Yes.

"To overthrow the Government of Sir John Macdonald."

The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) actually invites to the platform a gentleman to support him whose policy and object in life was to overthrow the Government of Sir John Macdonald.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A very laudable purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. There are different ways of accomplishing a laudable purpose. In this particular case you will observe the gentleman who was asking the support of another gentleman to defeat the Cabinet, afterwards objected to the principles involved. He goes on to say:

"I conclude by wishing you success and by telling you that if we French Canadians are united, that if we work all together hand in hand, we shall soon rise from the painful position in which we are placed to-day because we shall certainly have to aid us the help and alliance of all good English citizens."

Including of course the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). No doubt he presented his case in that way.

"Of all those who desire as we do, to see peace, concord and harmony, reign between the divers races which compose this Dominion; the latter are yet numerous enough to make us hope for a decided triumph before long. That is my hope."

These were the sentiments which Mr. Picard endorsed, and they do not appear to be such as to prevent the present complainant taking his place on the platform beside him, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), took advantage of Mr. Picard's influence, vote and support; and yet after the contest is all over this hon. gentleman finds out some months afterwards that his dignity has been offended. Let us take the utterance of the hon. member to-day. Where does he draw a line as to what a person under those circumstances can do? He says he finds no fault with his constituent, Rémi Tremblay, for speaking in his own parish. This gentleman I suppose was a resident of one of the parishes in that riding. He says he would not have been offended if Mr. Tremblay had confined his operations to the parish in which he was a voter, but when he goes beyond that line Mr. Tremblay deserves to be thrown on a heartless world with a position. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it would be perfectly proper and consistent for Mr. Tremblay to use all his influence to obtain a certain result inside of certain geographical boundaries, and not to do it on the other side of the boundaries so as to defeat the election of the present complainant? I fail to see the consistency, and therefore I take it that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is not sincere in his complaint.

Mr. IVES. If you are going to take that statement I desire you to quote it correctly. I said that although I did not approve of his taking any part in the election further than voting, yet I would not have taken any action against him if he had confined himself to his own parish.

Mr. MULOCK. That is what I say. It would not have offended the hon. member if Mr. Tremblay had confined himself to one township, but it happened that he went to some other township. Does not that prove want of sincerity on the part of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives)? Does it not prove that the Speaker, having heard the admission made by the hon. gentleman, should attach no importance to the statement made in the letter of the present member that the presence of Rémi-

Tremblay was distasteful to him by reason of Mr. Tremblay's conduct during the election? I think this discussion has resolved itself into one point. It appears to me that the Government are at the bottom of this transaction. It cannot happen except through the influence of the Government, and it is part and parcel of a certain policy, which I believe is the only settled policy the Administration has, and that is to remove from office by force every man who will not vote for them, to crush all who cannot crush them. We know that the Government's railway policy was fixed until it was changed, but it has been changed a good many times. They have had a fixed policy of loyalty, they were not going to discriminate, but they did; they had a fixed policy in regard to the tariff and were not going to have reciprocity, but last night I understand the First Minister said he had offered unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. SPROULE. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always calling question. I only wish that the great naturalist, Mr. Darwin, had lived long enough to settle his theory about the missing link. I do not intend to go into the policy of the Government except on this one point of dismissals and I see the hand of the Government at the bottom of this, the same as we see the hand of the Government at the bottom of the dismissal of those three Irishmen in Montreal the other day. I am not going to discuss why they were dismissed. Everybody knows why they were dismissed. They had made themselves distasteful not by speaking but by simply exercising their right to vote. Those three Irishmen simply voted against the Government and they were dismissed, and here we have this time dismissed Frenchmen. What are those hon. gentlemen doing now? They were at once declaiming against a war of race and creed but they have adopted a different policy. They are now declaring a war of race and creed against representatives of two of the large elements in this country. I thought that every true Canadian welcomed to Canada a man of any nationality if he became a good citizen and helped to promote the welfare of the country. I thought the shamrock was entitled to a place here in Canada, I thought it was entitled to take root here and grow. I thought that the *fleur de lis* was entitled to a place in the Canadian nationality, but hon. gentlemen now for some reason and on account of some influences behind appear to have laid down as their policy what I may put in one sentence: "No Irish need apply." No man shall have a position in this Administration unless he bends the knee to Baliol, and unless he submits to be a faithful servant and follower of the Administration here. Now, if that be the policy let it be known, let it be declared, let us know exactly where we stand and let it be a part of their fixed policy, but do not adopt such a sham as is presented in this case by the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), declaring that as it happened his super-sensitiveness in spite of his better nature, has compelled him to express four months after the offence, that he has been deeply wounded in his feelings by a person who at that time was a free and independent elector and it must be remembered that the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) was only a private citizen then, too. Under those circumstances I deplore the action of the Administration, for they are responsible for it and they will be held responsible for it. The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) I presume, has dug his own grave by this little transaction, the same as the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has dug his grave by this arrangement with regard to his own constituents. But whether those gentlemen have dug their own political graves or not the merits of the complaint made by the member for Richmond and Wolfe do not, in my opinion, justify the action of Mr. Speaker. Do not mistake me as for one moment en-

dorsing the utterances of the gentlemen in question. I have read, and I have read with regret some of the extracts from their speeches, but in view of the circumstances prevailing at the time, in view of the inflamed state of the public mind at that time, in view of the action of leading members of this House at that time, and in view of the necessity of forgetting if you can a blot on the history of Canada, of forgetting all those sad circumstances of 1885, it would have been wiser in the public interest and more generous on the part of the strong to the weak that this matter had been allowed to pass by in silence. Being of this opinion, I disapprove of the action of the Speaker, I condemn the Administration for it, and as to the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) I think he has made a grave mistake, and one which he will regret.

M. LANGELEIER (Montmorency): M. l'Orateur, ceux qui, de ce côté-ci de la Chambre ont parlé avant moi, ont traité la question de privilège qui s'élève en ce moment, et je crois pouvoir dire qu'ils l'ont traitée d'une manière victorieuse et qu'ils ont démontré à la satisfaction de cette Chambre, que l'Orateur avait certainement outrepassé les pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés par les règles de cette Chambre lorsqu'il a démis les messieurs dont nous avons à nous occuper dans le moment.

Je crois que l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat sera le premier à regretter la démarche qu'il a faite dans cette circonstance. Tout le monde sait que depuis plusieurs années, il a pris une part très active aux luttes politiques de ce pays; tout le monde sait, surtout dans la province de Québec, qu'il a parcouru presque tous les comtés et qu'il a porté des coups très forts et qu'il en a reçus de vigoureux à son tour.

Eh bien, M. l'Orateur, je crois que l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat n'a pas toujours entretenu des sentiments semblables à ceux qu'il a exprimés aujourd'hui; il n'a pas toujours eu l'épiderme aussi sensible qu'il a bien voulu nous le laisser croire dans la présente circonstance. Pour établir ces faits je me permettrai de citer quelques lignes du discours prononcé par l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat lui-même dans cette Chambre, le 12 avril 1884. Voici ce qu'il disait à propos des injures qu'il recevait:—

Je n'ai jamais espéré l'approbation générale; dans les mêlées aussi nombreuses qu'ardentes dont notre province a été le théâtre, il fallait recevoir autant de coups que l'on en donnait. J'ai eu ma part de blessures mais les seules, qui m'aient fait souffrir sont celles qui venaient de mes propres amis. J'ai eu cette mauvaise fortune d'être attaqué dans mon propre camp; j'ai gémi de cette division et j'en gémissais encore. Mais je le déclare ici, malgré ces attaques, malgré ces légitimes impatiences qu'elles ont soulevées, il ne m'est pas laissé de place pour l'aigreur et le ressentiment. N'ayant jamais agi par passion, je puis parler sans amertume, et c'est avec le désir et l'espoir d'amener ceux qui me combattent à des sentiments plus justes à mon égard que je suis entré plus minutieusement dans les détails de cette politique de chemin de fer dont on s'est servi pour me battre en brèche.

Je crois que si l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat eût mis en pratique, dans cette circonstance, les principes qu'il a posés en 1884 dans le discours que je viens de citer, il aurait agi beaucoup plus sagement qu'il ne l'a fait.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de traiter la question au point de vue constitutionnel, et je me bornerai à dire quelques mots sur le mérite même de la question. Je prétends que même en admettant que messieurs Tremblay et Poirier auraient pris part aux luttes électorales, qu'ils se seraient occupés de politique, ils n'auraient fait qu'user d'un droit qui leur était reconnu par cette Chambre et par l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat lui-même, comme j'aurai occasion de le démontrer dans un instant. Mais avant d'en arriver là, je crois qu'il est bon de résumer en quelques mots les accusations qui sont portées contre messieurs Tremblay et Poirier par l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat et par l'honorable député de Richmond et Wolfe (M. Ives). Elles peuvent se résumer comme suit:—

Que messieurs Tremblay et Poirier, ont fait avec une violence inqualifiable la dernière campagne électorale tant sur les hustings que dans la presse;

Que M. Ernest Tremblay, dans une brochure adressée au Secrétaire d'Etat aurait écrit sur le compte de celui-ci des choses tellement offensantes et calomnieuses qu'il ne saurait ni lui parler, ni le saluer dans la Chambre; et, il ajoute: je suis sincère en disant que sa présence dans l'enceinte de cette Chambre est pour moi une nuisance à laquelle il me semble qu'on n'a pas le droit de soumettre un député.

Voilà les accusations qui sont portées contre les trois messieurs dont nous sommes à faire le procès. Pour bien comprendre cette question, je crois qu'il est important de se rendre compte de quelle façon ces officiers sont nommés. On sait qu'ils sont nommés par un comité spécial de cette Chambre qui est chargé particulièrement de voir à ce que les débats soient fidèlement rapportés et bien traduits. Et pour montrer combien on est jaloux des privilèges accordés à ce comité; pour montrer combien on en comprend l'importance, je citerai quelques-unes des paroles dont s'est servi l'an dernier l'honorable M. Blake, lorsqu'on a voulu faire des changements dans le comité. Voici ce qu'il disait:

Il n'est, je crois, aucun comité où la connaissance parfaite des devoirs du personnel permanent, de la besogne en général, soit plus importante que le comité des *Débats*; et pour ma part, autant que j'ai droit au choix des membres de ce comité, je soutiens que ceux des membres qui ont agi d'une manière satisfaisante par le passé ne doivent pas être retirés de ce comité.

Eh bien, si on était d'opinion à cette époque qu'il est important de ne pas changer les membres de ce comité, parce que, d'après l'expérience qu'ils ont acquise dans le passé, ils sont plus en position que qui que ce soit de voir à ce que les débats soient rapportés fidèlement et à ce qu'ils soient traduits aussi fidèlement, je crois qu'il est important aussi de ne pas changer, sans des raisons sérieuses, sans des causes graves, les traducteurs des *Débats*, comme on veut le faire maintenant, j'oserais le dire, pour de simples caprices.

La grande objection que l'on fait, c'est que ces messieurs se seraient occupés de politique. Eh bien! M. l'Orateur, oui ils se sont occupés de politique. Mais comme je l'ai dit il y a un instant, ils avaient le droit de le faire. Et même s'ils n'avaient pas le droit de le faire, ceux qui sont les plus coupables sont ceux qui ont déclaré dans cette Chambre que lorsqu'ils recevaient cette position, les traducteurs des *Débats* n'étaient pas empêchés de prendre part aux luttes politiques, d'écrire dans les journaux, enfin d'exercer tous les droits qu'ils possèdent comme citoyens. Je me permettrai de citer des extraits des discours qui ont été prononcés alors en Chambre par quelques députés, et notamment par l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat. En 1884, M. Bergin disait ce qui suit:

"We felt it was not the duty of the committee to inquire into a man's politics, but into his qualifications, and that politics had nothing whatever to do with a man's qualifications as a servant of this House."

L'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat lui-même disait dans le même temps:

"We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of *Hansard*. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for *Hansard*, are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification."

L'honorable député de Norfolk-Nord (M. Charlton) s'exprimait comme suit, lorsqu'il était question d'augmenter la rémunération accordée aux traducteurs. On donnait pour raison que leur salaire ne devait pas être augmenté, par le fait, qu'en dehors des sessions ils pouvaient s'occuper de journalisme et prendre part aux luttes politiques. Voici les paroles de l'honorable député de Norfolk-Nord (M. Charlton):

"I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not."

Voilà donc quelle était la position prise par plusieurs députés de cette Chambre. Nous avons la déclaration de
Mr. L'ANGELIER.

l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat lui-même qui dit que lorsqu'on nomme des traducteurs, on ne doit pas rechercher quelles sont leurs opinions politiques, mais qu'on doit tout simplement examiner s'ils sont qualifiés à remplir la position. Or, sur ce point, personne ne contestera les qualifications des trois messieurs dont j'ai mentionné les noms. Personne ne contestera que messieurs Tremblay et Poirier sont des traducteurs modèles, et qu'ils faisaient leur besogne avec une rapidité extraordinaire. Déjà, dans une couple de circonstances depuis le commencement de la session, des députés se sont plaints que la traduction était très arriérée. Eh bien! l'an dernier, il est facile de le voir en comparant les dates, la traduction, se faisait très rapidement et n'était pas en arrière comme elle l'est maintenant. Je fais ces observations pour démontrer que sous le rapport des qualifications, personne n'a accusé ces messieurs, et personne ne les accuse de ne pas avoir rempli fidèlement leur devoir. Le seul reproche qu'on leur fait, c'est de s'être occupés de politique.

J'ai dit que quelques-uns des députés de cette Chambre ont posé le principe que ces traducteurs avaient le droit de prendre part aux luttes politiques et d'exercer leurs droits de citoyens. J'ajouterai que non-seulement les députés de cette Chambre, mais la presse conservatrice, la presse qui est chargée d'un bout de l'année à l'autre de chanter les louanges du gouvernement, s'est chargée d'établir le principe qui, il me semble, devrait guider la majorité de cette Chambre et l'empêcher de commettre l'injustice qu'on va l'appeler à sanctionner.

Si on regarde dans les journaux qu'y voit-on? Prenons par exemple *La Minerve* du 15 juillet 1884, et l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat (M. Chapleau) qui renie *La Presse* comme son organe, assurément ne voudra pas renier *La Minerve*. Voici ce que disait *La Minerve* à cette date:

"La position de traducteur des *Débats* n'empêche aucun des membres de ce bureau de se mêler de politique et d'écrire dans les journaux en dehors des sessions."

Le 21 juillet 1886, *Le Monde*, l'organe de l'honorable ministre des Travaux Publics, disait:

Quant à la question de droit, *La Minerve* l'a décidée elle-même.

Et *Le Monde* cite de *La Minerve* les paroles ci-dessus en les approuvant et en les invoquant même contre un entre-filet glissé dans *La Minerve* et contraire à cette prétention. *Le Monde* ajoute:

Nous répétons donc que notre confrère a été induit en erreur sur ce point, ou que des gens mal intentionnés ont profité de l'absence des rédacteurs réguliers du journal pour insérer cette note erronée.

Répondant également à *La Minerve*, *La Presse* du 20 juillet 1886 disait:

La Minerve a donc mauvaise grâce de reprocher aux traducteurs des *Débats* d'exercer un droit qui leur a été reconnu par la Chambre.

Maintenant, M. Vanasse, le rédacteur du *Sorelois*, si je ne me trompe pas, et qui est aussi un des traducteurs des *Débats* de cette Chambre écrivait dans son journal, à la date du 20 juillet 1886, ce qui suit:

M. Vanasse repoussa victorieusement les attaques déloyales dont il avait été l'objet. Il expliqua qu'il ne dépendait aucunement du gouvernement, qu'il avait été nommé traducteur par un comité de la Chambre des Communes, composé de libéraux et de conservateurs et que le gouvernement ne pouvait le destituer, n'ayant rien à voir dans le bureau, mais qu'il fallait pour cela un vote de la Chambre des Communes.

On voit par ce que je viens de lire, que ce traducteur, M. Vanasse, s'est chargé de tracer quels étaient les pouvoirs de l'Orateur; il déclare positivement qu'il n'est pas au pouvoir de l'Orateur de démettre les traducteurs, mais que ce privilège n'appartient qu'à la Chambre. Le même journal poursuit:

M. Vanasse a parlé une deuxième fois, puis M. Ernest Tremblay, de Saint-Hyacinthe—pas celui qui a pris part à l'assemblée tenue en cette ville samedi dernier—a porté la parole dans l'intérêt de la cause libérale.

Si nous n'approuvons pas toujours les opinions politiques de M. Tremblay, il est une chose cependant que nous approuvons chez lui et que nous nous faisons un plaisir et un devoir de constater: c'est sa manière

courtoise de faire la discussion. Le langage poli dont s'est servi hier M. Tremblay contrastait en effet singulièrement avec les paroles saugrenues, les expressions triviales et grossières du jeune démagogue Lemieux, et l'auditoire a prouvé qu'il savait parfaitement faire la distinction entre un homme bien élevé et un polisson.

Voilà, M. l'Orateur, en quels termes l'un des collègues de M. Tremblay l'apprécie. Voilà en quels termes un journal conservateur, le *Sorelois*, apprécie M. Tremblay. On voit de suite quelle différence il y a entre l'appréciation donnée par le *Sorelois*, et la façon dont l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat a traité M. Tremblay aujourd'hui, lorsqu'il s'est servi de l'expression de *blackguard* devant la Chambre.

Maintenant, M. l'Orateur, s'il faut absolument que les traducteurs qui prennent part aux luttes politiques soient mis à la porte, il ne doit pas y avoir deux poids et deux mesures.

Ce qui est juste pour MM. Tremblay et Poirier doit l'être également pour les autres. Eh bien ! nous constatons que parmi les traducteurs, se trouve un M. Lassalle, et on m'informe que ce monsieur est le secrétaire de l'association conservatrice de Montréal. Ce monsieur a pris la peine de traverser le fleuve et de se rendre dans le comté de Chambly pour faire la lutte contre mon ami, le député actuel de ce comté (M. Préfontaine). Eh bien ! si c'est un grand crime pour MM. Tremblay et Poirier d'être allés faire la lutte contre le député de Richmond et Wolfe et contre l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, dans Terrebonne, est-ce que le crime n'est pas aussi grand pour M. Lassalle qui est allé faire la lutte dans le comté de Chambly ?

Maintenant M. Vanasse dirige, comme je l'ai dit il y a un instant, le *Sorelois*. Eh bien ! dans les dernières élections générales il a fait toute la campagne contre le candidat du parti national, M. le Dr Ladouceur.

Passons au cas de M. Beaulieu. Ce monsieur, le chef du bureau des traducteurs, a été pendant plusieurs années, rédacteur de la *Minerve*. Pendant les dernières élections générales, qu'est-il arrivé ? on avait cherché en vain, dans le comté de Saint-Jean, un candidat qui voulait bien s'immoler sur l'autel de la patrie contre l'honorable M. Marchand, on a finalement trouvé M. Philippe Pelletier, avocat, de Montréal. Eh bien ! M. Beaulieu, pour lui donner un peu de poids, l'a pris en société, afin de pouvoir dire que M. Pelletier avait des intérêts dans la ville de Saint-Jean. Si j'ai mentionné ces faits, ce n'est pas pour faire un reproche à ces messieurs, et prétendre qu'ils n'avaient pas droit de prendre part aux luttes politiques ; au contraire, ils avaient ce droit, lequel a été reconnu par la presse et par la plupart des députés de cette Chambre appartenant aux deux partis politiques. Mais j'arrive au cas de M. Poirier. Le cas de M. Poirier diffère considérablement de celui de MM. Tremblay, qui ont écrit l'un une pièce de poésie, et l'autre une brochure politique. Quant à M. Poirier je ne connais que l'accusation portée contre lui par l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat. Il n'est accusé que d'avoir parlé dans les assemblées politiques et d'avoir insulté l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat.

Eh bien ! devons-nous le juger sans l'entendre ? M. Poirier nie formellement l'accusation qui a été portée contre lui. Il y a d'un côté l'affirmation de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat,—pour qui j'ai tout le respect possible,—mais d'un autre côté, il y a la dénégation aussi formelle, aussi emphatique de M. Poirier, en qui j'ai également confiance. Voici du reste sa lettre en réponse à l'Orateur de cette Chambre :

Si je croyais vous être agréable, M. l'Orateur, en vous donnant des explications détaillées en réponse à cette lettre, je m'empresserais de vous les donner ; mais à quoi bon ? je relève du comité spécial de la Chambre désigné sous le nom de "Comité des Débats" et je suis en état de démontrer à ce comité—s'il me fait l'honneur de m'appeler devant lui—que je n'ai rien fait qui le justifierait de demander ma destitution à la Chambre.

Voici, toutefois, ce que je puis répondre à l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat : Je me suis occupé de politique durant la vacance qui s'est écoulée depuis la dernière session, et j'ai pris la parole dans un certain nombre d'assemblées publiques ; mais en faisant cela, j'ai exercé un droit reconnu aux membres de notre bureau par les principaux organes français du gouvernement ; un droit que plusieurs membres de cette Chambre et du

Sénat m'ont invité à exercer ; un droit que mes collègues conservateurs du *Hansard* ont exercé comme moi ; un droit que l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat lui-même a paru reconnaître jusqu'à ces derniers temps, puisqu'il a attendu jusqu'au 22 mai 1887, pour se plaindre de moi et qu'il n'a pas tenu compte de ma participation aux luttes qui ont précédé la vacance qui s'est écoulée depuis la dernière session.

Comme on le voit, nous sommes en présence d'une affirmation et d'une dénégation. Eh bien ! je le demande, puisque la Chambre se constitue aujourd'hui en tribunal, puisque la Chambre est appelée à juger ce monsieur, va-t-elle le faire sans l'entendre ? Voici M. Poirier qui dit que les accusations portées contre lui sont fausses et mensongères, et il demande à être entendu devant le comité des *Débats*. Est-ce qu'on peut refuser cet acte de simple justice ? Est-ce qu'il y a un seul député qui oserait rendre son jugement sans entendre la partie intéressée ?

J'ai entendu cet après-midi l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat dire : Il est vrai que je suis sorti de la question constitutionnelle, il est vrai que je suis entré dans le mérite de la question, mais, ajoutait-il, je suis le demandeur. Eh bien ! s'il y a un demandeur, il y a aussi des défendeurs ; s'il y a un accusateur, il y a aussi des accusés. S'il lui est permis de venir sur le parquet de cette Chambre porter des accusations contre ces trois messieurs ; s'il lui est permis de leur dire des injures, comme il l'a fait cet après-midi, il me semble qu'en justice on doit permettre à ces jeunes gens de se défendre ; on doit entendre leur défense en regard des accusations qui sont portées contre eux.

On a fait allusion cet après-midi au cas de M. Elie Tassé. Ce cas n'est pas du tout analogue à celui-ci. D'abord, M. Tassé n'était pas un employé de la Chambre ; il était simplement à l'emploi du gouvernement, et les injures dont on se plaignait et qui ont été publiées dans la *Minerve*, ont été écrites pendant le cours de la session, c'est-à-dire pendant que M. Tassé était payé pour donner tout son temps aux travaux de la Chambre. M. Tassé a pris sur lui d'écrire dans les journaux et d'insulter certains députés qui étaient ici à remplir leurs devoirs parlementaires. Il est donc bien facile de voir que le cas de M. Tassé n'a absolument rien de semblable à celui qui nous occupe dans le moment.

M. l'Orateur, on a fait beaucoup de bruit à propos de cette brochure de M. Tremblay. Le grand crime de M. Ernest Tremblay, est d'avoir écrit une brochure, qui, paraît-il a extrêmement déplu à l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat. Eh bien ! Quel est celui qui a provoqué cet écrit ? C'est l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat lui-même. On se rappelle qu'à la suite de l'exécution de Riel, une commotion considérable a eu lieu dans la province de Québec ; on se rappelle que tout le monde était passablement excité ; on se souvient qu'un grand nombre de députés qui siègent dans cette Chambre partageaient à cette époque les opinions que nous partageons encore aujourd'hui. On se rappelle que lors de la formation du parti national, il y a des figures que nous voyons aujourd'hui dans cette Chambre et qui ont maintenant abdiqué le parti national qui étaient contre l'exécution de Riel. Mais du moment que Riel a été dépendu, ils se sont trouvés déliés et ils sont revenus au gouvernement.

M. l'Orateur, cette brochure a été écrite tout simplement en réponse à un manifeste de l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat adressé aux électeurs du comté de Terrebonne, manifeste qui a été publié dans les journaux et qui a été soumis à la discussion. M. Tremblay, exerçant ses droits de citoyen et de journaliste, a pris sur lui de commenter le manifeste de l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat aux électeurs du comté de Terrebonne. Et si les députés de cette Chambre veulent prendre la peine de parcourir cette brochure, ils constateront qu'elle a été écrite avec beaucoup de loyauté pour l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat. On y discute certains passages du manifeste de l'honorable ministre, et tous les passages qui sont discutés sont cités ; je crois que je pourrais mettre au défi de trouver dans tout ce qui est tombé de la plume de M. Tremblay, des expressions qui soient injurieuses à l'adresse de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat. Ce qu'il y a de plus violent

dans cette brochure ce sont précisément les écrits des hommes qui aujourd'hui donnent leur appui au gouvernement; ce sont les discours qui ont été prononcés par les hommes qui donnent aujourd'hui leur support au gouvernement. Ce sont, par exemple, les discours prononcés par l'honorable député d'Hochelaga (M. Desjardins) qui a dit dans le comté de Lévis, je crois, que sir John avait commencé sa carrière à la lueur de l'incendie du parlement à Montréal et qu'il allait la finir sur l'échafaud de Régina. Ce sont les paroles et les écrits de l'honorable député de Yamaska (M. Vanasse). C'est la lettre de l'honorable député de Jacques-Cartier (M. Girouard); cette fameuse lettre qu'il a adressée au parti national. Malheureusement, il ne se rappelait pas l'autre jour, dans le comté de L'Assomption, d'avoir écrit cette lettre. Nous avons dû la lui mettre sous le nez pour rafraîchir sa mémoire défectueuse.

Si on me le permet, M. l'Orateur, je citerai quelques passages de cette brochure pour démontrer quel langage on y tient. C'est un langage énergique, mais en même temps, c'est un langage poli et parfaitement parlementaire. Or, si on démontre que ce langage serait admis dans cette Chambre, je ne vois pas comment en dehors de cette Chambre on pourrait s'en plaindre, comment on pourrait dire à M. Tremblay: Vous avez dit des choses épouvantables contre moi, et votre présence dans cette Chambre est devenue intolérable. Voici ce que dit M. Tremblay à la page 5 de sa brochure; ceci est emprunté à un journal conservateur:

Mais ce n'est pas un homme ce Chapleau, disent-ils maintenant, c'est un chacal, c'est une hyène, car il n'y a que ces bêtes fauves qui déterrent les cadavres pour en repaître leur voracité. Voilà les exagérations de langage auxquelles vous avez contraint vos adulateurs; voilà les excès de parole que j'hésite à vous transcrire ici parce que je suis ennemi de toute violence.

On voit que M. Tremblay trouve lui-même que ce langage était un peu exagéré.

Et n'allez pas croire que c'est par un artifice de rhétorique que je vous transmets cette expression des sentiments soulevés contre vous. C'est dans les rangs des vôtres qu'on vous reproche d'avoir recommencé le procès d'un homme qui a subi la peine de la sentence portée contre lui et à qui on ne peut plus demander, selon la formule, s'il a quelque chose à dire avant que la loi ait son cours. Car, dit Monseigneur Taché, dans un écrit qu'il vient de livrer à la publicité, "pourquoi joue-t-on le rôle si inique de recommencer le procès de l'infortuné, exécuté devant le public, en invoquant les témoignages des Révérends Pères André et Fourmond, qui, mis sous serment à la cour, ont rendu un témoignage dont la conclusion naturelle n'était certainement pas l'échafaud? On va jusqu'à torturer l'âme si généreusement aimante de Monseigneur Grandin, en lui prêtant un rôle indigne de sa position et de son cœur. Et tout cela, on a l'audace de le dire, pour faire prévaloir la vérité.

Ce langage est sévère, mais qui en fait usage? C'est Mgr Taché.

A la page 7, M. Tremblay ajoute:

Vous avez remarqué, je l'espère, que ce n'est pas moi qui parle ici, mais que ce sont les sentiments mêmes de vos suivants, maintenant séparés de vous, que je signale à votre appréciation.

Comme on le voit, dans chaque circonstance, M. Tremblay prend la peine de signaler à l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat que le langage qu'il lui tient,—langage sévère et blessant pour lui—que ce langage n'est pas de lui, mais qu'il vient de bouches qui jadis chantaient ses louanges.

A la page 12, après avoir fait des citations des journaux conservateurs, il dit:

"Ce spécimen des dispositions actuelles de vos amis doit suffire à vous démontrer que les exigences despotiques de l'esprit de parti n'ont plus de prise sur ceux que l'exécution de l'apôtre des revendications mettaient à réveiller de leur ataraxie et qu'ils condamnent la politique générale du gouvernement sans se soucier plus que cela de l'approbation antérieure qu'ils lui ont donnée.

Je vais prendre maintenant la liberté d'examiner votre manifeste point par point et de le soumettre à l'épreuve de mes commentaires. Mais il convient, avant de commencer, de vous rappeler que la pendaison de Riel a été appelée dans tous les assemblées publiques et par la quasi totalité des journaux de notre province, un meurtre politique, un assassinat juridique, un crime horrible de la perpétration duquel le gouvernement de sir John A. Macdonald, tel que composé lors de l'exécution, doit être tenu constitutionnellement responsable. MM. Trudel, Desjardins, Beaubien, Girouard, Vanasse, Armand, Bellerose, Bergeron, tous

Mr. L'ANGELIER (Montmorency.)

sénateurs et députés conservateurs, ont été de cet avis et ont déclaré avoir été odieusement trompés par vous et par vos collègues. MM. Amyot, Tarte, Garneau, Faucher de St-Maurice et autres sommités du parti ministériel ont fait des déclarations analogues."

A la page 18 de la même brochure, on lit ce qui suit:

Monsieur Girouard, député conservateur de Jacques-Cartier, a dit: Le gouvernement nous a odieusement trompés.... Je le déclare hautement, je ne veux plus soutenir le gouvernement.

On voit que l'honorable député de Jacques-Cartier (M. Girouard) a changé d'opinion depuis ce temps-là:

..... ce n'est pas parce qu'il est canadien-français que M. Girouard retire sa confiance au ministère; c'est parce que, dans son appréciation, le ministère est un odieux trompeur. L'honorable sénateur Trudel, dont la répugnance pour toute idée de révolte est bien connue, approuve ce qui vient d'être dit. M. Laflamme, ancien ministre de la justice, donne son adhésion à ce mouvement. M. Desjardins, député conservateur d'Hochelaga, dit: Les ministres nous ont tenus dans une déception continuelle. Ce n'est pas des ministres anglais qu'il parle; c'est de vous et de vos deux collègues français dans le cabinet. Et il a terminé en s'écriant: Que la carrière de sir John qui a commencé en 1849, au reflet de l'incendie du parlement à Montréal, aille finir derrière le gibet de Riel!

Voilà les paroles les plus dures qui se trouvent dans cette brochure.

Maintenant, dans une assemblée tenue dans le comté de Lévis, à Bienville, en 1887, M. Tarte, l'écrivain distingué, le rédacteur du *Canadien*, tenait ce langage:

En 1837, nous avons eu pour nous des Anglais et des Français de France. En restant dans la constitution nous aurons pour nous la majorité des Anglais bien pensants. Nous avons déjà pour nous les Irlandais qui ont aussi le cœur et le sang chauds. Mais nous ne sommes plus avec les tories. Et je vais vous citer des faits incontestables qui nous donnent mille fois raison de nous séparer d'eux. En 1869, sir John, un homme éminent certes, mais aussi fourbe qu'il est éminent, fit venir de Rome Monseigneur Taché, pourquoi? Pour tromper les Métis, au risque de ruiner ce prélat parmi les catholiques. Un autre fait historique est que les Métis sous sir John ont été traités en parias.....

Un autre trait de sir John, c'est sa lettre à son fils, dans laquelle, lui, l'un des conseillers de Sa Majesté la Reine d'Angleterre, il faisait appel aux volontaires de Winnipeg et d'Ontario pour écraser les Canadiens français.

Et quels sont les commentaires que fait M. Tremblay?

Ils le tiennent pour fourbe parce qu'il est fourbe, et c'est cette fourberie et non sa nationalité qui lui mérite ces manifestations hostiles.

Je citerai de plus de cette brochure les paroles de l'honorable député de Montréal-Est (M. Coursol). Les voici:—

Nous avons pris cette résolution, messieurs, parce que l'honneur et la justice nous l'imposent. Nous n'avons pas demandé la commutation de la peine de Riel seulement parce qu'il était français, mais parce qu'il ne méritait pas la mort, parce qu'on n'exécute plus un condamné politique dans aucun pays du monde. Voilà la faute impardonnable de sir John A. Macdonald, la raison qui nous l'a fait abandonner.....

Nous ne cherchons pas une guerre de race; nous ne réclamons qu'une chose: respect à notre race comme elle respecte les autres races; justice égale pour tout le monde sur la terre du Canada..... Ceux qui ont demandé la tête de Riel devront bientôt courber la leur devant l'attitude et la protestation indignée de tout ce qu'il y a d'honorable non-seulement chez les Canadiens-français, mais chez tous les citoyens de la Confédération à quelque origine qu'ils appartiennent.

Je citerai encore les paroles d'un homme dont les principes ne font pas de doute pour personne. C'est l'honorable M. Malhiot, l'ancien *leader* de la Chambre, à Québec.

J'ai toujours suivi le drapeau conservateur, messieurs; mais aujourd'hui je n'hésite pas à dénoncer les hommes responsables du crime contre lequel nous protestons; je n'hésite pas à m'unir au mouvement qui se fait pour renverser le gouvernement des bourreaux de Riel; c'est ce que nous avons à faire en ce moment; quand nous l'aurons exécuté ce gouvernement, il sera temps de voir quels matériaux devront entrer dans la nouvelle organisation; nous verrons quelles alliances meilleures que celles du passé nous devons faire avec les partis dans la province d'Ontario.

Trop longtemps la province de Québec a servi de marche-pied à ceux que nous avons eus pour alliés dans les autres provinces. Il semble être temps de chercher de nouvelles alliances.

Maintenant on trouve dans le pamphlet incriminé les résolutions qui ont été adoptées au Champ-de-Mars, à une assemblée à laquelle assistaient un grand nombre de députés et de sénateurs conservateurs. La première et la deuxième résolutions se lisent comme suit:

Résolu :

1. Qu'en faisant ainsi exécuter Louis Riel, le 16 novembre courant, le gouvernement de sir John A. Macdonald a commis un acte d'inhumanité et de cruauté indigne d'une nation civilisée, et a mérité la condamnation de tous les amis du droit et de la justice, sans distinction de race ou de religion ;

2. Que le consentement donné par sir Hector Langevin, sir Adolphe P. Caron et l'honorable Joseph A. Chapleau, à cette odieuse exécution, constitue une trahison nationale et mérite spécialement la réprobation de tous les citoyens de cette province ;

Eh bien ! voilà les expressions les plus fortes qu'on trouve dans ce pamphlet. Elles ne sont pas de M. Tremblay, elles sont tombées de la plume de journalistes conservateurs ou de la bouche d'orateurs également conservateurs.

On vient de voir l'opinion exprimée par certains députés de cette Chambre sur cette question. Voyons maintenant ce qu'a dit *La Minerve*, journal reconnu comme un vieil organe conservateur, le lendemain de l'exécution de Riel :

Si profonde est la répulsion qu'inspire l'idée seule de l'exécution de Riel, que jusqu'au dernier moment, hier, on espérait encore une commutation de la terrible sentence. C'en est fait des espérances de toute une race et de la pureté immaculée de notre blason national.

Il n'a pu s'écouler 20 ans sans que le grand livre de la Confédération canadienne fût maculé d'une tache de sang. C'est avoir perdu bien jeune sa beauté virginale ! Aussi rien d'étonnant que la population soit émue jusqu'à se porter à des manifestations bruyantes même de sa colère.

L'ère des supplications est passée. L'ère des récriminations ne saurait nous convenir ; celle des déterminations inflexibles suivies de résultats pratiques peut seule nous satisfaire. La journée d'hier va fournir les éléments d'une page nouvelle de notre histoire.

Le même journal écrivait, le jour même de l'exécution :

Nous n'apprenons rien en disant qu'il se rendra des comptes à la prochaine session. Et nous le jugerons lui (sir John) comme les autres.

Si c'est, comme nous le croyons, le parti orangiste qui a présidé à l'acte impolitique de ce jour, il y aura un règlement définitif entre ce parti et le nôtre, hormis que l'arrêté de compte date d'aujourd'hui même, ce que nous serions loin de regretter. Si le gouvernement a eu la main forcée par cette coterie maussade qui vit exclusivement de haine, il en subira les conséquences.

Passons maintenant à ce que disait un honorable député de cette Chambre, le député d'Yamaska, M. Vanasse :

Je proteste contre l'exécution de Louis Riel. Je ne veux plus supporter le gouvernement qui ne mérite plus la confiance des hommes bien pensants. Sir John emportera dans la tombe le déshonneur qui s'attache à son nom. Quant à moi, je suis prêt à remettre mon mandat si mes électeurs n'approuvent pas ma conduite.

L'honorable député n'a pas, que je sache, remis son mandat. Il n'a pas été chercher l'approbation de ses électeurs ; mais au contraire, — ses votes sont là pour le constater — il s'est rangé sous l'étendard du gouvernement, et je crois qu'il peut être compté comme un des plus fidèles amis, un des plus vaillants appuis du gouvernement.

Et le *Quotidien*, journal publié à Lévis ; l'organe, j'oserais dire, de mon honorable ami le député de Lévis (M. Guay), disait :

La voix de l'humanité n'a pas été entendue. Le droit et la force triomphent, c'est vrai ; mais la justice a les mains couvertes de sang.

Et si aujourd'hui nous n'avons plus le motif de sauver la vie de l'infortuné Riel, nous avons celui de venger sa mémoire et de sauver l'intégrité de l'honneur national.

Le Nord, journal publié à St-Jérôme, s'exprimait dans les mêmes termes, et finissait en disant :

Nous dénonçons le gouvernement Macdonald et demandons sa déchéance.

Un autre journal conservateur, l'organe de l'honorable ministre des Travaux Publics, écrivait ce qui suit :

Nous écrivions hier :

C'est pour la Puissance du Canada un jour de deuil que celui où elle voit se dresser un échafaud politique.

Nous aurions pu ajouter que, pour la province de Québec surtout, cette date du 16 novembre était une date funèbre.

En effet, à Montréal, à Québec, dans tous les centres populeux, la nouvelle de l'exécution a été accueillie par une explosion de pitié et de colère. Il est clair que la province de Québec attendait une mesure de clémence. Son attente a été trompée, et voilà pourquoi elle s'agite.

Le Journal de Québec disait à son tour :

Le drame de Régina a posé un problème difficile à résoudre ; mais qui n'est pas au-dessus de la sagesse humaine.

Et cet autre journal, *Le Nouvelliste*, qui était dans le temps l'organe de l'honorable ministre de la Milice (Sir A. P. Caron), ajoutait ce qui suit :

Mais la rage du tigre orangiste restait inassouvie !

Maintenant elle est satisfaite.

L'élément français et catholique a payé son tribut à la haine des sectaires.

" Ajoutons que le parti conservateur de la province de Québec a reçu la récompense de l'alliance politique qui a permis à cette minorité, méprisée dans sa propre province, de partager avec lui l'honneur du " pouvoir. "

Notre députation a le sentiment du patriotisme et de l'honneur national. Elle a la confiance du peuple. Qu'elle se concerte avec sagesse et agisse avec prudence, et elle peut compter sur l'appui de la Province dans tout ce qu'elle fera pour maintenir son prestige " et lui assurer des alliances " profitables.

" Car il est inutile de se le cacher, l'orangisme qui a toujours été un " élément désorganisateur dans le parti conservateur, a creusé un abîme " entre nous. "

Eh bien ! je crois avoir cité suffisamment d'extraits de cette brochure, pour montrer que le langage incriminé, celui dont on se plaint si amèrement aujourd'hui, n'a pas été tenu par son auteur ; mais qu'au contraire, il n'a fait que citer ou rééditer les paroles des conservateurs, pour les commenter. Je le demande en toute franchise, est-ce que ce n'était pas le droit de M. Tremblay, comme citoyen, de discuter le manifeste de l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat ; manifeste qui était public, puisqu'il avait été publié dans les journaux ? Est-ce que ce n'était pas son droit de l'interpréter à sa manière, et de citer les paroles et les écrits d'hommes qui avant l'exécution de Riel avaient appuyé le gouvernement, et qui depuis sont revenus encore se placer sous son égide paternel ?

Il est un autre point qui devra frapper les députés de cette Chambre. Puisque nous sommes prêts à passer sentence sur ces messieurs ; puisque la majorité est probablement disposée à les expulser sans les entendre, je rappellerai à l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat qu'il manque de justice envers eux. L'honorable secrétaire d'Etat, lorsqu'il est appelé à rendre compte de sa conduite à ses électeurs du comté de Terrebonne, se plaint dans son manifeste de ce qu'on le condamne sans l'entendre. Voici entre autres choses ce qu'il dit :

Autant je respecte le sentiment national qui produit le mouvement actuel, autant je déplore la cause de ce soulèvement, autant je gémis sur les tristes conséquences qui peuvent en résulter. La meilleure preuve que la cause est mauvaise, c'est qu'un esprit d'injustice semble la dominer. On soupçonne, on accuse, on condamne d'anciens et fidèles serviteurs du pays sans les entendre, avant même qu'ils n'aient parlé.

Puisque l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat se plaignait dans cette circonstance qu'on voulait le condamner sans l'entendre ; puisqu'il trouvait que c'était une injustice ; comment se fait-il qu'aujourd'hui, changeant de front, il vient devant la Chambre, demander qu'on condamne ces trois jeunes gens, qui n'ont pas même l'occasion de se faire entendre ? Il veut les condamner sans qu'ils aient la chance de se faire entendre devant le comité des *Débats*, ou devant la Chambre. Il devrait, ce me semble, se montrer plus généreux, plus magnanime, et faire l'application du principe dont il réclamait le bénéfice pour lui-même, lorsqu'il était mis en accusation devant ses électeurs.

Maintenant il y a une chose qui est frappante, c'est que cette brochure a été écrite en décembre 1885, et que ce n'est réellement qu'à cette session, en 1888, que ces deux messieurs se sentent insultés. Ceci me rappelle l'histoire d'un Allemand qui avait été au théâtre et qui avait assisté à une comédie très amusante. Au bout de trois semaines, il était à table avec sa femme à dîner, et tout à coup il éclate de rire. Sa femme lui demande ce qu'il a à rire. Il lui répond : Je pense à cette comédie que j'ai entendue il y a trois semaines. C'était si drôle que je ne puis m'empêcher de rire. Ces messieurs sont pires que l'Allemand ; cela leur a pris trois ans avant de découvrir qu'ils avaient été insultés dans leur honneur et de venir se plaindre devant cette Chambre.

M. l'Orateur, il est un fait qu'il est bon de signaler. L'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat et l'honorable député de Richmond et Wolfe (M. Ives) disent : nous avons été insultés comme députés. Je nie cela. A l'époque où cette brochure a été écrite, ils n'étaient pas députés ; ils n'étaient que de simples citoyens qui retournaient devant leurs électeurs pour se faire réélire, et par conséquent, M. Tremblay avait droit de discuter les questions publiques comme le faisaient tous les citoyens, au point de vue de son parti. On ne peut donc invoquer cette raison. Et quand ces messieurs viennent nous dire : nous étions des députés, je réponds : vous n'étiez pas des députés à cette époque-là ; vous n'étiez que des citoyens qui sollicitiez la confiance publique, et vous étiez exposés, comme tous ceux qui recherchent la confiance publique, à voir votre politique critiquée. Et qu'est-ce qu'il y avait de plus juste que de critiquer le programme même de l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat ?

Maintenant, depuis que la prétendue offense a été commise, il y a eu dissolution du parlement, et il y a eu une session l'année dernière. Cependant, ces messieurs n'avaient pas encore senti qu'ils avaient été insultés. Mais à la session de 1888, probablement parce que de nouveaux aspirants se présentaient et désiraient prendre la place de nos trois amis, ils se sont aperçus qu'ils avaient été profondément blessés dans leur honneur et qu'il fallait jeter ces trois jeunes gens sur le pavé après leur avoir donné l'assurance dans le passé qu'ils pouvaient prendre part aux luttes politiques et écrire dans les journaux sans s'exposer à perdre leur position.

Voilà, M. l'Orateur, l'injustice criante que l'on menace de commettre au préjudice de ces trois personnes. L'honorable secrétaire d'Etat dit : J'ai été insulté dans mon honneur. Eh bien ! s'il a été insulté dans son honneur, deux recours lui étaient ouverts : il pouvait s'adresser aux tribunaux, ou porter sa plainte devant cette Chambre. Mais s'il voulait venir devant cette Chambre, il devait mettre en accusation régulière ces trois jeunes gens afin de leur permettre d'être entendus, et ne pas les condamner sans les entendre. Cependant la Chambre se rappelle que lorsque nous avons demandé la production des papiers concernant cette affaire, sans l'intervention de l'honorable ministre des travaux publics nous n'aurions pas pu les mettre devant la Chambre. Les documents étaient en français et la majorité anglaise de cette Chambre aurait été forcée de juger cette question sans pouvoir s'en rendre compte. C'est grâce à la magnanimité de l'honorable ministre des travaux publics que la majorité dans cette Chambre a été mise en mesure d'apprécier les faits et de pouvoir donner un vote avec connaissance de cause.

Si ces messieurs se sont rendus coupables d'injures aussi graves qu'on le prétend envers l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat ils sont passibles de dommages-intérêts. Mais j'en appelle à mes honorables amis, qui sont deux avocats distingués, et je leur demande s'ils réclamaient des tribunaux des dommages pour ce qui est contenu dans cette brochure, s'ils recevraient un millier de piastres, le montant du salaire d'une année de ces messieurs ? Certainement non. Ce serait des dommages excessifs. Eh bien ! pourquoi cette Chambre qui est le plus haut tribunal du pays rendrait-elle un jugement qui serait contraire à celui qui serait rendu par les tribunaux du pays auxquels l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat aurait dû s'adresser ?

Je terminerai ces quelques remarques en citant un article de la *Minerve* à propos d'une destitution, que l'honorable Secrétaire d'Etat ferait bien de méditer avant de persister davantage à demander la destitution de ces trois messieurs. Voici ce que disait la *Minerve* à la date du 23 mai 1863. L'article est intitulé " Une destitution est une tache. " Voici comment se lit cet article :—

Et pourtant sous le règne du ministère McDonald-Sicotte toute l'influence de M. Dorion a servi à inaugurer un large système de destitutions iniques, cruelles, révoltantes ! Des employés civils consciencieux, intègres, capables et sans reproches, ont été impitoyablement jetés sur

Mr. L'ANGELIER (Montmorency.)

le pavé, sans égard pour leurs familles réduites à la gêne, souvent à la misère, par suite de cette cruauté chez les hommes du pouvoir. " Ils comptaient sur la foi publique pour être maintenus dans leurs situations, " mais avec des ministres qui du commencement à la fin se sont moqués de la foi jurée, ont conspiré contre leurs propres paroles et leurs propres engagements, à quoi servent les notions ordinaires d'honneur et de morale ?

... " Vous avez beau faire vous resterez petit, très petit à côté des hommes du caractère moral de M. le Dr Meilleur que vous pouvez destituer, que vous pouvez réduire à la misère, quand un hasard infortuné vous donne le pouvoir, mais que vous ne réussirez jamais à rabaisser dans l'estime publique ! ! Une destitution est une tache, mais quand elle est faite injustement et tyranniquement, la tache s'imprime au front du ministre sans cœur et sans entrailles qui se sert de la force que donne l'autorité pour persécuter ses compatriotes !

Je crois que si l'honorable secrétaire d'Etat méditait cet article de la *Minerve*, il s'apercevrait qu'il a fait fausse route, et il retirerait conjointement avec l'honorable député de Richmond et Wolfe (M. Ives) les accusations qu'ils ont portées contre messieurs Tremblay et Poirier. J'espère que si la Chambre est déterminée à en venir à la conclusion que ces messieurs doivent être destitués, elle leur accordera au moins cette justice élémentaire, à laquelle tout le monde a droit, c'est-à-dire de pouvoir produire leur défense soit devant un comité de cette Chambre, soit ailleurs.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the argument in regard to the original resolution before the House has been left largely in the hands of legal gentlemen, but it must not be forgotten that every member of Parliament is supposed to be as good a lawyer as another, especially in his experience of parliamentary practice. Now, Sir, as you are well aware, although I am not a lawyer, although I cannot claim to be a venerable individual, I am beginning to find myself rather a venerable member of the House. For that reason I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion on the point of parliamentary law that has been raised, and without going over all the arguments that have been adduced, it seems to me, Sir, clear that no individual can deal with the employés either on the reporting or the translating of the Debates, but that they are to be dealt with by the committee of this House appointed for that special purpose. It appears certainly that that committee did attempt last year, by a close vote, to transfer the responsibility in regard to the dismissal to the committee or to the Speaker or to the Committee on Internal Discipline ; but, Sir, they failed in doing so, because that having passed in the committee, neither the chairman nor anybody else would venture to move the adoption of that report to the House, and the report became consequently so much waste paper. Therefore the responsibility of the committee to the translators and the power to dismiss or appoint remains where it always has been in the hands of the committee, and when the committee attempted to deprive itself of that power or responsibility it was not successful. The committee and the committee alone remained responsible for all dealings with those employés. The consequence is that when the Speaker or anybody else pretends to have dismissed those translators that pretended dismissal is null and void. Those translators are officers of the House to-night as much as they were when first appointed according to my view of parliamentary law, and will remain so until they are dismissed by the House or the committee of the House appointed to deal with such questions. I believe that in a court of law those translators could collect their pay for the part of the session during which they have been here and have not got their salaries, and I believe if they went into the Exchequer Court they could collect their salaries until they are properly dismissed. I am sorry to find that not only the Speaker illegally and against the orders of the House pretended to dismiss those men, but at the same time he has appointed others in their places who are drawing the salaries which are due to the men whom he unfairly and improperly professed to strike off the roll. That is

my view of the technical question. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) being a lawyer himself, has attempted to deal with this question of parliamentary law, but he has, as usual, only shown his complete ignorance of the subject. The hon. gentleman quoted to us a statute which gave the Speaker power after enquiry to dismiss any employé of the House. He forgot two things. He forgot that the statute was passed soon after Confederation, and long before there had been any Debates Committee, and long before there were any employés under the care of that committee. Therefore the wording of that statute cannot possibly refer to those employés. Above all, he forgot to tell us that the Speaker did not hold an enquiry before proceeding to dismiss those men on the *ex parte* statement of two supporters of the Government which appointed him, and he took upon himself, without enquiry or without giving the translators a chance to defend themselves, to exercise an illegal power by telling them that they were dismissed and preventing them from drawing salaries to which they are legally entitled at the present moment. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is ignorant of the fact that the statute does not apply to these employés, and he forgot to tell you what he knew very well, that even if the statute did apply, the Speaker did not carry out its terms. That statute authorises him to hold an enquiry and afterwards to suspend; but he held no enquiry, and instead of suspending these officials he dismissed or professed to dismiss them. Then, the hon. member brought up the case of Mr. Tassé, who was a translator in 1873, and whose case he said was precisely similar to this one. Here again the hon. member for Texas—I beg his pardon, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe—it was pure slip of the tongue—displayed his utter ignorance of the business of the House. He has confused Mr. Tassé, translator of official documents, parliamentary papers, bills, and so on, with the translators of the Debates. The two classes of men are perfectly distinct. Instead of the cases being precisely similar, they are as opposed to each other as any two cases can possibly be. Mr. Tassé, translator of parliamentary papers, was a permanent employé of the House, regularly appointed by the Speaker and dismissable by the Speaker. He was dismissed by the Speaker in pursuance of his undoubted right. But the three translators in question were translators of the Debates, not appointed by the Speaker, but by a special committee of this House, to whom the House has entrusted all its powers of appointing and dismissing translators of the Debates. I do not discuss the question whether Mr. Tassé was properly dismissed or not, as that does not apply to the present question. Then, the hon. gentleman discussed the case of an extra clerk, which is just the same as that of Mr. Tassé. Extra clerks are taken on by the Speaker's appointment, and are dismissed by him at any time with or without cause. There again there is no resemblance whatever to the case of these three translators of the Debates. Then, the hon. member found the case of Mr. DeCelles, who was a translator of the Debates in 1876, and he thought surely that his case must be parallel to the present case; but he forgot, if he ever knew it, which I greatly doubt, that previous to 1873, the translation of the Debates was done by contract, and that the translators at that time were not officials of this House in the sense they are now. Therefore that case is not at all parallel to the case before us. Now, the hon. member said that the quotations made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were from *La Presse*, with which none of the translators were connected. There again he showed that he had not been listening to the speech of my hon. friend, for the quotations made by the hon. member for Bothwell were not made from *La Presse* chiefly, but the most damaging of those quotations were made from *Le Monde*, a paper of which Mr. Lasalle, one of the translators who is still retained on the staff, is the editor.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is not the editor, although he is a writer on a paper.

Mr. VANASSE. The extracts the hon. member read were not from *Le Monde*.

Mr. CASEY. I have some of them here, and they are from *Le Monde*. If the hon. Secretary of State says of his own personal knowledge that Mr. Lasalle is only a writer and not the editor of that paper, I accept the statement; but it is quite proper to assume, when Mr. Lasalle was known to be campaigning against the hon. Secretary of State at that time—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. CASEY. Not against him individually, but against the Government of which he is a member—that those writings in the paper of which he wrote the campaigning parts, were from the pen of Mr. Lasalle. My hon. friends the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe are certainly to be congratulated on the outcome of their action on this occasion. They appear to have sought two things—relief from some who troubled them, and public notoriety. They have obtained both. They have obtained a degree of notoriety which one of them at least, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, would probably never have attained under any other circumstances. They have obtained relief from trouble by getting rid of these gentlemen who are thorns in their sides, though it remains to be seen what the House and the law may have to say about the supposed dismissal. But I have to call attention to the fact that they do not unite in their treatment of the cases in all points. They unite in declaring themselves, by the action they have taken and the speeches they have made, the two members on that side of the House who have the thinnest skins, who most quickly and deeply feel anything that may be said or done against them, who are the most ready to resent against a helpless employé of this House something that may have been said against them in the heat of the political arena. I do not know any two hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who would have put themselves in the places of those hon. gentlemen, and I say it to the credit of the party. Does anyone suppose that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is sitting beside the hon. Secretary of State, would have acted in this way if these translators had taken the same action, and used the same language against him in the heat of the campaign? He has been attacked time and again in much more violent language than that used by Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier, and have we ever heard of his asking for the dismissal of any of those who have attacked him? No. It is these two junior members of the House who have shown themselves so impatient. Although much the juniors of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, they have shown themselves much more forward, much more impatient of contradiction, much more inclined to wreak vengeance on those over whom they may think they have power. It is this young member of Parliament and this young member of the House who have taken advantage of their position to gratify personal spite in this way on these men. The right hon. the First Minister, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, or any of the other gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, would not be suspected by anybody on this side of taking such a course, and we would not have suspected it of these hon. gentlemen if they had not convicted themselves by the action they have taken. They have shown that they possess influence of a very peculiar and extraordinary kind with the Cabinet. What is the sum and substance of the reasons they give for asking the dismissal of the translators? They produce a number of utterances made by these translators on the hustings, but it is perfectly clear that

these utterances, made during the campaign, were not more injurious than the utterances of Conservative employés who have been retained in their positions, and if hon. members who are now hand in glove with the Ministry. After settling out that these translators, whose political autonomy had never been hitherto questioned, had used the language which everybody else had used on the public platform, the hon. the Secretary of State says :

"I could neither speak to them nor consult them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence in the precincts of the House is to me a nuisance, which no one has the right to subject a member of Parliament to."

And because the hon. the Secretary of State thinks their presence is a nuisance, he, in his high mightiness, the Great Mikado, the grand Lama, says the presence of these men—never mind their wives and families—is a nuisance to him and they must be dismissed. That is not enough. A still greater power appears on the scene in the person of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe who says speaking of Mr. Rémi Tremblay :

"He is unfit for the position he occupies, his presence is distasteful to me, I cannot have any communication with him, and I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

The presence of Mr. Tremblay was a nuisance to the Secretary of State and distasteful to the all-powerful member for Richmond and Wolfe. If it were parliamentary to use the phrase, I should say that such language on the part of any two members of this House in regard to any employés depending on their positions for the support of their families, was nothing short of scandalous. The hon. the Secretary of State defended this action on the ground that the dignity of the House required it, and he said he would take the same course if any other member of the House except himself had been attacked. He made a very grand speech and played his rôle very well, indeed; but when our unfortunate friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) took the floor, he did what the Irishman did, he opened his mouth and put his foot in it, or rather he put both his feet in it, for he destroyed the whole case which the Secretary of State had so laboriously built up. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe told us plainly that it was not with him a question of the offended dignity of the House, it was not because Mr. Rémi Tremblay had said anything insulting to him, but it was because he had made too many Rouge votes in the county of Richmond and Wolfe. Had Mr. Tremblay confined himself to one parish, the hon. member said, I would not have minded it, but wherever I went he followed me, and he was making Rouge votes and abusing me everywhere. The whole case of the hon. the Secretary of State is thus given away. It was not a question of the dignity of the House, but a question of making Rouge votes. When we come to the question of the offensive language used, let me ask you to compare it with that used by present supporters of the Government in the course of the agitation that followed the execution of Louis Riel. One gentleman is reported by *La Presse* as having said in Montreal on the 26th November :

"The Ministers have proved that they are heartless. The conduct of one whose name is never mentioned has been shameful."

I am informed that "the one whose name is never mentioned" is the hon. the Minister of Militia.

"This being, whose name has been banished from the Canadian dialect, attended a banquet where Riel's head was a surprise dish offered to the guests."

That banquet, I believe, was the banquet at Winnipeg.

"Sir John made a great mistake if he thought the Province of Quebec would accept Riel's execution without a word of protest, and he will be dismissed from power as he deserves. These sentiments are engraved within our hearts, and it is the duty of all those who can act in a manly way to avenge the death of Riel by dismissing from power the men who have steeped their hand in the blood of the leader of the half-breeds."

MR. CASEY.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, Oh.

Mr. CASEY. I hear hon. gentleman over there, and I think I could point him out. If I told him who the gentleman is who is reported by the *Presse* to have used that language, he would not speak to him any more. That gentleman is the hon. member for Hochelaga, at present a member of this House, and a warm supporter of the Government which he then attacked in such scathing terms. He is now, however, fit to associate with the Ministers and honored—I do not deny that he is justly honored—by them, but I say that while the Government are glad to have the support of that hon. gentleman, those other two gentlemen which happened to be on the opposite side of politics, and who have taken away more votes from the hon. the Secretary of State and from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe than the hon. member for Hochelaga, have to be sacrificed. I claim that there is neither British fair play nor common sense nor justice in the whole transaction.

An hon. MEMBER. Cock-a-doodle-doo.

Mr. CASEY. As the old cock crows, the young cock learns. I hear a cock crowing on the benches, and I would advise that boy, for he must be a boy member, or he would know better, to observe the conduct, not only of those immediately in front of him, but of those in the front rows, and like them to listen quietly to what is said. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Langelier) read in French several interesting expressions of opinion made by different members of the House and others; one or two of which I beg leave to read also in English, because I am afraid that many of my fellow citizens from Ontario were not able to follow him in French. A despatch was sent to the Government on the 13th November, 1885, as follows:—

"Under the circumstances Riel's execution would be an act of cruelty of which we refuse to share the responsibility."

And that was signed not by any unfortunate translators, but by the following members of the House:—Messrs. C. J. Coursol, Alphonse Desjardins, D. Girouard, F. Vanasse, L. H. Massue, F. Dupont, A. L. Desaulniers, J. B. Daoust, J. G. H. Bergeron, J. W. Bain, P. B. Benoit, E. Guilbault, G. A. Gigault, G. Labrosse, L. L. L. Desaulniers, F. Dugas and H. Hurteau; in all seventeen, and this despatch was published in *Le Monde* on the 14th November, and *Le Monde* stated that despatches to the same effect were signed, by whom do you suppose? By Messrs. Ouimet, Fortin, McMillan, Taschereau, Landry and Lesage. If any one could say anything more severe in reference to the Government than that Riel's execution would be an act of cruelty, which was practically putting them in the position of murdering the man, I do not know what could be said. Some of these gentlemen have no doubt reconsidered their decision, and they had undoubtedly a right to reconsider it, but, if they are still treated as honorable men and upright members of Parliament after making such a declaration, why should these poor men who said the same thing and no more be treated as they have been? I think that the language used by these translators on the platform and in the press was just the same as that which was used by the French opponents of the Government at that time. They just took the tone of the campaign that was going on, and when they were accused of having used language of that kind, what did they do? Everyone of those gentlemen wrote to the Speaker and protested that, if they had been carried away by the heat of the campaign into using language which was improper or insulting, they wished to retract any offensive or insulting words they had used, and they asked for an investigation before the Speaker in order to clear their skirts. They denied that they had done so in the first place, but they said that, if they had in the heat of the campaign they were willing to retract and apologise. But the Speaker did not grant them what, under the statute, he

was bound to grant them, an enquiry, which they were entitled to, not as an act of grace but as an act of right and of law. No, they were not granted that enquiry, but their heads came off at the demand of the great Mikado and the Grand Llama. I overlooked one extract in French which deserves to go on the pages of the *Hansard* in English as well. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) at the same meeting to which I have referred, said, according to the report in one of his own papers:

"The Ministers have constantly deceived us"

And he concluded by saying:

"Let Sir John's career, which commenced under the ghastly light of the burning of the Parliament House at Montreal, come to an end behind Riel's gibbet. We must refuse our support to those who have sold us in the Federal Cabinet."

And so on. What could be stronger than that?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Did I say that?

Mr. CASEY. That was reported in a Montreal newspaper, and it has not been denied up to this day that the hon. gentleman used that language. When an hon. member of this House, who is still an honored supporter of the Premier, can say that the career of the right hon. gentleman commenced under the ghastly light of the burning of the Parliament House at Montreal, which is true enough but is not pleasant for him to hear, and when he can remain the friend, and the honored friend, of the Premier, why should we allow the personal spite of two members of this House—one a junior member of the House, the other a junior member of the Government—to be wreaked on three innocent individuals who did not say more, who did not say as much, and upon whose dismissal depends the support not only of themselves but of their wives and families? Everyone who was in Parliament at the time, and everyone who has read the documents which are before the House knows that perfect freedom of political action was allowed to all the gentlemen who were appointed on the Debates staff in 1883, especially to the translators. It was known that they were journalists, it was known that they would be here as special correspondents or editorial correspondents if they were not here as translators, and it was admitted on all hands, as is proved, that they retained their political liberty. The only proper accusation that could be brought against them would be that they exceeded the proper limits by attacks upon members of the Government who were members of this House. It has been proved that their remarks were below the standard of the remarks which were hurled against hon. Ministers by some of their present supporters during the campaign in Quebec and the agitation which followed the death of Riel. Therefore there could be no reason for their dismissal. A great point has been made as to their attacking members of Parliament, but it must be remembered that at that time the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and the hon. the Secretary of State were not members of the House any more than the translators, or the reporters, or the pages on the floor of the House. They were simply citizens who were asking the electors to make them members of the House, and they had no more right to consideration than any other man who was asking for election. If the House were to be dissolved to-morrow, the hon. the Premier, except on account of his age and experience and his venerable appearance, would have no more right to ask for consideration than if he were the greenest farmer from a backwoods settlement. Neither the Premier nor the farmer would be a member of this House. In regard to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who is not even a member of the Cabinet, the case is much stronger, and I think the depositions, which I hope everyone has read or will read if he has not read them already, which were put in by that hon. gentleman in sup-

port of his own case, show that the language which he complains of as insulting to himself was not as strong as that which was used against the Government by hon. members of this House with whom he feels himself honored to associate to-day. That is the whole case, and I think the House, if it acts upon considerations of justice, will see, in the words of the amendment, that these men should not have been dismissed, even if it were within the Speaker's jurisdiction to dismiss them, and further, that it was not within his jurisdiction to dismiss them at all. But I waive the technical point, and I think I am within the facts of the case when I say that, if he had the jurisdiction, the facts did not warrant his dismissing these men.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know that I should have intruded upon this debate but for some remarks which were made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). That hon. gentleman indulged in some wit of the same kind as some others who have spoken on the same side have indulged in. I will only say this, that having listened attentively to this debate, my admiration for the logical power has been displayed on this side of the House, is only surpassed by the pleasure that I experienced at those witty sallies that we have been delighted with. It is evidently considered a triumph of humor on the part of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to refer to my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe as the member for Texas, and then correct himself as though he had fallen into that *lapsus* inadvertently. And when the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referred to my hon. friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) because that hon. gentleman most properly said "question," when the hon. member was travelling as far away from the question as any hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side and that, Sir, is speaking as strongly as one can—when the hon. member for East Grey cried "question," the refined wit, the high culture of the hon. member for North York, found expression in the declarations "it was a pity Darwin was not here, because he would be aided in finding the missing link." Well, Sir, I apprehend that the features of the missing link would at once be moral as well as physical, I apprehend that the intellectual and moral features of the missing link would find this peculiarity, that they would have no power of co-ordinating facts. Sir, I have listened to hon. gentlemen after hon. gentlemen here to-night, and I am bound to say that had I not heard them speak on other occasions, and if I had not heard them talk over the tea table down in the supper room, at times when I saw some evidence that they are capable of reasoning, I should have thought Darwin need not go to the member for East Grey, but he might find all the moral features of the missing link amongst hon. gentlemen who have been speaking on the Opposition to-night. Why, Sir, when I heard the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speak, I was amazed at his finding an analogy between the position of Dr. Kenealy, a member of the British House of Commons, and one of the gentlemen employed as translators in this House. But another hon. gentleman insists, in fact one hon. gentleman after another insists, that there is no analogy whatever between an ordinary sessional clerk and a translator though there are all sorts of analogies between the position of a member of the English House of Commons and one of the translators of this House. Sir, I fear that the brain of my hon. friend the member for Bothwell is a brain of defective analogies. My hon. friend is a learned man, he is a man of great industry, and his mind is stored with facts, but he is incapable of co-ordinating them, and the consequence is that he belongs to that race of statesmen who are very learned but who are always wrong. He is like a clock with an elaborate face to it, but that never tells the right time. I like to hear him, I like to look at him, but I will say this, that the genius of

persuasion may have kissed his brow, but it was with frozen lips. Now, Sir, there are three questions before this House. The hon. leader of the Opposition, like a statesman, raised the question of the jurisdiction of the Speaker. I will not trouble the House with going over the ground that was so admirably gone over by my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe, but I do say that he and the learned Minister of Justice showed clearly that the Speaker has jurisdiction in this case. Then the hon. member for Bothwell comes in with an amendment and he casts doubt on the position taken by his leader; to use the admirable expression of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, he proposes a vote of want of confidence in his leader. He says that even if the Speaker have no jurisdiction, still, under the circumstances of the case, the Speaker should not have dismissed these gentlemen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he had jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIN. Even if he have jurisdiction. I am obliged to my right hon. friend. That is not the only time he has corrected me; I am always satisfied to be corrected from that source. Mr. Speaker, he then, in a certain sense, proposed a vote of want of confidence in himself, and he goes on to say, as knowing that he had not taken a very secure position, that "in the opinion of this House the language used by those translators was not more violent than the language used by translators who have not been dismissed." Why, Sir, this is not a hasty utterance in debate, this is not a hasty expression, that the ebullient genius of my hon. friend might have led to; this is a carefully worded amendment, and what do we find? We find this hon. gentleman taking up this logical position that, because some other translators may have done wrong, therefore the translators whose wrong-doing has been brought to the attention of the Speaker, should go scott free. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and what would be thought of him, what would a judge think of him, if he were to defend a criminal at the bar by saying: "My Lord, I grant you that the case is very strong against this criminal, but there are at least half a dozen men just as bad who have never been arrested." As I say, Sir, it is part and parcel of the logic that has been manifested. Take this newspaper scrap business. The style with which they discuss these newspaper extracts! I have heard, Sir, of thunder and small beer, this is a case of thunder and big scissors. They come here with their newspaper scraps. What on earth does it matter to this House what the *Minerve* said? The hon. gentleman for Bothwell declared that he should approach this question in a judicial spirit—what does it matter to this House what one newspaper after another has said? The question we have to decide here, in the first place, is, has the Speaker jurisdiction? Then the other question has been raised, whether, if he has jurisdiction, he has properly exercised that jurisdiction. Now, Sir, about the accuracy of my hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). He brought that light, airy artillery of his wit and power on some hon. gentlemen opposite, and he spoke of the inaccuracy of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself declares that the three translators appealed to the Speaker, that they wanted an enquiry before the Speaker. He said that with the documents in his hands. What is the fact? They never did anything of the kind. They wanted an enquiry before the Debates Committee, of which I happen to be a member, and when the question came before that committee we discussed it very fully, and what we decided was this: That while we were seized as regards any question of want of efficiency on the part of these men as translators, we had nothing whatever to do with their conduct apart from that; and we referred the matter back to the Speaker. And what does the Speaker do? The Speaker meets that committee of the House that has charge of the conduct of

Mr. DAVIN.

what might be called the government of the household here. They met, they discussed the conduct of those gentlemen, and they decided that it was not in the public interest they should be retained. What idea have hon. gentlemen of what should be done? Did they suppose that it is to be accepted for one moment that if the conduct of every subordinate employé of this Parliament is not such as entitles him to be retained in the employment of Parliament, we are to meet every night like this, and hon. gentlemen are to come here with their newspaper scraps and give us these scissors rhetorics, all as to the question whether these gentlemen were properly dismissed or not? Why, the fact that we are debating this question here shows that if any wrong were done, the jurisdiction of the Speaker will not be final and we will discuss it here. Far be it from me to say one harsh word of those gentlemen. I do not know them. That profession is cognate to the profession that I once had myself, and my sympathies, so far as I have any sympathies, would be with them. But what do we find? The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) says that they apologised, he says that they expressed regret. I am sorry to say that the worst part of the conduct of those gentlemen is not, in my opinion, what they said on the hustings when fighting a political battle, but it was in the demeanor they assumed when dealing with the Speaker who represents this House of Commons. Their position is this: they defied the Speaker. They said: "You have no jurisdiction, we appeal to the Debates Committee. They say they have an independent position which has been recognised. And how do they prove this independent position? By answering that they are in the employ of the Parliament of Canada, in the employ of the Government of Canada therefore, which represents this House for executive purposes, and yet they can go broadcast through the country and try to lower the efficiency of that Government by lowering its dignity. Do hon. members think that the position is tolerable? The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) quoted certain dicta, but there are stronger dicta which the hon. gentleman might have quoted if he had thought of them; these are statements of a gentleman who will be thought the highest authority by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. I have the language before me of Mr. Blake, who said:—

"So long as nomination by patronage continues, resulting generally in the appointment of one friend of the party in power, it must be agreed in the course of time that public officers must dissociate themselves altogether from the field of politics. Everything pointed to the position that a public servant should be neutral—that he should have nothing to do with politics, that he should not consider himself the servant of the majority or the minority, but the servant of the whole people, that he should have such relations to the members of this House that the most active partisans on either side might have free, frank and friendly communication with him on public matters."

And yet with such statesman-like language on the part of the late leader of the Opposition, a man whom we all honor, a man held in reverence by the Opposition here, we have one member of that party after another rising and denouncing the Secretary of State, forsooth, because he gave expression to the very difficulty that has been sketched by Mr. Blake here. He found it difficult to meet those people he said; it was not pleasant to meet them; he could not have that frank and free discussion with them that Mr. Blake said was essential to that relationship not merely between a member of the Government and an employé of this House, but between the humblest member of this House and such an employé. That is not all. In the same speech Mr. Blake said:

"But there was a concurrence of opinion among both parties that their right ought to be simply the right of voting (that is the employee), and that any public servant who went farther than that went beyond the line of his duty, and deserved censure if not dismissal. He said dismissal."

Then Mr. Mackenzie in the same debate spoke equally strongly. He said:

"It was quite enough that they should have the right to vote under the law; but it was altogether intolerable that civil servants should actively engage as electioneering agents."

Of course, we have the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) saying that a certain Act, the Act that has been quoted, was passed before the *Hansard* staff was organised. What difference does that make?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the slightest.

Mr. DAVIN. It requires that particular perspicuous orb, of which hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side have command, to be able to see an analogy between a member of the British Parliament and one of the *Hansard* staff and to see no analogy between such an officer as is described in clause 16, and a member of the *Hansard* staff.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I am really sorry that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is not in his place, because he is a very learned gentleman, he is a distinguished graduate of Toronto University, in fact I think he occupies the second position, that of Vice-Chancellor of the University, and I will say this, that he is an honor to the University. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say that his biblical education has been neglected. I am very sorry that he is not here, for I should have liked to have given him a lesson on biblical literature. He spoke of the Government of Canada as determined to dismiss these gentlemen, and determined not only to dismiss them, but to dismiss some people whom he describes as devoted to the shamrock, and it was beautiful to see the Donnybrook Fair enthusiasm he got up about those gentlemen. He seemed to think this Government is determined to destroy the shamrock and *fleur de lis*. I apprehend those hon. gentleman of the Rouge party, the leading and active members of the party are not very devoted to the *fleur de lis*. I should have thought it would be quite another emblem they would have been devoted to. As for the Government going against those gentlemen or against the devotees of the shamrock where was the evidence? None whatever. No more than there was any evidence for the assertions of the hon. member that this or that person wrote such articles to which he referred. But my hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referring to the language that the Supreme Power addressed to Elijah said that the Government was determined to destroy anyone who would not "bend the knee to Baliol." Well, Sir, of course we have heard of Baal. I know Baal, but I am not acquainted with Baliol. There is a Baliol College at Oxford, but there is no connection whatever between the founder of Baliol College and the Baal that is referred to in that recondite quotation from Holy Writ. Sir, I am deeply grieved, I am grieved because I know something of the early training of my hon. friend, and I know he has been well brought up. I know he used to be sent to the Sunday School and that he was afterwards examined as to his achievements there and I am sure that he must have lately neglected his biblical studies to have given us that time honored quotation as "bends the knee to Baliol." But, Sir, he is not in a very bad position, because on that side of the House he has the assistance of my ingenious friend, who is the very learned member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I have no doubt they will bring out a revised edition of the Old Testament between them, and the next time I turn to Kings, I will find that "7,000 will not bow their knee to Baal," but "7,000 will not bow their knee to Baliol," and my hon. friend from Ann Harbor will declare that some editions of the Septuagint will be found with "Baliol" in it. Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to the great inconvenience that might occur if the doctrines of these gentlemen were accepted. Suppose we accept the doctrine of the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that any conduct, no matter how violent against a member of this House, and of which a member of this House had complained, must yet be overlooked by the Speaker. Suppose we accept that, why, Sir, the language may be used towards a man that this House would elect a Speaker, and the Speaker would have to come in contact with those gentlemen who have used opprobrious and offensive and insulting expressions for which they never apologised; because in those documents placed before us there is no apology and only to be found insult heaped upon insult. We have had the whole matter before us in the committee. Would it not be an unenviable position suppose my hon. friend the Secretary of State had been made Speaker, would the relationship be a pleasant one between those gentlemen and the Speaker. I think, Sir, it would lead to a great deal that was undesirable. Sir, I have heard a great deal about the rights of journalists here. I am a journalist if I am anything. I have heard a great deal about the rights of journalists, but I never have considered that it was the right of a journalist to use language insulting towards any man. If it is known that because gentlemen are journalists and have certain rights that they can come here and be employed as servants of this House and then go when they like and where they like and hurl insults and calumnies broadcast against some of the most honored men in this House, it would be a bad precedent. Why, Sir, the thing is perfectly improbable. I will say this in passing also that in this question we have nothing to do with the motives of my hon. friend the member for Richmond (Mr. Ives), or with the motives of the hon. the Secretary of State. I will not discuss their motives. I believe their motives to be good. I believe the Secretary of State, when he says that he is anxious for the dignity of the House, is sincere. Why, Sir, if a man occupying his position were not jealous for the dignity of this House he would not be worthy of his position. When he says he is jealous for the dignity of this House I believe him, but, Sir, I put aside the question of his motives. We have nothing to do whatever with the motives no more than a judge administering the law would have anything to do with the motives of a man who had brought before his attention a person charged with certain offences. All the judge would have to do in such a case would be to decide where the indictment lay, whether the charges were proved, and whatever the motives might be he would have to find accordingly. Mr. Speaker, I have brought before the House the points that struck me as I listened to this debate. I hope that my hon. friend, the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), will speak on the subject, and he will go more fully probably than I have into what was done in the committee, if he should think it necessary so to do. But, Sir, on this subject I may be permitted to express a hope which I trust will meet with the approval of the House. I do not know whether I should venture to express that hope. My hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke of himself as if he were an old member and he spoke of some hon. gentlemen as "boys in parliamentary knowledge" and "boys in parliamentary experience." Well, Sir, in the same way I am a boy in parliamentary experience as compared with my hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) and yet, Sir, I will venture—throwing myself on the indulgence of the House—to express the hope that the older members will set to young members such as I am a better example of deliberative discussion in this assembly; this the first deliberative assembly of English-speaking men after the Imperial Parliament, and that they will come here and debate as men with reason and with knowledge should debate and not come here reading bundles and yard arms long of newspaper extracts which have as much to do with the question and with the real issues as they would have to do with the attempt to square the solar parallax. I have heard of a man who, in solving the problem of perpetual

motion, said he obtained a complete solution by contemplating the durations of a chipmonk's tail.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of those officials has caused a considerable debate in the House. The translators are appointed by the House, the *Hansard* is a growth of the House and the officers are appointed by the House and not by the Speaker. They are not officers of the House in the same way that other officers are appointed. It was only a few years ago since the *Hansard* was instituted by the House and I understand and I expect that there should be fair play in this connection and that those who are appointed on the staff as translators or as shorthand reporters should bear a relative proportion to the strength of parties in this House. The translators, it appears, are eight in number. It appears that they took part in the election that was held in the beginning of 1887. It appears that both those who profess to be Conservatives and those who profess to be Reformers took part in that election, and I have no doubt they both displayed the same amount of zeal. I have not heard complaints against those translators who opposed gentlemen on this side of the House. It is well known that gentlemen on this side of the House are not apt to complain of every trifling case that arises. They have perhaps just as good cause as hon. gentlemen opposite to complain against these *Hansard* translators. It appears that at that time Richmond and Wolfe and the county of Terrebonne were without members; the House had been dissolved, and these gentlemen were not members of the House. These translators were, then only speaking of persons who were not members of the House; and if one side had a right, the other side had just as good a right to go out and take part in the election. It is not seriously contended that there shall be one law to govern those who are Conservatives, and another law to govern those who are Reformers. That would be a singular proposition to lay down; yet that is the principle on which the dismissal of these translators is based. I contend, and I think I contend rightly, that the Speaker has no authority to dismiss these translators; they were employed by the House, and can only be dismissed by the House. It is very probable that the translators did not know who the hon. member for Terrebonne, the Secretary of State was. It is probable that they had not heard of the greatness of that distinguished man, or read his life and times by one of the papers in the Province of Quebec. This work gives the portrait of this distinguished man. But I will trouble the House to read a little of the life history which it gives of him, and if these translators had seen this and learned the great height to which the hon. Secretary of State had attained in the political world, they might probably not have ventured to say anything about that individual. This history says:

"In the 5th century before Christ there appeared a man to whose ear all the people of Greece seemed attached. His insinuating and persuasive eloquence had crowned him king of speech, and his oratorical contests which were but one series of victories gave to his century the name of Pericles. What an admirable analogy between that phase of Greek history and the present time in Canada? In the two countries all depends on speech. The acts of the Governments are discussed openly, the people take part in Government contests. Speech is sovereign. The statesman should be an orator. And if Pericles at Agora, in Athens, defended the rights of his people, here the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in seductive accents of persuasive eloquence supports with energy the rights of progress and patriotism, everything connected with him recalls to mind that fine eloquence which fascinated and conquered antiquity and enlightened the modern world with the purest rays of oratorical art. It is not the harsh and dry speech of the ancient Romans which had its place rather in the bloody battles in the circus than in the debates in the forum, neither is that full and majestic eloquence, but an eloquence deep and often without originality of which Cicero is the most brilliant representative. Mr. Chapleau belongs to the finest class of exalted orators, the speech at the same time harmonious and sweet, his incomparable mastery of irony, the broadness of his views and above all his invincible love for his country have raised him to the rank of Demosthenes and Isocrates."

But I will allow the hon. Secretary of State to speak for himself. He appears to have been brought up with the

Mr. DAVIN,

culture which my learned friend here (Mr. Davin) talks about. Under circumstances so agreeable and so refined, here is what he says of himself:

"What is politics? Until now I thought that it was the science of men and things applied to the administration of public affairs. I thought that it was the art of instructing the people and directing them towards their destinies in the world. Was I mistaken? Am I therefore a simpleton? It is true that I was very young when I learned the element of politics. I liked politics before having known the way of interest, ambition or intrigue. I studied politics before having understood the narrow meanness or the calculating impudence which is connected with it. I had just left college. I had read in the history of my country that my forefathers came of a race which could be said with reason: *Gesta Dei per Francos.*"

That is what the hon. Secretary of State said of himself. He had studied politics before meanness and intrigue had entered into it; and this is the gentleman who insists on having two of his French compatriots removed for taking lessons at his feet, for standing on the same platform as himself and discussing public issues before the people. What were the reasons which led the Secretary of State to come and ask the Speaker to discuss them? It was for taking the same stand that not only he, but all the people in the Province of Quebec, took on that occasion. That is the head and front of their offending. That is why they are now being persecuted. I think the hon. Secretary of State has been studying intrigue to some extent since the time he went to school. Now we find him coming and asking the Speaker of this House to dismiss these translators, because he says:

"I could neither speak to them nor salute them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence within the precincts of this House is for me a nuisance to which it appears to me, no one has a right to subject a member of Parliament."

No doubt the hon. gentleman exclaimed to himself and wondered in his youth,

"Oh, why were voters made so coarse,
And M. P.'s made so fine?"

That is the sentiment he displays in the petty act of malice he seeks to inflict on these translators, because they exercised the privileges of British freemen at a time when they were not employed by this House to make known their opinions to the people among whom they lived. One of them states that he did not mention the name of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. What an omission? To imagine that any person could write the history of this country and not mention the name of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe! Scarcely, if he had written the political history of the Province of Quebec. I wonder at the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe being so terribly thin-skinned as to be offended at the language these men have used. It is true the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has been living away down in the sunny South for a certain number of years. It is true he has taken a certain amount of surplus cash and invested it down in Texas—in that land where they are so polite, and where they are so light and free, that when he comes back here to Canada he is astonished that gentlemen in Canada have opinions and express their opinions in clear, straightforward language without anybody gainsaying them. But the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, living down in Texas, having taken away the surplus earnings of the people in Quebec and Ontario and invested it there, says:—Why, it is a terrible thing?—that the presence of these translators in the House is disgusting to him. After a residence of three or four years in Texas, he comes back and finds they have used language he was not accustomed to hear in Texas, and which was very offensive to him. Here is what he says:

"He has also written several articles for the press, abusing me and the Government, and he was and is a violent partisan, unfit for the position he occupies and whose presence is distasteful to me. I cannot have any communication with him."

Poor fellow!

"I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

Just because his presence is distasteful. Is every hon. member to say that merely because an officer of this House is distasteful to him, that officer must be dismissed? What would we come to if such were the rule? Why, the thing is absurd. It is a monstrous proposition to make, that because an officer of the House is offensive to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, perfumed with the airs of Texas, the owner and master of a ranche down there, he must be dismissed. I wonder why we should discuss that question here at all. Why should we not discharge these officials right away? It was a terrible commentary on British institutions that they should think or say anything that would be offensive to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, with all his Texas air, brought up from the ranches of Texas; it is terrible that anything should be said against him, when he can stand the language of the cowboys and those who live down there. Now we find that those translators have not said anything that is very severe comparing their utterances and writings with the utterances of some strong supporters of the Government. We have a right to expect that the members of this House should set the example to the officials and to the people of this country by using moderate language. If they expect the people to be moderate, if they expect the officials of the House to be moderate, they should be moderate themselves. In this House we have occasionally heard observations made, which, if followed out, would lead to most disastrous consequences to those who made them, but time smoothes down all these acerbities. We remember in this House hon. gentlemen making serious statements against other hon. gentlemen, and yet we have found that time, that smoothing agent, has removed all those disagreeable reminiscences. We find those against whom the strongest epithets were used by leading members of the Government, afterwards honored by that Government, and recommended to Her Majesty as fit and proper subjects for royal decoration. Who can forget the observations made with regard to the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), by the right hon. the First Minister; we all remember the epithets which were applied by the hon. the Minister of Finance on one occasion in this House to that same hon. gentleman, and yet we see that same hon. member for Montreal West causing those gentlemen to go before Her Majesty and that he be named as one willing and deserving of knighthood. Would it not be more manly for the Secretary of State and for the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to allow time to heal this trouble and repair the wrongs that have been done? Why, this appears to have been a cold-blooded, premeditated thing. After the excitement had died away, three months after the elections, this Pericles, who, or his antitype, was born some years before Christ, lays this charge before the Speaker of this House, and the Speaker himself has made statements, I believe, just as strong against the Government as those translators have. The Speaker was just as much opposed to their policy in regard to the execution of Riel as were the translators. What did the Government do with him in order to convince this country of the insincerity of their course? They said to their friends and to the people: We have executed Riel, and we believe that we were right in so doing; we have been condemned for doing it, but those who were opposed to us were knaves, cowards and traitors. And the Government led the people to believe in the sincerity of that statement, but what do we find? We find that they appointed to be the first commoner the hon. gentleman who gave them abuse without stint. They showed thus there was no sincerity in all the appeals they made to the Protestant element. What was their great slogan against the Reform party in the last elections? It was the cry of danger to Confederation from French aggression. We were

told by the Tories that Confederation was threatened by the stand taken by the French, and the Government wish to show by the dismissal of these translators that they are going to do something to resist the aggressive character of the French people, in this House at least. I would, if I did not fear being taken up for reading language that might perhaps associate my name with literature of a peculiar character, read what the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance said, as reported in the *Hansard* of 1878. It is perhaps best not to read it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Give everything you can against him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have an idea that the right hon. the First Minister might probably not care to hear the language he used some years ago. I do not know that he ever publicly retracted that language, or that the hon. the Minister of Finance ever publicly retracted it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not spare him, let us have it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. As that seems to be the general desire, I will read it. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) was then a member of this House, he represented a constituency in Manitoba. There were some differences of opinion existing between the First Minister and the Finance Minister and the hon. member for Montreal West, and they set to work to clear up these difficulties the last day of the last Parliament of 1878. They came here and had a most animating—I do not know what other form of description I might give it, but I will let you judge for yourself as to the epithet that should be applied. After they had sparred, Mr. Tupper said: "Coward, coward, sit down." They went on a little further, and Mr. Tupper says: "Coward, coward, coward." Mr. Smith says: "You are the coward." They go on a little further, and Mr. Tupper says: "Mean, treacherous coward." Then Mr. Tupper says, "Coward, treacherous," and then Sir John A. Macdonald says: "That fellow Smith is the biggest liar I ever met." After language of that kind, I am somewhat surprised that the Secretary of State should feel keenly the language that has been used to him by these translators.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, but his dignity, you know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But at that time he was not a member of the House, and, although this historian says the Secretary of State is such a wonderful man, I do not know that he is of much better mould than the Minister of Public Works. I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works has learned intrigue or not. I understand the historian says that the Secretary of State did not learn any intrigue, and it appears to have been born with him, this air of lack of communication which he should have, and which every member should have, with the officials in this House. I think a more silly pretext to gratify a little personal malice and spleen has never been heard of. Look at the position in the Province of Ontario, which has been governed by that distinguished man, the Hon. Oliver Mowat, for the last sixteen years. Where do you find any evidences of this petty malice being visited on those who opposed him? Why, the greater portion of the Civil Service there are those who are politically opposed to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They were when he began, and they continued so as long as they lived, and their places were only filled when those had passed off the stage by death or something of that description. You never find and you never heard of a single instance where any such petty, dominant, arrogant assertion of power was observed or ordered by that hon. gentleman. This is but a prostitution of power to gratify some little political partisan spirit. This is unworthy of a Government, to take vengeance on those who are not officers of the Government but officers of the House. They went out three on one side and five on the

other. Look at the broad spirit which animates the Liberal party on this side of the House. We do not bring charges against those who oppose us. We do not descend to such petty meanness. We are too liberal in our views to do anything like that, but the Secretary of State coolly and deliberately, with malice—I say it deliberately—endeavors to ruin these men, and I believe there are some men on that side of the House who are willing to assist him. In my own riding, there are two gentlemen who have held positions under the Liberal Government of Ontario ever since I have been a member of the House. They both oppose me, and they go out and do their level best against me. I have never brought any charges against them. I have no doubt they have used language as strong against me as the language which has been used against this Pericles, this Secretary of State, but I have never brought any charge against them, and I believe it would be against dignity, against my dignity, to bring any charge against them if they had used such language. This is not the first evidence we have had of the narrowness which governs the present Administration, apart from the general policy of the Government, which is a narrow policy, a restrictionist policy, and their policy in connection with the Civil Service is just as narrow. Shortly after they came into power, when the Inspectors of Weights and Measures were good men, able men, honest men, capable men, appointed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), what did they do? They passed an Act of Parliament and cut off the heads of every one of them, merely because they were not appointed by that Government, because they were not creatures of that Government. You would imagine that these offices were unnecessary and uncalled for, but they turned right round and appointed others in their stead. That was a most arbitrary, a most narrow exercise of the prerogative of the Crown for the purpose of gratifying party aims. They gave as an excuse at that time that it was done for reasons of economy. Why, the Department at the present time is not as efficiently administered as it was then and costs as much. Those gentlemen gave out to the people that they were merely cutting off the heads of those officials to exercise more economy with the public money, but they turned right round and appointed others. You find the same thing in regard to little petty post offices. I applied for a little petty post-office, or I presented a petition from the people in a part of the riding I represent. They applied for a post office and asked me to present a petition to the Postmaster General. I did present the petition to the Postmaster General. It was a very important office. It was in a rural section. The salary of the Postmaster would be about \$10. But they were so careful that they would not be governed by the petition of the people, but had to look round for some Tory in order to find out who should be appointed Postmaster. If the affairs were administered in the interests of the people, it would be all right, but those gentlemen administer affairs altogether and exclusively in the interests of party. Then, before the election, there had been several rural post offices of small moment, but very much desired by some people in that riding, which had been hanging fire for four years, and just before the election those post offices were constituted, and the Government came out and said: See how vigilant the Government are in the interests of the people, when all that time the people had been petitioning for these post offices, and they would not establish them. That is the trouble with this Government. They do not consider the people at all. Their administration is entirely in the interests of the party. Whether the people petition, or desire, or deserve, is a question that does not concern them, unless they find how far it will serve their party. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) rebuked the member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He termed him Baal.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Here is an instance of Scripture repeating itself. Baal was rebuked by an ass.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman's knowledge of Scripture. It was not Baal who was rebuked by an ass; it was Balaam.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He also told us he was going to instruct the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) on bibulous literature. I do not know whether he thought the bibulous qualities of the member for North York had not been developed, and that he would instruct him.

Mr. DAVIN. That would be impossible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. At all events, he has shown us that he has seen the Bible somewhere. I suppose they have it up in the Prairie Province, and I recommend him to read it again. I say in conclusion that the motion that has been introduced by the leader of the Opposition, is, in my opinion, a correct stand for this House to take. I do not believe in allowing any official of this House to take away the privileges and the rights that the people gave to the members of this House, and when the members of this House appointed that committee on the *Hansard* debates, and when those gentlemen have discharged the duties entrusted to them with zeal and ability, then I say the Speaker of this House has no power to dismiss any of the officials appointed by this House unless he is directed so to do by this House. It is beyond his prerogative to dismiss them, and I consider that he has exercised partisan powers that should not emanate from the Speaker's Chair. The Speaker, of all gentlemen in this House, should hold the balance of power equal between the parties, and he should guard the interests of both parties, particularly of the minority. You will find that laid down by all constituted authorities, and every gentleman in this House must come to the conclusion from reading them that it is the duty of the Speaker to exercise that right and power, with which he has been clothed by members of this House, with fair play, with justice, and with equal rights to both parties. I think the Speaker travels beyond his prerogative when he attempts arbitrarily to dismiss any officials of this House before he has had the order from this House to do so. It is the power that creates that should destroy. The House of Commons alone should give instruction to the Speaker to have these officials removed, and if the Speaker attempts to do that without an order of this House, he is going beyond his jurisdiction. I think if the Secretary of State would only ponder over this question and reflect upon the language that was used of him by this author, whose name I do not know, if he calmly and carefully considered the opinion given in that paper, he would rise superior to this little petty malice, and would withdraw from the Speaker the request to have these translators removed. I think it would do him infinite credit with his wonderful abilities which have been paraded by this authority; it would show that he had a magnanimous heart in his bosom; I think it would do him a great deal of credit to reinstate these parties, and to let them go on and pursue the work which they have done with efficiency and despatch.

Mr. SPROULE. We have just had an exhibition of the logic that hon. gentlemen have given this House, and if close reasoning could prove anything, I think they might hope to accomplish a great deal by their arguments. It seems to have been the object of hon. gentlemen, from first to last, to steer as far from the subject of discussion as it was possible for them to do. The gentleman who has just taken his seat has travelled over very extensive ground, he has pressed into service almost everything that his fertile imagination could invent, but without touching the question at issue at all. His sallies of wit addressed to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) appears to be in harmony with

his reasoning. He referred to him as representing that character in the Bible where it is said that Balaam first spoke to that noted beast, the ass, but he did not tell the House that it was the ass who replied to Balaam. It was true that the member for Assiniboia made his criticisms, it was true also that a reply came back to him. If there was any analogy in the scriptural quotation, it must apply to the party that replied to Balaam, and if he himself be Balaam, who must the party be who replied to Balaam? The hon. member for Assiniboia made reference to the report, not a very courteous and gentlemanly one, that was addressed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to this side of the House, when "question" was called, because the hon. gentleman was wandering entirely from the subject. The hon. gentleman from North York gave his first edition of his speech before dinner. I think the House accepted it as his views upon the subject. But that hon. gentleman has this peculiarity, that he sometimes revises and gives a second edition of his speech. It is true that his speech after dinner was revised by the original author, but when we come to compare what he said before dinner with what he said after dinner, we may be charitable enough to suppose that there is a reason for excusing the great difference between the two. But coming more directly to the question in which we are interested, I think that when we adopted the system of reporting the debates of this House, and of translating them, we entrusted that duty to men in whom we had every confidence. Both sides of the House have a right to look upon those men with confidence, as honest men, as honorable men, as men who would not willingly misrepresent the statements of any hon. member; and if we afterwards find them using language the most intemperate, the most extreme, and I think I might say the most untrue, that could be either invented or spoken by one man against another; and if we find some of these same men coming back as translators for this House, how can we ever have confidence in them, that they will do their work impartially? But we are asked whether we are prepared to condemn the Speaker because he exercised what is recognised to be his undoubted authority in dismissing these men. I think both the law and the rules of this Parliament, as laid down by the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), must be admitted by every fair-minded gentleman in this House to be the correct rules, and to be the law which governs either the engagement or discharge of employes of the Government. I say we are asked to condemn the Speaker because he has used his undoubted right in discharging men that he believed were not fit to be employed in the capacity they occupy. Now, I think we can come to but one conclusion, after looking carefully over both the law and the rules under which he acted; and if we find that he has acted within his right, then I think we ought to sustain him. But if we go beyond that, and if we ask ourselves whether the language that these men have been charged with using is such that a member of Parliament could endorse, either in this House or out of it, against members of Parliament, I think we can come to but one conclusion. I may be pardoned if I give you some of the choice epithets which were hurled at heads of Ministers of the Crown in this House. I have here some of them, as given in a report that is before this House, and I assume it to be correct. It says that Mr. Rémi Tremblay courted the loss of his position. Now, I may say in passing, that hon. gentlemen opposite contend that this gentleman apologised for using language in the temporary heat of debate, that he might not have used under other circumstances. But instead of apologising, at the very time he used that language he stated that he was likely to be called to account for it and that he was willing to risk his position. Is that like apology? Hon. gentlemen defending him say this was done in heat of debate, and afterwards he made an apology. The same gentleman, I believe, if I have not forgotten the distinction

between the two, made a reference to that statement, and stated that he regretted that he was unable, except in an indirect way, to give the lie direct to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, that he was unable to do it to the Secretary of State, as he was able to do it to the member for Richmond and Wolfe. I say that was clearly the inference that must be drawn from the letter he wrote to the Speaker afterwards, in reply to the allegation set forth by the Secretary of State and by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). Did that look like an apology? It was rather a defence. He said they might be pardoned for having the temerity for standing by their convictions. They were honest enough to admit those were their convictions. And in my opinion it was a defence rather than an apology for what they had stated. He goes on to speak of those hon. gentlemen who represent the Crown to-day:

"Triumphant vice insults helpless virtue. Orangeism, that hideous monster which hell has vomited forth on Canada, raises its horrible head and casts a covetous eye on the prey which hateful treason is preparing to throw to it."

Is that language any hon. gentleman would tolerate against himself or any of his friends either in this House or outside of it? Is it language we should condone by allowing these men to hold responsible positions between two contending parties, believing that they will fairly discharge their duty impartially towards men against whom they have used such intemperate language. It is not reasonable, it is an insult to the intelligence of the House and of the people to say that we are obliged to retain such men in the employ of the Government, knowing they have used such very extreme and intemperate language. He says:

"The hangmen are jubilant."

Who are the hangmen? Those hon. gentlemen entrusted with the confidence of the people, some of them for more than a quarter of a century, those hon. gentlemen who stand so high to day in the confidence of the people as to have been returned, once, twice, three or four times not but very many times by enormous majorities. And those are the men designated as hangmen. He continues:

"They have succeeded in proclaiming to the world that we are a heartless and venal people."

Then he goes on to say:

"The re-election of all the hangmen Ministers, and the sustaining in power of Sir John Macdonald and his accomplices, stains with a fresh blot, still more ignoble than the first, our escutcheon, which had been already sufficiently degraded."

After the elections, when the country had given its verdict, Rémi Tremblay published the following:

"At last you have had your day of victory; you have insulted the country in its agony. For you, treachery is a title to glory; you heap opprobrium on the noble Gallic race."

"Everlasting shame to you, mercenary renegades, for whom lucre is the supreme law!"

"Courtiers of a sanguinary sect, traitors to your native land, traitors to your faith; degenerate sons of a manly race, conceived by self-interest, born of terror; applaud and shout for joy, you servile phalanx; we are branded, thanks to you, a heartless people."

And those men who used such language against Ministers of the Crown are men whom hon. gentlemen opposite would attempt to stand up and defend. I do not wonder that they themselves indulge in intemperate language both in and out of Parliament, when they are prepared to condone and to defend such language. I do not wonder that their followers use violent language, when hon. gentlemen, who by the rules of the House we are compelled to call honorable, defend such conduct either inside or outside of the House, they should be the last to do it. But the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in his celebrated after-dinner speech, which was so different from his before-dinner speech, when he might say of himself: It is not I that speaks, but the spirit within me—he was speaking out

of the fulness of his heart, said we hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for it, and we condemn them for it. Hon. gentlemen have been condemning them for years. They have held the Government responsible for years, and hon. gentlemen representing the Government and their friends in this House and the country are willing to bear that responsibility. They are willing to shoulder it, and the country will exonerate them for doing anything wrong. They say we hold them responsible for it and condemn them for it, and that some of us on this side of the House have dug their political graves. He spoke of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. It ought to be at least one consolation to the hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that when they have indulged in prophecy they have only made faithful that saying of the Scriptures which declares there shall be many false prophets in the latter days, because their prophecy has nearly always been unfulfilled. It has rarely ever come true, and therefore it carries very small weight with hon. members of the House. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) comes forward with an amendment which, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says in so many words condemns his own leader. I believe such to be the case. The hon. member for Bothwell goes further and lays down a proposition or allegation, the most unreasonable proposed by any man who pretended to have ability. What is the nature of the amendment? It is that if Mr. Speaker has the authority, under the circumstances, we think he was not justified in using it, and that in the opinion of this House the language those gentlemen used was no worse than the language used by other translators who are not arraigned before this House. But they are not men who were not arraigned, we are here to try. No matter how intemperate their language, we are not conversant with that language because it is not before us, but we are conversant with the language used by the gentlemen arraigned before this House and dealt with by the Speaker of the House previous to this debate. Those men are the men we are trying, and not those who have not been arraigned. It is absurd to contend that two wrongs ever make a right. If other gentlemen have been wrong that is no reason to say those men are right. It matters not what language may have been used by other gentlemen, the only language before us is that in the printed record, and it is for the House to judge whether that language was right or wrong. The hon. gentleman has referred to the conduct of various Governments, and has referred to employés of the Governments who have taken part in elections, and if you believe the contentions made by those hon. gentlemen, you would believe that both they and their party never indulged in anything like recrimination. Is not the history of the Government of Ontario, of the Government of Quebec, of the Government of Manitoba an argument to the contrary? All those Governments have adopted the same rule, and have invariably dismissed parties brought to their notice as violating this rule. It was only two days ago that we saw this occur in Manitoba in regard to a very large number. Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that Mr. Greenway had not dismissed civil servants who have been in opposition to his Government and to his party? And it is only within a few days past that he has been dismissing them. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Hon. Mr. Mercier in Quebec has dismissed those who are opposed to him? Why we see an account of it day after day. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Hon. Oliver Mowat is following out the same rule invariably in everyone of those cases? And if it has not been carried on to a greater extent it is due to the fact because it has not been brought to the attention of the Government. In every Province the rule has been carried out, and those parties have been dismissed. It

Mr. SPROULE.

is not for us to say to-night whether the principle carried out to extremes is right or wrong. It is for us to say whether we support the action of the Speaker in discharging what we conceived to be fairly his duty. If you go beyond that to say whether we believe the conduct of those men is entitled to be condoned or condemned by this House, I maintain that no matter from what point we view it, we are bound to condemn that language and bound to sustain the Speaker in his action. I for one am prepared to do so, not only on this occasion, but on every occasion where a charge comes before this House, no matter which side it comes from, and where I find the offence as grievous as it is in this particular case.

Mr. FISHER It is not my intention at this late stage of the debate to at all go into the question of the authority of the Speaker as to his action in the dismissal of the *Hansard* translators. There are one or two points I wish to allude to and which I will do very briefly. I was not at all surprised that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) quoted words from the Hon. Edward Blake's utterances upon constitutional questions and questions relating to the rights and privileges of people in this House. I have noticed on frequent occasions, Sir, that hon. gentlemen who differ from the Hon. Edward Blake on many questions when they wish to quote utterances of a broad and patriotic and statesmanlike character are obliged to go to the words of that gentleman to support their assertions and to make a point if they can. If the hon. gentleman's contention is correct that it is not right for public servants to engage in a political warfare I would like to know how it is that while the Secretary of State has insisted upon the dismissal of those three Liberal *Hansard* translators that he has not also insisted upon the dismissal of the other five translators who certainly have taken part in political discussions and certainly have taken a controversial position upon the political questions of the day. If the one side is to be dismissed and this is to be the rule of procedure by the Government, they ought to dismiss their own supporters as well. Perhaps I may not ask nor expect that they will agree to this. I do not believe, Sir, it is the intention or the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite to follow out that rule. I know, Sir, that in years gone by not only have they allowed particular supporters of themselves in the civil service to go to the country and canvass and work against gentlemen on this side, but I have myself in my experience suffered from that fact. Perhaps I ought not to say suffered, because I do not think that gentlemen who came to work against me accomplished any very great good for the party they worked for. In 1882 I was running for a vacant seat in the House of Commons, and a gentleman who was at that time in the employment of the Department of Agriculture was present in my county and spoke against me at various meetings and against the party to which I belonged with considerable vehemence and considerable virulence. Still that gentleman was not only not dismissed from his employment but he has since obtained preferment and advancement in the Civil Service at the hands of the gentlemen who employed him then to do that party work for them. I do not believe this is an isolated instance, for I know several occasions in which this occurred. I think the duty lies but ill in the mouth of the hon. Secretary of State and of the hon. gentleman now on the Ministerial benches to pretend for an instant that they are jealous of any abuses of a political character in the Civil Service which they control. But, Sir, I have no particular object in speaking here to-night, and it is to a large extent in consequence of the regret which I feel that the hon. Secretary of State in speaking of these gentlemen should, as I understood him, characterise them as blackguards and use very strong epithets in regard to them. I am not personally acquainted

with the utterances or speeches of two of those gentlemen. In regard to one of them, Mr. Ernest Tremblay, of St. Hyacinthe, I am well acquainted with his utterance, with him personally, and with his conduct in the campaign to which allusion has been made. It happened, Sir, that in the last general election for this Parliament Mr. Ernest Tremblay was in my county. Mr. Ernest Tremblay in that contest assisted me in my campaign and I can say most emphatically that not only is Mr. Ernest Tremblay a well educated, well informed, and cultured gentleman, but that on every occasion that he spoke in that country or in that campaign his utterances were uniformly characterised by extreme courtesy to his opponents and by an absolute and entire lack of any references that would be considered personal or against which objection could be taken. Not only can I make this statement but I have in my hand a letter which was addressed to Mr. Ernest Tremblay by a gentleman in my county who has managed and controlled and conducted the campaign against me. I will read that letter so that you, Sir, may understand that those are not simply my own experience that I am expressing with regard to Mr. Tremblay but that they are also the opinions of those opposed to him in that campaign and against whom he spoke not personally but politically. The letter is dated :

"KNOWLTON, 7th June, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 4th inst., I must say that I was present at most all the meetings you attended in Brome, P. Q., during the last Federal election. On no occasion did I hear you make a personal attack on any of the Ministers or any member of Parliament. You will pardon me if I say that I regarded your speeches rather as political lectures for a select assembly than as effective hustings addresses. You are at liberty to make such use of this letter as you please.

Yours truly,

"W. W. CUITO."

Now, Sir, I think that so far as Mr. Ernest Tremblay's conduct in the campaign to which allusion has been made is concerned, that this letter written by a former colleague of the Secretary of State, and a gentleman whose word the hon. the Secretary of State will take, and whom he holds in high estimation, will sufficiently dispose of the accusation in this respect. But, Sir, this is not the only proof that I have in regard to the conduct of that gentleman during the Federal election campaign. It happened at one time he was not occupied in my county and that he left my county to attend a public meeting in the County of Richelieu, at St. Roch. On the following day the *Sorelois* gave the following account of an encounter between Mr. Ernest Tremblay and Mr. Vanasse one of his colleagues in the *Hansard* debates translating staff. Mr. Vanasse was I understand at that time the editor or manager of the *Sorelois*, the newspaper from which I am quoting :

"Mr. Vanasse spoke the second time and then Mr. Ernest Tremblay, from St. Hyacinthe, not the one who attended the meeting held in this town last Saturday addressed the meeting in the interest of the liberal cause. If we do not always approve of the political opinions of Mr. Tremblay there is in his case one thing of which we do approve and which it is a pleasure and a duty for us to mention and it is his courteous manner of carrying on a discussion. The polite language which Mr. Tremblay used yesterday, contrasted peculiarly with the preposterous remarks and the rude and vulgar expressions of the young demagogue Lemieux, and the audience proved that people can perfectly make a distinction between a gentleman and a blackguard."

Here is the utterance of that gentleman's colleague, who met Mr. Tremblay on the hustings, and so far from characterising his language as the hon. Secretary of State to-day characterised it, as that of a blackguard—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. Secretary of State say he did not; I am glad to find that he was more guarded in his language and that he did not use this extreme epithet which I thought he did use; but I fear that some of the epithets he did use were almost as bad. But I am

32-1888-5

glad to find that one who was present at that meeting, and had a better opportunity of knowing what Mr. Tremblay's language was like, though politically opposed to him, has characterised it in the way I said. I confess I am very much disappointed to find that this question in regard to these gentlemen has been brought up again this session. I am surprised to find a gentleman in the position of the Secretary of State, who, perhaps, on the spur of the moment, immediately after the campaign, might have felt hurt by the language used, and might have been indiscreet enough to allow himself to be carried away by his personal feelings, and to forget the dignified position he ought to hold in this Government; I am surprised to find that he has nursed his wrath for a whole year; and that, instead of this matter being allowed to pass away as a thing of the past, his vengeance must be carried out to the end. I believe conduct like this is unworthy of a Government. I was going to say that it was unworthy of the Secretary of State, but perhaps I had better not. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that it is worthy of himself, I am quite ready to let him think so. I am not going into the details of the question as to who ought to dismiss these gentlemen, or as to how their action should be treated, which I believe has been thoroughly discussed by gentlemen on this side. I must again express my surprise that this action has been taken, as I think the question might have been left in abeyance and this discussion avoided.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not going to enter into this debate; but I desire, with the indulgence of this House, to read a speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which I intended to hand to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but which I omitted to do in time. The hon. member for South Oxford in the session of 1886 made use of these words :

"Now, I have always myself contended, and I am quite willing to give the gentlemen opposite the benefit of that contention, that if a civil servant, a man in the employment of the Government, chooses to step out of the line, and chooses to canvass or make himself conspicuous in opposition to the candidate of the Government, he must take the consequence. I have always believed that it is impossible to maintain the discipline of the service if that occurs."

Furthermore, he says :

"If the hon. gentlemen who are the subjects of this motion are prepared to show that this gentleman actively interfered. I say that I, for one, would sustain the action of the Government in dismissing the civil servant."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for North Bruce has correctly defined the position I have always held on this question. I am of opinion that a civil servant who intermeddles in political matters takes his political life in his hands, and must abide by the consequences; and all I would ask in this matter is that the same rule and the same measure be extended to all those gentlemen of the translating staff who have interfered in politics. If it be right to dismiss the one, it is equally right to dismiss the other. That is the position I hold on that subject, and I think it is a position which is pretty generally held. It was substantially the position which I understood my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) to take regarding the merits of the question. Here we have seven or eight translators, all of whom it appears have been interfering actively. Some two or three are selected for dismissal. My hon. friend objects, and objects very properly, to those who interfered on one side, being servants of this House, servants of the whole body, being selected for dismissal, and the others being let go scott free. That is the objection of my hon. friend, passing over for the moment the point as to who had the right to dismiss, which is an entirely different point. The question as we now have it, is on the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I believe. I am quite prepared to say that my own view of the case is that no civil servant at all should interfere in

elections, and I would go even further, as I have said many a time, and say that I think it would conduce to the general welfare of this community and to the welfare of the civil servants themselves if they were relegated very much to the position to which we relegate our judges, and required in elections to abstain even from voting. That, however, is another matter; but I still adhere to the position I have always held as to the interference of the civil servants in elections.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It appears to me that after the expression of opinion of the hon. member who has just sat down, this discussion is practically closed. In fact, the ground which has been taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition has been left altogether in the speeches which have been made, and especially in the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. In fact, most of those who have spoken have tried to cover their retreat by exhuming from the past some speeches which at the time they were made seemed to have been after their own hearts. Well, I do not care for myself if they are quoted in the House, and if they have the same significance now, I do not know that they will be very creditable to the opposition themselves. If it is true that a certain number of members belonging to the Conservative party thought it necessary, in fulfilling what they considered their duty, to condemn the Government on certain matters, and afterwards, felt it to be their duty, as between the two parties, to continue to support the Government in power, I think it is not very creditable to the Opposition to invoke those expressions at the present time. I think it does not reflect a great deal of credit on the Opposition to go on making those quotations, because, although we condemned the administration of the Government in some measures, we believed it to be our duty and in the interests of the country to support them in their general policy. In fact, at the last general elections, all the members who opposed the Government on the Riel question declared, with the assent of the electors in our Province, that they would support the Government of the day, because, after all, they are the only Government which could represent the true interests of the country, and because the people had no more confidence in the Opposition then than they had before. I think it is my duty to say a few words as to the policy adopted by the Debates Committee with regard to those appointments. Up to 1880, this House will remember that the Debates were given under contract. In 1880, official reporters were appointed, and the Committee then took care to declare by resolution that those reporters would be officers, under the rules and regulations of the Speaker and the Commission of Internal Economy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. DESJARDINS. In 1880, the official reporters were appointed regularly by a committee of the House, and the translation continued to be done under contract up to 1883. Then, when the translation was no longer done under contract, the committee did not consider it necessary to declare that the translators would be considered officers of the House; and it was only because they would not be obliged to do other duty than to translate the reports of the debates that they were paid only \$1,000 per session, while the reporters got \$2,000 with the understanding that after the session they would be at the call of the different departments or the Speaker to fulfil any necessary duty. That was the only reason why there was a distinction made, and we declared then that the translators would be only subject to the duty of translating the debates of the session. To show that we had no other idea, I will quote the contract that was made some years ago for the publishing of the Debates, by which the House will see that the committee understood then, that, being in existence only during the session, any work that was to be done after the House closed,

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

was to be subject to the control and authority of the Speaker. Here is the contract:

"That if at any time during the continuance hereof, the contractors shall fail to carry out and perform the conditions of this agreement and contract and all his obligations under the same, to the satisfaction of any committee of the House of Commons aforesaid, which may be duly appointed to supervise the reporting and publication of the debates aforesaid, if Parliament be then sitting or of the Commissioners under the Act respecting the internal economy of the House and for other purposes, if Parliament be not then sitting."

Mr. LAURIER. Parliament was sitting.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Parliament was not sitting. Suppose the translators after prorogation had taken place, neglected to complete their work, who would call them to time, if not the Speaker? The House having prorogued the Committee of Debates is no longer in existence, and consequently the Speaker or the Commission of Internal Economy must deal with the translators regarding the completion of the work or their conduct, should they fail to accomplish their work or behave in such a way as to incur the condemnation of the constituted authorities. Further, it will be seen by the order of reference that the committee is appointed to supervise the printing and reporting and publishing of the Official Debates. It has nothing else to do. When the Speaker, who has been very unjustly attacked by an hon. member here for having acted in a partisan spirit in that matter, was called to dismiss those translators, he did not rush into it, he did not immediately dismiss them, but he sent letters to those who had been accused, and gave them a chance to make any explanation they might think fit to make. In fact, he consented to send to the committee of the House of Commons the complaint of the hon. the Secretary of State and of the hon. the member for Richmond and Wolfe, only towards the end of the Session. The committee took those letters into consideration, and when they saw that the accusation was not about the way the work was done, but was with reference to a breach of discipline, they said: We have nothing to do with that, and referred it to the Speaker. The rules of Parliament must be applied in the settlement of the questions like this. If the committee had taken authority in this matter, we would have had two conflicting authorities. Therefore, the majority of the committee, after having considered the whole question carefully, declared they had but one thing to do, and that was to declare, as stated in the report that was laid on the Table at the end of last Session:

"That whereas this committee has been established for the special object of looking after the reporting, the translation, and the publication of the Debates; and whereas, the complaints of the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe against the conduct of the gentlemen connected with the French translation of the Debates, made to the Speaker and referred by him to the committee, appeared to the said committee to be in the nature of a question of privilege and discipline, and therefore do not fall under the control of the said committee, be it resolved that the said complaint, with the answers thereto, be referred back to the Speaker, to be dealt with by him as he sees fit."

Objection is taken against the Speaker's dealing with that matter, after that report was sent to him. It was not necessary that the report should be carried by the House in order to give effect to that resolution. We see that concurrence in the reports of general committees is not necessary unless the resolutions brought before the House involve an expenditure of money, or the appointment of some one, or some action to be taken by the House. In this case, there was no action recommended. We merely declared in that report that we had nothing to do with the question, that it was within the province of the Speaker and under the authority of the Speaker to deal with that matter. I find here, on page 452 of Bourinot, that:

"It is the practice to move concurrence in the reports of committees in certain cases. For instance, the reports on printing are invariably agreed to, as they contain recommendations for the printing and distribution of documents, which must be duly authorised by the House

Also, reports containing certain opinions or resolutions are frequently concurred in, on motion. But, when the report does not contain any resolution or other proposition for the consideration of the House, it does not appear that any further proceedings with reference to it as a report are necessary. It remains in the possession and on the Journals of the House as a basis or ground for such further proceedings as may be proper or necessary."

They make an accusation against the Speaker because he took action on the report. He could not do without it. In fact, the committee not only placed that resolution in the report which was brought before the House, but a copy was ordered to be sent to the Speaker himself, so that he was cognisant of the fact that the opinion of the committee was that it had nothing to do with that question of discipline, but that in its opinion it was for the Speaker to deal with it, so that the Speaker and the House were in possession of that report, and it was for them or for any member who did not agree with that report, or who did agree with it, to take any proceedings on the report, to rise and move in the House so as to deal with that report, either against or for. I think that question is pretty well settled. I think, after all, the discussion can be resumed in the reading of the clause of the statute, which I think is as clear as it can be. The question before the House as to the jurisdiction of the Speaker is plainly defined by the statute itself, which says:

"If any complaint or representation shall at any time be made to the Speaker for the time being, of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer, messenger or other person attendant on the House of Commons, now or hereafter to be appointed, it shall be lawful for the said Speaker to cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it shall appear to the Speaker that such person has been guilty of misconduct, or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown"—

They do not say if he has been appointed in such or such manner, or appointed by the Speaker, but he has not been appointed by the Crown.

"then, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

In fact, this has been so well acknowledged that since 1873, after the dismissal of Mr. Tassé, nobody was ever called to the Bar of the House when there was a complaint against him, but, upon calling the attention of the Speaker to the case, the Speaker would remove him, and that was all. I think that has been the practice. Some cases have been quoted, but I find there are others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has read the clause of the statute which says the Speaker has a right to remove or suspend an officer for incapacity or anything of that sort. I understood the hon. gentleman to argue that, in this case, that was a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the committee. If the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the statute applies to this class of cases, he will see that he must be wrong as to the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Not at all, because the House has given special authority to the committee to deal with the qualification of the translators. The House has acknowledged the right of the committee to recommend the appointment of the proper persons to be translators, and that is all the right given to the committee. In fact, that is precisely the explanation of that part of the clause of the statute. The House has legislated otherwise as regards the translation, because it has given the committee the right to deal with the qualifications of the translators, but, as to their behavior or as to questions of discipline, no authority has been given to the committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that provision is a statutory provision. The other is a mere resolution of the House, and, if he is right as to the construction of the statute, clearly no resolution of the

House can override the authority given by the statute, and then the committee cannot have any authority at all.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It has never been contested, and it has been acted upon as the policy of the House, and the rule adopted by the House was never put in conflict with the statute. The first appointments made were those of the official reporters in 1840. What does the resolution say, which was concurred in by the House?

"That, as greater permanency in the *personnel* of the reporting staff would ensure a higher state of efficiency, the committee would recommend that six reporters be engaged and recognised as officers of the House, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be enacted by the Commissioners for the Internal Economy of the House."

That was the declaration which was made when the first officers under the committee on the Official Debates were appointed. They were immediately acknowledged as officers of the House. It is true that, when the translators were appointed, the Committee did not find it necessary to make the same declaration, because it was really considered that these officers could not be treated otherwise than those who were the reporting officers of the House. They were the same officers, and were acting under the same authority, and under the same rule, and I do not think it can be contended that it has ever been the idea or opinion of the House that they would constitute two conflicting authorities in this House; so the Speaker remains the authority of the House, the guardian of the dignity of the House, the one to whom any member who has been unjustly dealt with, who has been attacked or calumniated or insulted by any of the officers of the House, must apply for redress, and I think that is the only conclusion at which we can arrive.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So many appeals have been made to me, to my good heart, as some hon. member says, that I cannot allow this debate to close without saying one word. If it was a question of personal resentment, I would answer immediately that I forget and forgive all that those gentlemen may have said against me. I have already shown my good will towards one of them, whose dismissal has been decided on by the Speaker, Mr. Poirier. He was a candidate against me in 1882 and in 1883, and in 1884 I recommended him to the *Hansard* Committee to be appointed as translator. It is true I was badly rewarded by him, as he said in the country that I must have lied here when I stated that I did not know he was an applicant for the position up to the time I had heard that he had been recommended. It is true I said that I was ready to forgive the past, and I said that he was qualified to be a translator. As for personal resentment, I have none. I only wish to maintain the authority of the Speaker, the authority of this House, and the dignity of its members. I say that the conduct of these men since the complaint was made against them, has been even worse than it was before against myself and other hon. gentlemen in this House. Since that time, if they had made the least apology to the Speaker, if they had only explained that the offensive language they used was in the midst of a wild excitement in the Province of Quebec, I would have been the first to ask the Speaker, and to ask my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, to forgive and forget. But instead of that, they have been defiant in this House, they have been parading themselves in the corridors, and their conduct is not changed. If the decision of the Speaker of this House is set aside, the meanest messenger employed in this building would have the same right to set at defiance the authority of the Speaker, and to treat the members of this House, whose servants they are, with contumely. Again it has been charged that I am actuated by spite. That is not so. I do not wish to refer to the quotations that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has made from the *Monde*, expressions that have never been written in the *Monde* by anybody who occupies a position here as a servant of the House. My hon. friend

has been mistaken, misinformed, his quotation is incorrect, and is not true. I have never been accused in the *Monde*, or even in the *Presse*, of being a public thief; he will never find that in these papers, and his quotation is untrue. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), said there was a great difference between people according to the salaries they were paid; and that a man who is paid two or three thousand a year would have more respect for the House, more respect for the authority of the Speaker, than a man who is paid only one thousand for three months' work. Sir, I do not weigh the honor of the House and the dignity of its members by dollars and cents. The man who works here for three months for one thousand dollars should be subjected to the same rule as a third-class clerk who works for four hundred, or a messenger for three hundred dollars a year. These technicalities of the hon. gentleman are not worthy of this debate. When I made my complaint before the Speaker I did it in accordance with the same principle that guided me in 1882, when I was Premier of the Province of Quebec. I had an Order in Council passed saying that members of the Civil Service should not meddle conspicuously in elections, and should not go on the hustings and oppose candidates. I was exactly of the opinion of the hon. member for Oxford. I say now that if any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House makes a complaint against one of the officers of the House, belonging to my own party, and if the hon. member says that offensive expressions have been used against him publicly, I would at once vote to dismiss that officer. In 1882, in that report to Council, I stated that it would destroy the trust, and confidence, and the harmony that should exist between civil servants and members of the House of Assembly, if the former were allowed actively to engage in politics. I was not alone in taking that course. On the 11th April, 1887, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, Premier of Quebec, whom the hon. member for Oxford banquetted and applauded last night, said the same thing that I did, and he dismissed, whom? Not merely a civil servant, but he dismissed Mr. Lanctot, interpreter in the Court House at Quebec, a man learned in the law, a Queen's Counsel, whose knowledge of both languages entitled him to serve as interpreter in the courts. Here is the reason given for his dismissal by the Premier of Quebec.

"That Mr. Lanctot has presented himself as a candidate, that he has defended one party and opposed another on the hustings."

And the Premier concludes:

"Under the circumstances, and applying the principles laid down by the Order in Council of the 20th April, 1882,"—

That was my Order in Council.

—"with reference to the interference of employés in the election, that gentleman is dismissed."

My course in this case has been consistent with my course in the Government of Quebec. I have always been in favor, without regard to one side of the House or the other, of discipline among civil servants, and if the Speaker's decision was not supported in this case, any or all the messengers might leave this House at will, and we might be insulted by them under pretence that they are citizens, and can say everything they please of members of this House. I was almost ashamed to hear some hon. members say to-day that we cannot be supposed to take notice of all the obloquy and calumny that may be heaped upon us. Then the hon. member for Bothwell said that hon. members with whom I shake hands to-day have used expressions against me as offensive as any that I have complained of. That is not true, but if it were true, I can still meet those gentlemen afterwards, and shake hands, and be friends with them, and sit on the same platform and in the same Government. A public man must have no resentments, because we do not know what a few days may bring forth, and we should always act honorably towards one

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

another. Some of my hon. friends have been sitting along side the Premier of this House, who were formerly strong opponents of his. The Hon. George Brown sat in the same Government with him, and God knows what they said of each other previously on public platforms. I know very well the hard language that has been used against me publicly by some hon. members who are now my friends, men who, at a time of great excitement in the Province of Quebec, expressed publicly their disapproval of the Government, but those hon. gentlemen never used in private such personally offensive language as would prevent us from meeting, and shaking hands, and being friends. Nobody will find in the mouth of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), for instance, who was probably one of those who was carried the furthest away in the excitement of 1885, that I was a public thief, that I was a dilapidator, that I was a liar. They will never find in the language of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who was also in that movement, anything of a personal character. We must make allowance for the expressions of public men on political questions, which are far different from private and personal calumny. These hon. gentlemen were members of the House, they were not asking for favors, they were not in the service of the Government, they were their own masters as well as we, and they had a right to stand up with me as an equal. The hon. member for Bothwell reminds me of a story. A cook once said to his master: "Sir, your expressions are such that they require us to meet in an encounter." The master said: "Very well, but you must first leave the kitchen, and then we will see about it." I have not done anything from a feeling of resentment or spite, but in my actions I have been inspired only by a feeling as to what is due to the honor and discipline of the House.

Mr. PLATT. I rise to express my opinion to the House, and I never desired to force it upon the House with more tenacity than I do at the present time, when I find my opinion differs from that of a large majority of those who have spoken upon this question. The people of the country may be listening to this debate with more interest than we imagine. Members of Parliament may think that in the present discussion they are supreme, that they are much better than outside people; and I apprehend that when we are in Session we are supreme, but when His Excellency dismisses us at the close of the Parliament, all the citizens are placed on a par. I differ from those on this side of the House, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite who have expressed the opinion that members of the Civil Service, especially members of that part of the Service who are essentially members of the House receiving their authority from Parliament, shall be debarred from the rights of citizenship when this country is called upon to express its opinion on public questions. That is the ground upon which I object to the opinion expressed on the floor of this House, that there is a certain class of our community that should be debarred from expressing, at any time, their opinions upon the questions of the day. I am prepared to take my stand upon this ground, that even the Civil Service, even the *Hansard* translators, and above all those who are employed in the public service, the same as I might employ men in my service, should be debarred from citizenship, is to me something repulsive. I cannot for a moment accept the idea that we in this country, having so few people, a few millions, having as many thousands as we have millions in our employ, should allow men to be made slaves, should allow their intelligence to dwarf, should have no opinions of their own, should not dare to enter on public discussions when a general election comes round. I grant that during the session of Parliament they should act with a certain amount of courtesy to members of Parliament; but when His Excellency dissolves Parliament and an appeal is made to

the people to express their opinions on the great public questions, then I say a civil servant is just as good as a member of Parliament or any body else; there is no man in this country having a right to vote who has not a right to express his opinion. It is only a matter of degree. Members of Parliament face each other, draw the sword of warfare and tell each other what they think face to face; but are we to suppose that those who are in the employment of the House of Commons or the departments of the Government have no opinions on these questions? If they have opinions, why in the name of common sense, should we not allow them to express those opinions. I take it that the moment His Excellency dissolves Parliament the people of the country are in common, no man is better than another, every man should be allowed to express his opinions just as he thinks, and although the Secretary of State may think that at certain times and on certain occasions it behooves a member of the Civil Service to pay obeisance to him or a member of Parliament, there is a time when these men feel they have within them just as much manhood as I have or as is possessed by that hon. gentleman or any member of Parliament. Why should we ask them to deprive themselves of the right of citizenship and the right to discuss the public questions of the day; and if they do express an opinion, why have they not the right to express an opinion just as strongly as has a member of Parliament? I wish no dividing line between the citizens of this country; I do not believe there should be a class of men who should make themselves slaves because they serve Parliament or the Government. Let us all be free men, let us have free speech, free thought, free action. I do not believe hon. members on this side need be afraid of the civil servants in the employment of the Government unless we have done something wrong, and hon. gentlemen opposite will not fear the expositions which intelligent men such as the translators may offer unless they have done something wrong. When we find these men acting upon their common rights as citizens, when they are manly enough to go forward on the public platform and expound their opinion on public questions, is that a reason why we should have them dismissed from their positions and slaves instead of free men occupy the positions which they occupied before? On no other subject do I feel more keenly than this, that we are not a sufficiently large population in this country to have any large number of our citizens made slaves, unable to express themselves, unable to vote, unable to act as their conscience dictates. I claim for civil servants of the country, for the *Hansard* reporters, for the translators that they are citizens as much as you and I are, Mr. Speaker, and while I do not question the legal right of the Speaker to act as he has done—that is a part of the question I leave to old parliamentarians and lawyers—but as citizens I think they have the same right as I have or any member has to act at a general election just as each man's conscience dictates. I say, therefore, that we should not support the dismissal of any civil servant so long as he acts as I act and anybody else acts according to his conscience and the best interests of the country which it is his bounden duty to serve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I cannot earn the applause of my friends behind me, because I am not going to make a speech on this occasion. The subject has been fully discussed on both sides, every hon. member understands the question and the various phases of it as they appear in the different speeches addressed to the House. I am satisfied that the Speaker had the power which he has exercised, that the power was given to him by the complaint addressed to him as to the conduct of these three persons mentioned. I am satisfied these three persons come within the purview of the statute, that they are persons attendant upon the House, and, therefore, if the mis-

conduct has been complained of, it is the Speaker's duty to act upon it and within the scope of his power to do so; and I also think, after hearing the language that has been used, and after an inspection of the papers laid before the House, that these men richly deserve the exercise of the power by the Speaker. I therefore, move in amendment to the said proposed amendment, that all the words after the word "That" in the original motion, where it appears the first time, be struck out, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

"Mr. Speaker, in dismissing Rémi Tremblay, E Tremblay and A. E. Poirier from their offices of translators of the Debates of this House, has acted within the scope of his powers, and has exercised such powers with a due regard to the dignity of this House, and to the consideration and respect due to its members."

Mr. LAURIER. I have just one word to say in answer to the right hon. gentleman. If the same measure of justice is to be applied to all the offenders who have equally offended in this matter, the resolution of my hon. friend does not go far enough and it should include all those who being actual officers of the House are not only during the elections, but are day after day writing letters and writing correspondence to their papers upbraiding members of this House. The practice should not be tolerated at all. I have said in my opening remarks and I repeat it here that it should not be tolerated that an officer of the House should engage in active politics. I think the principle is a wrong one. I agree with my friend from Oxford. I agree with everybody who has spoken on this side that if my hon. friend the Secretary of State wants to pose in a magnanimous position it does not lie in his dismissing men because they offended him, but let him say, we have been violating the rule, let us make a new rule and let us forget the past, and then we will think it magnanimous. Notwithstanding what my friend may say, I cannot believe he is actuated unconsciously, perhaps since he protests with anything but resentment. If he were not actuated by resentment he would say: I will make it a rule that those men will not in future trespass against the privileges of this House; but the result will now remain with the connivance of the hon. gentleman who leads this House that three men will be selected because they have not offended against the majority, and those who offended against the minority will be paid and protected by the majority of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to make that charge against us. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause he will see that the Speaker has no power to dismiss or suspend an officer except a complaint or representation is made against him. A complaint and representation was made to the Speaker against those three men. No complaint or representation was made against the other five men of which the hon. gentleman now speaks, and until a complaint or representation was made to the Speaker he did not interfere. It was such complaint and representation that invested him with the power, and if a complaint or representation is made to the Speaker about the other parties at any time I have no doubt that the Speaker will take the same course in respect to those other parties as he was obliged to take on the representation made to him respecting the other three.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say one word in answer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not make such a complaint against any of those translators here on the Debates, because they have been allowed the right in the past and I would think it unmanly on my part if I were to make any such complaint. I have a paper here full of extracts. It is true that I am not called a *pendard* or such expressions but I am treated to things not at all flattering of myself. I will not make

any complaint against those translators so long as it is allowed by this House that they have a right to engage in politics or anything else after the session. So long as that is not forbidden I will not make a complaint.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not taken any part in this debate, but I have listened to it with a good deal of attention and I am surprised at the course taken by the right hon. gentleman in moving this amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course I expected that the *claqueurs* behind him would interrupt. I knew what was to come and I expected it.

Mr. RYKERT. You have been there.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have never been there a tool. I am surprised at the remarks of the right hon. gentleman. He says it requires a complaint to be presented to the Speaker before action can be taken by the Speaker in dismissing those men. I am not going to discuss the question whether the Speaker has the power to dismiss them or not. That has been discussed by other gentlemen in this House. In reference to the conduct of the right hon. gentleman who professes with such humility and suavity to present to this House the position in which the matter stands I am going to say that this debate has shown the other five translators are guilty of the same things as has been alleged against the other three. Those allegations have been made by gentlemen who occupy a position in this House which entitles their statements to be received with reliance and respect. The right hon. gentleman instead of moving an amendment to dismiss those men, who from enthusiasm or strong party feelings might be led away by the practice which prevailed—not alone amongst the employés of Parliament, but amongst the employés of the Government in Ottawa and elsewhere, who have taken part in public contests—I say it would have better become the right hon. gentleman if he had taken the stand, that after hearing the allegations against those three men, he should defer the matter until he considers the case of the others. I am not going to justify those men, for my opinion is this upon that question: that the employés of the Government, or the employés of this House, ought to refrain from taking any part in public contests when a contest is going on. They may have their opinions, they may even state their opinions, I would concede that, but they cannot take any very active part at all events in any public contest that goes on. It would better become the right hon. gentleman as arbitrator of the affairs of this country and as the absolute autocrat of this House if he in this case said: Those three men have had a charge laid against them because they have chosen to attack the hon. the Secretary of State and the case of the other men who were equally guilty upon the statements made in this Parliament, and upon the honor and responsibilities of members of Parliament must be considered. It would have been better for the right hon. gentleman to have taken the course, if he desired to be fair, of giving those charges consideration and if those other five men are equally guilty to deal out the same treatment to all alike, because hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have brought charges which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have refrained from doing, he should not dismiss those three men and keep the others in office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. Oh, oh! It would better become the right hon. gentleman, if he desired to show any spirit of fair play and distribute that justice which he professes to distribute, to have said to this House: We will defer consideration of this matter until we have considered the cases of the others and are in a position to treat all

Mr. LAURIER.

alike. For my part I shall vote against the amendment not because those men have the right to interfere in public affairs at all, but I vote against it as a protest against the injustice done to those men by the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister professes to act in a fair manner towards those three employés of the House whom he says have been complained against and who deserve dismissal. The hon. gentleman knows that the members on this side of the House have again and again proposed that those employed in the public service should cease to be political partisans on either side the moment they are employed. That is a principle which the hon. gentleman has never conceded, and so far as those translators are concerned it was said at the time of their appointment that the House gave employment to them but for a very small portion of the year and that their salaries were less than the ordinary reporters upon the Official Debates, and that they were to be at liberty to engage in ordinary avocations whenever they were not employed here. It was well known at the time they were appointed that some of them were on the political press of one side and some on the political press on the other side, and it was expressly stated by the committee at whose instance they were appointed that they were not to be interfered with in their political freedom or independence. That was the position in which the parties stood, and the hon. Secretary of State has complained against those men for exercising their rights as free men.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and the hon. gentleman who moves the amendment is acting on that assumption. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that he caused to be appointed here a number of men who were engaged as reporters on the political newspapers supporting him, as extra sessional clerks at \$4 a day, and that they never wrote a line in the public service, but received their \$4 a day to contribute to those newspapers which were weekly employed in maligning and misrepresenting hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. And now, for him to say that he is prepared to sustain the Speaker in dismissing an official the moment he is complained against on that side of the House, is a very extraordinary statement to make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I will not charge him with saying it, but I will say that the hon. gentleman is prepared to sustain the speaker in dismissing an official from the public service as soon as he attacks any one on that side of the House, but he is not prepared to dismiss him when he attacks hon. gentlemen on this side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that either.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, that is the clear inference, not only from what the hon. gentleman has moved and said, but from what he has been doing for the last ten years. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to this section of the Act, because I do not think it is open to the construction the First Minister has put on it. At all events, that is not the clear and obvious construction that has been put on it by the House. What has the House been doing? A committee of the House has been appointing certain officers; it has exercised supervision over them; it has done what the Speaker is authorised to do with regard to the officials here spoken of; it has judged of their fitness, and has decided whether they ought or ought not to be retained in the service. It is well known that no decision of this House can override a statute; but if these people come under this Act, this committee has been overriding this statute. The term "other person" in the Act does not refer to this class of officers, but only to those

who are appointed either by the Speaker or by the Crown. These officers are appointed by neither, and therefore the House has properly interpreted the Act in authorising a committee to judge of the fitness or unfitness of these men, and not the Speaker. The House has for the past five years been assuming that by doing this it has not been going in the face of this statute. Without interfering with the statute at all, the services of these men might be dispensed with precisely as they were appointed, by resolution of this House. Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear that the resolution of the hon. gentleman is a mere *ad captandum* resolution. It is one intended to perpetuate a personal wrong done to these parties. It affirms a jurisdiction which under the provisions of this law is not given to the Speaker. It is making the declaration that the House has for the past five years been guilty of a usurpation of functions not given to it by the Act. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say it is impossible for him to escape from that position, and he now asks the House to stultify itself and to declare that it has been acting contrary to the provisions of the statute for the last five years. I trust that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House, at any rate, will be guilty of so gross an act of inconsistency, as well as so gross a wrong, as would be effected by the adoption of this resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking to the question. If the hon. gentleman who is interrupting me had one tithe of the interest at stake that there is at stake in this matter, he would be ready to spend half a night of the time of the House; and he is ready to do a gross act of injustice to three men who have done no wrong and who are entitled to his protection. The hon. gentleman who is interrupting me is ready to take the bread and butter out of the mouths of men who are just as honest, as intelligent, as earnest in defense of what they believe to be right and fair, as the hon. gentleman himself is. It is a matter of too much consequence to those parties to be treated as cavalierly as the hon. gentleman proposes to treat them. Here are men who are shown from the extracts that have been read to have said more violent things of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches than those whom they propose to dismiss, and they do not even complain of them, because they belong to the party behind them; and they now level their attacks daily against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and are maintained in that position. Sir, this resolution is a resolution to discriminate between men belonging to different political parties. It proposes to mete out one measure of justice to one portion of the public service, and another and different measure to another portion, and I trust, Sir, that this country will not fail to mark the course hon. gentlemen opposite are taking. Why, the right hon. the First Minister sustained here last year a man who, in violation of his oath of office and in violation of the statutes, did a gross wrong to eighty members on this side. And what has he done to him now? He has put him into the Agriculture Department, in charge of an important portion of the public service, with a salary of \$600 or \$800 more than he received before. It will be possible, with that fact before the country, to convince any one that the hon. gentleman proposes to punish these men, not because they have done a wrong, but simply because they happen to be Reformers.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald.)

YEAS :

Messieurs

Audet,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brown,
Bryson,
Burns,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Chisholm,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Colby,
Corby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coulombe,
Couture,
Daly,
Daoust,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Deaision,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dickinson,
Dupont,
Ferguson (Leeds & G.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Weiland),

Foster,
Freeman,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guilbault,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hall,
Henderson,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Joncas,
Jones (Digby),
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Labrosse,
Landry,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Macdonald (Sir John),
Macdowall,
McGilla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (C. Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLellan,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,

Mills (Annapolis),
Moffat,
Moncreiff,
Montague,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Patterson (Essex),
Perley (Assiniboia),
Porter,
Prior,
Putman,
Reid,
Riopel,
Robillard,
Roome,
Royal,
Rykert,
Shanly,
Small,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Pictou),
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wilson (Lennox),
Wood (Brockville).—113.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Bécharé,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brien,
Burdett,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Choquette,
Chouinard,
Cook,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dessaint,
Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,

Ellis,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Geoffrion,
Godbout,
Guay,
Holton,
Ives,
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier (Montmor'cy),
Langelier (Quebec),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIntyre,
McMillan (Huron),

McMullen,
Meigs,
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Préfontaine,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Rowand,
Ste. Marie,
Semple,
Sutherland,
Trow,
Turcot,
Watson,
Welsh,
Wilson (Elgin).—61.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Motion of Mr. Laurier, as amended, agreed to on the same division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:55 a.m. (Thursday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 12, 1888.

No. 33.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GAMING IN STOCKS AND MERCHANDISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill from the Senate (No. 95) respecting Gaming in Stocks and Merchandise.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved that the petition of the Central Railway Company, which was reported on and not allowed by the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration. He said: The objections which were taken to the Bill when it was before the committee have since, I understand, been removed.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: This Bill makes one or two not very important amendments to the present Act, and provides for the issue of permits on examination and report by the Inspector of Boilers to persons who carry passengers on their boats in certain waters, which are defined.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

DETENTION OF A REGISTERED LETTER.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay to Mrs. Barbara Winkler, of Newstadt, the balance of principal and the interest on the sum of \$689.60, contained in a registered letter sent her by the Bank of Commerce, Walkerton, on the 22nd of June, of which sum she received only \$688.80 on the 12th of December, 1887, and whether any steps have been taken by the Government to discover and punish those guilty of the detention of said letter?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member is authorised to ask this question by the hon. member in whose name it stands?

33-1888-1

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be better to state that, as otherwise it would be irregular.

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has made no payment whatever to Mrs. Barbara Winkler, of Newstadt, on account of the money contained in a registered letter to her address which was lost in the Walkerton Post Office. The money paid to her was paid by the postmaster of Walkerton, whose office was responsible for the letter going astray. Mrs. Winkler has received \$688.80 out of the amount of \$689.60, and for the amount of 80 cents remaining unpaid she must prosecute her claim against the postmaster of Walkerton. The case was thoroughly inquired into at the time by the Government inspectors, but they were unable to discover that anyone connected with the Post Office Department was in any way responsible for the loss of the letter.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE DEBATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the House to the numerous complaints that have been made by members of the press, that they have not received, as has heretofore been the custom, copies of our *Hansard*. I think some of the hon. gentlemen who preside over the distribution of the *Hansard* are here, and I would be glad to know from them if steps have been taken to remedy these complaints, because I must say it has been most unfortunate if the *Hansards* have not been distributed to the newspaper press regularly. It is almost the only way in which the people at large can obtain a reasonable return for the very large sum of money the Debates cost us; and if through any inadvertence that has been done, I hope that members of the committee will rectify it without delay.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not know the reason of the failure to distribute the *Hansard*, but I know that the committee has given no orders to have the supply cut off. I will enquire and ascertain why it is that the Debates have not been sent out as usual to the newspaper press.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may remark upon this point, that I enquired at the *Herald* office on Saturday in reference to the complaints that were made, and I find that we received the copies of the debates. But I understand that country papers are complaining that they have not received it. The city papers I believe have no cause of complaint.

Mr. HESSON. I think that hon. gentlemen are under a misapprehension upon the whole question. Complaint is not made by the newspapers that they are not receiving the daily issue of the *Hansard*, but that they are not supplied by the Debates Committee with a bound copy.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, no.

Mr. HESSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. You hear that complaint all around the House, and if you will simply open your ears you will hear it from the gallery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I mentioned the matter is that I have received information that during the last debate the *Hansards* have not been supplied to the country press.

Mr. GILLMOR. It occurs to me that we should distribute rather the corrected copies of the *Hansard*, instead of the daily issue. I think the corrected copies of the *Hansard* is what should be distributed to the press. All the members of Parliament get the first copy before it is corrected, therefore they have it as it is taken by the reporters. But these copies that are not corrected go over the whole Dominion, and the people see the report of a man's speech with all its imperfections and the mistakes that may arise in taking down the speech, or some omissions that may have been made. He meets that everywhere, and he says: "That is not my speech as corrected." All the members of the House have an opportunity to correct their speeches, and it is the corrected speeches, in my opinion, that ought to go to the country; then, whenever a member is called to account for his speech, he refers to the corrected copy, and there is what he said. Of course you may say that members may alter their speeches; but I think there is not much danger, because the whole of the 211 members have heard the speeches, and if there has been any alterations made, it can be detected. But sending out the daily issue is a great evil, and I think it would be better to have the corrected copies go out to the country and the press. I am anxious that the press should have just what an hon. member said, and intended to say.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the hon. member that the *Hansard* should be corrected before it goes out. I will give you an instance in point. When I was speaking here the other day, I made the remark that I had "a boatswain" in my employ, and it was taken down as "a Boston man." Now, I am sure that no hon. member of this House would wish a statement of that kind to go to the public, an incorrect statement. I think the suggestion of the hon. member is a very good one, that we should send out the corrected report, and I think the hon. gentlemen who have control of this matter should take it in hand.

Mr. EDGAR. I see that the hon. Minister of Customs is in his place, and he can recollect that on Monday he suggested an amendment to the motion that I made for papers and correspondence between the Canadian and American Governments about wrecking vessels, limiting that motion to the papers since the last return; but he was not able at that time to tell the House what the date of the last returns was, and he said that he would do so. I would like to know from him the date of the last return, so that we may refer to it. I would like also to suggest to the Minister that the returns should be brought down at as early a date as possible, in order that it may be before the House when the Bill comes before us on that subject which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has in hand. With reference to the matter which was spoken about just now, the *Hansard*, I quite agree with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) in reference to imperfect reports. I remember that on a former occasion—if I may be allowed to refer to a former debate, without being irregular—I happened to remark that an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House spoke with the airs of "Turvy Drop," and I was horrified to see in the *Hansard* next day that I was charged with saying that the hon. gentleman spoke with the airs of "a turkey cock."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We have had all these questions in the past in connection with the *Hansard*. If you adopt the principle that none shall go to the country except those that have been previously corrected, it simply postpones the receipt of them by the newspapers for several months. Now, any one who knows anything about newspapers, knows that they cease to be of any value if they do not get the material with which they make their comments for two or three weeks after the event, when the matter ceases to be of any practical interest. The mistakes that the gentleman refers to are mistakes that are almost in-

evitable, and I think that we may fairly say of the *Hansard* staff, and the reporting of our debates at the present moment, that I do not think there is to be found anywhere—and I use that term in the broadest sense—half a dozen gentlemen who do their work more conscientiously, and on the whole, more satisfactorily, than the gentlemen who are at the table now. The other question, as to whether the debates, as officially revised, should go to the press, is, of course, a separate question altogether, and it involves a separate explanation. For myself, I would like very much to see them get the corrected copies, because all these reports are matters of record, and newspaper editors, in discussing these questions later on, have to refer to the *Hansard*, and it is a very decided advantage if they can refer to the corrected copy, as bound. As for these little errors that occur, where one hon. gentleman says that he was made to say he was employing a Boston man instead of a boatswain, and the other remark, that an hon. gentleman spoke like a turkey cock instead of Turvy Drop, these are mistakes that almost any person in hearing them, especially the latter, might make; but these are technical errors that are of very little importance. I think it would be a very serious matter for the press if they did not get the *Hansard* before it had passed through the hands of the members, and through the hands of the printers the second time.

Mr. TROW. It has often seemed astonishing to me that there are not more errors in the *Hansard*, and I am frequently astonished to find the speeches of hon. gentlemen so correctly reported. Private discussions go on all round the Chamber when hon. gentlemen are speaking, and I am surprised at the accuracy of the reports; it is evident to me that the reporters are thoroughly up in their profession, or otherwise they could not perform their duties in the perfect manner they do perform them.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, when this subject is under discussion, it would be well to have a general expression of the House in regard to it, because I believe the opinion is prevalent throughout the country that it would be a great improvement, even with the delay that would occur, if a revised copy of *Hansard* were sent to the press. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says it would be a serious matter if it was not sent out immediately to the press, but, in any event, the copies of *Hansard* can only reach the press a hundred miles or so of the capital within a day or two, those going down to Prince Edward Island, Halifax, Manitoba and British Columbia not reaching there for several days. It could not make much difference if there was a few days' longer delay, provided a correct copy was sent out. The *Hansard* is referred to principally by the weekly newspapers throughout the country, and if *Hansard* sent out this week were too late for next issue it could be used the following week, and it would be almost equally fresh. Complaints are constantly received in regard to this matter. Members are called upon to account for speeches they make in this House, and they are able to question what it was represented they did say, and they were entitled to do so, because they did not correct the original copy of the report. When we consider the difficulties the reporters have to contend with, first, in regard to hearing accurately what is said, then in taking it down, then in transcribing it, and inaccuracies take place; add all these together and it will appear that the daily issue sent out is literally full of mistakes and of little or no use. Now, we can easily get the copy of speeches within twenty-four hours; twenty-four hours after that I think almost every member would correct it, and we would have a delay of only two days, and a great benefit would accrue from a correct copy going out of what members said, and which they must stand by, and for which they would be expected to be held accountable. It is most important that this should be done, and from the expressions I have heard from differ-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ent members on both sides of the House, this amendment should be made so that correct copies would be sent out.

Mr. LAURIER. There is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and it is the most objectionable practice which has grown up of late, and which, if pursued in, will surely impair the good relations that ought to exist between the two sides of the House. Every division we have had during the present Session has been characterised by most offensive manifestations on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite against some hon. members on this side of the House. There seem to be some hon. members who are made the butt for hooting and insults. Hon. gentlemen opposite must admit that if the practice is continued it must provoke retaliation, and retaliation would be far more desirable than the practice itself. I can understand there will be, and must be, differences of opinion in the House, but every member has a right to expect that his opinions will be respected by his colleagues. In so far as I am concerned in this matter from the position which I occupy, I shall endeavor to see that not only the debates but the proceedings will be characterised and conducted—and I invite the co-operation of my hon. friends on this matter—with that courtesy which should prevail in such an assembly as this. At the same time I shall expect that the same courtesy be extended to us by the other side of the House. Last night the division was conspicuous by the most offensive manifestations, and I have only this to say in conclusion, that I hope in future such manifestations will not take place as occurred last evening.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is very important each side of the House should respect the other side, and each member should respect all the members of the House. Of course, the hon. gentleman has observed certain manifestations that have taken place during divisions, but I must say that, with my recollection of last Session, I cannot but feel that similar manifestations were made towards certain members on this side of the House by hon. members opposite. Perhaps that would not be a good reason for one side or the other to retaliate, but it shows, at all events, that if there has been any feeling in this direction on one side there has been the same feeling on the other side of the House. Therefore, without naming or recriminating I think, speaking for this side of the House, that we agree that it would be a great deal better that no manifestations should be made against any hon. member. Of course, there is always allowed the parliamentary manifestation of "hear, hear," when a member's vote seems to be a little extraordinary to members of the House. That is the parliamentary way of showing approval or disapproval on one side or the other, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not wish to put a stop to that proper way of manifesting one's sentiments; but I am sure we all agree, as well as the Opposition side represented by the hon. gentleman, that the proper way of conducting the business of this House is to cease on both sides from making manifestations of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not exactly remember what took place last Session, but perhaps the hon. gentleman has a stronger motive for remembering what took place than I have. I thought, as hon. gentlemen opposite were far more numerous than those on this side of the House, there were more manifestations on the other side than on this; but, at all events, let that be so or not, I hope that we will agree that past issues be buried and a better understanding be had in the future.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the suggestions made by the leader of the Opposition, and I was glad to find the leader of the Government for the time being assented to the suggestion that special manifestations should cease. The act of calling out "hear, hear" is not very

offensive, but there are other calls which have been made to certain members which are really personally offensive. Both parties are somewhat to blame. The only party really free from blame in this House is the party represented by myself, and I may say for that party that I will endeavor to pursue the course pointed out by the leader of the Opposition and accepted by the leader of the Government for the time being, and refrain from anything like very offensive personal remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think the hon. gentleman has undertaken a most important task, and a more difficult one for him to perform than that of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BOWELL. I promised the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to tell him when the last report upon wrecking and tugging was laid before the House. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Sessional Papers of 1881, No. 9 of 37 and 38, No. of paper 50, he will find the report.

Mr. EDGAR. That was the matter to which I referred.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. AMYOT. Do I understand that the Government have abandoned their Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government do not propose to introduce any Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act, but we have as the hon. member will see on the Order paper a Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act on the same subject as his Bill. I would suggest that he should let his proposal stand until that Bill is in committee, and then we can discuss the whole subject more easily.

Mr. AMYOT. I suppose there will be the same chance given to my Bill to have it considered if it is not included in the Government Bill. I understand the Bill on the Dominion Elections Act and on the Dominion Controverted Elections Act are two different things. The hon. Minister says his Bill on the Dominion Elections Act comprises the same thing as mine, and I have no objection that it should stand. I do not care who proposes it if it becomes law.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government Bill I referred to is not to amend the Controverted Elections Act but to amend the Elections Act, and it does not contain the provision which the hon. gentleman has in his Bill. It seems to me it would be more convenient if he would let it stand until the Government Bill is in committee, when he might move, if he adheres to his view about this provision, to add it to the Bill relating to Elections, although it is not technically under the same Act.

WRECKS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dawson for an Order of the House for a return respecting Canadian vessels lost or wrecked on the great lakes during the past season of navigation.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was last brought before the House the discussion was postponed until the hon. the Minister of Public Works should have brought down his report, and now that the report is in the hands of hon. members, they will be able to see the extent of the losses and the number of wrecks on the great lakes. This is a very important subject. It is too much the custom in a great many quarters to look upon those lakes as mere mill ponds, and as seas requiring very little attention and in which there is very little danger, but lakes that run up to the length of 400 miles and have a width of 200 miles, as

Lake Superior has, would be formidable seas anywhere. The losses which have occurred last year are much less in number and less in amount than those which occurred some years previously. During the last six years the losses on the great lakes have been exceedingly heavy. A number of fine steamers have been lost and a great many valuable lives have perished. But, as I said, the number has been fewer and the amount of loss involved much less last year. That, Sir, is due in a great measure to the improved manner of the inspection. The Government now inspect the hulls and machinery of steamers, and that, I believe, has led to a great saving in life and property. A great deal has been done, but a great deal remains still to be done, and this inspection should be carried somewhat further than it has hitherto been carried. It should extend to vessels which now escape inspection, and I shall touch on that point later on. In the meantime I will draw attention to what the report says of the losses that have occurred on the great lakes last year :

"The barge *Oriental*, of Kingston, 328 tons register, left the port of Charlotte, U. S., on the 23rd of October last, with a cargo of coal 650 tons in weight, in tow of the steam tug *Scotia*. The vessel was 21 years old, and was probably worth \$1,000. Her crew consisted of a captain, who held a certificate of service as master, a mate, who was an un-certificated man, and two deck hands. There was also a woman cook on board. The vessel encountered very heavy weather and when about three miles from Port Dalhousie the tow line parted. The *Oriental* went down with all on board and the *Scotia* made for the port of Niagara, which she reached in safety."

Now, Sir, here is the case of a vessel into the loss of which an investigation was held and it was clearly proved that this vessel was not only unseaworthy but that she was overloaded, and that it was in the power of people consigning freight in order to make money, to put an unseaworthy vessel to sea, the result of which was the loss of five lives. Five poor people were carried to the bottom without any means of saving themselves. That is one instance. Now the next thing spoken of in the report is the loss of the *California*.

"The propeller *California*, of Montreal, left Chicago for a port in Canada on the 1st October last, with three passengers and 22 of a crew. She had on board 20,000 bushels of corn, and 696 barrels of pork on deck. On the morning of the 23rd she encountered very heavy weather and commenced to leak; the cargo also shifted and increased the difficulty of steering the vessel to such an extent that she would not answer her port helm. The violence of the waves drove in the anchor shutter, and the vessel shipped a great deal of water through the opening. The leak continued to gain and put out the fires, leaving the vessel at the mercy of the wind and waves, and she finally foundered on the night of the 3rd of October off St. Helen's Island, towards which the vessel was drifting. The vessel was built in 1873, and was cut in two and had 35 feet added to her length in 1883. She was 900 tons gross and 580 tons register tonnage. By this casualty seven of the crew and two of the passengers were lost, although the vessel had four boats, which left her when she foundered with a few persons in each."

Here is another case of overloading. There could be no doubt that that vessel could only carry 22,000 bushels of wheat or corn, and that those 690 barrels of pork put on as a deck load was the cause of her loss. Here is also a statement of the total amount of loss :

"The disasters reported to this department as having occurred to vessels on the inland waters of Canada, and to Canadian vessels on American inland waters during the year 1887, were 39, and the tonnage involved was 13,137 tons register. The number of lives lost was 21, and the amount of loss, both partial and total, to vessels and cargo, as far as estimated, was \$90,915."

Now, Sir, last year, although wrecks were fewer and the total amount of loss less than ordinary years, here is an actual loss of over \$90,000, and it becomes a very important matter to enquire how this loss could best be prevented. I think, Sir, there is one obvious way in which that can be prevented, and that is to compel the barges, the smaller craft, and the craft which are now very little looked after, to undergo an inspection as well as the large steamers. I have recently received several letters from experienced lake captains about this system of putting unseaworthy barges in tow of steamers, and the result of enquiries which

Mr. Dawson.

I have been making may be taken from what I will now read :

"Referring to barges in tow of tugs, they should have the stability of a sailing vessel, and if not of sufficient sail power to take care of themselves under all circumstances, they at all events should be provided with good This in itself might be the means of saving the crew and vessel. A ground tackle, that is, good anchors and chains suitable to their tonnage, good boat, with all necessary appliances ready for immediate use : life-buoys and life-preservers for the crew, properly placed ; a captain and mate with certificates, good substantial windlass and bits, tow ports well secured, food, tow lines of sufficient length. Barge towing is very hazardous, and every reasonable precaution ought to be used. When you consider the tug and her tow on a lee shore, the tow line parting and the barge left helpless, her anchors, handled by competent men, might even then save both crew and vessel. The tug towing the barge has no security that her machinery may not give way at a perilous time, showing plainly the necessity of the barge being well found in crew and outfit. The unseen vessels that are under repairs : *Manitoba*, *Detroit*, *Champion*, *Owen Sound*, *Frances Smith*, *Collingwood*, *Southern Belle*, *Deseronto*. The hull inspectors, up to this date, know nothing of repairs done to the resurrected craft ; they have no power."

From another source I have this :

"Hull inspectors are not privileged to use their discretion in matters of inspection, materially affecting their duties. They are hampered by not being allowed to see vessels undergoing repairs. When closed up and completed the repairs are not visible to the inspector, and then the only possibility of ascertaining the correctness of the statements furnished by owners of the repairs, is redocking, which causes great expense and very great dissatisfaction."

Now, Sir, that is a point to which I would draw particular attention, the necessity of having a vessel inspected when she is undergoing repairs. She can then be easily seen. But after she has been patched up and painted over, and when everything looks smooth outside, it is very difficult for the inspectors to ascertain whether or not there is anything wrong with her. Another frightful source of danger is sending out vessels overloaded in the fall. There should be some means found of preventing that ; and I think it could be prevented, as I suggested on a former occasion, by giving authority to the Customs officers at the different ports to decide when a vessel is overloaded. In all of these lake-going vessels there should be a line such as that known in England as the Plimsoll line, beyond which they should not be allowed to load. It is not in the regular steamers that the danger lies. On Lake Superior there are a number of very fine steamers, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, those that ply from Sarnia, and those that ply from Owen Sound. There are no vessels in the world superior to those, or better adapted for the navigation for which they are used ; in fact, they are floating palaces. Those vessels are always inspected, and it is not in them that the danger lies. It is in those patched-up vessels, old schooners, not properly rigged, which are sent out in tow of steamers, and which are cut adrift the moment danger arises, and are very likely to be lost. One cause of disaster hitherto has been that the lakes were not properly surveyed ; but I am very happy to say that that risk is likely no longer to exist. There has been an admirable hydrographic survey going on from year to year on those lakes, and I hope it will be continued until a complete survey is obtained. The survey made by Admiral Bayfield, which has immortalized, and very justly immortalized him, was made under circumstances which did not admit of his finding all the shoals existing in those lakes ; but the hydrographic survey which has been going on since has revealed a great many hidden shoals and rocks, which will hereafter appear on the charts. In order to convince the House of the necessity of going on with these surveys and the necessity of providing properly for the navigation of the great lakes, I need only draw attention to the enormous traffic which is springing up on them. Last year I took occasion to say that the traffic of the great lakes passing through the Sault Ste. Marie canal was nearly equal to that passing through the Suez canal, which passes the traffic of three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. Would it be believed, Sir, that on these inland

lakes we have a traffic not very far short of that traffic? I have not precisely what it was during the past summer; but in 1886, 4,527,000 tons of freight passed through Sault Ste. Marie canal; and I am told that during the past year the freight tonnage exceeds 6,000,000 tons. Now, Sir, that represents an enormous traffic, which you may form some idea of when I tell you what the traffic of the Suez Canal has been. In 1879 the total freight traffic of the Suez Canal was 3,236,000 tons, in 1880 it was 4,344,000 tons, in 1881 it was 5,794,000 tons, and it has gone on increasing until in 1886 it had reached over 8,000,000 tons. But here is an inland canal of North America, the traffic of which is not so very far short of the traffic of the Suez Canal. Now, Sir, what does all this show? It shows that there is a traffic growing up on our great lakes that should be adequately provided for. It shows that every precaution ought to be taken to make the navigation of those lakes as safe as it can possibly be made. I am happy to say that on the Canadian side of the largest of these lakes the navigation is naturally very safe, and with a few more lights and a few additional harbors, the whole traffic to and from Sault Ste. Marie would be brought in that direction, through Canadian waters, calling at Canadian ports, and giving life to Canadian traffic and trade. I believe that I have drawn the attention of the department to all that I can think of at present in relation to this matter, and I hope the inspection of these old barges and the preventing, if possible, of their going out will not be neglected. I have a list here, Inland Lloyds special register for 1887, and it is perfectly frightful to see by it the number of old wooden vessels, from 25 to 36 years of age, that are being patched up and repaired. The traffic on the great lakes will be very large this summer, and if all these vessels are to be allowed to go forth in tow of steamers, the temptation to send them out will be great because the traffic will be great and the profits large; and unless something be done, we may look to a larger and more deplorable loss of life than has occurred in years past.

Mr. DAVIN. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of my hon. friend. I think that the Department of Customs might be very properly utilised for carrying out the intentions that have been so well explained by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). In looking over the report of the Department of Marine, I find that, in the case of the *California*, the account given there can leave no doubt whatever in the mind of anyone that that vessel was unseaworthy. She was valued at \$27,000, although unseaworthy, and insured for \$21,000. We may be perfectly certain that the vessel was not worth \$27,000, and of course the temptation to overload a vessel like that and to send her out in an unseaworthy condition, taking all the risks, is very strong to the owner of such a vessel. The question is one that appeals not only to our humanity, but to our esteem for our reputation as a great commercial community, and it is one in which the western people are deeply interested. I would therefore urge strongly, in supporting the motion of my hon. friend, this subject on the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is not necessary, so lucid and so full has been the statement of my hon. friend, that I should say more than that, having looked into the question and knowing something about it, I can endorse all that my hon. friend has said upon this subject.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to say only a few words in order to call the attention of the House to the report made by the owner of the barge *Oriental*, the case of which was referred to by the hon. member for Algoma, when he made this motion some weeks ago. As regards the subject-matter of his motion, the hon. gentleman has my most cordial assent and support. I think it is of the deepest moment that vessels should be thoroughly inspected and every precaution taken to prevent their leaving

shore, unless they are in a seaworthy condition. Thousands of lives are entrusted to them, and every precaution should be taken to ensure the safety of those lives. If there is a Plimsoll in England, we ought to have one here in Canada, who will see that the lives of these poor men, who have to earn their living by going down to the deep, should be protected; and I hope the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not allow the inspectors to do just as they please, but will see that they do their duty, and thus take care that these old vessels, of which the hon. member for Algoma has spoken, are made tight and seaworthy before being allowed to leave port. But, while I regret very much the loss of life which took place last year, we must, in justice to the owner of the barge *Oriental*, let him state his own case, and he has sent me this letter, a portion of which I think it my duty to read to the House. He says:

"That the barge was not an unseaworthy vessel, but was one of the strongest boats of her class that was ever built on the lakes, and when I owned her was very tight. I sailed her for the two seasons before her loss, with heavy freights, and on several occasions in heavy storms, and she never strained or made a drop of water, and she was at the time of loss in good condition and perfectly strong and tight. From the water to the top of the rail amidships was six feet, and the distance of the bow was ten feet, when loaded, which is a very large size for a boat to have out of water."

That disposes of the statement that the boat was overloaded. Another statement is made that the tow line was cut, and that she was allowed to drift in the trough of the river, and so perish. To this charge, the owner replies that the tow line was not cut, but that the barge sunk before the tow line broke; and he has proved that by demonstration, having sent down a diver to examine the position of the barge, who reported that she lay upon the bottom of the lake, in thirty feet of water, heading straight for the harbor to which she was heading at the time of the disaster. She had not turned in the trough of the sea as she would have if she had sunk after the tow line broke. Moreover, the diver who went down, reports that the hull is perfectly strong and tight, and the disaster apparently occurred through the neglect of the unfortunate men who were on board, in not having the forecabin properly secured. It was not secured at the time, and the sea washed over her, and she foundered. In justice to the owner, Captain Fraser, I think this statement should be made, and I do so at his request.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether there is any truth in the statement which appeared in some of the papers, that certain portions of the hull of this vessel were exhibited to him, and were found in a state of advanced decay. I know nothing of the facts, but that statement was made, and probably the hon. gentleman will inform the House whether it was correct or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Some very small portions of the vessel have been brought to the department for examination, and labels have been put on them to show the parts from which they come. It is scarcely probable, until the vessel is raised, as I believe the owner intends to do, to say accurately whether it is true that these come from those portions of the vessel or not. I may, at this stage of the discussion, say a word or two with reference to this matter. I had not the advantage of hearing all that my hon. friend for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) said, but from what I could gather in his speech, he has collected a large amount of valuable information which will be on record, and which I will take occasion to look very carefully into. It must not be supposed, however, that the Marine Department, either now or at any previous time in its history, has not been as careful as possible in looking into this matter, especially of inland navigation, and in taking the best means in its power to overcome the difficulties and make navigation on

our great lakes as secure and safe as possible. The Steamboat Inspection Act has gone a long way in that direction. A large portion of the expense of the department for new lights and fog-alarms is now made in the region of the great lakes, which is rapidly bringing up that portion of our waters to a state of very great efficiency and security as far as these are concerned. Again, as my hon. friend has said, we have had an exhaustive survey conducted on the most dangerous of those waters in and at the mouth of the Georgian Bay. This survey has been a great advantage so far, and will be of still greater advantage when completed. Notwithstanding the remark of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), I think we have a very good board of steamboat inspectors and of hull inspectors. They are all men who do their duty very faithfully. I have called their attention, owing to disasters which have taken place lately, and the information which has come to the House in a special manner this year, to the inspection of boats of the class spoken of, these old boats which are being lengthened and rebuilt, and have asked them to insist on a most thorough and vigorous inspection of that class of boats. They should look after those boats while they are in the process of being repaired, when they have a better opportunity of seeing the progress which is being made with them. As to the *Oriental*, the matter was very thoroughly investigated, and my officers who investigated and reported on that came to the conclusion, notwithstanding the evidence which was given by the owner himself, that the vessel was not a seaworthy vessel, and that it was owing in the main to her unseaworthiness that the accident occurred. That vessel went out from an American port, and of course we have no jurisdiction there. No law that Canada has or could have could remedy the difficulty in the case either of the *Oriental* or of the *California*, both of which were sent out from foreign ports. Of course greater care could be taken in regard to them, being Canadian vessels, when they leave Canadian ports, to prosecute their foreign voyages, to see that they were seaworthy. As to the overloading, that is a matter which would be in the power of the country in whose ports they loaded, and from whose ports they started. I believe, in the case of the *California*, the evidence shows that the vessel came to grief chiefly from the want of shifting boards with reference to her grain cargo. It was late in the season and she had a large cargo on board and the precaution of putting in shifting boards was neglected, and the grain shifted, and that was the chief cause of the loss of the vessel. As to the inspection of all these barges, that would involve an extension of the policy adopted by the Government some time ago as to steamboats, and it would not only be expensive but would be burdensome to the shipping if it were carried out in the same way as it is with regard to steamboats. Still, I have no hesitation in saying that both the expense and the burden should be incurred if it can be shown that it is necessary to take measures for the preservation especially of life, and the preservation of property as well. But, taking this series of years from 1870 to the present time, we have had a very gratifying record in the Dominion of Canada as to these casualties, and this last year the number of lives lost was, I think, only 46, which is less than the number in 1870, and only about one-fifth of the average number from 1870 to 1887. My attention has been called from various sources to the matters which the hon. gentleman has called attention to, and I will give my best attention to the subject, and if anything further is necessary I am sure the Government will be prepared to do their duty in the premises.

Mr. SPROULE. When this subject was under consideration some years ago, I made a suggestion which, I think, would tend largely to remedy the evil. I think this evil

Mr. FOSTER;

is principally due to the fact that men who are expected to perform the duty of looking after vessels when they are in port seldom do it. The duty is given to Customs officers, and, although they may understand that it is a duty they are expected to do, I do not think they understand that it is one which they are compelled to do. What a man is not held responsible for when he neglects it, he is not likely to look after very closely. As time advances, the casualties which happen make us understand more clearly the importance of having a man at every large port in the country where vessels are calling and leaving in great numbers every year, whose special duty it shall be to look after those vessels when they are in port, not only to see that they should not be overloaded, but to see that the cargo is so distributed as to suit the craft it is on. I think, when the *Jane Miller* was lost, it was generally believed that her loss was attributable to the fact that her load was on deck, and that consequently she could not stand the roughness of the sea. Various vessels have been lost on the Georgian Bay and in the Channel and on Lake Superior, and there has been scarcely one in regard to which there does not appear to have been some defect which might have been removed. While this might be an additional charge on shipping, I do not think that is a fair argument against incurring the expense, because, if a single life is lost in one year which might not have been lost with proper precautions, I think it will be held that it is the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to continue his exertions—for I think they have been well directed in the past, towards the end of saving life—in that way, and I think that there might be a great saving of life and property in this way. If you look at the amount of freight which is lost and its value, and compare that with the cost which would be incurred by the appointment of a few additional inspectors or men to look after vessels in important ports, the expense is comparatively trifling. Perhaps one-tenth part of the cost of the freight which has been lost—leaving out of account the value of human life—would more than pay the additional cost for inspectors to take the further precautions where necessary. Then, in regard to the inspectors of hulls and of steamboats generally, I believe it is held that an inspector of engineers, to be competent, should be an engineer himself. I understand that the present inspectors are engineers; but it is equally important that the inspectors of hulls should be shipwrights, or should have been ship carpenters at least. I am credibly informed that the inspectors we have at present are not all ship carpenters; that they have never served their time at that business, and that they, therefore, cannot understand it as well as those who have. If anything can be done, I think it is important that the best men should be employed. If any freight can be preserved from destruction or any lives from being lost by the appointment of additional men, I think it is equally incumbent upon us, in order to have this done, to appoint, not Collectors of Customs, but a special man to look after vessels in every port where they are in the habit of calling, to see that they are not over-loaded, that the freight is properly stowed away, and that, when leaving, they are properly equipped with every provision for the saving of life in case of stress of weather. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is entitled to a great deal of credit for bringing this matter before the House year after year. From his position he is cognizant of a great many of the accidents that take place. He is constantly travelling up and down the lakes, and the trade is continually increasing, and there are a large number of crafts on the lakes which are old and are becoming rotten and should be taken off the lakes entirely. I think this system of an inspection should extend not only to steamboats but to sailing vessels and all kinds of boats which are found on the lakes, whether for the purpose of carrying freight or passengers, because every one of them carries less or more of human

life, and whenever there is a loss, almost always there is a loss of human life. But if this trouble were taken, if they were inspected, I think it would be equally desirable, because these sailing vessels do carry both freight and passengers. It is important that the hull inspector should examine the whole of them, not only after they are repaired and painted up, but while the work is going on. I think it would be still better to have the repairs made under the supervision of a competent officer whose duty it should be to see that all the timbers of that vessel were sound, as well the new timber as the old timber that was left in them.

Mr. MASSON. I am very glad this matter has been brought up and that so much valuable information has been given to the House respecting vessels. That a certain advance has been made during the last few years in the matter of inspection, and that great benefits have already been derived from inspection, is well known to all those interested in the trade of our lakes; but that a great deal more has yet to be done, is also well known to all those interested. I wish only to point out now the importance of inspection, both during the course of construction and during the course of repair. I think that is a matter of very great importance, and I was pleased to hear the Minister of Marine say that inspectors have instructions to inspect while repairs are being made on the class of vessels referred to by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). If such instructions have been given to the inspectors, I believe they have not acted upon them to any great extent; I know from my own personal observations that, so far from going out of their way to inspect vessels in course of repair, they have absolutely refused to do so, telling the parties who asked them to go and inspect while repairs were being made, to see if anything more required to be done, so that the owners might turn out a ship in a seaworthy condition, and in a condition that would assuredly pass a most rigid inspection—I say when the inspectors were invited to examine these repairs, they replied to the owners: “Finish your vessels, and when you are ready to call for inspection, we will go and inspect; until then we have no right to do so.” Now it appears that they were not obeying their instructions. I would press upon the House and the Department the necessity, not only that the inspectors should have the privilege of inspecting during construction, but that it should be their bounden duty, whenever called upon, and even if not called upon, to inspect any vessel they know to be in course of repairs or construction. When an old vessel is being repaired the object of the owner is to make it pass inspection. Besides, under this system, the dishonest builder is put in the same position as the honest builder. It is in the interests of the honest builder to turn out a good and seaworthy vessel, and it is to his advantage to have an inspection while the repairs are being made, and that the repairs should actually be made under the direction and superintendence of the inspector. I do not think any honest builder would object to that. The hon. member for Algoma mentioned one or two vessels undergoing repairs at Owen Sound. I may say that the Dry Dock Company of Owen Sound has specially asked for inspection while vessels are in course of repair. It is their aim to turn out the very best kind of work, and the most seaworthy vessels, and, on behalf of honest men, I think it is the duty of the department not only to make it the privilege of the inspector, but to make it his bounden duty, whether called upon or not, to inspect vessels, whether in course of repair or under construction.

Mr. COOK. I believe with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that it would be well for inspection to take place while a boat is undergoing repairs, as well as during construction. But I am of opinion that as there are several shipyards on the Georgian Bay and the inland waters, and as these shipyards compete against each other,

the one that turns out the best work will get the greatest amount of trade. Now, I believe the Board of Steamboat Inspection in the city of Toronto are a very efficient lot of gentlemen. I am satisfied that Mr. Harbottle is a very painstaking and efficient officer, and I have yet to learn that he has refused to inspect any boat under his jurisdiction. I believe Mr. Harbottle is always ready and willing to do his duty, and I do not believe, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has stated, that he has refused to do any important duty incumbent upon him as steamboat inspector. If the Government propose to have an inspection of vessels that are under repair, it would be necessary for them to appoint an assistant, and that would increase the expense to the country. I believe that a change for the better is taking place, and since an inspector of hulls has been appointed, we are getting a great deal better class of vessels upon the lakes. It is very important that inspection should be rigid, and that unseaworthy vessels should not be allowed to go out. I believe that the *Oriental*, from the information I have received, was not a seaworthy vessel. I have seen pieces of wood exhibited in the windows in the city of Toronto, that were said to come from that wreck, and they were entirely decayed and rotten; whether they really came from the wreck, I do not know. Now, several disasters have occurred lately on the great lakes, attended with considerable loss of life. The *Asia*, for instance, you will remember, only a few years ago, went down. It was said she was unseaworthy, but I believe that, upon investigation since, it has been discovered that she struck a reef of rocks that was discovered since a survey has been going on. Surveys are of great importance to the shipping in the Georgian Bay, on the north coast of which a great many reefs and shoals were found by the survey that is going on, that were not known before. Although the *Asia* may have been seaworthy and a good vessel, yet, striking a reef like that, she would have gone down. I believe that the inspection is doing a great deal of good upon the lakes, I am glad to know from the lips of the Minister of Marine that he is vigilant in that regard, and that he has given instructions to the board that inspection shall be carried out rigidly in order to prevent, if possible, a recurrence of the disasters that have taken place in the past.

Mr. WELSH. With respect to the system of steamboat inspection and the inspectors, I think the law is very good. It may be subject to some improvement, but down in the Maritime Provinces there is no complaint, and the steamboat inspectors there have given satisfaction to the public as well as to the steamboat owners. If I understand the matter rightly, it refers more particularly to the navigation of inland waters, of lakes and rivers. In regard to building under inspection, I do not think we can lay down a cast-iron rule with regard to it. Considerable expense would be attached to it, and people would be forced to get inspectors to examine the ships. But the public interest would be secured by adopting a principle something like that adopted by the Board of Trade in Great Britain. There the ships are classed in Lloyds or Veritas, or some other society for classing ships. If a man wants to charter a vessel he turns up the register and finds where a certain vessel was built, what it is classed and so forth, and the insurance companies know what rate to charge, and the shipper knows what risk he will be compelled to run. Notwithstanding that system is in force in England they have also a board of trade inspection. In all the ports there are boards of trade inspectors appointed and paid by the Government, and are not allowed to charge any fees or extra remuneration. There is one of these inspectors in every principal port, and his duty is to see that no rotten or unseaworthy ship goes to sea; if such should be the case he is held responsible, and no doubt he loses his

office. Port wardens have been appointed by the Government here in all the ports of the Dominion by the present Dominion Government. These should be appointed board of trade inspectors, and be compelled to see that no ship that is old, unseaworthy or rotten, should be allowed to sail. In England the law is that a board of trade inspector can go aboard, without leave or license, of any ship ready to sail. He has the power to prohibit a vessel from sailing. There is a board of arbitration also, and one appointed for Canadian ships, in England. I remember an instance of my own. I had a new ship, and unfortunately she was touched with worms. She was in England, and I found it would cost a very large sum to repair her. I determined to bring her out here and replank her; but on taking her out of dock, ready for sea, she was stopped by the Board of Trade inspector. When asked the reason, he said that she was not seaworthy. I had to send an agent there. He brought the matter before the Board of Trade, and by representing the matter and by putting a life-boat into the vessel, I was permitted to bring her out. All the difficulty experienced here would be removed by the Government appointing the port wardens at the different ports Board of Trade inspectors and entrusting them with the duty of seeing that no vessel left port that was unseaworthy. I am satisfied that would obviate the difficulty; but I do not approve a system of appointing inspectors and compelling vessels to be built under certain regulations. I believe in Free Trade. At the same time the Government should have Board of Trade inspectors to stop any ship that was unseaworthy. A vessel might be built in the best style and fitted out in first-class style, and yet three months afterwards she might meet with an accident that would seriously impair her condition. This system of forcing people to have vessels built under inspection was not found to work successfully in practice. I think this is a good motion to bring before the House, and the subject should be taken in hand by the Government and be dealt with in an inexpensive way and with great regard to the safety of the public interest.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I cannot fully agree with the remarks of the last speaker, although he no doubt fully understands marine matters. It would appear, if you look at the records of the wrecks on our northern lakes and inland waters, that some measures should be adopted by the Government to prevent the great loss of property and sacrifice of human life that annually occur. I can fully understand that a proper inspection of vessels during the time of construction would prove of great value, for it would be the means of securing efficient construction. I was very much pleased that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that the Government were carefully examining and seeing that the inspectors did their duty. That may be the case to a great extent as to sea-going vessels; but in regard to vessels on our great lakes, I am afraid that attention is not paid to the proper inspection of the boats and the manner in which they are loaded and the way they are constructed. I think these different matters are not fully and carefully attended to. Further, I contend that they have no right to load a barge or vessel below a certain mark. If it is necessary in England that there should be a Plimsoll mark, why is it not necessary in Canada? Are the lives of our people not as precious to us as the lives of the people of Great Britain? It is the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see that vessels navigating the lakes are not overloaded. We know full well that these inland lakes are far more treacherous than the sea. There is greater danger to life and property than there is in navigating the open sea, yet there is marked indifference on the part of the Government to see that human life is protected in a proper manner. I think it is the case that many of the engineers who are

Mr. WELSH,

employed upon those vessels have not passed an examination as to their competency before taking charge. Such should not be the case. There should be an examination; but if I understand correctly—I have seen it so reported in the press—it is the intention of the Minister of Marine to lessen or almost do away with the examination of engineers running vessels. That would be an unfortunate thing, a calamity. We all remember the sad accident that occurred to a boat at London a few years ago, due to negligence on the part of the authorities to see that the vessel was not overloaded. And circumstances of that kind occurring ought to be ample and sufficient to induce the Minister to see that every person employed upon those pleasure vessels should be competent for their position and able to perform their duties efficiently and well. I hope that after this discussion and after the manner it has been brought to the attention of the House by the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), the Minister will exert himself and see in the future that every man employed upon any of those vessels where they not only carry ordinary freight but human freight on board should be an efficient man, that the boat should not be overloaded, and that the materials of which the boat is constructed are of the best that can possibly be obtained. If he will do that he will do a good service, but if he relaxes his energy he will do a wrong, I believe he will be held responsible for the wrong if he will permit in any way the lessening of the severity of the examination which engineers and all those connected with vessels have to pass to show that they are fully and thoroughly competent to perform the duties that devolve upon them.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much agree with almost all that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I am only sorry that in the last few words he addressed to the House he seemed to imply that he thought it possible that the hon. the Minister of Marine would relax his vigilance. I do not think we have any reason to suppose that that is at all likely. I think that since the hon. gentleman has occupied the position he now holds—

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for one moment. I said I had seen in the *Empire* that a relaxation was likely to take place in the examinations of engineers on passenger boats.

Mr. McNEILL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not hear that observation, and I sincerely hope that no relaxation will take place. If there is any intention or any prospect of any such relaxation taking place, I should only add my mite of approval to what the hon. gentleman has said. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing if there were any degree of relaxation, and, on the contrary, I think we ought to proceed in the very opposite direction. When we see the loss of life, when we see the amount of misery that is entailed by that loss of life, when we see the loss of property and realize the enormous extent of that loss year after year upon the lakes, anything like relaxation of the rules which now obtain, would, I think, be nothing less than a calamity. While I agree with a great deal what my hon. friend has said I must say that I do wish to enter my protest against a remark which has fallen in the course of this debate, namely, that the proper way to do is to leave this matter to competition, as it were, that is to say, that the best builder will be the man who will get the best custom. That may be all very well, but I do not think that that will be a remedy for those who find a watery grave in rotten or weakly constructed vessels. The fact is, that I think my hon. friend, the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), deserves the thanks of the country for the manner in which he has adhered to this matter. From the very first he has taken it up warmly, he has stuck to his guns and I believe that he is now about to do us a very great service. The two points which seem to

have been brought before the House to-day are with reference to the inspection and loading of vessels. So far as the inspection is concerned it seems to me that if we are to have vessels constructed as they ought to be constructed, it is absolutely necessary that the inspector should be called upon to inspect the vessels while they are being constructed, for we all know how easy it is to cover up any defects afterwards. The real way to strike at this mischief, is to have a thorough inspection of the vessels during the course of construction. My hon. friend, the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that when a Government inspector is called upon to do this very necessary work, he refuses. If that be so I hope that the Minister of Marine will see that in future the inspector pursues a very different course. The question of overloading is one of almost as great importance and to all those who have taken any interest in this question must be very well aware of the most incalculable advantage that has followed in England from the use of the Plimsoll mark. That is simply a round mark upon both broadsides of each vessel with a line drawn through the middle, and any person, whether he be a seafaring man or not, who sees that vessel afloat can, at a glance from the shore, tell whether or not the vessel has been overloaded. A mark of that kind if it were rendered necessary to be used on our lakes would be fruitful of the very greatest possible advantage and would be the means of saving many a life and many a wreck. That is so far as sailing vessels are concerned. I do not know whether in the case of steamboats on the lakes it would have the same effect, because the difficulty there seems to arise, not so much from the overloading and not so much from the vessel being sunk too far in the water, as from the fact that the cargo is badly stowed. In many cases, as in the case of the *Jane Miller*, referred to by my friend the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the loss did not arise there from overloading, but it arose from improperly loading the vessel. When the *Jane Miller* was lost she had hardly any cargo in her hold, and the whole cargo was in the upper works of the vessel. It was a deck cargo, and when she came to round to heading for the land in a breeze of wind a squall struck her and she simply turned right over. There was no sea on at the time, and it was not in rough water she went down. It was in perfectly smooth water, in an almost landlocked bay. That vessel was lost simply from improper stowage, and the Plimsoll mark would have no effect in such a case as that. The appointing of inspectors at each port, whose duty it would be to see that no vessel was allowed to leave the port unless her cargo was properly stowed, would meet that difficulty. I do not see why the Custom house officers in the different ports might not be utilised for this purpose. They cannot be expected to do the work unless they get extra remuneration; but in a case of this kind, when we remember the loss of life and the losses of property each year, the additional expense which would be incurred in that way is a matter which I think this House ought scarcely consider at all, because it would be infinitesimal as compared with the property which is lost, and compared with the loss of life it is a thing that cannot be weighed in the balance for a moment. I sincerely hope the Minister of Marine will take this matter deeply into his consideration, and that he will see that no relaxation in the rule shall occur, but that he will make the rules still more stringent than they are at present, both in regard to inspection so far as the construction of vessels is concerned, and in regard to the inspection of loading vessels.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me say just one word in reference to a remark which dropped from the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) who stated that he had seen in

the papers that deputation had been waiting on the hon. the Minister of Marine asking for a relaxation of the rule in reference to steamers on the lakes. Having been instrumental in moving in this matter, I may just say that the deputations that I accompanied to wait on the hon. Minister of Marine did not ask for any relaxation of the regulations in reference to the inspection of steamers or vessels on the great lakes or the minor waters. What we have asked and do contend for applies to a class of small steamers of twenty or thirty tons plying on the minor waters of Canada. Where I reside there are large numbers of small yachts of twenty or thirty tons that are engaged during the pleasure season, for a week or ten days, in taking out fishing parties. Before these steamers can engage in such pursuits, they must, under the present regulations, have a competent captain and a licensed engineer. On account of the scarcity of licensed engineers, there are not sufficient to fill all the places, and according to the law at present, a person cannot become a licensed engineer unless he has served three years in a marine engine shop, and one year on a steamer. We have many mechanics who help to construct engines, and who are just as competent as if they had served the required three years. What we ask is that a competent person may be granted a permit over a specified route for a limited time, and that legislation may be passed giving the Minister power, on the recommendation of the inspectors, to grant such permits. That has nothing to do with the motion before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to correct one impression which I did not intend to convey with reference to the inspection spoken of by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It is not the duty of the inspectors to make more than one inspection yearly. When the owner of a boat has it ready for inspection, it is his duty to notify the board and have it inspected. If he does not do that, he is liable to a penalty. If the chairman of the Board of Inspectors refuses a request to go and see a vessel that is undergoing repairs, on the ground that it was not ready to undergo inspection, the letter of the law would justify him in doing that; and when I spoke of his having visited several of those vessels undergoing repairs, I did not mean that it was the rule that he should do it, but in a great many cases I have given directions for the inspectors to do it, being guided by the circumstances. As the information my hon. friend asks for has been brought down in the report of the Department, probably it would be as well, after having had this interesting discussion, that he should withdraw his motion.

Mr. DAWSON. I had no intention, in mentioning the vessels that had been lost, to cast any reflection on anybody. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has referred to the captain of the *Oriental*. I believe he was a brave and gallant man, as is proved by his having gone down with his vessel. I was very happy to hear the hon. Minister of Marine express his opinion that, notwithstanding the increased expense that would be involved, a more comprehensive system of inspection should be undertaken, if thereby life and property should be secured. As to the remarks made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), in reference to Captain Harbottle, I quite agree with him that he is a very able and excellent officer; but certainly one man cannot do everything in the matter of inspection. Now that this discussion has taken place, and that this amount of interest has been excited, I would, with the leave of the House, withdraw the motion, as all that I wished to gain has been gained in drawing the attention of the Government to the matter.

Mr. LISTER. Before the motion is withdrawn, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), as to allowing people without proper certificates to act as engineers. If

such a course were adopted by the Government, we might as well abolish the system of granting certificates altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. I would just say that I intend to introduce a Bill dealing with the suggestion of the hon. member for Leeds, and the whole discussion will come up then.

Mr. LISTER. In that case, I will say no more on that point. But there is another matter that I want to bring before the hon. Minister of Marine; I brought it before the House one or two Sessions ago. It is this. The American Government will not permit a Canadian engineer to act as such on an American steamboat unless he has a certificate from the proper quarter on that side, and he must, in addition, be a resident of the United States. The consequence of that is that many of our Canadian engineers living in Sarnia and other towns on the border, have had to go and live in the United States so that they might take charge of American steamboats. I believe I am correct when I say that our law does not require engineers to be Canadians or British subjects before receiving certificates. If I am in error as to that I would like to be corrected. I know that our engineers complain very bitterly indeed that while the Americans protect their engineers, there is no protection granted to our engineers. If the legislation was the same on both sides, it would be an inducement to our people to go into engineering, and it would remove this well-grounded complaint. I am not complaining against the Government; I am merely pointing out the fact, and expressing the opinion that our engineers, who are a large and important class, ought to be protected. I hope the Bill the hon. Minister intends to introduce will provide for that.

Mr. BAKER. The discussion on this motion appears to be taking a very wide range. The subject of engineers and engineers' certificates, in my opinion, has nothing to do with the matter under discussion. That subject may come up at the proper time. We are talking of steamboat inspection, which may in an indirect way have some connection with it. To my mind, the disasters referred to must be attributable to one or two causes. Either the vessels were in themselves unseaworthy or they were unseaworthy from having been either overloaded or improperly stowed. As to the remedy, I think that would lie in the first place with the master of the vessel, who is responsible for everything connected, not only with the navigation of his vessel, not only with the discipline of his crew not only with the interest of the owner, but with the interests of the shippers of the cargo, and with the lives of all on board. It is his place to see that the vessel is properly equipped and manned, and that she leaves port in a seaworthy condition. In the first place, therefore, it is the duty of the master of the vessel to see that the vessel is in all respects seaworthy; secondly, at all the principal ports of the Dominion, there are harbor masters and port wardens, and if hon. gentlemen will refer to the Act of the harbor masters and port wardens, they will find that the port warden may, wherever he sees fit, initiate proceedings, when occasion may necessitate his doing so. Therefore, I think that with the master primarily responsible for everything pertaining to his vessel, and with the harbor and port wardens having general supervision of everything regarding the seaworthiness of the vessel, the ground is fully covered.

Motion withdrawn.

OWNERS OF BOTTLES AND VESSELS.

Mr. DENISON moved second reading of Bill No. 3—to protect the owners of certain bottles and vessels therein mentioned. He said: I do not see the object of the applause with which hon. gentlemen greet my rising to move the second reading of this Bill, unless it be that they have the

Mr. LISTER.

idea that I am doing something in the way of legislating in the cause of temperance. There is no doubt this Bill is in the interest of the manufacturers of soda waters and aerated waters, of whom there are a great many in existence in this country, and the industry has become a very extensive one. It is with the object of protecting them that this Bill has been put in my hands. I may say that on account of the manner in which this business is carried on a great deal of loss is sustained by those interested in it. A soda water bottle, filled with its contents, is, we will say, worth a dollar. The contents alone are sold at the value of 25 cents and the bottles are supposed to be retained in the ownership of the sellers, and they are valued at seventy-five cents per dozen, or, in other words, the value of the contents, as compared with the bottles, is as three to one. The trouble is that second dealers or junk dealers, as they are called, purchase these bottles from any person who may bring them to their establishment. The ownership, as I have said, has not passed from the person who sells the soda water, and he has therefore to sustain very heavy loss on account of these bottles being dealt in by these junk dealers. The object of the Bill especially is to prevent, if possible, any traffic in soda water bottles or aerated water bottles. The bottles, it is proposed, shall have a trade mark upon them, and they have also a peculiar fastening at the top which makes them of considerable value. This measure, I may state, is somewhat similar to Acts of a like nature which have been passed in some twelve or fourteen States of the Union, so that it is not entirely legislation of a new character. Under clause one, the bottlers are to have a trade mark on their bottles. Clause two prevents trafficking in the bottles, and throws the onus of proof on the party in whose possession the bottles are found. It is proposed to make some alteration in that clause. Clause three provides that no one shall fill such bottles. Clause four deals with the proof in the case of unlawful traffic. Clause five provides that a record shall be kept of the bottles by the junk dealers. Clause six deals with lost vessels. Clause seven allows a search warrant to issue, so that the owner of the bottles may have an opportunity of searching the junk shop and recovering the bottles, which are sometimes found there in large numbers. Clause eight provides for an appeal. I may say that if it is considered by this House that it would be better to leave this Bill to a committee, I would be very glad to move one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to say much on the matter. I do not know that I want to prevent the hon. member taking the second reading of the Bill, but I think he is dealing with rather a difficult matter, and it seems to me that if it goes into committee it will have to be very carefully considered indeed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was going to call the attention of the House to the Bill, with the same view that the hon. gentleman has just taken. I appreciate very highly indeed the reasons which the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure has for supporting it, and with an explanation of which he has favored me at some length privately. I understand pretty fully from those who are interested in the kind of business which this Bill is destined to protect, what the difficulties are in respect of it, from which they seek relief. It is stated that their bottles are manufactured in very large numbers, stamped with their names or their trade mark, and the liquids which they manufacture, soda water, ginger beer, and waters of that description, are vended and delivered in these bottles, the bottles themselves not being sold. It is stated—and this appears almost like an oversight or want of ordinary business precaution—that no record whatever is kept by them of the bottles they deliver to their customers or the public, and therefore they come and seek legislation of this kind to give them an extraordinary protection. The objections which

must be taken to the Bill are fundamental and extend almost to every clause, and I could entertain no hope that, if the Bill had a second reading and went to a committee, it would be even curtailed in such a way as to make it at all safe. If the business in which these gentlemen are engaged requires protection to such an extent as to make it a crime to be the possessor of a soda water bottle, the business is a very dangerous one to the community. There is hardly a householder in Canada who, if this Bill should pass, would not be likely to be brought before a magistrate and sent to goal for at least ten days. Before calling the attention of the House to the principal features of the Bill, I will mention that it professes to deal with the subject from the point of view of trade marks legislation; and in that respect I would ask the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill whether he would not consider that the measure which the Government introduced with regard to the fraudulent marking of merchandise is not sufficient to meet the whole purpose he has in view, in so far as that purpose can safely be carried out, or whether the Bill, in connection with that subject, introduced by the Government could not be amended so as to meet his view in so far as it is wise at all to carry out the precautions he wishes us to adopt. I think it would be unwise to deal with the subject of trade marks and the marking of merchandise in a general statute by which Parliament is asked to adopt the principle of recent English legislation dealing with that matter, and at the same time to pass an Act on different lines and to suit one particular business. I might call the attention of the House to what the remedies are which are afforded to these proprietors at present. They have the same remedies in this country as they have in Great Britain, and I have not heard that any legislation has been called for there by those that are engaged in this business. The remedies which are pursued in Great Britain by the manufacturers of these aerated waters are these: The junk dealers, or any one who has these articles improperly in his possession, is liable to be sued by the proprietor, and the value of the properties recovered. It is stated by the manufacturers that that is an insufficient remedy, because there is no means of ascertaining, without a search warrant, how many bottles the junk dealer has in his possession, but our own Statute in regard to junk dealers provides that they shall keep a record of every article they purchase. In our present Act there is a provision that if any person—

"Encloses, places or attaches any chattel or article, or causes or procures any chattel or articles to be enclosed, placed, or attached in, upon, under, with, or to any cask, bottle, stopper, vessel, case, cover, wrapper, band, reel, ticket, label or other thing having thereon any trade mark of any other person, he is guilty of a misdemeanor."

Let me refer to some of the clauses of this Bill. In the first place, the first section is purely trade mark legislation, providing that marks or devices may be registered. That is a feature of the present law and is unnecessary here, and will be more unnecessary after the Trade Marks Bill is adopted, if it should be adopted by the House. There is another provision which is already embodied in our statute. The third section reads:

"No person shall fill with soda waters, mineral or aerated waters, porter, ale, cider, ginger ale, milk, cream, beer, small beer, lager beer, weiss beer, white beer, or other beverages, or with medicines, compounds, or mixtures, any such vessels so marked or distinguished as aforesaid with or by any name, mark or device of which a description has been filed and published as provided in section one of this Act, or to deface, erase, obliterate, cover up or otherwise remove or conceal any such name, mark or device thereon, or to sell, buy, give, take, or otherwise dispose of or traffic in the same, without the written consent of the person whose mark or device is in or upon such vessel so filled, trafficked in, used or disposed of as aforesaid, or unless such vessel has been purchased from him; and the burthen of the proof of such purchase, or written consent, from the rightful owner or owners, whose registered mark appears on such articles, in the event of the defence of purchase, or written consent, being set up, shall be upon the person in whose possession such articles are found, who must strictly prove that such pos-

session is lawful, and duly authorised by the person whose registered name, mark or device appears or did appear impressed on such articles."

It is made an offence punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year, and not less than ten days, to have violated that section, and the effect of those provisions is, substantially, that, if any person in Canada hereafter is so unfortunate as to have one of these dangerous soda-water bottles in his possession, and puts milk into it, he is liable to be sent to gaol for not less than ten days and possibly for a year. He may put whiskey into it, but not milk, cream, lager beer, or ginger ale or anything of that kind. Even if he puts it in for household purposes and not for sale, he is liable to these extraordinary penalties and the burden of proof rests upon him that he purchased the bottle from somebody who had the right to the trade mark. I think that is a very unnecessary provision and a very extreme one, to provide criminal legislation of this character, changing the burden of proof, and compelling everyone who has innocently in his possession articles of this kind, to show how he became possessed of them. We know how common it is for persons to possess these vessels, and this Bill makes it not only fraudulent, but criminal to have these bottles in possession, without proving the title by which they were obtained. We know from the vendors that these bottles are sold in carts in the street to anyone who chooses to buy them. The bottles are not sold, but the mineral waters are sold, and the bottles are delivered, and they come into the possession of the servants of the household and are not under the immediate supervision of the proprietor of the house, but the possession of these articles and the attempt to use them, even for household purposes, is here made a crime. It would be far more reasonable, if these gentlemen need this protection—and I admit that they seem to need some protection—that, before they come here to ask for this extraordinary legislation, they should take the ordinary business precautions to preserve their property. At present they do not; they do not even keep a record of the persons to whom they have delivered bottles, and they propose to remedy their neglect by making it criminal on the part of those who possess these bottles. Section 4 pursues the same line, and makes it punishable without authority to use a marked bottle; and then there is a provision which is in our present law, and is therefore unnecessary, that the junk dealers shall keep a record, and penalties are imposed upon them if they do not. Then there is a provision making it penal even to buy, or sell, or use any bottle of that kind even though the bottle has been lost, and therefore it puts upon a person having one of these bottles, innocently in his possession, the burden of proving the title to it, which is absolutely impossible, considering that tens of thousands of these bottles are issued every week in large cities, especially in the summer season; and, if the person fails to prove his title to every individual bottle in his possession, although it is an absolute legal impossibility that he could do so in any court of justice whatever, he is liable to these heavy penalties. Then section 6 provides not only that, but that any person who is so unfortunate as to have any of these bottles in his possession is liable to have a search warrant issued against him. We know that the provision of law in regard to such warrants is that oath must be made that property has been stolen, and is believed to be in the possession of the person referred to, but under this Bill it is only necessary to have these bottles in possession to obtain a search warrant. Then there is a provision for the recovery of the various penalties. I hope the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill, and he has done it, I know, from the sense he has of the injuries sustained by the people in this line of business, will not press the Bill, but will consider whether a provision in regard to the fraudulent marking of merchandise will not be amply sufficient to prevent what I admit we ought to pre-

vent, that is, these bottles being made use of by other dealers who may have purchased them improperly from junk dealers, to prevent the bottles of one person being used by others in the same business. But I think to attempt to prevent by criminal penalties the innocent use and the household use of these bottles, and to impose such severe penalties would be exceedingly unwise and quite uncalled for, especially when we know how little care is taken by the proprietors themselves as to the bottles they use. I supposed that perhaps the Minister of Justice, in his many duties, had not been able to look at the Bill. I view it as a very extraordinary Bill, and I am glad to see that he has taken the same view of it. As I said before, I think it will have to be greatly curtailed in committee. I thought when on my feet before I would ask the mover if he could not cover all that ought to be covered by some amendment to the Act relating to trade marks, if it is not already covered. But the design of the Bill seems to me to be more than to prevent parties using other people's brands in order to sell their own goods, for the penalty in this, I see, is for removing, or erasing, or taking out the stamp, or the brand of the maker. The value of trade marks, as I understand them, lies in this. A manufacturer registers a trade mark, he is, perhaps, manufacturing a specialty, he has, perhaps, attained a name for the high quality of a certain kind of goods, and brands his name, or has it blown upon the glass and bottles, or brands it upon wood packages. All these packages are valuable because they have his name upon them. Another dealer, not as successful in business, with inferior goods, might secure the empty packages of this first manufacturer and fill them with his own manufactures and thus do the other man an injury. But the object of this Bill, it seems to me, does not cover that case, that should be covered under the Act. But it is made offence under this Act for a person having another man's bottles or boxes with his brand on them, to remove the brand, to deface or erase it. Therefore, the object is not to secure that a manufacturer's name being branded upon his packages they shall be filled only with the goods manufactured by him, but, as the Minister has pointed out, it seems that the effect of it will be, that however careless a manufacturer may be in the distribution of his goods and his empty boxes, they are to be taken care of by the community at large, and if they do not do so, they are liable to fines, imprisonment and penalties. I quite agree with what the Minister has said. I do not wish to oppose the Bill on its second reading if the hon. member is anxious to send it to committee, but I think that the work of the committee will be very formidable, because it certainly never could be allowed to pass in its present shape. I think, as suggested by my hon. friend, and as has evidently been suggested to the Minister of Justice, that if there be any difficulty by a party using the names of other manufacturers to sell his inferior goods, by using their empty packages, that they would be entitled to protection in that respect, if it is not already given to them in the Act relating to trade marks. But I think it is; if not, the Minister has said that he is willing to consider that matter.

Mr. EDGAR. I have looked over the copy of this Bill, as it has been amended in Committee of the Whole, and as it is proposed to be reprinted; and although it is proposed to remove some of the objectionable features from the Bill, I still agree with the Minister of Justice that there are many remaining. The provisions as to issuing a search warrant to find out whether a person has these in his possession, without proving that there has been some theft committed, is very unusual and unreasonable, I think. And so with regard to the provision as to penalty for parties having these bottles in their possession. Still I think something ought to be done, because surely it is desirable that we should encourage the sale of these cheap temper-

Mr. THOMPSON.

ance drinks. We are desiring in this House to promote temperance, I think, in every legitimate way, and if we support legislation which will protect those who make and sell what is generally known as pop summer drinks, we will be doing a great deal for the cause of temperance. But it does seem not unreasonable that when bottles made by owners especially with their own marks upon them, and containing these cheap drinks, costing three or four times, I believe, as much as their contents—I think it is not unreasonable to throw around them some protection. I think that, at least, if the Minister of Justice can put in the Bill which he has before the House now, the Merchandise Marks Offences Act, taken, I believe, from the English Act of last Session, largely, if he can insert in that a clause which will not prohibit people from having possession of these things, and force them to explain all about it, but will prevent them from exposing for sale these bottles so marked, I think he will be doing a right thing, a fair thing, and a service to the country.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think there is any objection to that at all. I may say that the present Trade Marks Act makes it a misdemeanor to sell a bottle, for instance, that is trade marked, with compounds in it other than those produced by the person whose trade mark it has. While that will be a misdemeanor under the Act, it will be under summary conviction, and the penalty will be much more stringent. I think the object can be quite as well served by the Trade Marks and Registration Bill.

Mr. DENISON. The Minister of Justice stated a short time ago that apparently there was no effort made on the part of these people to keep any record of their bottles. Although I am not well informed as to the manner in which they conduct their business, I am told it is almost impossible to keep any proper record of the bottles, and to have the bottles returned; that on account of the competition being so keen, they have to let the bottles go with the contents, and trust—if I may use the term—to luck to the bottles coming back. The effect of that condition of things is, that these smaller dealers may buy up bottles belonging to large dealers, and use them to sell their manufactures at a cheaper rate. You can easily see that if the larger dealer has to pay 75 cents a dozen for bottles, and 25 cents for the contents, while the smaller dealer can buy up the empty bottles at half-price, it puts the latter in a better position to compete with the large dealer. I am informed that some of the large dealers lose as much as four or five thousand dollars a year in bottles alone, that are used by smaller dealers and other people. I would like to say a word as to the question of search. That has been struck out of the amended Bill; but it says: "No person shall buy, sell, expose or offer for sale, dispose or traffic in bottles." The object of this Act, I may say, is not to prevent any persons having bottles in their possession or giving them away, but it is to prevent the traffic in bottles. It is principally aimed at the junk dealers who make a business of dealing in those kind of articles. However, Mr. Speaker, what we want is not particularly this Bill, but we want relief, and although I think it would be a little more convenient if this Bill should go through in its present state, still, as the Minister of Justice has stated that he can see his way clear to give us some measure of relief in his Trade Marks Act, I think that I will be quite justified in letting this Bill stand in the meantime, with the permission of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the best plan would be to adjourn the debate, then the Bill can stand on the paper, and my hon. friend, after examining the Government Bill, can consider whether he will press his own. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

DISCHARGE OF SECURITIES TO THE CROWN.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act respecting defective letters patent and the discharge of securities to the Crown. He said: I move the second reading of this Bill at the request of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is a Bill to remedy an old and anomalous state of the law, and it refers to transactions which occurred prior to Confederation and altogether in the Province of Ontario. Prior to 15th August, 1866, it was the law of Ontario that bonds given to the Crown either to secure debts or as surety for officials, postmasters, custom house officers or others, on lands were filed in the office of the clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench, *ipso facto* created a lien on the lands of the bondsmen without any further registration, any specific registration on the lands in the various counties where the lands were situated. This required so much searching that no man could get a clear title to his land or any parcel of land he was buying without having a search made in the office of the clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench. That was remedied by it being enacted in 1866 that those bonds should no longer be a lien on the lands unless specifically registered against them. The Legislature of the Province of Ontario, by the Revised Statutes have released the lands from those bonds, so far as that Legislature has authority to deal with them, that is to say, from any debts due to the Crown, which were within the provincial jurisdiction; and it is now asked by this Bill to release the lien on lands in all matters that come under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The difficulty has been suggested by the Referee of Titles of the Province of Ontario, who says it is a matter of very great difficulty and expense now to pass a title without going back and searching over those old liens to the Crown, and difficulty arises if a man has acquired his title from a man, say named John Smith, because there are several registrations under that name, and it must be shown that that was not the John Smith whose title is now being searched or affected. This difficulty is so great that the Referee suggests that the Dominion Parliament follow the example of the Legislature of Ontario, and release the liens upon the land so far as they are subject to the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand that this Bill is an exact copy of the section of the Revised Statutes of the Province of Ontario, changing the words "Provincial Government" to "Dominion Government," and I think it perfectly proper that it should pass. I suppose the blank date left in the clause will be changed, and it will be made to apply from and after the passing of this Act.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, from 1st of May or some such date.

Mr. EDGAR. The title of the Bill is also defective. That, however, cannot be changed until the Bill reaches its last stage.

Bill read the second time.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DENISON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 5) for the protection of railway employés. He said: I have been requested by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to move the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so I have only a few words to say in regard to it. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman is not present, as this is a very important measure for the protection of the lives of railway employés. I have before me a statement of accidents to such employés during the year 1886, and I find that in coupling cars there were 210 cases of injury and 12 deaths; walking, standing or lying on the track, 72 deaths and 63 persons injured, or in all 135 acci-

dents on the track. I suppose a considerable portion of these have been due to one of the causes referred to in this Bill, frogs on railway tracks, with regard to which provision is made in this Bill. I have here a copy of a presentment sent by the Grand Jury of the County of Elgin, in which they pray for several matters in connection with this Bill. They pray that all boxed or covered freight cars that are run over the various railways shall by law be required to have a one and a-half inch plank or board on the centre of the top outside for the use of the brakemen as a walk, the plank to be not less than eighteen inches wide. Also, that iron railings shall be placed along the footboards at a convenient height for the further protection and safety of brakemen. Also, that the old system of couplings and brakes, being insecure, unsafe and fraught with danger and accident, should, at as early a date as possible, have a modern improved system substituted therefor. Also, that all engines shall have a steam brake and cylinder attached to them after due notice has been given. There are also other matters mentioned in the presentment which it is not proposed to cover by this Bill.

Mr. COOK. I also regret, as does the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That hon. gentleman has given considerable attention to this matter, and I think he introduced the same Bill last Session. I have taken a very deep interest in this matter for a number of years past. While I had the honor of a seat in the Ontario Legislature I introduced a Bill similar to this, and, after introducing it, the Government appointed a commission, took the matter in hand, and passed the measure which is now the law in the Province of Ontario. But upon the passage of the Act, the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Finance Minister of this country, being at that time Minister of Railways, carried a Bill by which he took over all the roads of the Provinces; that Dominion Act rendered this Ontario Act almost worthless, because in that Province we have scarcely any roads that are not under that jurisdiction. The packing of frogs is a very important matter, but in my opinion the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough. There is one difficulty in the way, and that is the throwing open of switches. As switches are at present, they are thrown three inches apart, and the brakeman or man in the yard is as likely to be caught in the switch as in the frog. My former proposal was to have the switches so arranged as to be thrown open six inches, so that a man's foot could not be caught in them. It is from men having their feet caught that accidents occur, and they are crushed by the cars. The proposal respecting running boards is a very good one. On the whole, I approve of the Bill, and I hope it will pass into law. I trust the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), will be more successful this Session than he was last, and that the proposal to refer the Bill to a committee is not for the purpose of burking this very useful and important measure. The mover, on behalf of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), stated the great amount of accidents that have occurred in this way. I think it is nothing but right and just that the Government of the day should have an Act of this kind made law, so that protection can be extended to the people who are working on railways. There are such a large number of people now working upon roads in Canada that the danger has increased every year, because of the greater number employed. I think, Sir, that as this Government has passed an Act by which they took away from the Province of Ontario the large number of railways, formerly under the jurisdiction of that Provincial Act, that it is their duty now to afford railway employés, by Act of Parliament, the same protection that they had under the law of the Province of Ontario. I have an instance in my mind which bears on the question. Shortly after the passing of the

Act, by which the railways were taken over by the Dominion, an accident occurred upon the Midland Railway, whose character was obtained from the Local Legislature and which was under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. The party to whom the accident occurred sued the railway company for damages, but the court decided that as the Ontario Act had no jurisdiction the complainant should be nonsuited. I contend, therefore, that the Government should see that protection is extended to that class of people in this country who richly deserve the same protection at the hands of this Government that they receive at the hands of the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This no doubt is a very important Act and there can be no objection to referring it to a special committee. At the same time it appears to me that an Act of such importance proposing to deal with interests of such a large extent and in such various ways should be taken charge of by the Government and that they should deal with a matter in which the public are so largely interested. I hope the Government will take that view of it and when it comes from the Select Committee propose the measure to this House and accept the responsibility of it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, this I consider is one of the most important Bills that has been brought before the House during the Session and I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that it being such an important measure the Government should take the Bill in their charge and in amending the Railway Act that they should have the principle of this Bill incorporated in it. No one who has had an opportunity to witness the number of casualties on railways to brakemen and others who earn their living by being employed on railways will deny that there should have been long before some provision made whereby the lives of these unfortunate individuals might be protected to as great an extent as possible. We know very well that the avocation of the railway employé is a dangerous one under any circumstances. We know that they have to endure hardships which perhaps in no other calling are people called upon to endure. That being the case it ought to be the duty of those who have charge of railways and railway companies to make provisions whereby the lives of employés may be protected. When the Dominion Government assumed the control of the railroads running from East to West and took them out of the hands of the Local Government thereby preventing the enforcement of the Provincial Act they should have made provision for a proper guard and proper construction in the passing of the frogs. They neglected to do so however and very many lives have been lost on account of this neglect. Perhaps the most dangerous work connected with railroading and in which more lives have been lost than in any other is by brakemen who are compelled to remain upon those cars and pass from one car to the other to set brakes, falling off and being killed. Although the packing of the frogs may be absolutely essential and necessary for the protection of parties employed in and about the yards, I consider the necessity of making suitable and ample provision for the running boards so as to protect the brakemen, of far greater importance. Any one who has witnessed the brakemen running from one car to the other can readily understand the danger those men undergo while performing their duty on those cars. They not only have to be at their dangerous work when the weather is fine and when the cars are in safe and proper condition for them to pass from one to the other but they have to be at their post at all times and at all seasons during the most inclement weather, when perhaps from cold they are unable to move. They have at all times to go from one car to the other and run the risk of a sudden jerk, or a sudden jar which might precipitate them along the rails or between

Mr. COOK,

these cars, when they would be crushed to atoms in a second of time. It is utterly impossible during the prevalence of a storm of sleet or snow to keep those running boards properly connected. They become slippery and the men who are compelled to step from one to the other are placed in the greatest danger. Yet we find that the country has been quite indifferent to the dangers and the hardships which those men endure. The running board is a particular necessity and should be considered by this House. I can understand that we cannot perhaps legislate in this direction immediately, and have all cars passing through the country properly protected in this way.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When the House rose for recess, I was endeavoring to show the necessity that exists for protecting railway employés. I pointed out the absolute necessity of having the frogs thoroughly packed. I believe that it is in the interest of the companies as well as of the employés and general public that every protection should be afforded to the employés. The company would be less liable to damages in case of accident, and would have fewer maimed men on its hands. The Bill not only provides for the packing of the frogs, but also for improving the running boards. Everybody who has had an opportunity of witnessing the difficulties and hardships endured by brakemen in connection with their dangerous employment, will agree with me that if any device can be found for affording better protection to them, it is the duty of this House and the railway companies to see that such a device is employed. We all know that the present system of box cars with running boards is a very dangerous system, from which many lives have been lost. The space between the cars being considerable, when a sudden jar or jolt takes place, the brakeman, while coupling the cars, is very liable to be thrown forward, and having nothing to hold by to protect himself, is liable to be thrown between the cars and killed. Then, these boards are frequently wet, and frequently covered with ice or snow, so that it is almost impossible for the men to pass along them even during the day time. But consider for a moment the difficulties a man must experience during the night when passing over the cars with a lantern in his hand. If there is a jolt or jar when he gets near the end of the car, having nothing to take hold of to protect himself, he is liable to be thrown down between the cars, or thrown down on the top of the car and rolled off. Many lives have been lost by these accidents, which are constantly occurring. If we take the whole of the mortality in connection with railroading, I suppose there is no other cause that has produced as great a destruction of life and limb as this very cause. It may be objected that so long as our present close commercial relations with the United States continue, with cars coming from the American side to the Canadian side, and not constructed in the same way as our cars, the present system must continue. But this is no excuse. It is our duty to protect our own citizens. We all know the value of a life; we all know the value of a citizen of the Dominion of Canada; and those who are injured are generally young and useful men, who have arrived just at that time of life when they are going to increase the wealth of the country. They are those who have just started out in life, and they may have a wife and small family depending on them for their maintenance and support. If we can make any provision whereby the lives of these men will be more secure without injuring the railway companies, it is our duty to do it. Instead of injuring the companies, I think I shall be able to show that such a measure of protection for the men would be a material advantage and saving to the railway corporations.

Not only should the running board be improved, but the space between the two box cars should be overcome so that there would be, as it were, one continuous board from one car to another car, so that the brakeman would not be obliged, as at present, to leap from one car to another. I think this could be done without much difficulty. When the cars are attached a coiled spring could be so arranged as to allow the boards to come together when the cars are tense, and to spring back when necessary, so as not in any way to break the end of the running board. At present, when there is a considerable space between them, the ends of the running boards are frequently broken, thus increasing the space over which the employes have to jump when passing from one car to another. Then I think there should be a hand rail beside the running board, extending from one end of the car to the other. In the Bill it is proposed that there should be a side rail, either of iron or a chain, two and a-half or three feet high. Such a rail, placed on either side of the running board would give the brakeman something to take hold of in passing along the car. It could be made, say, of gas pipe, and when approaching the end of the car let the side rails turn to the right and to the left, so as to embrace the whole width of the car. If that were not done the brakeman would be obliged to step over the railing to apply his brake, and might be thrown from the top of the car. This device would I think very materially protect the brakeman in passing over the tops of the cars. As this is a question in which we ought all to feel an interest, I may be allowed to read you letters which I have received from men who are conversant with this subject, and who take a great deal of interest in it. One of these is Mr. Deyell who has written me as follows:—

"The old running board in general use by railway companies is still retained within a short distance of each end of car, this space being occupied by our device which consists of a casing, into this casing is placed a slide that can easily be moved in or out of casing and projects sufficiently over ends of car to fill up gap caused when two cars are coupled together, thus making a continuous running board whole length of car. It is made self-adjusting by coil springs back of slide and inside of casing allowing them to cushion into casing when two cars come together. It is likewise provided with a hinge in order to overcome unevenness of track or when two cars come together of different height."

He mentioned here a difficulty that I had not pointed out. Very frequently those cars are of different heights, some being from two to four inches higher than others. Of course there is less danger when they are of the same height, but when there is a difference in height, there is danger that a person running along the foot board would slip in jumping from one car to the other. This device is so arranged that it is on a hinge, and when one car is higher than the other the hinge will raise up, and allow one board to pass in such a position under the other as to keep continuous connection between the two cars. Now if such a device as this can be made applicable to freight cars, and it in no way interferes with the operating of the brakes, the cost of the end rail is of very little expense indeed; and I have made out a just case for calling on railway companies to comply with the request I am making. I have besides a letter from the secretary of the order of railway conductors. These men are constantly employed in railroading, and ought to be able to know what would be the best device in the interest, not only of the companies, but the men they employ. The following is the letter:—

ST. THOMAS, Ont., 18th March, 1888.

"I. DEYELL, Esq., St. Thomas, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—We have this day been shown a model of running board and roof box car, as designed by you, and after thoroughly examining the same have found it to be a complete device which will fill a long felt desire of all railway men whose business requires them to go over the tops of trains, as it makes it impossible for a person to fall between the cars when in the act of stepping from one car to another, and we heartily recommend its adoption on all freight and box cars.

"Signed on behalf of the members of Union Division No. 13, Order of Railway Conductors.

"G. H. HILL,

"Secretary and Treasurer."

I have also another letter from the Brotherhood Brakemen, the men to whom, I am contending, this boon ought to be given:

"ST. THOMAS, 27th March, 1888.

"ISAAC DEYELL, Esq., St. Thomas.

"DEAR SIR,—I am instructed by our lodge to inform you that we, as a body, have inspected your automatic running board, and it was the opinion of the whole lodge that it is the best device for protection of brakemen that has ever been brought before us. The points that we look at are, namely, an unbroken run way, no leaping from car to car, and the hand railing which you have placed along the running board and encircling the brake, will make it as safe as it is possible to do. We feel grateful to you, and will say if your device had been in use prior to this, we would not mourn so many brothers who have met their deaths by falling between and off the sides of trains.

"Yours sincerely,

"F. W. COWLEY,

"Secretary."

Of course, not being a railway man, I cannot say positively that this device will be a success, equal to what these men anticipate it will be. But I can say that no one who has seen the model can fail to see what a great improvement, as regards safety, its principle will create. I feel earnestly in the interest of railway men that something should be done to protect them. There is another provision in the Bill which I heartily approve of. That is the provision making it compulsory on all railroads to have some means whereby the cylinders may be oiled from the cars. That system is the one adopted by the majority of the roads at present, but there are some which do not adopt it, and which compel the fireman or engineer to go out of the car and run along the running board forward to the cylinder and there to place the oil in a cup over the cylinder. This was the system followed to a great extent upon the Michigan and Central road until the last two or three years, and it was the cause of many accidents, the men being compelled to go out in the dark on these running boards, perhaps only six inches wide, carrying their can of oil in one hand and with the other raising the covering of the oil cup, without any means of hanging on to anything, so that often they were suddenly thrown from these running boards and killed. Now, although the majority of railroads are using the oil from the cab, yet it is not compulsory, and some roads still adhere to the old system. I think it is in the interest of the country, as well as it is in the interest of those who are employed upon the road, that this should be made compulsory on all railways, that they should have a device by which the cylinders may be oiled inside the cab, so as to prevent the necessity of the men going out at all seasons, at all hours and under all circumstances to oil those cylinders. I believe our railway system is a very important one in the interests of this Dominion. I believe it is something we ought to do our utmost to make as complete and efficient as we possibly can, and there is nothing that will conduce to that efficiency so much as to give that protection and assistance to those who are employed upon it. If we could possibly make railroading as safe as other employments, railway companies would be able to employ men at a more reasonable rate, perhaps, than they are now compelled to pay, and it would not only benefit the men by saving and protecting their lives, it would not only benefit the various insurance companies who now lose heavily by the accidents to the men employed on the roads, but it would protect the companies which are more or less liable for the accidents which occur to their employes while they are in their employ. It may be said that the company compels these men to sign an agreement that they will not expect indemnity when an accident occurs to them, but, if it is shown that this is caused through the negligence on the part of the company, I think they are liable in a court of law for damages for injury to the individual employed on the road; and, if that is not the case, it ought to be the case. If it is owing to the carelessness of the company

that an individual who is compelled to remain in their employment in order to obtain his daily bread, is injured, the company ought to be held responsible and the time is not far distant when a compulsory law of that kind will come into force. Therefore, if you can make a provision to protect the company and the men, it is the bounden duty of the Government to consider the Bill carefully, to adopt its provisions and to incorporate them in the consolidation of the Railway Act, and to make it compulsory on every company to adopt the provisions of this Bill in every Railway Act which is placed on the Statute-book. Feeling this very strongly, I shall support the Bill with much pleasure.

Mr. SHANLY. I do not suppose there can be any special objection, at least I do not myself know of any special objection, to granting the special committee which has been moved for by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison), in the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But, as regards the Bill itself, it appears to me that it is entirely behind the times. I understand from some words which fell from the hon. member for East Simcoe that this Bill has been introduced from year to year to this House, and now it is simply what I would call a Rip Van Winkle Bill. It is not changed in any particular, and it is evident that the mover, in reprinting it from year to year, has reprinted it without any knowledge of what is going on in the railway world around him. I believe that the matters which this Bill proposes to deal with will never be settled by any legislation in this House, and my reason for so thinking is that the matter is now engaging the attention of a far abler parliament than ever assembled or ever will assemble for this particular purpose within these walls. That parliament is composed of men of the best brains and the best trained intellect in this direction that are to be found on this continent, or I might say in the world. It is a parliament composed of the master-mechanics of the continental railways, in which parliament Canada is represented, and it is a parliament in which every member knows exactly what he is talking about. You may ask perhaps what this parliament to which I refer has done. I will tell you what has been the outcome of it. Already the old-fashioned coupling, which has caused so much loss of life and so many accidents to limb, is a thing of the past. The decree has gone forth and an automatic coupling, which is to take the place of the old-fashioned coupler, is to be applied to all the railway cars of this continent, as well to those of this country as to the cars on the other side of the frontier; and what will compel us to use that coupling is not any legislation we may pass here, but a far higher law, the law of necessity, because we have to interchange with railways on the other side, and whatever improvements are decided upon by that parliament to which I have referred, and in which our own mechanical managers are consenting parties, will be used in Canada, without our legislating here in the crude fashion which is proposed in what I have called this Rip Van Winkle Bill. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has given us a very long dissertation upon another matter which is a fruitful source of very sad accidents, and that is the necessity which exists for the brakemen on railway freight trains to run along the cars from end to end, be the night ever so dark, and the tops of the cars ever so slippery. The hon. gentleman did not exaggerate when he said that was one of the most fruitful sources of accident, and scarcely an accident of that kind occurs which is not fatal. But I do not think the remedy my hon. friend proposes, or which is proposed by certain correspondents of his, will be worth patenting, because, before he could patent his invention and apply it to the cars, before the running board that the Bill of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) provides for could be applied to the millions of cars which are now travelling from end

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

to end of this great continent, the necessity for the poor brakemen to run along the tops of the cars will have ceased for ever. The same parliament that I have spoken of are now providing for the adaptation, to freight trains, of the Westinghouse brake which has been so great a success in securing the safety of passenger trains, and on some of the western roads it has been so successfully adapted that a pattern train of some 30 cars has been sent, at the expense of the Westinghouse Company, to travel all over the Union and to show how easy is the adaptation of the Westinghouse brake to freight trains. That being so, my hon. friend's running board passes away. The patent is not worth paying for.

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the hon. member, even if you had that law, would it be possible to do away with the necessity of brakemen passing upon the top of the cars.

Mr. SHANLY. It will not necessitate the passing of brakemen from car to car at all, or along the tops of the cars. The object of the Westinghouse brake is to get rid of the necessity of employing brakemen to run along the tops of cars. Now, it is only by unanimity of plan, and by singleness of action, that we can obtain practical legislation of this sort, so as to do away with the dangers which now beset so many railway employes. I would ask, what can we expect from this Bill before us? It provides for a running board; but can we, with our few thousand miles of railway, legislate for the tens of thousands of miles of railway upon the other side of the frontier. Why, Sir, after you have put a running board upon our cars, you may find a car from 500 miles on the other side of the line without a running board, and you may find another car from 500 miles east upon the Intercolonial Railway, without a running board. We can not legislate here for all the roads who send their cars into this country. It is only by uniformity, and concert of action by all the railways of the continent, that we can bring about these great improvements. Sir, I say again, this Bill evidences want of thought, it evidences complete ignorance of current railway events. It may just as well be referred to a committee, but the conclusion which the committee will assuredly come to will be that our best plan is to wait for the improvements that are now being devised by the parliament of master mechanics; and when they are proposed and brought into use, as they will be, the higher law of necessity will compel us to adopt all the improvements that are suggested elsewhere. The interchange of cars is absolutely necessary for us. We can no more work our railways without interchanging with the American system, then we could work them if we used a different gauge, the inconvenience would be just as great. I may add that attempts have been made by almost every State in the Union by legislation to adopt just such a plan as that suggested by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and plans have been adopted by various states that such and such coupling shall be used, that such and such devices shall be adopted. But the law was inoperative, because the moment they got to the frontier of the State they came to a different system of coupling, to a different system of improvements, and their own became entirely useless. Therefore, while I do not object to a special committee amusing themselves over this Bill, the conclusion will be come to that they know very little of the matter indeed. The special committee will do that much good, the members will come to perceive their utter want of knowledge on the subject referred to them, and they will assuredly come to the conclusion that the true way to deal with this matter is to leave it in the hands of the great parliament composed of the master mechanics of the continental railways.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentlemen who have preceded me to-night have addressed their remarks almost exclusively to this running board. I do not know that the mem-

ber for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), has any particular object in advocating this running board, other than the interests of railway men.

Mr. SHANLY. Allow me a remark. I see no reason why my hon. friend from Elgin should not advocate it; I am merely putting him right upon this point, and telling him that something is going to happen that will render this running board useless.

Mr. LISTER. We agree about the running board, to some extent—I do not know anything about it.

Mr. SHANLY. I would suggest that my hon. friend's name be added to the special committee.

Mr. LISTER. It is very likely that there is something in the running board. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman for East Elgin was actuated by some sort of a motive in saying so much about that running board. It is probably a good thing, but there are other features of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that deserve the attention of the House. In the first place, I think it is greatly to be regretted that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, is not here for the purpose of explaining to the House its peculiar features, and the advantages to be derived from the passing of this Bill. We do know, however, that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook) several years ago, when he was a member of the Ontario Legislature, introduced a measure of this sort for the protection of railway employés, and we know that the measure he introduced was, to a certain extent, adopted by the legislature of Ontario in 1881. Now, Sir, that legislation does not deal with this question of running boards, but it deals with questions which, I think, are of equal importance to the railway employés of the country, and which would not make it necessary that the railway companies should buy the patent that has been referred to by the hon. gentleman from East Elgin. In 1881 the Legislature of Ontario passed an Act for the purpose of making provision for the safety of railway employés and the public, and that Act only proposed to deal with the question of frogs, and with overhead bridges. Now, the whole legislation of modern times is to compel the employers of labor to provide, as far as is practicable and possible, for the safety of the people in their service; and if it is the duty of the manufacturers of the country to do that, it is equally the duty, if not more so, of the railway companies, so far as possible, to protect the thousands of men in their service from the dangers incident to the employment in which they are engaged. That legislation of Mr. Mowat was excellent legislation, so far as it went, and if that Act was copied by this Parliament and made the law of the Dominion, it would be excellent legislation, if it went no further. I think that this House, if they thought proper, could expunge the objectionable clauses of this Bill and compel the railway companies to protect, as far as they can, their employés by packing the frogs, and thus prevent many an accident resulting in death or injury to limb. If this House had not interfered with the railway charters granted by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, if they had not confiscated the railways that we in Ontario have paid for with our own money, the employés of the railway companies would have the right, under this law, to compel the railway companies to compensate them for injuries they have sustained by neglect to comply with the provisions of this Act. But, Sir, this Legislature, in its wisdom, thought it was necessary that the railways we built in that Province, should be taken away from us and brought under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. Railways extending only a few miles, and that could by no process of reasoning be held to be for the general advantage of this Dominion, were taken from us. The result was that railways which cost the Province of Ontario well nigh the

\$30,000,000 have been taken away from the Province, and control over them has been assumed by this Parliament. The consequence is that thousands of men who were in the employ of those companies find themselves to-day without remedy or redress for injuries which under the law that incorporated those companies would have given them compensation. It has been held by our courts in more than one case, and in one case of a peculiarly painful character, that the Dominion Parliament having assumed control of the road, having declared them to be for the general advantage, the laws of the Province of Ontario did not apply, and men who would have been entitled to damages under that law were thrown out by the courts in consequence. If this Parliament takes control of these roads, I say in all fairness and honesty we are bound to give the workmen employed by those companies the same protection they had when this Parliament took control, if we go no further; and if there is one thing about railways more dangerous than another it is an unpacked frog. Year after year, almost month after month, life has been lost, men's prospects have been ruined by injuries which they have received. Within my own knowledge and within a year past a young man, the support of an old woman and several relatives, lost his life by having his foot caught in a frog. It was caught and he was unable to extricate himself before a train came along and he was killed. His friends had no redress. In another case a young man lost his leg; and these injuries are going on almost monthly. Shall it be said that this House, which poses as the protector and defender of the working classes, refuses to give to those men a measure of protection they had when we assumed control of those railways? I say it is unfortunate that the hon. member who introduced this Bill is not here to-night to promote it. If this Bill is referred to the special committee which has been proposed, what does it mean? Why, it is a delusion and a snare. The workmen are led to believe that the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill is the champion of the workingman, and if it is referred to a committee it means that the Bill will never be crystallised into law during this Parliament and probably never. I am not here to attribute motives to any hon. gentleman. He may be interested in railways or he may not; but as a legislator, as a member here for the purpose of passing law in the interest of the community at large, I say that the interest of the railway companies should not for one moment interfere with the protection which the people of the country are entitled to receive as against those roads. We give the companies great privileges and great rights, and it is the privilege of the people to see that in return the companies give the people an ordinary measure of protection. That is what this Bill asks, and it will be compatible with the dignity of this House, with what we owe to ourselves, to strike out every section except the third section, and say that that section shall become law, and that the railway companies shall be obliged to pack the frogs as is provided in that section.

Mr. SHANLY. I did not at all touch upon the question of packing the frogs. I quite agree with my hon. friend in regard to that matter. I touched upon the points respecting which I said we could not practicably legislate, the interchange of trains between this country and the other side of the line. As regards protection with respect to frogs, we can do as we like. I quite agree that that clause should stand if it stands alone.

Mr. LISTER. I say, then, we should get legislation by degrees. If that clause is passed and becomes law we have done a great deal, because we shall make our law almost the same as that in Ontario, with the exception of the section relating to overhead bridges. I know nothing practically about running boards—of course, I know what they are, and presume they are exceedingly dangerous—but if

some means could be devised for the purpose of reducing the danger it would be a very great benefit. But I can readily understand that, perhaps, the passage of this law immediately might throw burdens upon the railway companies and disarrange their affairs in a manner that would not be at all desirable. This matter should be referred either this Session or another Session to a committee which could hear evidence and consider the whole question, and devise some method to ensure the safety of the men on our railways; but so far as the third clause is concerned, I say again there should not be the slightest hesitation, we will be faithful to the duty we owe to the public if we do not make that the law during the present Session. That would not throw burdens on the railway companies and it is something that will add greatly to the safety of the railways, not only for the men employed, but the people who may be upon the track for business or otherwise. I trust so far as that clause is concerned, it will become law. I am glad beyond measure that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) takes the view he does of this matter, because he is a man of great experience and his utterances are entitled to great weight upon such subjects. I think, as I stated a moment ago, we owe it to ourselves, to the people of Ontario at all events, to make the law as it was when the Dominion Parliament assumed control of the Provincial railways.

Mr. TISDALE. I think if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), had confined his enquiries with a view to arriving at practical conclusions, it would have been more desirable. In dealing with these matters, it should be the aim of hon. members to deal with them so as not to be adjudged as attributing motives, and thus be enabled to approach the subject in a proper manner. Surely we would then be able to approach subjects of this kind respecting which there is no shadow of partyism, and where no Dominion or Provincial rights would come into consideration. I regret this, because in a large part of the remarks of the hon. member I think the whole House will concur. I regret he should have deemed it necessary to speak as he did about the promoter of the Bill. As I understand, the promotion of a Bill of a public nature is this: as soon as a public Bill is introduced into the House it becomes the property of the House, and the introducer of the Bill must be considered as having discharged a greater duty than the balance of the House because he has taken the responsibility and trouble of putting it into practical shape and submitting the result to the House. I hold that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is now as responsible for this Bill as is the introducer, and if he is equally capable, as I believe he is to perfect it, then I think he should confine himself to improving the Bill, and if this course were followed we would get along a great deal better. In the few remarks that I have been called upon to address to the House I propose to try and act in that spirit. I do not agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that referring a Bill to a special committee means burying it. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied that the members named on the committee will do their duty and report promptly to the House, it is within the right of the hon. member, and I would support him in it, to change their names and substitute a committee who will report. I know that in the Railway Committee and in the Banking and Commerce Committee when special committees are appointed they report in a day or two. If these gentlemen who have been named are not of that sort he can move, and I will second him, that members be appointed on the committee who will discharge their duty. As I understand it, the reason for appointing a special committee is to expedite and not to delay the proceedings of the House, and I have no doubt that the gentlemen named on this committee will

Mr. LISTER.

take that course. I fully concur in the very practical remarks of the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) as to the care which should be taken in endeavoring to legislate upon a matter which we understand so little of. I think it would be a great mistake for this House to endeavor to deal with the subjects mentioned in this Bill in any other way than by a special committee. There, the practical men connected with the railways should be given an opportunity of informing us from their experience and from their practical knowledge as to their views upon these subjects. They need not rule nor control the committee but hon. gentlemen must all admit that those who spend their life time in the management of such matters are those best capable of giving information on which we can form our ideas. Let me say this, that although I have nothing to do with railways, no more than most hon. gentlemen here, if you take this continent and this country and see the great progress that has been made in the safety and all other appliances of railways, we ought not to insinuate and I do not like to hear it insinuated as it were, in the House that the railway companies are against those improvements. Look at our Patent Office or go to Washington and see the thousands of models of patent rights, such as the hon. gentleman from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) mentioned, and you will wonder how railway men know what to choose from, there are so many things which come under the notice of railway managers, enlightened, intelligent, as a rule merciful as they are, which it would be their own interest to adopt, or as the hon. member for East Elgin said, it was a matter of pounds, shillings and pence to them if those appliances could be adopted. There is no doubt that all those approved appliances if found practical when put on a railroad are a saving of money to the companies, because they are in some way or other liable for compensation for loss of life or property. I believe that the special committee is the only proper way to deal with those questions, except perhaps the question of improved frogs. I think it is wise that a special committee should, as far as they can, investigate it and report to the House. With regard to running boards I venture to say that if you ask a brakeman on one of those mixed trains whether he would like a change of this sort or not, it is doubtful if he would say that he would like it. I will tell you why. If you get a man used to one set of appliances with a broad running board and supports he gets as it were to trust in them, and the first thing he knows, if the night is dark or in a moment of danger or excitement, when he has all he can do to manage the brakes, he strikes another car that has not got the same appliances, and he is sure to go down at once. He had relied upon the appliances upon one car and this led him to trust to them when he got on the car they were not on. Those are matters that should be considered. I am not speaking against the principle of the Bill. I believe we ought to get such light as will enable us beyond peradventure to legislate in a way that will make our legislation an improvement and not simply an experiment. For instance oil cups are theoretical things, and in my opinion some of the railway companies will not put them in the cabs. If you enter into any railway furnishing shop in this country, or in the States where there are so many thousands of miles of railway, you will see all kinds of patent oil cups, but the trouble with them is that sometimes they won't work, and the machinery on which the safety of not only the engineer and fireman on the train, but the lives of the passengers and the property depend will get out of order. Within my own knowledge in running a small private railroad we had those oil cups, and we found that we had to take them off, because they would not work. The men never could tell whether the oil went into the machinery or not, and although great expense had been incurred we had to remove them and return to the old-fashioned way. I mention that

as an illustration why our Parliament should not exercise its power—and it is all powerful—in legislating about matters without having sufficient knowledge of them to legislate upon. It would be well, I think, that a special committee should examine this matter and let us have prompt action and report on which we can decide whether we should take the responsibility of recommending some of those appliances. If we say to the railway companies that this thing should be done it is a very serious matter. Suppose for instance that this Parliament should say those oil cups should be put on the trains and suppose the oil cups do not prove effective and lead to a disaster we take the responsibility of this by relieving the railway companies. We should not touch anything except simple matters about which there can be no discussion without having the opinions of the people who are responsible for the management of those great railways. It is a most dangerous thing to interfere in those matters without a proper knowledge of the subject and I think it would be highly improper for us to take any action without a special examination before a committee who understand what legislation should take place upon the matter.

Mr. BARRON. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. member of South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and I was a little disappointed to find that he made no reference to the fact of the Dominion of Canada confiscating the railroads of Ontario. I think, Sir, as the representative of an Ontario constituency he should have dwelt somewhat on that fact.

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks that that is part of the discussion. If he does I can say a good deal about it, because I think the matter was not fairly put by the hon. member who preceded me. I said I proposed to discuss the matter in question without bringing anything into it which might stir up feeling on the opposite side of the House so long as it is not pertinent to the question before us.

Mr. BARRON. I will agree with my hon. friend, who sits to my right, in saying that it is a pity the Dominion of Canada confiscated the railways bonused by the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BARRON. I am coming to the question. Because by their so doing they deprived the employés and the workmen of the railways of Ontario of a law which gave them certainly more protection than they have under any Dominion Act. As my hon. friend to my right says they have no protection at all under any Dominion Act. I agree with my friend to my right that it is a pity that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill is not in the House to-night to promote it. I recollect last Session a similar Bill was introduced by the hon. gentleman towards the end of the Session. Why it was not introduced till late in the Session cannot be understood, except for the reason that it was not desirable it should become law. It does appear to me that by referring the Bill now to a committee, such as is proposed, that the intention is that it shall not become law this Session, and that employés on railroads shall not have that protection that they had under the Provincial Act before the railways of Ontario were confiscated by the Dominion. Now, Sir, different gentlemen who have spoken have pointed out some defects that exist in the Bill as introduced. One thing that the Bill does not provide for at all is overhead bridges. It is a fact, I believe, at all events the cases in the Province of Ontario have shown, that in the case of probably one-half of the railway lines the brakemen have no protection from overhead bridges. Take for instance the Midland Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway Company is the lessee of that road, and has escaped the obligation to raise the overhead bridges to the proper height above the

tops of the cars by reason of the statute requiring the owner of the bridge to do so. Then again the statute requires the railway company to raise the bridge to its proper height within twelve months after the passing of the Act; but that provision does not meet the case of the Midland Railway, because the Grand Trunk acquired that road more than a year after the passing of the Act. Thus we find that a cause of serious injury and sometimes death exists on the great lines of railway in the country, and there is no remedy provided by law. Therefore I think it is a pity that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill this Session, and the same Bill last Session, is not in the House, because he would have recollected that I drew his attention to this matter last Session in order that he might introduce into the Bill some legislation to meet the serious case I have spoken of. I find that the Bill is also defective in not providing for a sufficient space in the switches. I believe that the Bill provides that they shall be opened three inches. It must be apparent to any hon. gentleman that danger is as likely to result from these switches as now results from frogs. We know how numerous railway employés are at the present time. Our whole country is honeycombed with railroads, and there are necessarily a great many employés, and their occupation is a very dangerous one indeed. Therefore, I think that this Bill, involving as it does such an important matter as the safety of human life, should be taken up by the Government. Let them follow the example set by the Government of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, as they have done on other occasions, and let them take control of and assume all responsibility for this very important measure.

Mr. TISDALE. The General Railway Act regulates all the bridges.

Mr. BARRON. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the case of *McLaughlin vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company*—

Mr. TISDALE. I am not speaking of cases; I am speaking of the law. The hon. gentleman has induced the House to believe that we have no law to regulate the height of overhead bridges; and he is finding fault with this Bill because he claims that it should do that. The General Railway Act provides that bridges must be so built as to be free from danger.

Mr. BARRON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the General Railway Act does regulate overhead bridges, but unfortunately that Act has been held not to apply to the Grand Trunk Railway as lessee of the Midland, for the reasons I have stated. Thus it was that in a case where the Grand Trunk Company was morally responsible for the loss of a man's life, it escaped that liability by reason of our legislation not being sufficient to meet the case.

Mr. TEMPLE. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has not spoken to a single section of this Bill. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), I think is the only one on that side of the House who has spoken to any section of this Bill. He speaks in favor of having the frogs closed up to a certain extent. I agree with him and with the Bill on that point, and I had that done myself years ago when I was connected with a railroad. With regard to the running boards, I think the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) is perfectly right. I do not see how you are going to have running boards with all the different cars that are in use. There are thousands of cars passing backward and forward over the international boundary for thousands of miles; and though you might have all the cars in this country built with the running boards in one form, all the cars from the other side of the boundary would have another kind, and these cars are mixed together in almost every train. Therefore, it is a matter of

impossibility to make any change in the running boards, and there would be more danger and more loss of life in having different systems of running boards on different cars in one train than there is at the present time. Therefore we should condemn that part of the Bill. With reference to the oiling of the cars, it is done by this system with a great deal of danger, and the system is in fact not practicable, so that it is given up by different railways. You cannot tell by this system whether the lubricator is working or not, and all the machinery may be broken up for the want of oil. There is therefore only one section of this Bill that can be recommended, and I think the best plan would be to refer the whole Bill to a special committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not understand the hon. member for West Lambton to cast any reflections on the promoter of the Bill for his absence to-night. I understood him simply to say that he regretted it, and I say that I regret it too, because I believe that hon. gentleman has made a special study of the matter, and it would be to our advantage to-night to have the result of his study and information. For that reason and no other, we regret his absence. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has told us that there were plenty patents of invention in the patent office to secure everything wanted. I know there are numerous inventions there, but I know also that not one in fifty, in railway matters as in others, is practicable, and the best evidence of this is that they are not adopted for use. It is time that we were doing something in this matter. I was happy to hear that a far higher parliament than this has taken the matter in hand and that we might expect to see the whole thing settled. It is refreshing to know that the highest intellect in the land are considering this matter, and that when they see fit, they are going to remedy all the evils; but I would simply say they have been a mighty long time about it. Thousands of lives have been lost within the last thirty-five years. In fact not a week passes but we hear of the death or the wounding or maiming of some railway employé, yet these demi-gods have been asleep or on a journey all that time, and it is only now, when there is an attempt to do something, they tell us to keep quiet, and that they will soon settle the whole difficulty. I cannot help thinking that it will not do for us to shelter ourselves behind their gigantic intellect. Although our intellects may be limited and our experience small, yet we have a great responsibility resting upon us, and that responsibility becomes the more apparent when we consider the difficulties that require protection. These men whom we desire to protect are the employés of rich and powerful companies; they are men who have not the means nor the influence to protect themselves, they are men who are exposed to the greatest dangers. So well known is this that insurance companies charge the highest premiums to brakemen of any class in the community, and it is a well known fact, established by statisticians, that the average life of a railway brakeman is the shortest of that of any class. It is therefore high time that this House took some action in the matter. Reference has been made to the fact that the Dominion Government has taken over almost all the railway lines in the country. In most of the Provinces, in Ontario I believe, they have passed laws to protect the employés of railway companies. By the taking over of these railways by the Dominion, these Acts have become inoperative, and it seems strange to me that the Government should have neglected all this time to make some provision for the protection of these people. In view of this fact, I think it is a great pity that the matter was left to be dealt with by private members of the House. It certainly was one with which the Government should have dealt, if only for the reason that they have access to more sources of information than have private members.

Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill before the House is too important to be dropped, even though the hon. gentleman who proposed it is not here. I am sure he is as much disappointed as any hon. gentleman here can be having to be absent. I had a conversation with him for some time about this measure, and I am quite satisfied that some of the amendments suggested by hon. gentlemen were intended to be introduced at the proper stage by the introducer of the Bill. I think there would be a better outcome for the Bill if it were referred to a special committee with power to call witnesses and papers. I do not think any hon. gentleman who has ever given consideration to the question, or has ever gone into the yards where a large number of cars are standing and seen the narrow spaces men have to travel on in fair weather and foul weather, in daylight and darkness, will fail to admit that in the interest of humanity it is important some change should be made. When we remember that these railway employés are obliged to travel in daylight and darkness on these freight cars, with a very narrow board, in some cases not more than twelve or fourteen inches wide, and often covered with a sheet of ice, and that these narrow spaces on the tops of the cars are not guarded by any railing to which the brakeman can possibly catch on, we cannot wonder that the number of accidents is so large. It is therefore of great importance that we should, if possible, devise some means of removing this evil and saving a large number of lives. One clause of the Bill provides for making the board of a certain width, sufficient to allow a man to pass along conveniently; in addition it provides a railing and also for the running boards coming as close together as practicable, so that men can pass from one car to another without running the risk which they must now run. If there was nothing else in the Bill, it is important that it should become law, but there are other important amendments that could be introduced in the select committee, and that select committee should be enabled to take evidence and to look into the matter more closely. There was another question brought up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they seemed to hold that it was a drawback in connection with our control over railways in this country, and that is the fact that the Dominion Government has said that certain railways are in the interest of the Dominion, and therefore come under Dominion control. If I understand anything about law, I think that is an advantage to the employés on the roads, because they are passing constantly from one Province to another, and an accident may happen in one Province to-day and in another Province to-morrow. That necessitates carrying on the action under different laws. The law in one Province may be different from the law in another. Now, no matter in what Province the accident occurs, the prosecution is always conducted under the same law, and therefore the people are able to understand and to interpret the law and are able to understand the responsibilities of the company and what redress they may have in the event of accidents. I believe it was intended to go further in this law and to provide also for compensation for all accidents to employés on the road no matter from what cause. Some may hold that it would be unwise to make such a provision, but other countries have adopted it and have found it to be not injurious to the railways and to be beneficial to the employés; and I think, remembering the large number of accidents which occur from year to year and the causes of the accidents and remembering the careless indifference which is generally exhibited by railway companies as to the safety of their employés, it becomes all the more important that the Legislatures of the country should take up the subject and pass some such imperative law to compel them to provide for the safety of human life where provision for it can be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have listened with very great attention to the very interesting and important dis-

ussion we have had. I am quite certain it would be very difficult to find any question which would appeal more to the feelings of members on both sides of the House than this, which is a matter of vast importance. I regret exceedingly that the promoter of this Bill is not present. The very fact that he has from time to time moved in it shows that his attention has been drawn to it and that he has given a very considerable amount of consideration, but I am certain that every member of the House must have been very much impressed with the very practical observations made by the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly). It is a great advantage to this House, when questions of this kind come up, to have gentlemen whose profession has directed their attention to matters of this importance, and whose great ability is recognised throughout the country as fitting them to give advice to the House on questions of such transcendent interest. I feel the force of what has been said by several members on both sides of the House as to the great responsibility that must necessarily devolve upon the Government in relation to a matter of this kind affecting the safety of human life and the prevention of a great number of very deplorable accidents, and, I think, under the circumstances, in the absence of the promoter of this measure, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways has an important Bill on the paper, which I trust his restored health will enable him in a short time to present for consideration, the best course to take would perhaps be to adjourn the debate, and allow the question to rest on that adjournment until the railway measure for which the Government is responsible is laid before the House. Then this Bill can be brought forward, and gentlemen who have taken an interest in it, who have investigated the subject and who may be prepared to offer valuable suggestions, will have the opportunity of presenting those views, and we would be in that way enabled to incorporate any feature of this Bill or any suggestion, having in view the attaining of the important object at which this Bill aims in the Bill for which the Government is responsible. I trust, therefore, I shall meet with the approval of gentlemen on both sides of the House if, with that object, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

AID TO WRECKED VESSELS BILL.

Mr. HAGGART (for Mr. KIRKPATRICK) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. He said: The object of this Bill, as I understand, is to give similar privileges to American wrecking vessels to those which are allowed us on the other side. I believe legislation has been passed in the United States which allows our vessels to assist wrecked vessels in United States waters on condition that similar legislation is passed in our country which will allow American wrecking vessels to enjoy similar privileges.

An hon. MEMBER. Reciprocity, is it?

Mr. HAGGART. True reciprocity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that the mover of this Bill is not present. It is a Bill of very great importance, and one which, I think, ought not to be proceeded with by the House on the very brief statement of the hon. gentleman who has been kind enough to move it in the absence of the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. The measure is one of great public importance, which I think should not be hastily or summarily dealt with. The question has been before the House, it has been made the subject of a good deal of diplomatic intercourse between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada. A measure somewhat similar to this has, I think, been put on the Statute-book of the United States, providing that, in a certain contingency,

there should be reciprocity in regard to this matter. It is very well known that the Government of Canada have for a very long period been extremely anxious to expand that reciprocal action between the Government of the United States and the Government of this country, and to place it upon a very broad basis in connection with the coasting trade. A standing offer, as the House is well aware, is upon our Statute-book inviting the reciprocal action of other countries, and a number of countries have taken advantage of it. We stand in the position that we are quite prepared to offer the great advantages of the enormous coast which we possess and the very valuable coasting trade of Canada to any country in the world which is prepared to give to Canada the like privileges in its waters. I hope the time will come when the great country to the south of us will be prepared to meet us on that question, and when we shall have an opportunity of registering Canadian built vessels in the United States of America and giving similar privileges to vessels built in the United States to have registry in Canada, and that under the same arrangement vessels under the flag of the United States will have the same coasting privileges that our own vessels have, while we on the shores of the United States will enjoy the same privileges which we are prepared to extend to them. I think, Sir, under these circumstances, we have reason to look forward to a much larger measure of reciprocity than the limited one involved in this question of wrecking. But apart altogether from the general question of reciprocal trade between the United States and Canada, there is the coasting trade of the inland waters. I believe it is very well known that the Government of Canada have again and again proposed to the Government of the United States, that if they were not prepared, on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the two countries, to have mutual reciprocity in coasting, we have invited them to have reciprocal action in regard to the coasting trade of inland waters; and reciprocal action in regard to the coasting trade of the great lakes and the inland waters, would at once dispose of all the difficulties connected with this question of wrecking. I did not intend to offer a single remark upon this subject until I had heard what was to be said by the advocates and the opponents on this measure, if it has any opponents; but I could not allow the second reading of this Bill to pass accompanied only by the few observations of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who was not responsible for the Bill. I therefore rose simply to prevent the question being put to the House until we could have an opportunity of hearing what was to be said for and against this measure. Therefore, if it is intended to proceed with the Bill, as the promoter of the measure is now in his place, I would like to be allowed to rest my observations at this point, until I hear what that hon. gentleman has to say in regard to this question.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sorry I was not present to relieve my hon. friend of the duty of moving the second reading of this Bill. I intended to listen to what was to be said by hon. gentlemen, and to offer some remarks at the close of the debate; but as the Finance Minister has asked me now to explain the object of this Bill, I shall take the opportunity of doing so. The Bill, Sir, is a very simply one in form, but it is far reaching in the principle it involves. The question of reciprocity of wrecking is one which interest a very large number of our citizens. When I tell the House that the number of vessels navigating the inland waters of Canada is upwards of 4,000, that there are 35,000 seamen employed on those vessels, and that the capital invested in our inland marine amounts to many millions of dollars, the House will perceive the great importance of the subject dealt with by this Bill. The question of preventing vessels, either American or Canadian, from assisting others which may be stranded, or in distress,

or wrecked in the waters of either country, seems to have been of somewhat recent date. I believe it is only within a few years that any attempt was made to prevent Canadian vessels from rendering assistance to American vessels or Canadian vessels in American waters, and *vice versa*. In 1842, the question of the free navigation of the inland waters was dealt with by the Ashburton Treaty, as stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the other day; but whether that gives the right to aid vessels wrecked or distressed, I do not think can be doubted. It does not give that right explicitly, and it is only the common law of humanity which would compel us to claim that right. But the customs law as enforced now, distinctly says that American vessels cannot afford assistance to Canadian vessels or American vessels in Canadian waters. The law was so interpreted by the late Government in 1878, and the then Minister of Customs issued a circular to all the custom houses informing them that American vessels were not to be allowed to render assistance to vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters, and that if any American vessels did so, they were liable to be seized. In consequence of that circular some American vessels rendering assistance to vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters, were seized, and now application has to be made to the customs authority for permission. The hon. Minister of Customs stated the other day that such permission was never refused if it was shown that no Canadian tug or Canadian wrecking vessel could go to their assistance. But, Sir, I submit that before that information can be obtained, before it can be ascertained whether there are any Canadian tugs that can go to the assistance of a vessel in distress, great injury to life and property may occur, and the critical moment may have passed when assistance could be of any avail. The American Government seeing this, and having such a large number of vessels—because American vessels far outnumber Canadian vessels on our inland waters—desirous of having reciprocity in this matter, they passed a Bill in 1878, declaring that Canadian vessels of all description :

"May render aid or assistance to Canadian or other vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada, provided that this Act shall not take effect until proclamation by the President declaring that the privilege of aiding American or other vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States, has been extended by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and declaring this Act to be in force."

Now, Sir, that Act has remained on the Statute-book of the United States ever since 1878, and no action has been taken by this Government. An opportunity now offers for us to put in force the principle which was recognised by both sides in this House the other day, one side asking for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in everything. If they ask for unrestricted reciprocity, surely hon. gentlemen will be glad to take partial reciprocity as a means towards that end. Every hon. gentleman, I take it, on that side of the House who voted for unrestricted reciprocity, will be prepared to vote for this very important measure of partial reciprocity. Those hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who voted for a resolution declaring that they always has been in favor, and were still in favor, of reciprocity with the United States, provided it did not interfere with the National Policy, must, I think favor, this Bill also; because the National Policy is not in any way affected by this Bill. In fact it helps the National Policy. The National Policy was adopted for the purpose of fostering the shipping industry, among others, that large interest which we want to develop and strengthen; and everything that would tend to the prosperity of that interest ought to receive favor at the hands of the friends of the National Policy. We find all the shipping men of the country in favor of a measure which will render them assistance and help to protect their property when in jeopardy. The in-

Mr. KIRKPATRICK,

surance men, who derive a large income from our marine interest, are all in favor of this measure. Every facility should be given to parties who will invest money in wrecking appliances and in bringing, as quickly as possible, wrecking vessels to the aid of vessels in distress. I think, therefore, both sides of the House should favor this motion. I said that this stipulation or restriction upon the right of common humanity to render assistance to vessels in distress and to save life and property was first passed by the late Government. I have here a copy of the instruction issued, and I will read it. It is a circular issued on 8th March, 1878, addressed by the Commissioner of Customs to collectors of Customs throughout the country, and is as follows.—

"SIR,—I am now instructed by the Minister of Customs to call your attention to the bearing of the customs law upon the treatment of wrecked vessels or property in Canadian waters, which provides in effect that no vessel, foreign or Canadian, has legal right to interfere with vessels or material in Canadian waters, unless permitted by the collector of customs at the nearest port after reporting to him. And no foreign vessel should receive such permission, as it is contrary to customs law, and should be placed under detention in case of violation."

I can hardly believe the statement I read in some of the papers published from the Secretary of State at Washington alleging that actually where an American tug went to an American vessel and removed the frozen bodies of the captain's wife and boy from the wreck and saved part of the cargo she was actually fined for rendering such assistance.

Mr. CHARLTON. What case was that?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That was the case of the *Augustus Ford* driven ashore near Grand River in December, 1874. The vessel *Brian* which was passing near the place at the time took off the frozen dead bodies of the captain's wife and boy and saved part of the cargo of the wrecked vessel, and was fined for doing so. It is true that part of the fine was remitted afterwards, but the fact remains that for rendering that service in the hour of distress an American vessel was actually subjected to the laws of this country and was fined. It is hard to believe that there should be such a want of common humanity and neighborly feeling between these two countries as to permit such a thing to be possible. I hope now that the United States has shown a desire to have a reciprocity treaty in this matter, that she has held out the hand of neighborly good feeling, we will have a similar law placed on our Statute-book to that in the United States. It has been objected that we would be giving away a great deal by doing so, that we should insist upon some other reciprocal right being given to us, for instance, that of the free navigation laws or the free right of towage. But if the United States will not give us this, let us not insist in dragging in something not germane to the subject and which will destroy its whole effect. Let us in the cause of common humanity, as they term it, provide that the first person that shall come to the aid of life and property in distress shall have the right to do so. It has been stated a large portion of the wrecks are in Canadian waters. I hold in my hand a statement which disproves it, a statement of the wrecks of last year, and it will astonish hon. members, I am sure, to know that last year there were 204 lives lost in our inland waters and not less than \$4,500,000 worth of property was destroyed; the total losses comprise 73 vessels, representing over 20,000 tons. Out of those 73 vessels which became a total loss only 11 were lost in Canadian waters. We have been told that the reason for enforcing the customs law was that the wrecks were in American waters as four or five to one; but here is this statement that of 73 vessels that proved a total loss only 11 were wrecked in Canadian waters, and of 100 vessels that were a partial loss only 12 were in Canadian waters. This shows that we will not be giving up a great right for the benefit of Americans. We are opening up to our own wreckers and those who have wrecking vessels and appliances a large territory in which to ply their vocation.

Moreover, it must be remembered that of those vessels which are navigating the lakes the largest and most valuable of them are American vessels, and they ply more especially in American waters. The wrecks that are most valuable to the wrecking companies are American vessels and the great losses are in American waters. I contend, therefore, that it would be a distinct advantage to our Canadian wrecking companies and wreckers if we had in this matter a reciprocal right of free wrecking.

Mr. COOK. What proportion of the mercantile marine of the great lakes belongs to Canada?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. A very small proportion at present. Out of four thousand vessels a very large proportion are American and they are the most valuable. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have good reason to believe that this is going to be rapidly changed owing to the opening up of our North-West and the large crop of wheat which is coming down to Fort William and Port Arthur to be shipped from those ports either to the St. Lawrence or by Buffalo to New York, which will require Canadian vessels to bring it to the St. Lawrence. That has caused a great demand for Canadian tonnage, and to-day we know there are two large vessels coming from England across the Atlantic to be employed in this grain trade. Mr. Marks, of Port Arthur, and Messrs. Corwall & Grasset of Toronto, have each ordered a large steam vessel of over two thousand tons burthen, and these are only the forerunners of the large fleet that will be required to carry the grain crop from Fort Arthur and Port William. In a very few years the Canadian tonnage will bear a very fair proportion to that of the United States, but at present American tonnage is much larger and altogether out of proportion to Canadian tonnage. When the Americans not only offer reciprocal wrecking to us but press it upon us, and in the dispatches received from Washington which have been printed and brought down in the papers, it appears they express a very great desire that the common right of humanity, as they express it, should be accorded by this Government and we should have free wrecking, and that the right to render assistance to life and property when in distress should be as free as the air we breathe or the sunlight. If the House will give it a second reading and when the Bill comes up next week I will propose that some changes can be made which shall make it applicable to all the points that may be raised. It now does not provide I think sufficiently to meet the wants of the case, but I would prefer to make those amendments later on and I hope the House will give it a second reading.

Mr. SHANLY. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance just now referred to this Bill as limited in its scope. It certainly is very limited, but the cases for which it is proposed to provide are almost certain to be of a very urgent character indeed. When our house happens to be on fire we do not generally ask where the firemen came from with their engine before we allow them to couple on the hose. Therefore I hope when the matter comes up for debate again the Government will not ask that this Bill should be postponed until a larger scope of reciprocity in other cases will be decided upon.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Bill receives its second reading, if it does receive its second reading, I desire to address a few remarks to the House in connection with the consideration of this question. Reciprocity in wrecking is rather a convenient term and upon the surface it would seem that the proposal made by the American Government in their statutory offer of 1878 that there should be reciprocity in wrecking between the two countries was a reasonable question. But I think, Sir, when we examine into the question a little deeper that facts will present them-

selves for the consideration of the House which are not apparent on the surface of the question. We have a very skilful use made of the humanity cry, and I shall be able to show a little later on that the course of the Canadian Government in that respect cannot be called into question at all, and that the action of this Government has been invariably humane and that in every case of emergency. In every case where there was danger of loss or imminent danger of loss of property that could be averted by prompt action, the Canadian customs authorities have always promptly granted a permit for American vessels to act. I will come to that more fully later on. This policy of restriction, with regard to wrecking upon the coasts of our great lakes, whether right or wrong, is a policy that was not inaugurated by this Government, but it was inaugurated by the American Government. They initiated the orders of which my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) complains, and our Government was simply forced, in self-defence, to issue orders of the same character protecting our own interests from the attack made by this order of the American Treasury Department. This course, Sir, which was rendered necessary by the American action happens to have proved to be a course which has redounded very largely to the advantage of Canada, and in consequence of that fact we have the American Government applying to us through its statutory offer of 1878, and making applications in various ways, to induce us to give reciprocity in wrecking, while they are going back on their own proposition, retracing their steps and asking us in point of fact to enter into an arrangement that would give them the whole business, which I shall proceed to show later on. The way the thing has worked has been this: It is true as my hon. friend says that the greater part of the tonnage on the lakes is American tonnage; it is also true as is shown by the report made by Mr. Lewis (which unfortunately was lost between some two departments of this Government and never was published and which is alluded to only in the records) that up to that time a large portion of the wrecks on the great lakes had taken place on Canadian coasts. It is this fact that leads the American Government, the American shipowners, the American insurance companies and wrecking companies to desire the alteration which my friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) also desires should be made in reference to this policy. The hon. gentleman tells us that surely if we cannot get all we want in unrestricted reciprocity it would be a good thing to take a little. Well, that depends entirely upon the circumstances of the case. If that little is something entirely to our disadvantage I am not in favor of taking it. If I may be permitted to refer to the matter, I may say that the hon. gentleman referred to the little we took the other day in the shape of the admission of trees and fruits and so forth. So far as I am concerned I think we took that little with rather a bad grace and had it not been for the unfortunate offer which we had made which forced us into rather an unfortunate position and rendered it expedient to take these, I think that most of the members of this House would not have taken that small measure of reciprocity we took the other day. I am not much in favor of taking another dose of the same kind when the circumstances are so much different. Now, the business of wrecking of course pertains to the coasting trade. Wrecking is an incident of that trade. We have upon our Statute-book an offer, which is also a statutory offer, made in the year 1870—eight years before the American offer was made—which is contained in chap. 14, 33 Vic., sec. 2, and in that section we extend to the Americans this offer. The statute goes on to make provisions with regard to the coasting trade, prohibiting in the first section any but British vessels carrying passengers or freight from one part of our coast to the other. The second section contains this offer:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not, while such Order in Council is in force, apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country and to carry goods and passengers, from any port in such country to another, and may, from time to time, revoke or alter such Order in Council."

As I said, wrecking is an incident in the coasting trade, and I am not in favor of allowing the American people or Government to select that particular incident in the trade, of which reciprocity will be a great advantage to them, and drop all the rest where reciprocity in trade may be of some advantage to us. If they desire reciprocity on the great lakes let them give us reciprocity in the coasting trade as well, of which wrecking is an incident, but to allow them to select this one thing in which we had the advantage over them; an advantage acquired by their own act, for their own act forced upon us the course that we took, and which resulted to our advantage. If they desire that incident of the coasting trade let them open the whole question as to trade on the waters of the great lakes. Now, Sir, with regard to the orders issued by the Customs Department in this country, and with regard to the assertion that the policy pursued by this Government has been an inhumane one, and one not characteristic of the spirit of this age of civilisation, I wish to point out what those regulations have been. I have here No. 9 of the Sessional Papers of the year 1880-81. This subject of wrecking had been made a subject of communication between the Governments at that time, and Sessional Paper No. 50 of this volume contains the correspondence in relation to that matter. I have selected from this correspondence some portions which will clearly show in what spirit our Government had treated this question. The first paper is the copy of a report of the Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council for Canada, approved by His Excellency on the 6th of June, 1879:

"The Committee have had under consideration a despatch from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington to Your Excellency of 18th December last, and enclosures, relating to the regulations in force on the lake coast of Canada, respecting the treatment of wrecked vessels and property in Canadian waters.

"The Honorable the Minister of Customs, to whom the above mentioned despatch and enclosures were referred, reports that the question appears to be misunderstood by the authorities at Washington, owing, he believes, to the fact that the action of the Customs Department has been presented to them not only in an exaggerated but a very erroneous light.

"That as it respects the Department circular of 8th March, 1878, a copy of which he submits, it was, he states, addressed to collectors of customs only, and was intended to remind them of the proper bearing of customs law upon wrecked property actually stranded upon the Canadian shores, and this they thoroughly understood. That no Canadian officer ever interpreted the circular or the law, as justifying interference with the efforts of vessels of any nationality to succor any vessel in distress and save human life or property, while there was a possibility of preventing their loss, nor has any case of such interference ever occurred.

"That in the matter of the steam tug *Sarah Bryant*, wrecked in November, 1874, alluded to by Mr. Evarts, it is plain that the circular could have had no influence upon the officers concerned, as it was not issued until about 3½ years after the occurrence, and that the assertion made by the master of the *Bryant* that he took off the frozen dead bodies of the captain's wife and others is not justified by facts, there being living witnesses and documentary evidence, of the most unquestionable character, to prove that the living and the dead were taken from the wreck by a Canadian boat crew, before the tug arrived at the scene of the disaster. The correspondence upon what point he also submits.

"That in the case of the *Champion* it has been freely admitted that the officer who seized her, did so under a mistaken impression as to the nature of the Act, and that he was simply, as he supposed, enforcing the law prohibiting foreign vessels from towing in Canadian waters. That this description of work has never been allowed by the United States customs to Canadian vessels in their waters. That the vessel, however, was not detained an hour, and the only inconvenience suffered was leaving a deposit for a short time with the collector of Customs of the sum of \$400, which was promptly returned as soon as the Commissioner of Customs became acquainted with the facts of the case.

"That the desire of the Government of Canada has always been, and still is, to effect a mutual arrangement by which the coasting laws might be so ameliorated on both sides, as to enable them to dispense entirely with the present unpleasant and inconvenient restrictions upon the movements of the vessels of either nation, but that in the meantime the laws must be respected, and while the claims of humanity

Mr. CHARLTON.

have been, and always will be duly recognised, it is the special duty of the Department of Customs to protect the rights and interests of the Canadian commercial marine against the encroachments of all parties.

"That the Government of Canada is not only willing but anxious that the most liberal interpretation shall be given to laws relating to the navigation of the inland lakes and rivers, and are ready to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United States, with the view to the adoption of a more liberal policy in this respect, but that they cannot consent to any measure which would give United States ship owners privileges in Canadian waters not secured in equal proportion to Canadian ship owners in United States waters, nor can any partial system of reciprocity be accepted, which in its practical operation would favor the latter at the expense of the former."

That is exactly what is asked here, a particular system of reciprocity that will favor the United States at the expense of Canada; that is the partial application of the system of reciprocity that is asked by my hon. friend. Then, we have in a circular, No. 231, the following addressed to the collector of Customs:

"CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,
"OTTAWA, 19th September, 1879.

"Sir,—Referring to the Departmental circular No. 210—3, of 5th of March, 1878, on the subject of wrecking by foreign vessels in Canadian waters, I am desired, by the Minister of Customs, to inform you that the circular is not to be understood as having any application to cases wherein life may be endangered, or where property may be jeopardised by delay, such, for instance, as the grounding of a vessel in circumstances in which immediate assistance would prevent a wreck. Nor is there any possible case in which vessels of any nationality should be prevented from going to the rescue of persons in peril of their lives, or of vessels in danger of being lost.

"You will understand the terms 'wrecked vessels or property in Canadian waters' as referring to vessels and cargoes cast upon the Canadian shores, and stranded or wrecked requiring apparatus for their removal or discharge of cargo into other vessels, and to goods which may have been discharged or floated off therefrom and cast upon the coast, and in either case coming within the provisions of the revenue laws.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"J. JOHNSON."

In reply to this we have the following from State Department at Washington, dated 2nd October, 1879:

"Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 30th ult, transmitting a copy of circular issued by the Customs Department of Canada, defining the terms of circular No. 210, of 5th March, 1878, in relation to wrecking by foreign vessels in Canadian waters, and to express to you the gratification with which this Government has learned of this measure of relief."

So that we see that the character of the interpretation by the Customs Department of their regulation was satisfactory to the authorities at Washington. Then, we have later on in this correspondence some facts such as the matter referred to by my hon. friend with regard to the wrecking of a vessel at the mouth of the Grand River, in which the tug *Sarah Bryant* figured. That was one of a series of misrepresentations which had been made to the American Government. The facts are rather dim in my memory, but I believe that those dead bodies were taken from that schooner by a Canadian tug, that all the relief that was rendered to it was rendered to it by a Canadian tug, and that the *Sarah Bryant* only came from Buffalo after all danger to life or property was past, and had to be warned off. Now, I have here some other documents to show the nature of the charges made against the customs authorities of Canada. Here is one, referring to the case of the *Jane McCloud*, addressed by Mr. W. Evarts to Sir E. Thornton on the 3rd of February, 1880:

"The case of the *Jane McCloud* is, in particular, notable. That schooner went ashore at the mouth of the Six Mile Creek, near Wilson, on the morning of 2nd November last, and was towed off by a Canadian tug, which later was not only detained and heavily fined, but was permitted to accomplish her humane work without her name being even ascertained. I need scarcely advert to the treatment which an American tug might, under similar circumstances, have met with in the waters of the Dominion, inasmuch as past correspondence has served to familiarise both of us with the aspect of the subject and to make clear the difficulty which in such a case might attend the exercise of the discretionary power of deciding whether life or property was or was not imminently endangered within the meaning of the recent explanatory circular of the Dominion Government."

In reply to this we have this communication contained in a copy of a report of a Committee of the Honorable Privy Council on the 19th November, 1880 :

"The communication of Mr. Evarts to Sir Edward Thornton, of the 3rd February, refers to former correspondence on the same subject, and transmits for Sir Edward's information a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the United States Treasury, with reports from the customs officers of the United States stationed at Wilson and Oldcott, in the district of Suspension Bridge, in the State of New York, relative to the cases of certain Canadian vessels which went ashore on United States coast of Lake Ontario during the month of November, A.D. 1879, and to the assistance rendered on those occasions by Canadian tug boats, calling special attention to the case of the *Jane McCloud*, which went ashore on the 2nd November, 1879, at Six Mile Creek, in the State of New York, and was towed off by a Canadian tug boat without, 'Mr. Evarts observes,' the tug boat being detained or heavily fined by the authorities, but permitted to accomplish her humane work without her name or nationality being ascertained.

"The Minister submits that the aid in this case afforded to the vessel in distress without the nationality of the tug boat which accomplished the 'humane work' being enquired into, was an act which, if performed by a United States tug boat towards a vessel in like distress on the Canadian coast, would be treated in the same manner and with the same consideration as was shown on the occasion referred to by the custom house officers of the United States.

"The Minister observes that the cases of Canadian schooners, *Gold Hunter* and *Wave Crest* sunk in harbor of Oldcott seem, from the statement of the deputy collector of Oldcott, to have been substantially as follows :—These vessels having been sunk were respectively raised and floated without any assistance having been rendered by Canadian tug boats, but they were afterwards towed to ports in Canada by Canadian tug boats, towing in this character being by usage a recognised right of vessels of either nationality, being quite consistent with the coasting regulations both of the United States and Canada."

So much for those charges. Upon examining into them, we find they are without foundation. Then a very serious charge was preferred in the case of a raft of 2,000,000 feet of timber in the tow of the tug *John Owens* which was driven ashore on a point below Pelee Island. Representations were made to the Department of State that this raft was in imminent peril, that the American tug having it in tow was not allowed to do anything for the relief of the raft, that other American tugs were not permitted to engage in the work of relief, and that the raft lay in a position of imminent peril for thirty hours before aid could be obtained. We have a communication from the State Department to the Canadian authorities on the subject, dated 13th June, 1879. I will not take the time to read it, but will show that the charge was entirely without foundation. In the first place, the assertion that a timber raft would be in imminent danger after going ashore was preposterous. It would make no difference in danger to the raft whether it lay there thirty hours or thirty days, and there could have been no emergency or danger or loss of life on that score. But in a report by the hon. the Minister of Customs, contained in a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, the following facts are set forth :—

"First, that the raft was actually in the condition of being towed by the two United States tugs above named at the time it was injured. Second, that the cause of the injury was a heavy storm which prevailed, combined with the fact that the two United States steam tugs exerted too much force in endeavoring to prevent the raft from being driven on shore by such storm, the consequence was that the raft was torn to pieces by the said tugs.

"Third, that no Canadian officials refused to allow any United States tugs to proceed to the assistance of the raft.

"Fourth, that no application was ever made to any custom house officer in Canada for permission to allow any United States vessel to give assistance in the case, and that at the date of the occurrence there was no Canadian custom officer located on Pelee Island.

"Fifth, that the masters of the tugs '*John Owens*' and '*Kate Williams*' submitted that they were not interfered with, and that Mr. S. P. Bliss, the owner of the raft was not only no party to the complaint, but repudiates the idea of his knowing any complaint or cause of complaint against Canadian customs official in that case."

That was all there was of that case. Then we had another very serious complaint in the matter of the seizure of the American tug *Relief* with a raft in tow, by the Canadian tug *Prince Alfred*, and it was asserted she was seized in American waters nearer the American shore than the Canadian, at the head of the River St. Clair. When that com-

plaint was examined, it was found the tug *Relief* had gone contrary to law to a Canadian harbor without reporting at any Canadian port, and had taken a raft of timber at Georgian Bay, and was trying to escape the payment of export dues and of timber dues. She was seized in consequence of contravention of the Canadian law. When we examined the charges against the Canadian Government, they proved to be entirely baseless, and I repeat the Canadian customs authorities have dealt with this question in a broad, humane spirit from first to last, and that the American Government and vessel owners have no cause of complaint against us. The system is one inaugurated by themselves and which we have simply followed; and the regulations of the Customs Department, Ottawa, throughout have been of a character to compare most favorably with the conduct of the American Government, as I will proceed to show. I have here the Executive Document No. 204, 50th Congress, 1st Session, which contains the correspondence with regard to the wreck of the *Algoma*, and the application of the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for permission to use their own plant in rescuing that steamer, and which shows the course pursued by the American authorities in reference to that matter. The case was briefly this: The *Algoma* was wrecked upon Greenstone Island, near Isle Royale, during a snowstorm in November. The manager of the line, Mr. Beatty, of Port Arthur, applied to the collector at Duluth for permission to send for the plant belonging to the owners of the boat, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to rescue the boat, and the tugs of the company were sent to recover the dead bodies and the purser's safe; but they were not permitted to pursue their work. Then formal application was made for permission to use the company's wrecking plant, and the fact was set forth in the application that Duluth was 200 miles distant while Port Arthur, where the company's plant lay, was but 50 miles distant and almost within sight. The correspondence then shows that the Duluth collector informed the authorities at Washington that there were no means procurable at Lake Superior for the performance of this work except the means in possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and after a correspondence extending over a number of months, the Canadian Pacific Railway were finally compelled with their own plant in sight of the wreck, to go, not only to a distant point, but to go beyond Lake Superior to the other end of Lake Huron, to the city of Port Huron, Mich., to get plant. There cannot be a case pointed out in the history of the Customs of Canada in which so rigid an interpretation of the law has been insisted on, and the owners of wrecked property compelled to go such a distance to obtain relief, when relief from the other side was near at hand. I shall read a report on the correspondence because it places our own Department of Customs in the most favorable light in contrast with the Department at Washington. The first letter is from Mr. Henry Beatty, manager of the traffic lines :

"TORONTO, 27th November, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—Upon the morning of the 7th November, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's steamship *Algoma* was wrecked upon Greenstone Island, off Isle Royale, Lake Superior. The survivors were brought into Port Arthur the evening of the 9th, and it became necessary to take immediate steps to secure the mail, the purser's and ship's books and papers, and the bodies of the drowned. It was impossible to make arrangements for American tugs, and I therefore ordered the company's tug *Liskievt* to the scene of the wreck, with instructions to spare no pains to find all the bodies possible and return with them to Port Arthur. I also telegraphed my chief clerk in Port Arthur to be particularly careful to do nothing to contravene the United States Customs regulations. The tug returned on the morning of the 22nd, having succeeded in finding four of the bodies. I am anxious to make arrangements to raise the boilers, machinery and such cargo as may be secured, consisting of steel rails, bridge material, &c., early in the spring. Will you be good enough to let me know if boats belonging to this company may be employed, or, failing this, if I may arrange for boats belonging to Port Arthur which may be suitable. I desire, of course, to secure what remained of the vessel worth saving at as little expense as pos-

sible, and shall feel extremely obliged if you can consistently with existing regulations, favor me with the necessary information.

"Yours obediently,

"HENRY BEATTY,

"Manager Lake Traffic.

"Hon. DAN. MANNING,

"Secretary of the Treasury."

Here is the reply from the Commissioner, Mr. Patten :

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 11th December, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—This office received on the 9th instant, by reference from the Secretary of the Treasury, your letter of the 27th ultimo, relative to the wrecked steamship *Algoma*, and the employment of certain vessels to raise the boilers, machinery, cargo, &c.

As an answer to your enquiry whether the tugs of your company and boats belonging to Port Arthur, which are suitable, may be employed in the business, I transmit, herewith, a copy of a letter dated the 4th instant, addressed to the collector of customs at Duluth, instructing him in regard to the matter.

"It is suggested that you communicate with him on the subject."

Here is the communication to the collector :

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 4th December, 1885.

SIR,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 24th ultimo, stating that you have noticed that two or three Canadian tugs from Port Arthur have been engaged about the wreck of the steamship *Algoma* in picking up bodies, &c., and inquiring if vessels have the right to collect the cargo and what action shall be taken by you in regard to the matter.

"No authority of law exists under which they can pursue their business in waters of the United States, and the masters or the persons employing the vessels should be advised accordingly.

"It is understood that, in this case, the tugs were employed in the first instance by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

"A notice from you to Manager Beatty, of said company, that the employment of the vessels is not in accordance with the regulations upon the subject, would probably serve to cause the persons responsible for the vessels to refrain from any violation of the law.

"Please give him notice without delay, and take such other measures as on further investigation you may find to be necessary in the premises."

Then we have, following this, a letter from Mr. Beatty, dated the 14th December, addressed to Jarvis Patten, making further application with regard to the desire to obtain permission to obtain Canadian wrecking plant, and in reply to that on 16th December, we have another letter from Jarvis Patten, refusing the application. Then, on the 18th February, we have a letter from Mr. W. C. Van Horne, to which I call particular attention, because Mr. Van Horne relates instances where the Canadian Government have permitted the use of American vessels in the case of wrecked vessels in Canadian waters.

"CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.,

"MONTREAL, 18th February, 1886.

"SIR,—I beg to inform you that on the 7th November last the steamship *Algoma*, belonging to this company, and laden largely with steel rails and fish plates, the property of the company, was wrecked on Greenstone Island, near the eastern extremity of Isle Royale, in Lake Superior. The wreck lies in such a position that the engines and other valuable parts of the steamship may be recovered, as well as the rails and splices above mentioned. The nearest American port from which tugs and wrecking outfit can be obtained is Duluth, about 200 miles distant from the wreck, while this company has tugs and wrecking outfit of its own at Port Arthur, only 50 miles from the wreck, and almost within sight of it. I beg, therefore, to ask permission to use the tugs and appliances of the company in recovering its property from the wreck; and in doing so I would respectfully direct your attention to the fact that in numerous instances permission has been accorded by the Canadian Government to use American tugs and outfit, among which the following comparatively recent cases may be recited :—

"May 22, 1883, schooner *Ellsworth*, ashore near Sarnia, was permitted to use American tugs.

"September 12, 1883, schooner *Winslow*, ashore near Point Edward, was permitted to use American tugs.

"October 18, 1883, International Wrecking Company were permitted to use American tugs at Southampton.

"November 13, 1883, International Wrecking Company were permitted to use the American tugs *Baltica* and *Smith*, wrecking at Southampton.

"November 21, 1883, schooner *Carter*, ashore near Kincardine, was permitted to use American tugs.

"May 7, 1884, American tug *Smith*, with wrecking outfit, was permitted to work at the wreck of the steamer *Manitoba* at Southampton, and schooner *Carter* at Kincardine.

"April 9, 1885, permission was given to American scow, with wrecking outfit, to raise the tug *Heron*, sunk in Georgian Bay.

MR. CHARLTON.

"March 18, 1885, permission was given to one J. Donnelly to use American tools, &c., in relieving propeller *Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie, in Canadian waters.

"May 30, 1885, permission was given to J. Donnelly to use United States tugs to relieve the *City of Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie.

"October 10, 1885, permission was given to the steam barge *J. H. Fairwell* to relieve the schooner *Godfrey*, ashore at Stag Island.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. O. VAN HORN,

"Vice-President.

"Hon. DANIEL MANNING,

"Secretary of the Treasury of the U.S.,

"Washington, D.C."

Now, Mr. Van Horne cites these numerous instances, among many others which he might have cited, where the Canadian Government had allowed the use of American wrecking plant, American tugs and American lighters, to relieve vessels which were ashore on the Canadian coast, and yet we have the refusal of the American Government to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to use its own plant 50 miles distant to relieve its own vessel. We find it was driven, not to Duluth, 200 miles away, but to Port Huron, 600 miles away, to get the plant to relieve that wreck. On the 19th April, 1886, the following communication was sent to the Collector of Customs at Duluth, from Jarvis Patten, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation at Washington :

"SIR,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 13th inst., transmitting a communication from the United States' consul at Winnipeg relative to an application by George A. Priest, in which he requests permission to use certain wrecking plant owned in Canada, in raising railroad iron and machinery from the wreck of the steamer *Algoma*, now lying on Isle Royale. You are doubtless aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made a similar application, and that special exception in its favor to the regulations upon the subject was not authorized. This office is not advised whether reasonable facilities can be obtained at your port or elsewhere in the vicinity, in the United States, for doing the work. Where such facilities exist, it has been the practice to require their use in ordinary cases. It does not appear, therefore, that any special additional instructions to you in regard to the matter are now necessary. In this connection, reference is made to the communication addressed to you on the 4th of December last relating to the vessel.

"Respectfully yours,

"JARVIS PATTEN,

"Commissioner."

Then we have Mr. Patten's letter to Mr. Van Horne :—

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 28th April, 1886.

"SIR,—This office received on the 26th instant your letter dated the 18th of February last, relative to the use of certain wrecking material in the case of the steamship *Algoma*. The matter has been considered by the Acting Secretary. It does not appear, however, that, as the regulations now are, special instructions can well be given to the collector of the district in which the vessel lies. A copy of your communication has been forwarded to him, for such action as may be requisite under the general regulations upon the subject.

"Respectfully yours,

"JARVIS PATTEN,

"Commissioner.

"W. O. VAN HORNE, Esq.,

"Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company,

"Montreal, Canada."

Then we have this communication from the collector at Duluth to Mr. Patten, the Commissioner of Navigation, on the 24th May, 1886, and I call particular attention to this communication :

"SIR,—In reply to yours of 19th instant, relating to the wrecking of the steamer *Algoma*, would say that upon enquiry I cannot learn that reasonable facilities exist on Lake Superior for doing the requisite work. There are no such facilities here or near here.

"Very respectfully,

"H. B. MOORE,

"Collector."

And we have a letter on the 8th June from Mr. Patten, the commissioner to the collector at Duluth, as follows :—

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 8th June, 1886.

"SIR,—Referring to previous correspondence, I have to state that the manager of lake traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company informs this office that facilities for wrecking in the case of the steamer *Algoma* have been found at Port Huron, Michigan"—

600 miles away from the wreck

"and that a contract has been made accordingly."

The owners of that steamer were driven to Port Huron, though they had their own wrecking apparatus within 50 miles of the wreck, and the commissioner was informed by the collector at Duluth that there were no appliances on or near Lake Superior fit to perform that work. Then, on the 8th March, 1887, we have an enquiry answered by the Commissioner of Navigation:—

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, you are informed that this office is not aware of any law preventing foreigners wrecking in American waters, subject to the disabilities imposed by the tariff and navigation laws; that is to say, articles imported by them or vessels brought by them, would be subject to duty in the usual manner"

The foreign vessel could engage in wrecking if the owner would pay duty on his vessels and on his wrecking plant which he took in just for the purpose of engaging in the operation at that particular time. I have here besides a communication from Parker & Millen, of Detroit, enquiring of the Treasury authorities at Washington, and, as this correspondence is short, I may as well read it:

"DETROIT, MICH., 27th September, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—Can a Canadian steamer clear from a Canadian port and go to an American vessel which has run aground in American waters and release her, either by pulling her off, or by lightering a portion of her cargo, and take her to a Canadian port? An early reply will much oblige.

"Yours respectfully,

"PARKER & MILLEN.

"Hon. C. S. FAIRCHILD,
"Secretary of the Treasury,
"Washington, D. C."

And this is the answer:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 30th September, 1887.

"GENTLEMEN,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 27th instant, stating a hypothetical question relative to the rights of certain foreign vessels in American waters. The answer to your enquiry would depend upon the facts surrounding the case, which are not fully stated by you, and you are informed that it is the practice to decline answering hypothetical questions. If you have any particular case in view, in which there has been a violation of law the bureau will give the matter full consideration on receipt of a statement from you showing the facts in detail.

"Respectfully yours,

"C. B. MORTON.

"Commissioner."

"Messrs. PARKER & MILLEN,
"15 Atwater St., West, Rooms 3 and 4,
"Detroit, Mich."

"15 ATWATER ST., WEST, ROOMS 3 AND 4,
"DETROIT, MICH., 10th October, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter of 30th September is received and noted. It is to avoid violating the law that we ask a question. We want to know what the law is relative to Canadian tugs wrecking and towing in American waters. The facts are these: We have a large fleet of steam vessels navigating the lakes, and they very often get aground in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lake St. Clair. The majority of those grounding are in Canadian waters, and in order to release them quickly, we have provided ourselves with a Canadian steam lighter which is capable of lightering a portion of their cargoes and then putting them off the bottom. Now, it sometimes happens that they ground in American waters, and we want to know if this same steam lighter can clear from a Canadian port, go to these vessels aground in American waters and pull them off and tow them to a Canadian port, and it unable to pull them off without lightering, could she lighten a portion of their cargo and replace it again when the vessel got into deep water?

"Respectfully yours,

"PARKER & MILLEN.

"C. B. MORTON, Esq., Comr., Treasury Dept.,
"Washington, D. C."

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.
"WASHINGTON, D. C., 13th October, 1887.

"GENTLEMEN,—This office is in receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., stating that you have a large fleet of steam vessels navigating the lakes

and enquiring whether you can use, in connection therewith the Canadian steam lighter which you own, in lightering and wrecking said vessels should they get aground in American waters. In reply, I have to state that this office is not aware of any authority of law for such a proceeding. These questions are usually acted upon, in the first instance, by the collector of the district in which the work is to be done.

"Respectfully yours,

"C. B. MORTON,

"Commissioner."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the House to say whether the American regulations, as shown by this correspondence in reference to the wreck of the steamer *Algoma*, and as shown by this correspondence with Parker & Millen, of Detroit, and another letter that I omitted to read, to a collector on Lake Ontario in answer to the enquiry, which stated that permission had never been given in that district for Canadian tugs or vessels to do any work upon the American coast—I say I submit to the House, in view of these facts, whether the regulations of the American Government have not been more stringent than the regulations of the Canadian Government, and whether their conduct in matters of wrecks has not been, if we may use the term, more inhumane than the conduct of the Canadian Government; and I hold that the conduct of our Customs Department contrasts most favorably with the conduct of the Treasury Department at Washington in regard to this matter. Now, Sir, the investments made by Canadians in wrecking plant and outfit, with amounts to a large sum, would, on the upper lakes, be rendered practically valueless from the passage of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac. The effect of this species of reciprocity would be to give to American wrecking companies the entire business. In brief their position is this: We ask you to rescind a regulation which you passed in retaliation for a similar regulation passed by us; we ask you to rescind that regulation which you passed in self-defence and to abandon the advantage which that regulation gives you, and to abandon to us the entire wrecking business of the upper lakes, of which you have now a large portion. That is simply what it amounts to. It may be a question whether the result would be as I state. Now, Sir, while appliances for wrecking are just as good upon this side as upon the American side, and while the prices for relieving vessels are just as low as those quoted by American companies. I wish to draw attention to this fact, that the principal part of the tonnage is American tonnage. The underwriters insuring these vessels have their offices chiefly in Chicago, Detroit and Buffalo. Now, in case of the wreck of an American vessel, when information is received at the underwriter's office, or in any office where she is insured, the most natural thing in the world is for that underwriter to make arrangements with the wrecking company who is, perhaps, at his door. There is a system of commissions, not exactly bribes, which the underwriters receive from these companies, that make it to their pecuniary interest to give these contracts to American companies, and the result would be, I repeat, that if this proposition of the hon. member for Frontenac is accepted, the entire wrecking business upon the upper lakes would pass into the hands of American companies and the large investments made by Canadian citizens for tugs, for diving apparatus, steam pump, hydraulic jacks, chains, and pontoons, and for the various appliances in wrecking, would be rendered practically valueless. I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that no necessity exists for this step; I have pointed out what our customs regulations distinctly say, that in case of danger of loss of property or loss of life, the utmost latitude is given, that applications are never refused. And I can testify from personal knowledge that applications of that kind are never refused. Not only is that the case, but the Customs Department have gone still further, and have dealt in a most liberal spirit, as was shown by those cases quoted by Mr. Van Horne, in granting application for the use of American

tugs and appliances on the upper lakes. Now, Sir, my position in this matter is this: I say that the advantage we enjoy in the matter of wrecking is a very great advantage; I say that advantage does not accrue to us from the inception of a policy by ourselves, but that advantage was thrown upon us by the action of the American Treasury Department; that they inaugurated themselves the system for the purpose of protecting their own interests. They are placed in the position of the Irishman who was crossing a pasture one day, and was attacked by a bull. He got the better of the bull, in running around a stump, and took his shillelah, and beat the animal until he bellowed and was glad to get away. The Irishman said: "Bellow, you smithering old villain, who commenced this scrimmage?" Now, we did not commence this scrimmage, the Americans commenced it, and it has worked against them, as most of the wrecks occur upon our coast, and they are excluding from the wrecking of their own property. They complain, it is true, but this alleged advantage accrues to us in consequence of their own act, and I am not in favor of giving up the vantage ground we possess unless the Americans will make further concessions. Now, we have a standing offer of reciprocity contained in chap. 14, 33 Vic. made in 1870, in which we offered to the Americans, or any other nation, reciprocity in the coasting trade. Now, if the Americans want reciprocity in wrecking upon the great lakes, let them go further and propose reciprocity in coasting *in toto*, and I shall be very much in favor of it. If they will open the coasting trade on waters contiguous to Canada, on the great lakes, wrecking and all, that is all right; but if they want to select one instance of coasting in which they can work to their advantage and retain all the rest, where some little advantage would accrue to us, that is not reciprocity, gentlemen, and we will make the proposition either to go the whole thing or nothing. That, I think, is a reasonable position to take. These are my views, I think reasonable and common sense views, with reference to this question. As I said before, I repeat again, that we are not in the position with regard to a statutory offer here that we were the other day, when we felt compelled, to avoid any semblance of bad faith on our part, to accept an offer from the United States that was not much to our advantage. We are not in that position now. We have here a statutory offer that does not say "any or all," but it says all coasting trade, and of wrecking it does not say "any or all" but it says all, and if the Americans want to come to that statutory offer, all right; and if they don't want to come to that, let them stay where they are. That is the proposition I have to make. I believe we are entitled to stand upon that proposition, and if we do we will get concessions from the Americans that otherwise we would not get. They are actuated generally, I think, by considerations of their own interest, and we may as well be actuated by the same considerations in dealing with our own interest, and perhaps by following that policy we may get more than we otherwise would. I shall not trouble the House longer at this time. I was intending to offer an amendment, but I shall not do so at the present moment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have never in my short parliamentary experience listened to anything with so much pleasure as to the remarks of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It certainly is something new in our parliamentary experience when a leading member of the Opposition comes forward, and in such glowing and sensible terms defends a department of this Administration from attacks made upon it by one of his own supporters. And it is still more delightful after the very contradictory opinions we have heard on the subject of reciprocity to find the hon. member taking precisely the same ground with respect to this matter that the First Minister took with regard to the reciprocity treaty. I think the ground he has taken is a

Mr. CHARLTON.

perfectly correct one, and I hope the same ground will be taken throughout whether it is in regard to reciprocity in wrecking or in natural products or in anything else. The hon. gentleman has just said we are not to take one particular thing and agree to reciprocity upon that, simply because it happens to suit the Americans. That is precisely what was said at the beginning of the reciprocity debate by the First Minister, and I wish the same contention had been kept up throughout on this side of the House. I am not in favor of reciprocity, I think that the country can manage its own affairs and can do what we think will suit us best whether in regard to wrecking or natural products or anything else. That is a subject I shall not discuss, but I could not resist the temptation to congratulate my hon. friend upon the remarkable spirit which has been manifested by him in the speech he has just made, and of which, I hope, we shall have many instances before the session is drawn to a close.

Mr. CASEY. I can agree with a great many of the premises advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and those advanced by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), but I cannot agree in their conclusions. I have to confess that I am in favor of reciprocity pure and simple, and in favor of reciprocity in wrecking as well as in other matters. There are two sides to this question. There is the position of the man who owns wrecking plant, and that of the man who owns a vessel that may be in distress, and I think, taking the two together, the chances of injury to Canada are more by refusing the privilege of American vessels assisting Canadian vessels than by admitting that assistance. I think Canadian interests would gain more by supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) than by opposing the Bill, that it would be more to our interests to allow American wreckers to assist Canadian vessels in distress in Canadian waters and allowing Canadian vessels to assist American craft in American waters than by the present system of non-intercourse. I have always held that position. The present system is not due altogether to the Government in power. If I am not mistaken, it came into existence before this Government obtained office. I have always held, and I hold now, that reciprocity in wrecking is to the interest both of the American marine and our own marine, and for that reason I am in favor of the principle of the present Bill and will therefore vote for the second reading. When we come to consider its present details in committee I may have something to say, but so far as the principle is concerned I am in favor of it, and I believe that the interest of those who own the vessels which may be in distress and which may have an opportunity of being assisted by United States wrecking tugs is to be even more considered than the interests of those who own wrecking crafts on our own side of the lakes. I do not like to differ from the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and other hon. gentlemen who have laid before me powerful arguments in favor of their view of the case; I do not like to appear to be acting against the interests of my own section of the country. It is well understood that on Lake Erie, at all events, most of the wrecks occur on the Canadian shore. It has been urged upon me that because most of the wrecks occur on the Canadian shore we who live on the shores of the lake and represent the counties bordering on the lake should not support this Bill. I say that is the reason why we should support the Bill, because the interests of owners of Canadian vessels likely to be wrecked on our shores should be considered before the interests of those who own wrecking craft which would be called into requisition. The present system is a purely protectionist system, it involves protection to those who own wrecking craft, it involves protection of the most odious and unpleasant kind, a protection which involves possibly loss of pro-

perty and life to Canada. Consequently I feel bound by my duty to my constituents, who are to a considerable extent owners of vessels navigating the lakes, and by my duty to other Canadians who own vessels navigating the lakes, to support the principle of the Bill, which provides that whenever a Canadian vessel is in distress a United States tug may be solicited on the condition that the Americans will allow our American wrecking tugs to enjoy the same right in their waters. In regard to Lake Erie I believe the extension of this privilege will be rather in favor of the American owners of wrecking craft. In regard to Lake Ontario it might be in favor of the Canadians. I do not care whether these wreckers should gain more or ours should gain more, but I am of the opinion that our people interested in lake shipping would gain more by the adoption of the Bill than by its rejection and the continuation of the present system. For this reason I support the Bill in principle, and I reserve my opinion as to details until we go into committee.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I observe by the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the effect of the Bill is misunderstood by him as it is misunderstood by several members of the House. In order that fuller information may be placed at their disposal, and that the Government may be prepared to deal with this question in the manner in which they deal with all questions that come under their consideration, I hope they will assent to adjourn the debate. In making this suggestion I refer to one point. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error if he supposes that at any time the operation of the existing wrecking regulations interfered with assisting vessels in distress. I have never known a case where the Department of Customs has refused permission to American tugs to work in Canadian waters when there was a question of imminent danger to

life or property. I would therefore not go into the question to night if the Government would consent in compliance with my request to agree to the adjournment of the debate in order that fuller information may be had for their own satisfaction and the satisfaction of members of this House so that the question may be intelligently discussed on its merits. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say that I think the course proposed by the hon. gentleman will meet with the views of gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is a very important question of public policy as I ventured to remark in the few words I said before the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) addressed the House. I am sure after the very interesting discussion that we have had it will be considered only desirable that in a question of such an important policy the Government should have an opportunity to carefully consider the statements made on both sides of the House before the matter is disposed of.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand the hon. member for Essex moved the adjournment of the debate, and not the adjournment of the House, because I have something to say on this question.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Yes, the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debated adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Friday, April 13, 1888.

No. 34.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that on Tuesday next the House do resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorised, be the 1st July, 1890, instead of the 1st July, 1889; also that the company may be accorded a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the first above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to seven per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—NEW YORK, WADDINGTON AND OTTAWA RAILWAY.

Mr. HICKEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a portion of an editorial in last evening's *Evening Journal*, speaking of a railway charter which I have before the House. After a good deal of nonsensical verbiage, this paragraph occurs:

"In this new scheme, Dr. Hickey has associated with himself, several members of the Dominion and Local Houses, the applicants being J. F. Wood, M.P. for Brockville, George Taylor, M. P. for South Leeds—"

Along with others. I wish to say that neither Mr. Wood, nor Mr. Taylor, nor any other M. P. has anything to do with this charter. They are not applicants at all. These two gentlemen signed the petition out of courtesy to me, with others, for leave to introduce the Bill into the House, but they have no association with it whatever.

REPORT OF THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. HOLTON. I wish to enquire of the Government if it is intended to distribute among members of this House, copies of the report of the Royal Commission upon Railways, and the evidence taken before that commission? It seems to me that we cannot pretend to consider intelligently the Railway Bill that has been introduced by the Minister of Railways, without having these papers in our hands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other day another hon. gentleman called the attention of the Government to the fact that this report had not been printed or circulated among the members. Upon enquiry I found that although a printed copy had been brought down, it had been printed by the action of the Railway Department, which had had a number of copies printed some time before, and one of those copies was laid on the Table as the return, to be printed in the ordinary way. I have enquired as to the reason of the delay in the printing of that return, but I have had no satisfactory answer. I will call the attention of the chairman of the Printing Committee to the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. If that report has been laid upon the Table, it has been printed, I suppose, and there is no use of having it printed again.

THE BEHRING SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect the correspondence in reference to the American claims of sovereignty in Behring Sea, and the seizures of Canadian whaling and sealing vessels in that sea?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say with reference to the Behring Sea papers, that in the present state of diplomatic negotiations it is not thought advisable to bring them down.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper: "That the Bill (No. 65) An Act respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States, be read a second time."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the adjourned debate on the Bill now before the House, asking us to give effect to the treaty lately passed at Washington between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America, I desire to discuss it in the sense in which the hon. Minister of Finance recommended it to the consideration of this House. I desire to say that in a matter of so much importance to the people of this country in which the peace and welfare of 70,000,000 of the people are concerned, there are two considerations involved. The first is in its national character, the second is in its commercial character and the aspect which it bears with respect to the commercial interests of the people on this side of the line. I am free to admit at the outset that a measure of this kind calling forth settlement of some of those questions which have been vexed questions between the British Government and the American people for so many years, was highly desirable. I am prepared to admit that as composing part of the Empire the people of Canada might be called upon, if necessary, to make a certain amount of sacrifice to bring about a satisfactory settlement in that regard. If the hon. Minister of Finance, in introducing his Bill, had brought it down with the statement that it was purely in the interests of the Empire; if he had made the statement, which we all believe to be the case, that, if not at the dictation of England, at least in compliance with the strongly expressed desire of

England and her representative at that congress, concessions were made to the American people which the Government of this country had previously refused, that we were called upon in fact as part of the Empire to make those concessions in the interest of peace and good neighborhood, I think he would have fairly laid the ground of his action before this House. In that case we would perhaps have been able to discuss it in a different line, yet at the same time we would have been compelled to point out to the Government, to Parliament and to the people how the changes which had been made under that treaty were going to affect the people most immediately concerned, that is to say, the people of the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion. Looking at the Bill from the beginning to the end and regarding it very carefully in the light of the explanation given by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and the hon. the Minister of Justice, I have arrived at the conclusion that every concession which the Americans demanded in 1886 under Mr. Bayard's proposal to Lord Salisbury, has been granted. Those demands made by Mr. Bayard in that year were indignantly rejected by the Canadian Cabinet in language strong and emphatic, as has already been read to this House by the member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies). We sustained the action of the Government on that occasion, we sustained them in defending the fisheries, and in every word I ever uttered in this House or out of it I guarded myself against using any language which might be used by the Americans or their advocates in depreciating the value of our fisheries. The Government we felt, and I felt, were dealing with a question of so much importance in the general interests of the country that they required and had a right to be sustained by every person who was in a public position, who by his voice or by his influence could strengthen their hands in the negotiations, and therefore in this House and on public occasions elsewhere I always, I repeat, guarded myself so far as to use language which the Americans never could use against us when the fisheries question was considered. The questions which were submitted by Mr. Bayard in 1886 were of a character which formed part of the present treaty and negotiations. We find that under this treaty all those demands made by Mr. Bayard have been yielded. The hon. Minister of Finance asked us the other day not to press him in this discussion to compel him to say anything in defence of the treaty which might be used against its adoption on the other side of the line. The hon. gentleman need not have been laboring under any anxiety on that account. Ingenious as the hon. Minister of Finance is in his public discussions, with all the fertility of his imagination and resources, and I admit they are great, the hon. gentleman was not able, during that long and able address with which he favored the House on that occasion, to point out one single or solitary advantage which the people of Canada would gain if this treaty was put into effect, except that it removed doubts on certain points for which the Americans were contending, but which we on this side, and the British Government behind us, had always as steadily maintained. If it was negotiated to surrender points in favor of which we had been contending, which international law and treaty obligations showed we had a clear right to demand ever since 1813, if it was to give up those treaty rights to the Americans under the operation of this treaty, I do not think the Minister of Finance could point to them as any advantage to the people of Canada in this direction. He need not have been afraid of using any language which could have injured it. He pointed to the Treaty of Washington in 1872, and he said that the language which he and the leader of the Government used in defending that treaty in this House had been cited in the American case before the Halifax Commission. That was quite true, because in their great anxiety to carry the Washington Treaty, they made state-

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

ments which could not be corroborated and which were in contravention of the actual established facts of the case. Moreover, he said that all things come to him who waits, and the Washington Treaty which was assailed by parties in this House, and by myself among the number, was now looked to as a measure to which we would gladly resort. There was just this difference. I opposed the Washington Treaty on the ground that the right hon. gentleman who negotiated that treaty had been untrue to the interests of the Province which I represent. The right hon. gentleman during the negotiation had been for free admission of coal and lumber and salt, in addition to free fish, but in his anxiety to obtain other advantages and not being able to gauge the American plenipotentiaries, he threw away the offer which was so advantageous in the interests of the people of Nova Scotia for the moment, and when it came to be brought up again, the American plenipotentiaries withdrew the offer altogether. Subsequently he was obliged to accept a treaty much less favorable to the people of Nova Scotia than the one which had been previously offered by the American people. Now, Sir, it was on that ground, and on that ground alone, that I opposed the Washington Treaty, and if it were to be renewed to-day under similar circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that my course would have been the same. The hon. the Minister of Finance says that Mr. Bayard and the Government in 1885 made a proposal for a commission to consider the whole position of their relations with Canada. It was not solely with regard to the fishery question alone, but with the prospect of negotiating for the development and extension of trade between the two countries. Mr. Bayard said that:

"Entering into a temporary arrangement whereby the American fishermen were allowed the privilege during the remainder of the season of 1885, that the President would bring the matter before Congress next Session and recommend a Joint Commission of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to consider the question in the interests of neighborhood and friendly intercourse between the two countries."

Then we had the prospect of negotiating for the development of trade between the United States and British North America. Mr. Bayard's idea, it will be observed, at the very commencement of the negotiations seemed to look not only to a settlement of the fishery question, but to look to some arrangement whereby the commercial intercourse of the two countries could be extended and enlarged. The second commission, which was so happily inaugurated by the hon. the Minister of Finance and suggested by Mr. Wiman, led to a similar expression on the part of Mr. Bayard. In that letter, which has been so frequently quoted during the recent discussion, Mr. Bayard again renewed the same idea when he said:

"He was confident that we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to secure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Here, again, we have Mr. Bayard's reiteration of his desire to consider the whole trade relations of the countries, as well as the settlement of the fishery dispute. The hon. the Finance Minister, in reply to that, expresses his desire in very nearly the same language. He expresses his willingness to negotiate in that spirit, and when this position was arrived at and the Washington plenipotentiaries met, the Minister of Finance, as he has told us, and as we knew before, made the proposal to the American plenipotentiaries. Now, there is something very suggestive in this letter of the hon. gentleman, because, when you come to read it and read it carefully, you will see it contains more than would appear on the face of it. He says:

"Sir Charles Tupper begged leave to submit, that with a view of removing all causes of difficulties in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington."

That is to say, that we were to have free fish for free fisheries, although it will be remembered by hon. gentlemen that the hon. the Minister of Justice, in his remarks the other night, most indignantly denied the idea and repudiated the idea—and I suppose he spoke for the Government of which he is such a distinguished member—that he would be willing to resort to the old principle of free fish for free fisheries. But the hon. the Minister of Finance goes on to say that:

"They were to have enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of mutual arrangements for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada."

Therefore the hon. gentleman, as he frankly said, seemed to have had in his mind the idea at the very earliest stage of the negotiation, that the fishery question was one by itself, but it was desirable to use the fishery question as a means whereby we were going to secure a greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland. In pursuance of this idea the hon. gentleman told us with frankness that he made the offer of unrestricted reciprocity. He made that offer to the hon. gentleman, and he said:

"The offer was unrestricted reciprocity and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity to state just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocity of trade with Canada."

Was the hon. gentleman in earnest? I would be sorry to say that he was not. Was the hon. gentleman sincerely desirous of testing the opinion of the Government of the United States when he made the offer of unrestricted reciprocity? I hope he was. But, Sir, if we may gauge the opinions of his Government and his supporters, who during his unfortunate illness and during the long debate, which I hope it is not improper to refer to, that idea of unrestricted reciprocity which was only asked for by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), was repudiated by every speaker on the other side of the House and by every member of the Government who spoke on the question, although the hon. the leader of the Government did not commit himself further than by his vote. I say that the idea of unrestricted reciprocity which the hon. the Minister of Finance made was either in earnest or was in jest. It would be a poor compliment to the Minister of Finance to suppose that he went to Washington to jest on such a serious subject. I shall not do him the injustice to suppose that he would be so far regardless of his own dignity and the dignity of the country and of the Government he represented on the commission, as to have asked that the Government should have considered the proposition, which remember if they had met in a fair spirit, if they had turned around and said: Yes, we will meet you in a spirit of unrestricted reciprocity; would have compelled that hon. gentleman to have brought down this Session a measure of unrestricted reciprocity similar and in accordance with the resolution of my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) which he and his party have just voted down. In that connection I cannot understand the position of the hon. the Minister of Finance in making that proposal. And I should be very unwilling to suppose for one moment that he was not serious in doing it. He replies over and over again that he did Canada great service in ascertaining the views of her Government in regard to a matter in which we were all materially interested. Well, Sir, what did the resolution call for which has been voted down by the Government and party to which the hon. gentleman belongs? It only said this:

"That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith."

I ask any fair-minded man if there is any difference between that resolution which hon. gentlemen opposite voted down the other night and the declaration the hon. Minister of Finance has made here, that he offered unrestricted reciprocity to the American plenipotentiaries when he was at Washington? But the hon. gentleman would say that Mr. Bayard gave an answer adverse to his proposal. That is quite true; but he should have stated with equal frankness the grounds on which Mr. Bayard based that refusal. He might have stated to the House, so that it might form part of his very able speech when it went to the country, that the reason and the only reason assigned by the American plenipotentiaries for not considering his proposal for unrestricted reciprocity was that it was not consistent to do by an executive act that which was the peculiar power and privilege of Congress alone. Congress alone could deal with a matter of revenue and tariff; and while the American plenipotentiaries gave that as an explanation why they could not entertain the hon. gentleman's proposal, because it was beyond their power to deal with a question of revenue and tariff, yet, so far as we can gather from the information that has been laid before us—and I regret that it was not more full—they do not appear to have expressed themselves as hostile to the proposition of my hon. friend for unrestricted reciprocity. Therefore, we may, perhaps, gain this consolation from the discussion that has taken place between the hon. gentleman and the American Government, that that question may still be considered in abeyance, and that we may hope at no very distant day—perhaps when those changes are brought about which the hon. gentleman intimated to us the other day—to see the hon. Minister of Finance come down with a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as large and full as any member on this side of the House during the last three weeks has called for. But, Sir, it was not very consistent, I think, in the hon. gentleman to cover up the ground in the way he sought to do, and it does not reflect any great credit on him in the distinguished position he filled on that occasion, to come back to this House, and after having made this proposal for unrestricted reciprocity, and after having read it to the House, to tell us, with regard to the debate that took place here, that for nearly three weeks we had wasted the time of the House and the time of the country in discussing a measure that was about as practicable as the idea of building a railway to the moon. I say, after the hon. gentleman had proposed unrestricted reciprocity at Washington, and because we were seeking to give effect to the same idea through the representatives of the people in this House, the hon. gentleman would come down here and almost say, I was only jesting, I was not in earnest, and you are wasting the time of the House in discussing a matter which is just about as unreasonable as a proposal to build a railway to the moon, I think it was not a very dignified position for the hon. gentleman to assume. The hon. gentleman says he was instructed to obtain a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 for reciprocity in natural products and a renewal of the Treaty of 1871 relating to our fisheries. In this connection the hon. gentleman said that he found that the Americans did not want our inshore fisheries. I was very sorry to hear it. I do not wish to undervalue our inshore fisheries at all. On the contrary, I am disposed to attach a great deal of value to them; but the value of an article in a market is always just that much that you can obtain for it in open competition; and if the Americans do not value our inshore fisheries to the extent of desiring the use of them, it is pretty strong evidence to my mind that our inshore fisheries are not quite as valuable as I had always hoped and still hope them to be. The Americans are pretty good judges in these matters; they have as large an interest in the fisheries as we have; and they knew very well, from the information they had been able to obtain, how valuable our inshore fisheries would be to them, and if they were not anxious to

obtain them it only shows that they did not regard them as being as valuable as we had hoped. I look upon this as very unfortunate—as the more unfortunate, because we thought them of such a valuable character that they would form the most important factor in future negotiations. But it seems that the Americans have taken a different view and they came to the conclusion that they only wanted the privilege of purchasing bait, the use of our ports, and the privilege of transshipment for their cargoes; and they have got all these by the provisions of this treaty. And now, in any future negotiations we may have, looking to further trade relations with them, we have nothing whatever to offer them in return for any concession we may ask from them. Therefore, the moment the hon. gentleman found that the Americans did not value our inshore fisheries, from that very moment he should have held on with a firmer grip than ever to those privileges which they did value, such as shelter and transshipment of cargoes. The hon. gentleman said he found that there were 65,000,000 of people embittered against us, the people and press of both sides of politics, in consequence of the action of this Government in defending our fisheries. That was a very unfortunate condition of affairs, no doubt. It was a very unfortunate condition of public opinion in the United States, and I have no doubt that, to a certain extent, the hon. gentleman is right; but the hon. gentleman is well aware, as are other hon. members of this House, that that was not the primary cause of hostility against the people of Canada. The real cause and the beginning of the trouble arose when the Tory party, in 1878, led by the right hon. gentleman, laid down a policy of retaliation against the people of the United States. From day to day, in this House, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the public press of this country favoring their views, and in public speeches in all parts of the Dominion, by their supporters, it was represented that we could force the Americans into trade relations by means of the National Policy; the people were misled into believing that if we adopted the National Policy, that policy would have the effect of keeping out American products from the Dominion and would force the Americans to adopt reciprocity in a very short time. I repeat that that was the commencement of irritation on the part of the United States; and in order that there may be no doubt as to the views entertained by the leaders of the Government, I will quote a speech made by the Minister of Finance, in 1878, at Charlottetown, P. E. I. The hon. gentleman was then dealing with the position of the country; he knew how anxious the people of Prince Edward Island, and, in fact, the people of all the Maritime Provinces, were to secure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty; he knew there was no other subject which would go home so directly to their individual interests and into their everyday life; he knew, when addressing the farmers of Prince Edward Island, whose produce found a market in the United States, and in the United States alone, that there was no argument he could address them so potent and so likely to lend them to favor his policy as the argument that, by adopting it, we could secure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, and on that occasion the hon. gentleman said:

"All that you have to do is to support the protective National Policy of Sir John Macdonald, in order to obtain reciprocity with the United States within two years."

All they had to do, he said, was to sustain the national protective policy of Sir John Macdonald in order to obtain in two years a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty. The people were suffering for want of communication with the United States, and it was not unnatural that when they were listening to a gentleman of the persuasive eloquence of my hon. friend, and believing that the American people were crowding our markets with their products, while at the same time they were shutting out our products from theirs—I

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

say it was not unnatural, under these circumstances, that they should have taken him at his word. But years passed by, and the National Policy, instead of having the effect of bringing Americans to their senses, as was predicted by its authors, had the effect, as we have seen,—and as the hon. gentleman has admitted, though he gave some other reasons—of embittering the public mind of the people of the United States against the Dominion of Canada, and they said: Here are four and a half million people on our northern border who are going to adopt a fiscal and commercial policy of their own which is going to teach sixty five millions of Americans how to conduct business of their own country; we will let them severely alone. They did so, and probably, but for Mr. Wiman's interference, we would be let alone until the present moment. But time went on, and we come to 1886, and again the Minister of Finance spoke at Charlottetown, on 7th September of that year. The hon. gentleman no doubt felt that he was called upon to explain to the people, whom he had addressed eight years before, the reasons why this reciprocity treaty, which was to have been the result of the National Policy, was not obtained. He said:

"Since the expiration of the Washington Treaty we have shown our American neighbors that we intend to stand up for our rights and interests, by adopting that policy which will obtain a commercial treaty with the Americans at no very distant day, and I have every reason to hope that within two years we shall have such a treaty."

The hon. gentleman here again had to explain to them that by the continuance of such a policy we were going to bring the Americans to their senses. I did not, and I do not now blame the Government for carrying out rigidly the harbor regulations, except when they were carried out by incompetent men in an offensive manner. If we had our fishing rights under treaty, I hold it was the duty of the Government to insist upon their being carried out in a dignified manner. But what I found fault with was that the irritation, which was constantly growing between the American fishermen and the incompetent men who had charge of our small cruisers along the shore, added to the irritation which arose under the threat of the National Policy crystallized public opinion in the United States against us and was the cause of that hostility to the people of Canada which we always regret. I say that I have always been anxious for a renewal of the treaty, and on more than one occasion I have been spoken to with reference to it. While the commission was sitting at Washington, I was interviewed with reference to the possibilities that might result from it. I saw the difficulty the commission might have to encounter with regard to coal and wheat, and I suggested that if by leaving coal and wheat out of the question, an arrangement for other natural products might be arrived at, it would be satisfactory. I said:

"If by leaving coal and wheat out of the question, you could conciliate the coal and wheat interests of the United States, is it not possible that a treaty embracing all other natural products might be made acceptable to both countries. The Americans want our fish, lumber, potatoes, barley, and possibly oats, which, after wheat, are our chief products, and they also take many articles, such as cordwood, &c., which even now find a market across the line. This appears to me a reasonable and a rational *modus vivendi*, and if commercial union is found to be impracticable at present, such an arrangement as indicated might, for a time, be satisfactory. The commercial intercourse in this exchange of natural products would doubtless pave the way for larger concessions on both sides in the future, and lead in a natural way to commercial union, which, in the opinion of so many of our people, it is desirable to obtain as soon as possible. Any concessions to the Americans giving them the use of our ports for shelter, bait and transport, without concessions from their side of a satisfactory character in return, would, I feel confident, never prove acceptable to our people or be ratified by Parliament."

I was then apprehending just what has taken place. I was then fearing that the hon. gentleman was pressed, as I believe he was,—for it is all very well for him to stand up here and say that he was nobly sustained by his co-plenipotentiaries from Great Britain,—I believe that he was sustained so long as he kept in the line of their desires; I

believe that there was a strong, steady, persistent desire manifested by those plenipotentiaries for the settlement of this question, and I believe that the hon. gentleman was forced to yield to an arrangement which, under other circumstances, he would never have given way to. I say, with all due deference to that hon. gentleman, and without any desire to exalt him in the opinion of this country, that I would rather have had one Sir Charles Tupper at that commission alone than ten Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlains that England ever produced. The one was familiar with the wants of our people. He understood the condition of affairs, and, if he could have acted independently in regard to Canadian interests and Canadian sentiments, alone, I believe he never would have conceded these points, which are all the Americans want, and obtained nothing whatever for the fishing interests of Canada in return. I repeat, with all due respect to those distinguished gentlemen who were on the commission with the Minister of Finance, that their desire was and their sole desire was, to bring about a settlement of questions which had been of an irritating character between the United States and England; and we have been told by Mr. Chamberlain publicly since his return to England, that he came out here to make a Treaty that he had effected it and had brought about a peaceful solution of a difficult question which he believed was going to extend for many years between the two countries. The view I take from this evidence is that the hon. gentleman was pressed to yield these points which otherwise he would not have done. Now, referring to the Treaty, we are told in Article X that:

"United States fishing vessels entering the bays or harbors referred to in Article I of this Treaty shall conform to harbor regulations common to them and to fishing vessels of Canada or Newfoundland. They need not report, enter, or clear, when putting into such bays or harbors for shelter or repairing damages, nor when putting into the same, outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or of obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than twenty-four hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein, may be required to report, enter, or clear; and no vessel shall be excused hereby from giving due information to boarding officers. They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage; nor, when therein for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, shall they be liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues, or other similar dues."

There is a difficulty in this matter which I think must have escaped the notice of the hon. gentleman, and which I hope it is not, though it may be, too late to remedy. I have gone very carefully over the Treaty, and I do not find that, while the Treaty gives to the American fishermen the right to enter our ports without paying any harbor dues or light dues or other similar dues, or pilotage, the same privileges are extended to our fishermen in the ports of the United States. That is a very important omission, if I am right, because our fishing vessels visit Portland and Boston very frequently, and they should at least have the same privileges in American ports that American fishermen have in our own. I speak with reserve, but I have looked over the Treaty pretty carefully. I know it says:

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

But it does not say that there is any exemption from harbor dues or light dues.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would that be a privilege?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No, it would be an exemption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would not that be a privilege?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Whether it would be a privilege or not, this provision is indefinite. I hope I am wrong, but this should be so distinctly understood that there should

be no difficulty about it. Then, the other day, I noticed that the Minister of Marine, in reply to a question put by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), with regard to the duties paid by our fishermen, lays down the law on that occasion, and says:

"In Halifax, harbor masters' dues or not paid by any vessels under twenty tons, nor by coasting vessels, which include fishing vessels. At Pictou and Sydney, harbor dues are, by Acts of Parliament, exacted from all vessels over forty tons register; whether in practice fishing vessels are exempt when over forty tons cannot be stated without correspondence with the harbor masters of these ports."

I call attention to this because, while the Treaty would exempt American fishermen from these dues in visiting the harbors of Pictou and Sydney, the Nova Scotia fishermen would be obliged to pay the dues if the hon. gentleman's answer is according to the law. These are important places. Pictou is often visited by American fishermen *en route* to the North Bay, and to Prince Edward Island, and Sydney harbor is also an important place of call, and if our fishermen are obliged to pay all those dues which the hon. gentleman says they are on all vessels over 40 tons register, and the American vessels are exempt under the operations of the Treaty, it follows as a matter of course that our own fishing vessels are placed at a very considerable disadvantage. The question with regard to bait is one of the greatest possible importance. It is one which lies at the root of the fishery question, and the Americans justly understood and appreciated its value when they secured the privilege of obtaining bait under this Treaty. The result of the operation of this will be that the bankers going to the Western Banks commonly use clam bait, but those going to the Grand Banks, where they get the fish which are suitable for the larger markets, cannot expect to catch those fish without the use of fresh bait. They are a long way away from their own home, and their fresh bait will only last a short time, and if they are compelled to return to their own ports to get fresh bait if they can, and the supply is doubtful, and they cannot always get it, they would, practically, be almost compelled to give up the business altogether. But, now, all they have to do is to run into any near port on the Nova Scotia coast, from Cape Breton all along the coast to Halifax, and they will get their bait and be out on the fishing grounds again in a few days competing with our own people. This is still further a disadvantage to our own fishermen, though I do not say it is a disadvantage to our people, because they double the price of bait to our own fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you say they get that privilege under the treaty?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They would. They get it under this proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Under the *modus vivendi* and under the Treaty also. We are discussing both. They can to-day come into Nova Scotia coasts and ports and buy bait from our fishermen along the coast, and in consequence of their coming there, the cost of that bait is nearly double to a Nova Scotia banker. Now, I repeat, there are two interests in this matter. There is the interest of the man who sells bait, and there is the interest of the Nova Scotian or American who buys bait; but I am, in this connection, only discussing the way in which it affects our fishermen. I say, therefore, that the bait alone, which is a very important item in that connection, will be largely increased in expense to our Nova Scotia fishermen. These people then go out on the banks again, they return just as often as they like and get bait. Now, Sir, I was interviewed two years ago by the representative of a Boston paper on this very subject. Of course, I endeavored, as I always do, to maintain our own view of the subject, and to show our rights and the value of our privileges in this connection,

and generally in regard to our position. I said to the reporter of that paper :

"Another very important point that should not be lost sight of in this connection is that under this treaty the American fishermen could enter our harbors and bays, set their own nets and catch their own bait. The value to them of this privilege can scarcely be overestimated. As some idea of the value I may adopt their own view. It will be remembered that, some five or six years ago, the fishermen of Fortune Bay, Newfoundland, forcibly prevented American fishermen from taking bait for one day. Of course, under the treaty, the American fishermen had the right, and the Newfoundland fishermen were wrong in attempting to prevent them, and the result was an immediate demand from the United States Government for compensation for interference with their rights. This interruption was continued for a day or so, according to my recollection, and the American Government estimated the damage done the interest of their fishermen at \$15,000 to \$25,000. I do not at this moment remember the exact amount, though I am pretty confident it was the latter sum. But adopting the lower sum for one day's interruption, it would show conclusively the vital importance of the privilege of the Americans. The English Government settled the claim for very nearly the amount claimed, and although at the time it was generally regarded as a most preposterous demand, still looking at the effect it would have upon the interests of the fishermen lying there for bait, I scarcely think that the amount was more than it ought to have been."

Now, I was speaking at that time of the right of the Americans to set their nets and take bait themselves, which is not permitted under the present regulations, I admit, but the principle still applies. If they can come in and buy bait it is just the same thing to them, although it may cost them a little more—probably not very much, however. If they can come in, I repeat, and buy bait, and go out on the banks, and compete with our own people, the privilege to them is just as great as was estimated by themselves, at from \$15,000 to \$25,000, for one day's interruption in securing bait, at only one point, remember, along the extensive coast of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Therefore hon. gentlemen must see that in this matter the question of bait was one of life and death to them. The exclusion of Americans from the privilege of obtaining bait was having its natural effect, together with the protection of our fisheries, and one only has to take up the report of the Boston Fish Bureau for 1888 to see what a gradual decline has taken place in that great industry in the United States since 1883. In the year 1883 the total catch of fish was 1,061,698 quintals; in 1884, it was 1,001,303 quintals, a gradual decline; in 1885, 902,455, still declining; 1886, 828,572, still further declining; 1887, 676,723, showing an enormous decline. That is to say, that whereas, in 1883 the catch was 1,061,698 quintals, in 1887 it was only 676,723. The number of vessels employed decreased proportionately from 746 in 1883, showing a gradual decline through all the years to which I have referred, down to 1887, when there was only 560 vessels engaged in that business. In the same way the number of men employed gradually declined from 8,601 in 1883, down to 7,700 in 1887. Therefore hon. members will see that under the operation of the protection of our fisheries, and the exclusion of the Americans from our ports for the purpose of buying bait, they suffered to a very great extent. Now, if the plenipotentiaries had had that report of the Fish Bureau in their hands when they were negotiating this treaty, and been able to point out to the American plenipotentiaries that under the operation of this treaty it was a question of life or death to them whether they have a right to enter our harbor and take our bait—I say that our plenipotentiaries would have been able, in my judgment, humble though it be, to obtain a very different result from that which they ask us to accept now. Then, again, take the mackerel fishery during the same time. In 1878, the catch amounted to 196,468 barrels; in 1879, 220,599; 1880, 349,674; 1881, 391,657; 1882, 378,863; 1883, 226,000; 1884, 473,076; 1885, 329,943. In 1886, remember, under the operation of the exclusion, when it became most effectual and rigid, the number of barrels of mackerel instead of being at the point of 1885, during the time they had the privilege of entering our ports, amounted to only 79,998; in 1887, it was 88,382.

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Therefore, again, in respect to their mackerel as well as their cod fishery, this book shows incontrovertible evidence, produced by themselves, that under the operation of this treaty and their exclusions from our ports, their fisheries were gradually declining in the number of vessels and the number of men employed, and in the number of quintals of fish and barrels of mackerel that were taken. So, I say, that if hon. gentlemen had been in possession of a book or a table like that, from American sources, and had been able to point that out to the American plenipotentiaries, I think it would have been as strong an argument as they could use. Now, Sir, article 11 provided :

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada, or of the coasts of Newfoundland, in distress of weather, or other casualties, may unload, reload, tranship or sell—"

I need not read the whole of that paragraph. The next paragraph says :

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but such provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for re-sale or traffic."

It will be observed that in this section it says they should be offered facilities, for the purchase, not that they shall purchase. That is to say, that the authorities cannot interfere with them, and the authorities will not be able to interfere with any fishing vessel coming in there, as was stated by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, in explaining that section, took a very different view from that of the Minister of Justice, who was disposed, the other night to be rather facetious in regard to this matter, indeed he was rather facetious all though, and I thought treated a very important subject in a very jocular manner. However, the Minister of Finance says that they could purchase any supplies, including salt. The Minister of Justice said, the other night, we could not for a moment allow them to purchase bait, because bait was not an article usually granted to a trading vessel. I would ask the hon. gentleman what is the difference between bait, which the Minister of Justice says they may not obtain, and salt, which the Minister of Finance says they may obtain? They are necessarily supplies under the circumstances, and equally necessary for the prosecution of their industry and their voyage. The Minister of Finance said he would be glad to believe that the article would meet with the hearty approval of the House and the country :

"Would feel that he only acted with wise judgment and due regard to the best interests of Canada, for the sake of removing an international unpleasantness in putting those provisions into this treaty."

The whole thing seems to have been a sacrifice to peace, not a sacrifice in the interests of our people, but a sacrifice to conciliate the Americans, who raised their hands after all that had taken place and after they have been irritated to such an extent that they threatened—that is the word—the Dominion of Canada if we did not withdraw what they thought interfered with their people along the coast, that they might retaliate in a manner which would be unpleasant to us. I say this clause with regard to purchasing supplies is one that is likely to lead to a great deal of misconception. I contend that under the operation of that clause vessels may come in, as the Minister of Finance says, and may procure their provisions, including their salt, and if they take salt, why not take barrels, and if barrels, why not take bait? We have the word of the Minister of Justice, it is true, but I am disposed in this matter to accept the opinion of the Minister of Finance in preference, because the Minister of Finance doubtless is aware

what was the intention of it, and the intention evidently appears to be that the Americans are to get those supplies under those circumstances. I say that Mr. Bayard asked for all those privileges two years ago. In a schedule attached to his proposal for the settlement of all questions in dispute in relation to the fisheries on the north-eastern coast of British North America, he lays down certain propositions. First, he asked to have the headland question settled in favor of the Americans. The Government have yielded, and have given up a contention which the British Government have made for the last 70 years, and which the Americans have practically admitted under the treaties which have been made since that time, and which they practically confirmed by the decision in their own courts with regard to the seizure made by a Confederate vessel in the mouth of one of their own bays,—all of which bore out the contention which the British Government put upon the headland question. I am not saying whether it was right or wrong to have yielded it, but it was asked by Mr. Bayard in 1886, and the hon. gentleman has yielded it and has given the Americans just what they asked. The Government on that occasion answered in very strong and very emphatic language. The Government, in a paper called "observations on Mr. Bayard's memorandum" on page 251 of the Fishery papers, say:

"Article 2 would suspend the operation of the statutes of Great Britain and of Canada, and of the Provinces now constituting Canada, not only as to the various offences connected with fishing, but as to Customs, harbors and shipping, and would give to the fishing vessels of the United States privileges in Canadian ports which are not enjoyed by vessels of any other class, or of any other nation. Such vessels would, for example, be free from the duty of reporting at the Customs on entering a Canadian harbor, and no safeguard could be adopted to prevent infraction of the Customs laws by any vessel asserting the character of a fishing vessel of the United States."

Section 3 of article 15 of the treaty provides with respect to bait that it shall be secured by barter. I think the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to enforce the Customs laws under such an arrangement. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are well aware that all along the coast of Nova Scotia from one end to the other, there are ports frequented by our own fishing vessels as well as the American vessels. Take the port of Sambro, twenty miles from Halifax. An American fishing vessel will come there for bait, and under the privileges of this treaty it may secure that by barter. To what will that lead? Will it not lead to a violation of the Customs laws, in fact to smuggling? Will the Government be able to have custom house officers at all these different points to watch American vessels and see that the Americans do not smuggle when they come in for their supplies? The privilege given to them of giving barter for bait will lead, in my judgment, to an immediate, open and direct violation of the Customs laws every time such a transaction takes place. This treaty was undoubtedly undertaken with a view of settling difficulties on various points, of explaining away difficult points in the Treaty of 1813. I would ask anyone in reading this present treaty carefully to compare it with the old one. If there was one uncertain expression, or one point that could be taken advantage of in the old treaty, there are fifty in the present one. There is nothing but what may lead to future trouble, and so far as I can see the cause of irritation between the United States and Great Britain, so far from being removed will, in effect, be more likely to be increased year by year. Take for instance the privilege of entering our ports for bait and for reshipment. What does that mean? It means simply that you cannot seize an American vessel when she is within the three-mile limit. If she is fishing or preparing to fish of course she is subject to seizure, but there may be a dozen cruisers there, and though they may go to that vessel

and ask her what she is doing there she can reply simply: We are going to enter for bait, or supplies, under the provision of the treaty. I say that that very clause will lead to complication of a most serious character, and not only that, because if our inshore fisheries are of any value—and I contend they are—these American vessels going in and out of port under the sanction of the treaty, will violate that treaty whenever they get the opportunity, within the three-mile limit. Does anyone imagine that an American vessel, going in or out of one of our ports along our coast, and meeting shoals of fish, is going to sail through them, out of any respect for treaty obligations? Not at all; they do not know the fishermen if they think so. Fishermen will take fish whenever they come to their net, and those American fishermen, as they go in and out of port and find our fish, whether inside or outside of the limit, unless there happens to be a cruiser there—and it is impossible to have a cruiser in every port,—those people will practically have the whole use of our own inshore fisheries, valuable as the hon. gentleman says they are. In effect, you concede to them the right to enter our ports, you concede to them the right to obtain supplies, you concede to them the right of transshipment of their cargoes, which is a most important one, and I say, Sir, you have given up your whole case, you have given up the whole value of your fisheries to the American people. Let us understand it, for if that is the object the hon. gentleman has in view, if that is what the Government desire to give to the Americans under the operation of this treaty, not directly, I admit, but practically, the value and privileges of our inshore fisheries, let them say so, and let us understand it, because that and no other will be the result in reality. I say it is utterly impossible for the Government, by their fishery and custom house officers and by their cruisers, to watch along our Atlantic coast and keep American vessels off the three-mile limit, when they have a right, under the treaty, to go into port through that very water which is contraband for the purposes of taking fish. Take the privilege of reshipment. That is one of the most important privileges that you can give to the Americans. I confess that I always thought it was very hard, on the face of it, that our vessels could go into the United States and reship their cargoes, when the American vessels had not the privilege of coming in and reshipping their cargoes in this country. Still that was the treaty; those were the words of the treaty and they could not do so. But understand now what the advantage of this is. If one of those vessels is bound to the North Bay, up the St. Lawrence, for mackerel fishing and she has been successful she can tranship her cargo in Canada. Before this treaty she had her full cargo on board and she had to go back to the United States and land it there. She could not land it in Prince Edward Island, or in Canso, or in Halifax. And the time that she occupied in making the voyage from the fishing ground to a port in the United States and back to the fishery ground again, exhausted a large portion of the season, which is very short on that coast. Now, in the privileges granted by hon. gentlemen the American vessels can land their cargoes in Charlottetown under the operation of this treaty, and put their fish on board a steamer going to Boston, or she can run into Canso and put it on board a steamer bound for Boston, and the fish is in the market at once. This I contend is a most important concession to the fishermen. We have only to look at how the Americans themselves regard it to see this. The hon. gentleman fairly stated that the treaty was opposed for political purposes by a certain political section of the American people, and in this connection it appears to me that the question naturally arises whether we are doing a very wise thing in passing this treaty before we know what is to be its fate in the United States. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that if this Parliament deliberately

accepts the treaty, that our hands for all future time will be tied and we never can in any future negotiation go beyond the points which have been yielded in this treaty. We never can raise any objection to any demand which is conceded under the operation of its various clauses. But if the Parliament of the Dominion did not in its wisdom ratify this treaty, or if the Government did not ask Parliament to ratify it until it receives the sanction of Congress, then the Government and the people of this country will be able to say: It is quite true a treaty was agreed upon by plenipotentiaries from Great Britain and Canada embodying certain concessions to the people of the United States, but that treaty never received the sanction of Parliament. It will then stand in a very different position in the future from what it will if the Americans in any future negotiations are able to point to the fact and say that the treaty under which we yielded those concessions was deliberately accepted by your people. In any future negotiations between us those concessions must be taken as the starting point, and although I know the hon. gentlemen will not adopt my suggestion I do think that it is a matter of policy which it would be wise for them to consider, whether they would not be acting in the interests of the country to let this matter stand for a latter stage in the Session and see what action is taken in the United States,—whether it is merely passed over for reconsideration in December, or whether, as it is stated it may be, thrown out of the United States Senate altogether. If it is thrown out of the United States Senate altogether, I think our position would be a very unenviable one. If it is only carried over to the December session of Congress, then I admit it would not be quite in the same position; but if we pass the treaty here, and if the Senate throws it out, I think we will feel rather cheap at the offers which we have made and which the Americans have not for political reasons, it may be thought, fit to accept. The fishermen of this country are those who are most interested, and my anxiety is on their account, for I see plainly that having yielded to the Americans all that they wanted we have no prospect, and we have no probability, nor does it seem within the range of probability in the very near future that there is any chance of our having fish admitted free into the United States. They have the use of our ports for their operations, for purchasing their bait, and for landing their cargoes; and under these circumstances our fishermen will continue to labor under the disadvantages which they are under to-day. A large portion of their catch must go to the United States, because we have no other market. That is well understood by the hon. members of this House, and was very fully explained by Sir John Macdonald in 1871, when he spoke as follows:—

"It seems to me that, in looking at the treaty in a commercial point of view, and looking at the question whether it is right to accept the articles, we have to consider mainly that interest which is most peculiarly affected. Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interests in Nova Scotia, with one or two exceptions for local reasons, are altogether in favor of the treaty. They are so anxious to get free admission for their fish into the American market, that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude from them that market; that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry, and I say that that being the case,—if it be to the interest of the fishermen, and to the advantage of that branch of national industry, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for the Canadian No 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market, and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is, that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen. They are made the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen, or the American merchants engaged in the trade; and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people. Let any one go down the St. Lawrence on a summer trip—as many of us do,—and call from the deck of the steamer to a fisherman in his boat and

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

see for what a nominal price you can secure the whole of his catch; and that is from the absence of a market, and from the fact of the Canadian fishermen being completely under the control of the foreigner. With the duty off Canadian fish, the Canadian fisherman may send his fish at the right time, when he can obtain the best price, to the American market, and thus be the means of opening a profitable trade with the United States in exchange."

The right hon. gentleman there most correctly interpreted our position. But what position are we in to-day? We are still shut out of that market, and have no prospect of getting into it. The concessions made in this treaty, I might almost say preclude all possibility of the Americans ever opening their market to our fish; and how are we to compete with them in the same sea when they have all the advantages of our ports and of our proximity to the fishing grounds given to them, and when in addition to that, they can take their thousand barrels of mackerel to the United States and sell them for \$4,000 more than our fishermen can get for a thousand barrels in the same market? It is only by opening the markets of the United States that our great fishing industry can be extended. Our market is there, and the Americans know it as well as we do. They have been told it by the hon. First Minister and by others again and again. All our fish must go there, and we have to pay the duty on what we send, because their fishermen take the largest portion, and our fish must go in at the market value minus the duty they impose on us. I say, looking at the position of our fishermen at the present moment, I regard this treaty as a most fatal blunder and as an injury to our fishermen which they will not be able to survive very long. They have been hoping year after year that as soon as they gave up those advantages which they possess in the fisheries, they would be placed on an equal plane of competition with the Americans; but they see all these advantages swept away, and they are obliged to compete with the Americans with these disadvantages against them. Under these circumstances, I am very sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman that credit which has been given to him from Imperial as well as colonial sources. If, in the interest of the Empire, it is absolutely necessary that we should make these concessions, let us understand it, and I shall be prepared to make them and to take my share of the responsibility. But let us not put the matter under any false pretences—and this treaty has been submitted to this House under false pretences, if I may use such an expression, and if it is not unparliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. JONES. I do not think it is out of order. This treaty has been submitted to this House with the representation that it is in the interest of our own people, and I say it is against the interest of our own people who are engaged in that industry. It is in the interest of peace, I admit, and I admit that as part of the Empire we are obliged to make some concessions; and if the hon. gentleman will put it on that high level and appeal to the people on the ground that we are obliged to make sacrifices for the sake of Imperial interests, and to maintain a good understanding between two great peoples, I would be with him to a certain extent. But he has taken another ground; he has defended the treaty on the ground that it is in the interest of our own people, which is not the case. I repeat that if it would bring about a better understanding between the United States and the people of this country, which is very much to be desired, that is one point in its favor. It is the only point in its favor. If there was no other point that would commend this treaty to me, but if it would remove all causes of difference between the Americans and ourselves—if it would remove all those causes of irritation which have been brought about by the unwise fiscal policy of the present Government—if the Americans are led by it to see that there are five millions of people in this country who are anxious to establish trade

relations with them which would be of mutual advantage to both countries, and are willing to make concessions under this treaty in order to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, then I say the sacrifice, injurious as it is to the fishermen along our coasts, if it leads in the future to those greater advantages of wider commercial relations between the two countries, will possibly not have been made in vain.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, the question now under the consideration of this House is to my mind the most important one that has been under discussion since I had the honor of a seat here. The measure now before the House provides for the settlement of an important question which has ever caused a misunderstanding between the people of Canada and the people of the United States. It contemplates the removal of the barrier which now stops the way to freer commercial intercourse with the people of the American republic; it heals all old sores, and will lead to a more healthy condition of feeling between the people of the two countries; it establishes friendly relations between them; and I believe, Sir, if the treaty is adopted by both countries, they will go hand in hand, each under their own flag, in the paths of peace, prosperity and progress. Believing that, I think I am warranted in saying that the question now before us is the most important one we have had to consider during the present or past Session of the Parliament. It must be remembered, in considering this Fishery Treaty, that it was not the fault of the people of Canada that the happy relations which existed between the countries, while the Treaty of 1854 and the Treaty of 1873 were in force, that is from 1854 to 1866 and from 1873 to 1885, ceased after the abrogation of these treaties. These treaties, which disposed, for the time being, of the conflicting opinions that existed on both sides of the line as to certain sections of the Treaty of 1818, were both cancelled by the Congress of the United States, so that the people of Canada are not responsible for the retrogression from 1885 to 1888, and for the altered state of public feeling existing since 1885 between the two countries with reference to fishery matters. For that retrogression, from 1885 to 1888, the Congress of the United States is, in my opinion, solely responsible. The Treaty of 1854 was evidently more in consonance with the spirit of the age in which we live and with the changed condition of both countries than was the ancient Treaty of 1818. It disposed of the troublesome fishery question, and also permitted the interchange of certain commodities on terms fair and reasonable and advantageous to both countries. I find, on looking into this matter, that during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1854 to 1866, there was a large trade between the two countries. That was before Confederation, and to arrive at the exact figures, I have had to take the trade of each Province. I find that the imports of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, during those years, from the United States, amounted to over \$319,000,000, and that the exports of those Provinces amounted to some \$252,000,000, leaving a balance of trade in favor of the United States of over \$67,000,000, and yet, notwithstanding that very favorable financial result of the working of the treaty, the treaty was abrogated by the United States in 1854, and we were compelled to revert to the Treaty of 1818. Subsequently, under the fishery clause of the Washington Treaty, the disputes or differences of opinion which existed between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, as to the clauses of the Treaty of 1818, were silenced, to the very decided advantage of the people of both countries. That amicable arrangement was also brought to a close by the action of the people of the United States, and we were again driven to the Treaty of 1818. At the termination of the treaty in 1885, it will be remembered that Canada, at the suggestion of the Executive of the United States, and to show her

friendliness and sincerity in the negotiations for the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, refrained for six or seven months from enforcing the conditions of the Treaty of 1818, and waited until the President of the United States submitted his Message to Congress. When Canada found that the Senate of the United States refused to act on the request of President Cleveland, and refused to appoint a commission to consider this question, Canada adopted the only course opened to her, and that was to revert to the Treaty of 1818. It was the only course consistent with her own respect and with the interests of her fishermen. I contend, therefore, that for the ill-feeling to which the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has referred, as existing in the United States toward Canada since the abrogation of the treaty in 1885, the Congress of the United States is alone responsible. That ill-feeling originated, of course, in the enforcement on our part of the conditions of the Treaty of 1818, and yet that was the only course open to us; and it seemed to me a mockery and an absurdity, that after we had those relations with our neighbors under the treaty which expired in 1885, we should have to go back to the ancient Treaty of 1818. It is not creditable that two friendly nations, two adjoining peoples, who have so much in common, should be wrangling and quarrelling over a document that was brought into existence over 70 years ago. No matter how clear the conditions of that agreement may be, it is not creditable that in the present age we should be wrangling over it. It is much more sensible that we should come together, discuss the points in dispute, arrive at some practical solution, and then make a fresh start. That has been accomplished, the representatives of all the parties interested met at Washington, and after long and careful deliberations placed their labors before us in the form of a treaty, and submitted that treaty to us for approval. We know that the treaty has also been sent to the Senate of the United States by President Cleveland, accompanied by his own recommendation in favor of its adoption, and he has pronounced it a fair and an honorable agreement. I admit that Canada, in negotiating this treaty, has made certain concessions. As regards the value of those concessions, it is impossible to-day to estimate them, but we knew, when we submitted this matter to a commission and an arbitration, that palpable and inevitable concessions must follow. And I was a little surprised to find my hon. friend and colleague, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), complaining of these concessions. I was under the impression that he had himself recognised that it was absolutely necessary that some concessions should be made on both sides in order to arrive at a happier state of feeling than has existed during the past twelve or eighteen months, because I find that my hon. friend is reported in the *Halifax Chronicle* of July 1st, 1886,—I believe he quoted a portion of the interview, but I did not catch his exact words—as having said:

"Nothing but mutual concession and a determination on the part of both Governments to avoid cause for open disagreement can prevent the most irritating consequences; and our friendly relations might be strained to a degree that could scarcely bear further tension."

I think my hon. friend there has laid down the doctrine that mutual concessions are necessary even to preserve peace between the two countries. As regards the matter of concessions, we all know that, in the ordinary affairs of life, if there is a dispute between neighbors the most expeditious and satisfactory way of settling it is to call in parties acceptable to the disputants and to ask them to consider the matter in dispute and adjudicate upon it, and what is beneficial in private life is equally beneficial in public life.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not for one to give up everything and the other nothing.

Mr. KENNY. I never interrupt, but I do not object to the interruption. The hon. gentleman knows well that as

soon as a matter is submitted to arbitration or to a commission, that is a recognition of the fact that concessions are necessary on both sides. Now, looking at this question nationally, I say that, when I am called upon to vote on it, I consider that I am called to vote upon the most important question which has been submitted to Parliament since I have had the honor of being a member, but, as my hon. friend and colleague has mentioned, it is especially important to the people of the Lower Provinces, and notably to the Province of Nova Scotia. The whole fishery product of Canada in 1886 amounted to \$18,679,288, and of that amount Nova Scotia's share came to \$8,415,361. Hon. gentlemen will recognise at once how much more concerned we are in that Province in all that relates to fishery questions than is any other Province of this Dominion. It will also be found that whilst in the whole of Canada, there were 55,731 men engaged in fishing, of these 27,485 belonged to the Province of Nova Scotia; and while the tonnage engaged in that industry amounted to 44,000 tons, 29,000 belonged to Nova Scotia. While the total value that Canada had invested in fishing boats, ships, nets, &c., amounted to \$6,814,295, of that amount Nova Scotia possessed nearly \$3,000,000, or almost half. Of the whole fishery product of Canada, it will be found that we exported some \$6,843,388, and that Nova Scotia exports of fish amounted to \$3,899,077. I find that, of that amount, although my hon. colleague says the American market is the only market for our fish, of our exports of \$3,899,077, only about one-third, or \$1,358,024, went to the United States. As regards the condition of our fishermen, in whom we all take a very great interest, and who form a very large and important factor in our population, their condition to-day is, in my opinion, more satisfactory than it has been for many years. I believe that, at least as far as the fishermen of Nova Scotia are concerned, and I do not presume to speak for the fishermen of any other part of the Dominion, their condition as a whole is more satisfactory at present than it has been for many years. My hon. colleague has referred, in the course of his remarks, to the inshore fisheries of Canada, and has also called attention to the retrogression which has taken place in the general fishing interest of the United States of America, and he instanced the small product of mackerel for the year 1887. I think he could not have given us a better proof of the value of the inshore fisheries than that instance, because, if he had taken the trouble to enquire—and there are few gentlemen better informed on the subject than my hon. friend—he would have discovered that the last season was a poor mackerel season, especially for the Americans. The fish was caught principally inside the three-mile limit. The fish would not school off shore, so our fishermen caught mackerel by the old method of hook and line, and they did well, and that fish was almost all caught within the three-mile limit. My hon. friend knows that the Americans have exhausted their own fisheries by improper and injudicious fishing, and that there is certainly a risk of their doing the same, if they are not prevented, in our waters. The United States fishermen ignore entirely the Canadian regulations, as far as they are permitted to, and have the habit of throwing overboard fish they do not want, and thus help to destroy the inshore fisheries. I regret that, when this treaty was under consideration, some means were not adopted to put a stop to purse-seine fishing. That is more destructive than any other mode of fishing, and, if it be persevered in, will destroy the fishing on our coasts. It is known that, by the system of purse-seining, large quantities of fish are caught which are considered valueless by the fisherman, because he only wants the mackerel, and he throws the others overboard, to the great injury of our fishing banks. I regret exceedingly that it was not possible to arrive at some international mode of putting a stop to this injurious

Mr. KENNY.

system of fishing. While it is adopted by the Americans, our own people, to a certain extent, are almost compelled to adopt it in self-defence. My hon. colleague, in the course of his remarks, has referred to the fact that under the *modus vivendi*, the Americans are permitted to come into our harbors for the purchase of bait. The hon. gentleman must be aware that they can only exercise that privilege by paying for it, and that under the *modus vivendi*, they can frequent our harbors, on paying a tax of \$1.50 per ton, for the purchase of bait and other supplies. Why, Sir, it was only a few days ago that the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, with which the hon. member is familiar, found great fault with the conditions of the treaty, because it did not permit their fishermen to come into our harbors for bait. That is one of the charges brought against the Minister of Finance, of excluding the American fishermen from our harbors and preventing them from acquiring bait. My hon. friend says that Mr. Bayard considered the fishery question as one by itself, and he found fault, as I understood him, at least, with the hon. Minister of Finance for not going further and using this opportunity for negotiating a reciprocity treaty. Well, Sir, as I have understood the state of feeling which prevails among the statesmen and politicians of the United States, it is their desire and determination that the first question that shall be disposed of is this fishery question, and they will not entertain any trade negotiation on the part of Canada, any offers on the part of Canada, for freer commercial intercourse with them, until this fishery question is disposed of; therefore my hon. friend is right in saying that the fishery question is one by itself, and that it must be disposed of before any other negotiations can be opened between the United States and Canada. And I notice, also, that my hon. friend has found fault in respect of the headland question; he says everything has been given away in the headland question, and that Mr. Bayard got exactly, in that matter, all that he asked for. Now, Sir, I suppose I can hardly expect my hon. friend to praise the Government for this treaty, or for anything else they do; but I find that he took an interest in this headland question many years ago. In the *Globe* of May 16, 1872, I find that my hon. friend, in addressing the Parliament of Canada when the Washington Treaty was under discussion, found fault with the right hon. gentleman who was then leading the Government and advocating the treaty, because the headland question had not been settled. On that occasion he was reported to have said:

"The first question the arbitrators would have to decide would be the headland question, whether from headland to headland, or along the coast. It was, therefore, of the greatest importance that the High Commissioner should have settled definitely the question of headlands, so that the arbitration would have a basis on which to make their valuation."

Now, Sir, my hon. friend found fault in 1872 because the Government had not provided for a settlement of the headland question, and now he finds fault with them because they have settled it. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, states that in order to judge of the merits of this treaty, we should see how it is considered on the other side of the line. Well, my hon. friend knows that this very opinion which exists in the United States, and to which he has referred, as to the value of our inshore fisheries, gained importance and gained notoriety in the United States from the fact that a commission was held, and that certain of the public men of the United States visited the districts that were interested in fishing matters, Massachusetts especially, and held their commission in Boston and Gloucester, and received the evidence of those who were interested in the trade, and the undoubted consensus of opinion in those places was that the inshore fisheries were comparatively of little value—that evidently seemed to be the opinion. He must also have noted that this fishery treaty has been frequently assailed by people of the United States, an

those who are most interested in fishery matters in that country, because, they say, that it concedes every thing to Canada, while my hon. friend takes the stand that everything has been conceded to the United States. Now, Sir, I think that impartial people will arrive at the conclusion that has been pronounced by the President of the United States, that this treaty is a fair and honorable settlement of the difficulty. My hon. friend has not told us whether he is going to vote against the treaty or vote for it. He reminds me very much of what I read in the Biglow papers, of a man that he cooled off when he came to understand it. Now that my hon. friend and some of his neighbors have come to understand the question, they very likely have cooled off. But the organ of opinion which represents him in the lower Provinces, the *Halifax Chronicle*, informed us the other day that the House should be divided on this question, and that the treaty should not be ratified by this Legislature. Now, with that I cannot agree. I regret exceedingly, Mr. Speaker, that it was not within my power to arrive at Ottawa in time to have heard the very able, the very eloquent, the very exhaustive speech with which the hon. Minister of Finance introduced this important measure to the Parliament of Canada. I may say, Sir, that the criticisms which I have read of that speech in the public press, and the comments which I have heard from hon. gentlemen who had the pleasure of listening to it, very much add to my regret. I was also sorry that I had not an opportunity of hearing the very brilliant and very incisive speech of the Minister of Justice on that occasion. After those two distinguished statesmen have discussed this question, I think I almost ought to apologise to the House for taking up its time in discussing it, but the importance of this question to Canada, and to Nova Scotia particularly, must be my excuse. Now, Sir, assuming that there will be a division of the House, I am prepared to say that I will vote for the treaty for several reasons. I will vote for it because I believe it is the best answer this House can give to the retaliatory Edmunds Bill of the United States, because Mr. Bayard says this treaty grants to American fishermen all they can reasonably ask from Canada. I will vote for the treaty because I believe, when it is calmly and dispassionately considered and judged on its merits by the people of Canada and of the United States, it will recommend itself to their sober judgment and approval. I believe that the adoption of the treaty will improve the relations between the two countries and establish such friendly relations as ought to exist between us, and which will be lasting. I believe that the adoption of the treaty will remove every possible cause of misunderstanding between the people of the United States and the people of Canada, and that it will unite in the closest ties of esteem and respect all the members of these great English-speaking races. For these reasons I will vote for the treaty.

Mr. EISENHAUER. As the treaty now under consideration will very largely affect the county which I have the honor to represent, I desire to offer some remarks on the question. I think it will interfere very seriously with the rights of a large class of our population, especially the fishermen, and I am of the opinion that it will press most unjustly on our fishing interests. Several hon. gentlemen who favor the treaty have endeavored to lead the House to believe that it will in no way press injuriously on that class of our population. I, however, think otherwise. We have a very large fleet of vessels engaged in what is called the deep-sea fishing. The fleet from the town of Lunenburg alone comprises from 80 to 90 sail averaging 80 or 90 tons each, besides that half as many more which come from other ports in the county. Most of these vessels are engaged in the trawl mode of fishing and are obliged to use fresh bait, in fact that is the only bait they can use. During the years of the treaty when American

fishermen were allowed to come on our coasts and purchase bait, the price of bait to our fishermen was very much enhanced. I know that in some seasons our fishermen were obliged to pay as high as \$5 or \$6 for a barrel of herring. During the two or three years that have elapsed since the abrogation of the treaty, they have obtained their bait for 50 per cent. less, and in some cases at even a greater reduction. The cost of bait for one of these vessels for a season during the existence of the treaty would average from \$600 to \$800, and in some cases it has cost a vessel as high as \$1,000. During the last two years, however, the cost of bait for a vessel has not averaged more than \$300 or \$400. The price of bait again will be enhanced to what it was during the operation of the Washington Treaty, if the Americans are allowed to come in and purchase bait. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that no surrender has been made by Canada, and that any concessions made were of a very trivial character. I should like some of those hon. gentlemen to come down to my county and endeavor to make the fishermen believe that such is the case. Those hon. gentlemen, even the Minister of Finance, have sought to lead the House to believe that Canada has made no concessions. For what, then, were we contending; for what reason were the Government so rigidly enforcing the fishery and customs laws and regulations? Nothing is to be gained by ratifying the treaty at the present moment. In case the treaty was ratified by us and not ratified by our neighbors across the border, we would stand in a very much worse position than we would occupy if we allow the matter to drop. I think the Government would be acting in the true interests of the country, and the fishermen especially, if they would consider this matter seriously before the treaty was ratified. The chief reasons given for the arrangement arrived at are that it was entered into to prevent the United States carrying out their policy of retaliation. I cannot help saying that, in my opinion, the Government are somewhat to blame for the irritation that has been aroused among our neighbors across the border. In my humble opinion the Government have been too rigid and too severe. I may give an instance or two in which I was somewhat interested to show how very rigidly the Government have enforced all the regulations. The master of a vessel in which I was interested happened to fall in with an American vessel 14 miles distant from any headland. The American schooner was short of provisions and the men had scarcely anything left to eat, and the captain of the Nova Scotia vessel supplied the American with a barrel of flour and other small articles. The vessel, which was the *Scylla*, was seized and a fine of \$400 imposed for what I consider was only a humane act. The Government were, however, obliged to retract and refund the amount. In another case the master of a vessel in which I was interested loaned 12 or 15 barrels of salt to a brother in command of an American vessel the year previous to the abrogation of the treaty, and in 1886 those vessels fell in with each other and my captain returned the salt. That vessel was again seized and fined \$400, of which the department remitted \$300. I think that hon. gentlemen will admit that this is severe and rigid, but these are only a few of the examples which have come under my own personal knowledge. I think there is a good deal of truth in what the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr Jones) stated with regard to the treaty, for there are many points in it that will be open to contention and dispute, and instead of the treaty settling all those disputes I think it will just be the reverse. The hon. gentleman is also correct in his view with regard to several charges from which American vessels are exempt under this treaty, and which our vessels are obliged to pay. I think that is very unfair and bears very harshly on our fishermen. In my view it is impossible to carry on the fishing industry of our country, especially

as regards pickled fish—mackerel and herring—when we are met with a heavy tariff of \$2 in the United States. It seems to me that under this treaty we have given away the key of the whole situation. It is said by some gentlemen on the other side that this treaty will be the means of removing all difficulties between the two countries and will gradually lead up to wider trade relations. I hope that that may be the case, but I very much fear we have given away the key we had in our hands and which we could use in order to bring about this very desirable result. As was pointed out by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), the provisions of the treaty will enable American fishermen to secure larger quantities of fish for their market, and it will consequently reduce the price for our fish. The privilege of transshipment of their fish in our ports enables those vessels to catch larger quantities of mackerel than they were formerly able to do, because the time they lost in going to ports in the United States with their fares and coming back to the fishing grounds will be saved to them. I do seriously think, and believe, that this treaty will work very injuriously to our fishermen. I must say that I anticipated the result of this Washington commission all along. I knew very well that the Home Government was very anxious to have this matter settled, and that they would be quite ready to settle it in a manner very much contrary to our interests, so that I am not at all surprised at the result. That is very unfair to us; we were the weakest party of the three and we got the worst of it. It has been very properly stated here by a number of gentlemen that the American market was the only market for our best qualities of mackerel. We have four qualities of mackerel that find their way to the United States, besides a large portion of all the poorer qualities. During the year 1886 I think it was, the price for our best qualities of mackerel in the United States was very low, as low as \$3 or \$3.50 a barrel. On this fish we were compelled to pay a duty of \$2, as well as commission and other charges, so that the poor fishermen had not enough remaining to pay for barrels and salt, while the Americans had, at all events, the \$2 duty. During the treaty many of our vessels could take their fares of cod direct into the American ports from the Banks, and they got their return almost immediately. If this treaty is ratified they will not be able to do that, because the duty upon a fare of codfish equal to 2,000 quintals when dried would amount to \$1,700 or \$1,800 at a duty of half a cent a pound on green cod. We are, therefore, to a certain extent prevented from getting rid of the surplus of our codfish in the American market on account of the duty. This drives a large quantity of fish into the West India markets—a much larger quantity than those markets are able to consume, and consequently it lowers the price there as well. I think it would only be just and fair to those poor toilers by the sea, if the Government should increase their bounty to the amount they will receive from the American Government for licenses taken out by their fishing vessels. This treaty if ratified will injure the county which I have the honor to represent more than any county in the Dominion that I know of, for the reasons I have already given, and I think it would be only well that the Government should pause before ratifying this treaty, which will work so injuriously to all our deep-sea fishermen. There are a small number of fishermen who use the hook and line, and do not use fresh bait, who would not be much injured, but all others would be injured to a very large extent. Now, I am quite free to admit that the privilege of selling bait will be of some benefit to our inshore fishermen, but I am quite sure that if our inshore fishermen had the choice they would prefer to remain as they are at present, provided there is any reasonable hope of getting rid of the American duty on fish. After all, it is only a very small portion of their catch which our inshore fishermen sell to the deep-sea fishermen for bait. A very large por-

Mr. EISENHAEUER.

tion of their herring and mackerel are shipped to the American market. In the later part of the season nearly all their catch of mackerel finds its way into the American market, and they have to pay a duty on it of \$2 a barrel. Now, I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I would repeat again, in the interests of the fishermen of the county I represent, and in the interests of the fishermen of the country generally, that I consider that the Government has made some very valuable concessions. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who has just taken his seat, seemed to think that the concessions do not amount to much. Well, if that hon. gentleman goes down into his county, I think he will find that the fishermen there will tell him a different story. I think the concessions are very valuable; in fact, I think the Americans have got almost all they wanted, while we have got nothing. The hon. member said there were concessions on both sides, but he failed to point them out, and I have failed to hear any hon. member point out the least concession which we have got from the Americans. Therefore, I would very strongly urge on the Government to stay their hands from ratifying this treaty, for the present at all events, for I believe it will prove most injurious to a large class of our fishermen. I am sure that no arrangement that can be made between the two countries will satisfy the fishermen that does not provide for the free admission of fish into the American market. I am very sure that the whole of those engaged in the deep-sea fisheries, if they gave expression to their feeling, would be against the ratification of the treaty. For these reasons I do hope the Government will take into consideration the advisability of withholding the ratification, at all events for the present.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—Mr. Weldon (Albert).

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 94) to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. Daly.)

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. the Minister of Finance took the House with him through a long and eloquent retrospect of the history of the fishery question; but there was one point to which the hon. gentleman did not allude, and I feel that he will not object to my supplying the omission. When the Washington Treaty was abrogated, and it became necessary that we should protect our fisheries, cruisers were sent out to do duty along our coasts, and a large expenditure was incurred in the protection of these fisheries. After two years of this protection a general election took place, and I say it with pride, and it must appeal, I am sure, to the national sentiment of every hon. gentleman in this House, upon whichever side he may sit, as showing that we are not any longer purely a paper nation, that we are not any longer Canadians by Act of Parliament, that, at a time when it was most desirable in the interests of party to make every point score against the Government, I did not find, from one end of the Dominion to the other, especially in the western part of the Dominion, where certainly no benefits will accrue to the population by protection to the fisheries, that any voice was ever raised against this expenditure in the protection of our just rights. I feel that this is a thing of which we may well be proud, because when I go back to

the history of the United States, I find that, even after they had existed as a nation and as a confederation of States for twenty years, after the war with the United States in 1812, when the matter was brought before the commissioners appointed to settle the case, the feeling grew so intense on the question of the fisheries, which were claimed by New England in their entirety, and which the other States did not trouble themselves much about, that a breach nearly occurred, and it was a very serious question whether the New England States would not separate themselves from the rest of the Confederation. I mention this as pointing to the fact that I think our national sentiment has already grown to a point when we may claim that every portion of the Dominion feels a patriotic interest in what concerns any other portion. It is a matter of pride, I must say, that when we compare our progress with that of the nation to the south of us, we find that even twenty years after the confederation of the different Provinces of Canada into one Dominion, we have formed a true national spirit and are prepared to co-operate with each other in every respect in defending the interests of our people in whatever parts of the Dominion these interests may be affected. Our national spirit leads us to cultivate and protect the interests of another portion of the community rather than see it go by default and suffer, and in that sense we show that a national spirit has already taken root amongst us. In this connection, I am happy to say, that although, of course, I have not been able to go amongst my constituents and hear their views, I am in constant communication with them, that I am pleased to learn from all parts of the constituency that the people have not made this a party question, but are entirely in accord with the action of the Government. With reference to the remark of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that this treaty is composed of concessions made in favor of the United States, that may be the case. It is the case undoubtedly, but I would ask if those concessions made to the United States are not injurious to the interests of our fishermen, why should we object to them. If we find that the concessions made by us are in no ways inimical to our people, it is a triumph of statesmanship to have overcome by this means the difficulties of the situation and have arrived at a settlement satisfactory to both sides. There was some historical error in the statement of the hon. member for Halifax which I feel bound to correct. He said that under the Washington Treaty the interests of the Province of Nova Scotia were sacrificed, because the right hon. the First Minister refused to offer the United States plenipotentiaries free lumber and coal. I think that is undoubtedly an error, which I cannot allow to pass on the present occasion without correcting it. My impression is that the right hon. gentleman did not refuse to make this offer, but that the offer was withdrawn at the request of the British plenipotentiaries, on the ground that the compensation offered by Canada was not sufficient to offset the advantages which the United States had obtained. I have called attention to this because I do not feel it right that this statement should pass unnoticed. The hon. gentleman regrets very much that we did not offer to the United States the privilege of free fish in Canadian waters, in return for reciprocity in natural products, and he says that was the lever which should have been used to obtain reciprocity. The hon. gentleman poses as a friend of the fishermen, but I hardly think it is consistent with that position which he assumes, that he should be willing to sacrifice their interests for the purpose of obtaining a concession which would benefit other interests. I do not think it is the duty of true friends of the fishermen to sacrifice their interests for the sake of others. The hon. gentleman went on to say that he regretted that the Americans did not ask for the inshore fisheries, and he has assumed therefore that they placed no value on our inshore fisheries. Whatever value the Ameri-

cans may place on them, I do not hesitate to say that our people place a great value on our inshore fisheries. It is by means of those fisheries that a large portion of the population of the Maritime Provinces derive their existence, and were it not for this source of livelihood, they would be forced to seek a living elsewhere, and this is the only resource of the people living on those rocky shores. Were the Americans permitted to return to our fisheries as formerly, in a few years the fisheries would be fished out and destroyed by their reckless habits of fishing, and a large portion of our population forced to seek a living elsewhere. The hon. gentlemen referred to Art. 11 of the treaty. Well, I could hardly follow his reasoning with regard to it. He referred to that question of licenses, to purchase for the homeward voyage such provisions and supplies as are sold to trading vessels. He assumes from that, although the hon. the Minister of Justice set him right, that these vessels could come in and purchase bait and salt and barrels, and in fact everything they required, so as to make our coasts a base of supplies for their operations. I do not think that is the reading of the treaty and that it is so understood by the plenipotentiaries. He then touches on the headlands contention, and makes an assertion which I was a little surprised at, because if he had listened to the discussion across the floor, when the treaty was introduced, between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), he would have heard some information. He asserts that the headlands contention has been maintained by the British Government for the last seventy years. I think he might have heard that, on instructions from home, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), when he was Minister of Marine, thought proper to withdraw that contention, and not to instruct the cruisers to keep the Americans outside of that limit. The fact is that, in 1869 and 1870, as we have had already told us, the three miles boundary outside of the headlands was all we were permitted to preserve, but now, under this new treaty, they have adopted the regulations applicable to the North Sea Convention and adopted by all the nations of Europe, and have protected all bays where the headlands are ten miles or less apart. It is a distinct gain. The Americans have now acknowledged this, whereas they formerly claimed that they could come within three marine miles of the shore at any point. He also objected to vessels being permitted to enter our harbors to purchase bait under the article of the treaty by which, under license, vessels can enter for certain purposes, and he went on to show that this would lead to smuggling unless a large addition was made to the customs staff. I am afraid that, as long as foreign vessels are allowed to enter our harbors, as long as duties are levied, there will be a necessity for that, and, whether those vessels enter our harbors to purchase bait or anything else, for barter or for gold, as long as people require certain goods, those goods will be landed on shore unless steps are taken to prevent it. He also says those vessels will fish within the three-mile limit, unless cruisers are there to guard against that. How is this to be prevented? We have a long coast, and whether vessels come in for bait, or drift in, as they claimed last year, they will come in. As has been stated by the hon. gentleman, if the fish are there they will come after them, and I do not think the fact that they can come in to buy bait is of any consequence in that connection. Then the hon. gentleman says that we ought to wait until the Senate of the United States have dealt with this question. I do not agree with him in that. I do not think it is desirable that we should place ourselves in the position of a subordinate Legislature to the Senate of the United States. I think, as far as this matter is concerned, we are a sovereign Legislature within ourselves in regard to approving or disapproving of this treaty, and it is for us to deal with matters of interest to our own people without reference to the Senate of the United States. He says we

will feel cheap if the treaty is rejected there. I do not hold with him on that point, and I will give my grounds. We have been charged with carrying on our protective service in a barbarous manner, it has been charged that we have followed practices that would not be followed by any other civilised nation, and, if that is the case, if this matter should come to arbitration at any time, and that assumption prevailed, it is quite clear that we would have to surrender these points. So it is better for us to show that we are prepared to accept this rational and modern interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, and in so doing we shall have the sympathy of all nations outside. Should the matter be referred to arbitration later, the arbitrator certainly would not be prejudiced against us as a nation pursuing barbarous and irrational practices. I also fail to see the point which he tried to make in asserting that the treaty as now made precludes further negotiation, and finally closes any possibility of the American market being opened for our fish, which he as well as I and every man who handles fish, must desire and everyone who is interested in the fishing community must equally desire; but, so far from that it seems to me that we have placed ourselves in the very best position possible for this. The plenipotentiaries on either side were not permitted to make alterations in the tariff; they could only submit them but, while they stated that they were not authorised to negotiate on the basis of a tariff arrangement, they so made their arrangements that, until the fish are placed on the free list, the American vessels that fish off our coasts will be at a disadvantage in this respect, that, even if they have licenses, they will have to pay a license fee therefor, and, therefore, they will be at a greater expense than our vessels will be. The hon. gentleman produced a book which he appeared to think an authority on the matter of fish, and he said, if the Minister of Finance had had this book which I hold in my hand, he would not have negotiated this treaty. Why not? What is there in this book to preclude it? I have also a copy of the book in my hand, and I do not find anything in this book to prevent the Minister of Finance negotiating this treaty. I find that the hon. gentleman stated some facts from this book, and also I regret to say that, no doubt entirely unintentionally on his part, he made some misrepresentations of facts. He quoted from a table and said that the total importation of mackerel into the United States in 1887 was 99,995 barrels, and he mentioned how much the catch of mackerel in the United States had been reduced since they were shut out of our inshore fisheries; but, when I examined this return a little more attentively, I found that that amount is the total receipts in the Boston fish market of domestic and foreign catch. Then he went on to say that, as our catch was small compared with theirs, the price of mackerel was regulated by the home catch there, and our importation had to pay the duty. Without going into that question more fully at the present moment, I find that the domestic receipts in the Boston market are 25,664 barrels, and the foreign receipts 51,643 barrels; so that the foreign receipts in Boston are twice as much as the domestic receipts, in mackerel. If his argument is good for anything—and I am prepared to endorse it on that point that, where there is a sufficiency of the article in the market the importer will pay the duty if he chooses to send in any more, but that where there is not a sufficiency the consumer will pay the duty, and the home producer will gain the benefit—here we see that the imported article is double the quantity of the home production; but that is only in the Boston fish market. There really was a larger catch than that in New England, amounting to 88,000 barrels, which was the smallest catch for forty years. I think that is a proof that our protection of our fisheries, as I maintain and as our fishermen maintain, and our keeping the Americans

Gen. LAURIE.

outside the three-mile limit allows the mackerel to find a home there, where they are less disturbed, and larger quantities will fall into the hands of our fishermen, who fish in a better and more methodical manner than the Americans, and the Americans will take a smaller quantity year after year. The fish have a sort of intelligence, and they will come within the three-mile limit where they are less disturbed. The hon. gentleman who preceded me, the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), is a gentleman for whose opinions on the fishery question I have the highest respect. No man in this House is a better authority on fish than he is, and he deserves the highest credit for the impulse he has given to the county he represents, and for the intelligent way in which he has built up the trade there. All honor to him for it, but when he spoke on this point, he naturally spoke from the point of view of the particular branch of the fishery trade in which he is interested. He has a special interest. The inhabitants of the county of Lunenburg are much more engaged in that business, as he said himself. He spoke most fairly on the subject. He told us that his constituents were deeply interested in the deep-sea fisheries, but he went on and told us, and I give him credit for that too, how they were interested. He said that when the Americans, under the Washington Treaty, were given entrance to our harbors to buy bait, the price of bait rose \$5 per barrel for herring; that since the abrogation of that treaty the deep-sea fishermen had been enabled to buy their bait for 50 per cent. less. He showed us that during the treaty, the fitting out of a vessel going to the Grand Banks for bait, would amount to from \$600 to \$1,000; whereas since the abrogation of the treaty, they could purchase the same quantity of bait at from \$3.0 to \$4.00. Well, Sir, who gets that money? Where is it spent? Why, they buy their bait from the inshore fishermen, and these get the money. You will observe by this that the protection of the inshore fishermen has conduced to their advantage. The permission is renewed, and the price of bait will again rise. But if it raises the price of bait, that bait will be bought from the toilers along our coast, and they will get the money for it; in that sense the treaty would not be an injury to the inshore fishermen. Now he also made the point that it is most desirable that the duty should be taken off all sorts of fish, including codfish, because the United States people were our best market for our best class of codfish; and if they took them off our hands, they would enable us to obtain a higher price in the market that takes the largest quantity of our fish, but a second class article, that is the West Indies. Now, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that it is most desirable that the duty should be taken off. He touched upon another matter in regard to the application of the license fee, assuming that the Americans are going to pay it, and from what I saw in my county, they are already making arrangements to do so. The hon. gentleman from Halifax says that we got nothing and that the Americans Government got everything under the treaty. If we get nothing, and they get everything, I think the fairest way to ascertain is to ask, in the first place: What are the interests of our fishermen? We are dealing with a very divided interest. I do not say that the interest of the various classes of fishermen along our shores are antagonistic, but I do say they are diversified and different one from the other. They are all important. There is a large amount of capital invested in each of these industries. We will take, first, the shore fishermen. Now, how are our shore fishermen to suffer under this arrangement? Sir, when I had the misfortune, or the good fortune—I am not prepared to say which it was,—of running two elections during the last year, in a fishing county, as my opponent was opposed to the Government, I heard everything that could be said against the Government, and every point possible was made in order to throw discredit upon the Government. One of

the points that was made in December last was that the Minister of Finance had gone to Washington and that he would palm off, he would surrender, the shore fisheries to the fishermen of the United States, and that no price we could obtain would be sufficient to compensate our shore fishermen for the surrender of those fisheries. The Finance Minister has come back, but he has not parted with our shore fisheries; and although the hon. member for Halifax says he is sorry that the Americans did not ask for them, I, Sir, am very glad they did not ask for them, and I am very glad they did not get them, because I consider they are of the greatest value to us. When I talked to our shore fishermen, and in all my communications and conversation with them, "whatever you do," they said, "keep the Americans outside the three-mile limit." Well, Sir, they are to be kept out, and not only that, but a very lucrative market is to be opened to our fishermen, if the treaty is ratified; and if, by-and-bye, the duty is taken off fish, or the *modus vivendi* is established a very lucrative market will be opened to them and they will be benefited by a vast increase in the price of bait that they will be able to sell, not only to our own fishermen but also to the Americans. Now, Sir, we have a second class, the deep sea fishermen, those in whom the hon. member for Lunenburg is particularly interested, and in whom I am largely interested and whom I largely represent. Their principal desire is that the duty be taken off fish going into the States. But, Sir, how can we compel the Congress of the United States to take that duty off? You recollect, Sir, the old story of a traveller with a cloak on; and the sun and the wind were contesting which should get his cloak off first. In this case the wind will not get that cloak off first; the sun may. We may succeed by offering them certain inducements, we may get that cloak off, we may get the duty taken off. In the first place let us show them, as we are doing, as we have done under this treaty, that we are animated by no hostile spirit, that we are prepared to meet them in a fair and reasonable way. When they come to pay their license fee year after year, they will see that, on the whole, it will be advantageous for them not to pay the license fee, that it will be as well for them to enter into competition with us in their market, as to continue the present system of competition. That being the view, I think we have adopted the very best plan, under the circumstances, of getting the duty taken off. Now, there is a third and a very important class, and that is the inshore fishermen, and those who supply them. To them it will be a very great boon that the American fishermen may come into our harbors, may come upon our coasts and purchase such supplies as they need under the treaty, or under the *modus vivendi*. It will tend to increase the consumption of the products of our soil, and other products, even our manufactured products and also stimulate trade among themselves. One large and important industry there, is the collection of ice in winter. Now, ice is supplied now only to our own fishermen, but under this arrangement, it will be supplied, on a very much larger scale, to American fishermen as well. Frost is cheap in our country, and so is water, and we can make ice on a large scale, and sell an article that does not cost much except in the labor of gathering it. Then we have a fourth class, that is the class who man the Gloucester fishing vessels. It is a common delusion among the people of the United States, which they manifested when they got up this cry about our shameful treatment of their fishermen. They said: This is an industry of extreme importance to us, it must be protected, because it is the only nursery for our navy in time of war. Why, Sir, men from the Provinces man the United States fishing vessels, and therefore they have to be considered too. That is a very important element in the consideration of this question. One of the great grievances of these men is that they cannot visit their home during the summer.

Now, if this treaty is carried into effect, or if the *modus vivendi* is adopted, and they obtain a license, they will practically be able to visit their homes. They often run into port from the Roseway Banks and the Western Bank, to shelter on our coast, and in doing so one of their great grievances will be removed. I mention this because, even in the matter of duty, as a rule, the crews of vessels receive one-half the out-turn. Now, it is the impression that they are protecting American fishermen, that the duty is practically a bounty which goes to American fishermen as opposed to Provincial fishermen; but, as a matter of fact, these fishermen, not wild harum-scarum young men, but for the most part fathers of families who have made a practice of going away to the United States, who own they do not do any better when they go, but who go because they have been in the habit of going and do not like to change the system, obtain one-half of the present duty so long as the duty is imposed. So the duty, instead of going into American pockets, largely goes into the pockets of our own fishermen.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Gen. LAURIE. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will visit the Maritime Provinces he will find out that what I am saying is an actual fact; I am not speaking what I have read, but I am speaking what I know. There are disadvantages in connection with shipping in United States vessels. They are more reckless in sailing than our vessels, and while they do make larger returns they also make larger losses. I now refer to the book, which the Finance Minister was told he should have referred to more frequently, and I find that the losses of Gloucester vessels during the season of 1887 amounted to 22 vessels and 145 lives, of which I am sorry to say a very large proportion, far more than the majority, were those of fishermen from the Lower Provinces. I think, as I mentioned already, that the county which I have the honor to represent, where political feeling as a rule runs high has not undertaken, I am happy to say, to regard the fishery question from a party point of view. The people regard it from the commercial and practical point as to whether it will be a benefit to them or whether it will be injury, and the consensus of opinion, even by those who are on other points politically opposed to the Government, is that on the whole the new treaty will be a very great benefit. Their idea was, and their idea still is, as it must be the idea of every sensible man, that if in discussing the Treaty of 1818 with the United States we were to hold to our extreme position in regard to its interpretation and claim everything that we could claim under the treaty, no progress would be made. The United States did not contend that our position was a false one further than that our interpretation was not in harmony and consonance with the modern view, and, therefore, they were not prepared to abide by it. This is not the only instance of a nation refusing to abide by a treaty. We can go back to a time within the recollection of most of us when this occurred. After the Crimean war the Treaty of Paris was signed by France, England and Sardinia and by Russia, and under it Russia bound herself to certain conditions in the Black Sea; but when France was prostrated at the feet of Germany in 1870, Russia then thought it would be a good time to repudiate the treaty. She has done so. I say, therefore, it is all very well for us to assert that the treaty laid down such and such conditions, and, therefore, to the end of time, we are bound by them. Nations—it may be a matter of bad faith—need not do so; the precedent of violating treaties has been set, and being set it has been practically copied by our neighbors. It, therefore, was not wise for us to stand up and demand the full requirements of the treaty, like Shylock, but rather to obtain the best interpretation we

could and satisfy the reasonable views of the Americans, so long as they were not seriously to our injury. I conceive that while the treaty does not fully satisfy either party, neither has strong reason to complain. It was charged against the Government time and again that they should have arrived at some reasonable understanding in regard to this matter some years ago. If it was wrong for them not to arrive at a reasonable understanding then, surely it is right to have arrived at a reasonable one now, on the principle at all events that it is better late than ever, but at the same time the Minister of Finance has shown good reasons why this was not done, and I believe the majority of the people, judging from the expressions used throughout the country, are prepared to endorse the view that he expressed, that the opportunity was not offered until lately, and that at the earliest possible moment our Government and the British Government availed themselves of the opportunity, with the result that we now know. I think it is all very well to say that the treaty is only a concession to secure the peace of the Empire. I think the Empire has a certain claim upon us and is interested in our keeping on good terms with our neighbors. The country from which we spring, the country that furnishes an army and navy to work with ours and that enforces our treaties and supports them is worthy of some consideration, and this reasonable and modern interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 has placed us in a position that, even if the United States Senate should refuse to ratify this treaty, we have the distinct pledge and guaranteed support of the mother country to enforce our contentions and enforce our rights. There is one further point on which I should like to touch; it is that dwelt on by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and it is a matter worthy of consideration. The *modus vivendi* is to be introduced under a system by which a license is to be paid by the United States vessels for certain privileges, which are to be granted to them free when our fish can go in free to the United States. Until the United States vessels are taxed on the one hand, practically a bounty is given to them in the shape of the duty when they carry their fares back to port. They benefit and our vessels suffer to that extent—they are in a worse position by the amount of the bounty. The contention of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) is a most reasonable one, and I hope the matter may receive the consideration of the Government. It is not a matter in connection with the treaty but a matter of municipal regulation, and the suggestion is that the amount of the licenses paid by the United States vessels shall go for the benefit of our fishermen, so as to compensate them in some degree for the duty that is charged on their fish going into the United States, so as to place them on an equal footing with those who fish on the same banks and carry, to a large extent, their fish to the same markets, but who have the advantage of that bounty in their favor. Under all these circumstances I feel, all things considered, that while we have made concessions to the United States, which I think will meet their reasonable requirements, I do not think our fishermen have suffered to any serious extent, and therefore, I feel it to be my duty as representing a fishing constituency to support and vote for this treaty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that on rising to address the House on this occasion I am speaking on perhaps one of the most important subjects that has ever occupied the attention of this colonial legislature since the Dominion was formed. It is not too much to say that perhaps no question has ever come before us which has caused so much agitation, so much public attention on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers at home and so much trouble and interest to Her Majesty's Ministers in the colonies as this fishery question. And, Sir, I am more than pleased to find that the gentlemen who have spoken upon
Gen. LAURIE.

that question on both sides of the House have spoken on it as I believe free from any influences of party politics and in a manner to show that we are prepared to approach the consideration of it and to continue the discussion of it in the same spirit. Sir, I listened with great attention to the very able and eloquent speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, and while I have always admired that gentleman's ability, and acuteness, and dignity and eloquence, perhaps on no occasion has he ever presented a case to the House in which a bad case was so well put as that put by the hon. gentleman on Tuesday last. Sir, I listened to him with great attention when he asked this House to believe that the Government of which he was a member and the commission of which he was one of the representatives of England, in securing this treaty had performed a feat which would command the admiration of Canada, and enure to the benefit of her people. Sir, on these points I differ with him, but though I may differ with him in relation to the praise that he takes for the Commission and the laudation which he gave to gentlemen connected with it on the British side, and to the conclusions at which he arrived in reference to the benefits it would be to this country I must say that, looking at it, and looking at it in the consequences which the perpetuation of peace with our great neighbors on the south will bring about, although I look at the treaty as perfectly giving away the interests of Canada in almost every particular, I must tell this House that "give away" as it is and whatever the consequences of it may be, we have got to confirm and to carry out the treaty. We have got to do that, Sir, not because it is a just or a fair treaty to Canada, which it is not, and before I sit down I think I will be able if not to satisfy gentlemen on that side of the House I will be able at all events to induce the hon. the Minister of Finance to say that he certainly has colored the advantages which he alleged Canada would receive rather too highly. I speak now not for the purpose of opposing the treaty but I speak for the purpose of putting the case of Canada fairly before this House and before the country. I do it not for the purpose of obstruction, or bringing into disrepute the efforts of the hon. gentleman whose work during that long and tedious negotiation of three months in Washington, I have no doubt was in the best interests as he conceived of the country which he served. I speak, Sir, for the purpose of placing that gentleman and the Government he represents on this side of the water, and the Government on the other side of the water that accredited him to Washington in the position which I think they ought to be in, and to show that the credit they assume to adopt, for having accomplished the conclusion of a difficult question is not of that creditable character to them which the hon. gentleman assumes it is. Sir, these gentlemen believe that in accomplishing peace at any price they have accomplished a benefit for the country. Well, Sir, they have. Peace at any price is an advantage to Canada in her position in relation to our great neighbors to the south. Peace at any price is an advantage to Canada in the situation in which we are placed and in consideration of the way we have been deserted by Her Majesty's Ministers in England and by that British Government which the hon. gentleman has stated to us when he spoke the other day when he said: That when we appear at a commission or a convention or a public assembly of any kind our weight and our influence is measured by the power that is behind us, and I sitting at that commission in Washington as the representative of the greatest Empire in the world, felt that my statements and words carried with them a weight which I could not have assumed nor could have carried had I been simply a representative of Canada. Perhaps in some cases the hon. gentleman might be right. It is an advantage when we appear in a representative character to have

power and influence behind us, to have a moral and material weight that can carry out our wishes or that can enforce our wishes with power if it is necessary, or with that moral weight which it is always desirable to have. But, Sir, when that moral power and that moral weight is simply a name, as it has been for forty years past, then, Sir, I think it is of little use to a man sent to represent the interests of a country like Canada, and is it not a consideration. That is the position which I assume, and before I will sit down I think I will satisfy my hon. friend and the gentlemen who sit beside him, as well as gentlemen on this side of the House, that I am right. In making that statement I am making a statement which the records of the last fifty years will sustain, and, Sir, when I come to that part of my speech, or rather my explanation, because I will not call it a speech, I will ask the forbearance of this House if I have to delay for some time, perhaps it may be too long in reading authorities with regard to the statement I am making that the record of the last forty years has been an British desertion of the interests of her brightest and greatest colony. My hon. friend devoted a great part of his time to laudation of the gentlemen with whom he was associated. With that I will not pretend to find much fault, but I will say this with relation to Mr. Chamberlain, whom the hon. gentleman said: No man in England could have been selected more fit to represent England and to secure the interests of Canada at Washington than the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. That Mr. Chamberlain is an able and a clever man no one will deny. That he occupies a prominent position in the political life of England is true, that he may have rendered services to the country of his birth and of his occupation is also true, but, Sir, when he was selected to come out and to represent Canadian interests—or rather nominally English interests, but practically Canadian interests—at Washington, I differ with my hon. friend when he says that the selection was a good one, and that no more fitting man could have been selected to occupy that position. Sir, surely Mr. Chamberlain showed before he left England that he wanted and lacked that discretion which a statesman should possess. At a public meeting shortly before he left England he boasted of the position he was going to occupy and said that he was going out and that he would conclude a treaty and he particularly referred to the claims which had been made and which could not and ought not be sustained. Sir, what would you think of a juryman going on a jury to try a man for his life, who told us before he went on that jury that he knew the man was guilty. Suppose you appointed a person as arbitrator what would you think of a man stating before he went on there that he was going to give a verdict against you. That is the position of Mr. Chamberlain. But there is another objection to Mr. Chamberlain and I think it is a subject of regret, because of it, that he was appointed. We know, Sir, that there is a very powerful section of the British Empire who have a great cause of grievance against the whole country. We know in Ireland where the people have been striving and struggling, whether rightly or wrongly—I believe rightly myself whatever difference of opinion there may be about that—I say whether rightly or wrongly they have been struggling for privileges which have been denied them, and Mr. Chamberlain has been one of those men who have taken a strong part against those national aspirations of the Irish people. Sir, when we look at the United States and find the composite character of its population, when we find the large number of seven or eight millions, if not more, of Irishmen and their descendants who are in that country and wherever Irishmen are you find them occupying prominent positions in the executive of the country, in the legislative halls and in the administration of the public affairs. Will anyone tell me if we desire to get that treaty passed—if it is a desirable treaty to pass—that the fact that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was appointed to

come out to endeavor to secure the treaty was calculated to recommend him to that important and influential class of people in America who have something to say about the passage of this treaty before the Senate? Sir, my impression is that Mr. Chamberlain made a mistake in his utterances, and my impression is that the British Government made a mistake on the part of Canada in selecting Mr. Chamberlain for the position. Perhaps I might have said nothing about that were it not that my hon. friend, with a generous desire to speak friendly of the men with whom he has been associated, felt it necessary to give Mr. Chamberlain an amount of laudation and credit to which I have grave doubts about his being entitled. That is my justification for referring to him; and had the hon. gentleman not brought before this House Mr. Chamberlain's public services, his great ability, and his fitness for the position, and praised the Government who selected him, I should not have felt it necessary to refer to him in the way I have done. With regard to Sir Sackville West, I believe him to be a very respectable man. He also came in for a considerable degree of praise and laudation from the hon. gentleman. We know that in his association with other men, the great talents and abilities of our friend the hon. Minister of Finance command attention and respect. We know that Sir Sackville West is and has been all his life an employé in the diplomatic service of the British Government, and we know that his object is to serve the British Government. Serve Canada! What cares Sir Sackville West for Canada? What cares Mr. Joseph Chamberlain for Canada? What they desire to secure is the commendation of England and the English Government. That is the thing they have aimed at, and that is the thing they have obtained by this treaty. Sir, my hon. friend, in his speech of Tuesday last, gave a historical account of the fishery question for the past one hundred years. He pointed out what the arrangements were under the Treaty of 1783; then he came to the Treaty of Ghent; then he came to the convention of 1818; and he went on to tell us that the British Government had for the last forty years abandoned the view they had entertained as to the construction of the Treaty of Ghent for the previous forty years. The hon. gentleman noticed me shaking my head when he made that statement because I knew it was not true. I do not mean to impute wilful misstatements to the hon. gentleman. I would be sorry to do that, and if anything I say would seem to have that bearing, I know he will believe that I would not desire in the least to doubt his word, or suppose that he would make a statement to this House which he knew to be incorrect. But, Sir, I have been identified with this fishery question. Seven years of my life I spent in working it up. When I took it in hand the British Government was about to desert us; and for seven years my efforts were directed to trying to keep those men on the other side of the water, in the British Foreign Office and in the Colonial Office, up to their work, and preventing them from sacrificing and deserting Canada. Sir, I am making bold statements, but I will prove them before I sit down. The hon. gentleman next referred to the Treaty of 1854, effected by Lord Elgin, and he pointed out the great advantages which we had derived from that treaty, and I entirely agree with him. I believe that that treaty was the first entering wedge of free commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States. During the twelve years that that treaty lasted, to 1866, more real commercial progress and prosperity were developed in Canada, more farming industries were created, more mechanical employments were given to our people, than they had at any period up to that time. Sir, it was a matter of regret, not alone to the people of one section of this country—for we were then a number of isolated Provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, with separate Governments, and old Canada united—but every Province

sharing in the benefits of that treaty, regretted its abrogation at the instance of the American Government. Sir, the hon. gentleman stated rightly that efforts were made by the several Governments to bring about a renewal of that treaty. Their efforts failed, I am sorry to say. Neither one party nor the other of the political parties in this country was to blame for that failure. It arose from the fact, as the hon. gentleman rightly stated, that an unfounded prejudice existed, whether rightly or wrongly, based on the belief that we had favored the southern portion of the United States in the internecine struggle which had been carried on in that country for six or seven years. Whether we did or did not may be a matter of opinion, but my hon. friend's statement was correct, I have no doubt, that a very large portion of the people of this country sympathised with the North, because for one man who was found in the Southern army, six or seven or eight were to be found in the Northern. At any rate, the treaty was repealed, and the United States Government refused to renew it; and when Mr. George Brown and Mr. Justice Henry, who I am sorry is so low to-night —

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Better.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear it, for the country can ill spare a man like him, who has taken such a prominent part in this country, both in his political and judicial capacity. When he was sent from Nova Scotia and Sir Albert Smith from New Brunswick and the gentlemen from Canada went to Washington and failed to obtain a renewal of the Treaty in 1866, it was a matter of great regret in all the Provinces. Those who remember the history of Canada will remember the position the country was in at that time. Old Canada was so torn with political dissensions that there was scarcely a Government that could last a week with any degree of certainty. We found one of the old Provinces struggling against another, and it was then that the idea struck the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and a number of hon. gentlemen connected with him, to form a confederation of British America. Sir, we did form it, and I am proud to say that I took some part in its formation. As the Premier of my own Province, after one defeat I was successful in bringing the Province into line and inducing it to enter the Confederation. When I came here and took the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what did I find? I found that those gentlemen, in 1866, the year before we came here, had protested against the efforts of the British Government to induce us to allow the Americans to come in and occupy our fisheries for a year. I will say for the Government of that day that they wrote a most pungent dispatch, in which, although requested by the British Government, they refused to allow the Americans to come in and occupy our fisheries as they had done under the treaty. They communicated with the Governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and those Governments, out of deference to the wishes expressed by the British Ministers, consented, as did the Government of Canada, to an arrangement for allowing the Americans to come in on paying a tax of half a dollar a ton. That arrangement was come to in response to a dispatch of Sir Edward Cardwell, then Colonial Minister. That despatch can be found in a return brought down in response to a motion made by Mr. Blake in 1872. Sir Edward Cardwell urged the Government of the Provinces to permit the Americans to occupy the fisheries on the same terms as they did before, stating that if they would consent to that, before the year was out some new arrangement would be made. We did it, the several Provinces did it, and before the term came around again in 1867, we had formed Confederation, and the duty was imposed upon me of creating the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I did create that department, and I think that I can appeal with satisfaction to the House

Mr. MITCHELL.

and to the people generally to say whether, during my record of seven and a-half years, I did not perform my duty faithfully and effectively. When, Sir, in 1867, we were appealed to again renew the arrangement, I was called upon to enquire into and make a report on the matter, and I did make a report which is contained in the public records of this Parliament. In that report, I recommended an increase of duty and consented to a continuance of the arrangement, but only for one year more. That year passed away. The number of vessels the first year was considerably larger than the second and when we were applied the third year to allow the Americans to fish, we resented the application. We increased the duty, but consented only to put it on for one year more. Before that year was finished, I found that the British Government had again weakened and when I studied up the history of the question for the previous sixty or seventy years, I found that while the British Government had strictly enforced the headland question and the exclusion of Americans from the bays, and protected our inshore fisheries, about which there was never a dispute, for forty years after the Treaty of 1818 was made, yet, when in 1854 the Elgin Treaty was made, our exclusive rights over these fisheries were suspended during its existence, for twelve years, and the Americans were permitted to go in and participate in the fisheries under that treaty while it lasted. But when that treaty expired, in 1866, England resumed the protection of the fisheries of Canada and enforced the Treaty of 1818, as she had done up to the period of the Elgin Treaty, when our exclusive rights were given up. In place however of defending the position of Canada, as she had done for the previous forty years, we found that she weakened, and a large amount of correspondence had to be carried on to stiffen the British Ministers, but while occasionally they would stiffen, they would weaken again. When the hon. the Minister of Finance taunted me with the fact that we had not carried out our first instructions, he knew the reason, and I am surprised he did not do me the justice of explaining that it was under instructions from the British Government that I had issued my orders to carry out the instructions of Sir Edward Cardwell. Under this pressure, we had to recall our first instructions and to limit the exclusion to bays six miles in width instead of ten miles. From that time, my efforts commenced; and let anyone refer to the volumes of sessional papers in the library and read over the efforts that were made during those seven years to protect the interests of Canada, and he will see, at all events, that the Government of that day did their duty by Canada, and insisted upon the British Government not abandoning their rights. I will not pass this stage without paying a tribute to the right hon. the leader of the Government, for whatever may have been my feelings about him of later years, in those days, at least, he stood out for the interests of the country that he governed; and in every instance, without one single deviation, he took my part in my efforts to bring the Colonial and Foreign Ministers of England, who were both weakening in the interests of Canada, to their senses, and we did bring them to their senses pretty well. What came next? In 1870, a crisis arose in relation to the fishery question. It was evident to every one in the Cabinet and out of it that the British Government were weakening in sustaining our claims. First, in 1866, they asked us to allow the Americans to come in for one year; then they asked us to allow them to come in for another year; and then, in 1868, for another year; and in 1869, at last, a little rebellion of a mental character arose in the minds of some of us at least. It became my duty to deal with that question, and I did deal with it. But before discussing this point, I may ask the permission of this House to read in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman my report, because his remarks

imply nothing less than that I went back on my report and the position I assumed when I issued the orders and circulars to the marine police which I had organised. In that report, I will prove that the statement of the hon. gentleman that the British Government had stood by Canada was not correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has entirely misapprehended my whole argument, and my reference to himself. He has not only misapprehended my argument, but he has completely inverted the argument, and I will ask any gentleman who has looked at the verbatim report of my speech, if my argument is not this, that while Her Majesty's Government had technically always sustained the extreme headland extension, and the exclusion of the American fishermen from our bays, they had refused to sustain my hon. friend in his efforts to shut the American fishermen out of bays that are not less than ten miles in width. My argument was the reverse of what my hon. friend says it was. I showed that he had made that effort. I read his instructions to the House in which he had upheld the ten-mile limit and gave his instructions to that effect to the cruisers, and I read Lord Granville's despatch not to carry out those instructions, but to limit the exclusion to the three-mile limit. I showed that my hon. friend had been obliged, under the pressure of Her Majesty's Government, who would not support the larger contention, to issue further instructions in accordance with the expressed request of Lord Durham.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will read exactly what the hon. gentleman did say.

"I will now, Sir, proceed to deal with the subject of the treaty itself, and I take up first the most important question, that of delimitation. I need not tell you that that is a question which for seventy years has been an open sore. It is a question, which from the day the Treaty of 1818 was signed down to the present hour, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) knows, has been a most fertile cause of discussion between the United States and Great Britain and Canada. The Americans have maintained from the very outset that what we termed our exclusive right to shut them out of all bays was not well founded in the treaty."

That is not correct.

"They have maintained for seventy years that they had an indefeasible right under that treaty to approach within three miles of the shore of any bay or indentation. My hon. friend shakes his head; but I hold in my hand authorities, and I could give them to him by the score, in which they have again and again maintained that position, and demanded that right."

"Mr. MITCHELL. Did not Great Britain for forty years enforce her construction of that Treaty of 1818?"

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that nobody knows better than my hon. friend that Great Britain induced him to recall his regulations and instructions."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

M. MITCHELL—

"After he had issued them, and restricted his jurisdiction to within three miles of the shore."

"Mr. MITCHELL. And why? Because Great Britain could control the Government of this country, and I had to do it; that is why."

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never mind. My hon. friend's enquiry was as to the position of Great Britain, and I give it to him. Great Britain has always contended, and has rightly contended, for technical exclusion from any bay."

What I contend is that there was no technical exclusion for the first forty years, but there was an actual exclusion up to the year 1854 when the Elgin Treaty put our rights in suspense. That is what I contend and what I will prove before I am through.

"And the Crown officers of England have sustained that contention. But my hon. friend knows that it is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend has interjected that word "technical" into this discussion. I have never found any such word in any of the correspondence or the despatches,

which I have read and studied, and which I think I understand pretty well, during the seven years of my experience in that department, and for the previous forty years down to 1854.

"Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman let me put one question to him? He states that Great Britain has held a technical construction of the Treaty of 1818. I would say that Great Britain has effectually enforced her technical construction for forty years. And with reference to what the hon. gentleman says about exclusion from bays, the first decision was given in reference to the Bay of Fundy, where the headland on one side was American and the headland on the other was Canadian or Nova Scotian. That was the first give away of our treaty rights."

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend then means that for the first forty years Great Britain held a particular view which she has abandoned for the last forty years."

The House will see how the hon. gentleman, with that astuteness which characterises all his debates in this House, and, for anything I know, in other places, twists my words and puts a construction on my utterances which they would not bear. I do not say that he does that deliberately, but it is the diplomatic construction which he has learned in the last few years; and I may say that I congratulate him on the improvement in his treatment of public men, on there being less of the heavy attack and more of the *suaviter in modo* than there was before he took his residence in London and associated with peeresses and lords and kings and princes.

"Mr. MITCHELL. I do not mean that."

You see he would try to get that forced upon me.

"I do not mean that. I will say what I mean if the hon. gentleman will let me. I say that for the first forty years Great Britain legitimately enforced that contention and the Americans recognised it."

And I will prove that too.

"Under the decision in the case of the Bay of Fundy, one side of which was American and the other side Nova Scotian, it was held that that bay was not exclusively an English bay, and upon the decision in that case our rights were given away and suspended by England, and were not enforced as strictly as they had been before."

And he closed the discussion there, and I submitted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has just stopped exactly where he should begin. I said, referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that:

"From the time it was organised under his charge he showed the greatest possible determination to hold on to all that he had, and to get as much as he could in the interests of Canada."

Was that charging my hon. friend with surrendering anything? It was the very reverse.

"Now, I will draw the attention of my hon. friend and the House to the fact that, actuated by that motive, in 1870, he sent out the following instructions:

"In such capacity your jurisdiction must be strictly confined within the limit of three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, with respect to any action you may take against American fishing vessels and the United States citizens engaged in fishing."

"Mr. MITCHELL. Under instructions from England."

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. This is before the pressure, as the hon. gentleman will see, but he went on trying to get in the thin end of another wedge, and I commend his attempt. He said:

"Where any of the bays, creeks or harbors shall not exceed ten geographical miles in width, you will consider that the line of demarcation extends from headland to headland, either at the entrance of such bay, creek or harbor, or from and between given points on both sides thereof, at any place nearest the mouth, where the shores are less than ten miles apart; and may exclude foreign fishermen and fishing vessels therefrom, or seize, if found within three marine miles of the coast."

"Then he went on to give the jurisdiction and the action that should be taken under it; and the bays from which he instructed his officers to exclude American fishing vessels are those ten miles in width. What since? We have a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General:

"Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing except within three miles from land or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth."

"That is the answer to the instructions. My hon. friend, I grant you, was under compulsion; he was, I grant you, under pressure from Her Majesty's Government; but that only makes the case stronger from my standpoint, and my standpoint is that in the position we occupy, dependent upon Her Majesty's Government"

So I very reluctantly interrupted him in order to show that, instead of attacking the hon. gentleman for not having discharged his duty, I really commended him for attempting to carry out as far as he was able what we all thought were the rights of Canada, and I quoted the despatch of Lord Granville to show that it was under pressure from the Imperial Government that my hon. friend was not able to carry out his own views and wishes. I thought I ought to correct the erroneous impression which he had formed in regard to my remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL. And my hon. friend wound up that portion of his argument by saying that the terms we had obtained at Washington were better than those obtained before. Since there is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself as to the attitude of the British Government on this matter, I will proceed, with the permission of the House, to prove it. I hold in my hand a State paper which has formed part of the records of this House. It was brought down three years ago in answer to a motion for all papers connected with the Washington Treaty, which had not been brought down on Mr. Blake's motion, and this is one of them. I may say that I prepared this paper with great care, and there is not a statement of the greatest humiliation that England could show in the treatment of her greatest colony. If the House will bear with me, I will read it, though it is rather long. It is dated, Department of Marine and Fisheries, 4th July, 1870. And I may say that, of all the British statesmen I have had to correspond with, I never found one of them so weak in the back as Lord Granville. I may also say that I dated that paper on the 4th July on purpose, for the signification of the date, so that they might understand it.

"The undersigned had referred to him for report, a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General, under date the 6th ultimo, having reference to the instructions given to British and Canadian vessels for the protection of the fisheries, and also to instructions from the Colonial Office of 30th April last, extending the privileges of American fishermen beyond what they previously enjoyed, permitting them to enter bays not less than six miles wide, and directing that no vessel should be seized unless actually taken within three miles of shore, or within a six-mile bay, as stated therein; appended to which is a memorandum from the Governor General, under date of 22nd June, informing the Council that it is indispensable that the instructions issued to Canadian cruisers should be brought into complete conformity with the latest instructions on the subject, issued by the Admiralty to Vice-Admiral Wellesley.

"The undersigned has the honor to report that the instructions to Canadian cruisers were amended on the 27th ultimo, as requested by Lord Granville.

"It would appear that Lord Granville contemplated by the despatch to convey—

"1st. That his telegram and despatch of the 30th April, were intended to modify the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866, while the Council construed it as being required to be read in connection therewith, and they did not imagine that such an important concession of the rights of our fishermen, would have been made without consultation with, and the previous approval of the Canadian Government.

"2nd. That though the instructions from the Admiralty to the officers in command of ships of war employed in the protection of the fisheries, and from the Canadian Government to their officers similarly situated since April, 1866, which prohibited foreign fishermen from entering bays less than ten miles wide at the mouth, and which instructions suggested that the forfeiture of such vessels was, if possible, only to be enforced when fishing had taken place within three miles of shore; yet, notwithstanding the instructions, His Lordship now, for the first time, communicates to the Canadian Government the fact that it never was intended to be acted upon.

"3rd. That if any doubt existed about the meaning of the instructions, or the possible chances of a trespasser being taken by Her Majesty's cruisers, that doubt is now removed, inasmuch as his lordship intimates that it never was the intention of Her Majesty's Government that their vessels should seize a trespasser under any circumstances, and for fear of such a possibility his lordship now removes all chance of it by stating that 'the effect of my despatch, or rather of the letter of the Admiralty, which, it transmitted for the concurrence of your Government was, as regards Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of non-forfeiture so far absolute, as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized, except within three miles, and for an offence committed within those limits. It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced.

Mr. MITCHELL.

"The Canadian Government, by the approved report of the undersigned, of the 20th December last, was pledged to Her Majesty's Government to maintain an efficient marine police to enforce the law within the three-mile limit, in the belief that Her Majesty's Government would command respect to national rights outside thereof, and to which this Government conceived them to be pledged, as Dominion vessels, by the limitation of the exclusion of foreign vessels to bays from ten to six miles wide, are precluded from, in any case, seizing beyond three miles, and as British cruisers are now positively directed not to seize unless the offence is committed and the vessel actually seized within three miles of land, the reasonable presumption is that Her Majesty's cruisers are not intended to seize at all. As a matter of fact, they did not seize a single trespasser in the past four years. It will also appear, on reference to the reports of the commanders of Her Majesty's vessels on the station, that though they repeatedly boarded vessels within the three-mile limit, which vessels had no license, and were liable to seizure, there is no instance of a single seizure having been made."

There it is as clear as day that they are determined to abandon the whole thing, but the three-mile limit abandoned the head line question, abandon our bay, abandon everything but the strip of three miles around the sinuosities of our coast.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will not say "hear, hear" pretty soon.

"It would seem but reasonable, that if that policy as laid down, is to be maintained, and acted upon, that our fishermen who have had actual possession of the privileges referred to up to 1854, and who again by the lapse of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, were entitled to the same rights they enjoyed in 1854, should be maintained in their possession of all these privileges.

"7th. The despatch further remarks, that 'they (Her Majesty's Government) do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute, so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries.'

"In this paragraph there are two probabilities referred to:

"1st. The probability of an arrangement (trade arrangement, it is presumed) with the United States.

"2nd. The probability of the limits being fixed by arbitration, or otherwise.

"In reference to the first of these, it would have been much more satisfactory to the Government of Canada if the ground upon which Her Majesty's Government have founded the hope thus expressed, had been stated. Such hope entertained by Her Majesty's Ministers, has been held since 1855; it was believed in by Her Majesty's Government when Lord Clarendon wrote the despatch of 1866, which so ably indicated the position of British subjects in relation to these fisheries. Mr. Cardwell expressed a confident belief upon this subject when he induced Canada to adopt his licensing system, as a measure of expediency, for one year. His Grace of Buckingham and Chandos entertained the same hope; and now my Lord Granville, though five years have elapsed since notice of abolition, does not seem yet to have abandoned the hope that some arrangements may be secured.

"The Canadian Government regret that they cannot see either in the past or in the future, the same ground for believing that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at, nor, indeed, while the present fishery policy is maintained, any arrangement that Canada would be justified in accepting. On the contrary, it is believed that the chances of such a result are not so good as they seemed in 1866 and 1867; and that, so far from there being anything in the course taken by the United States to warrant the expectation of a fair trade policy being adopted by them, everything indicates the contrary result, and nothing tends more to encourage Americans in the course they have pursued than the spirit of concession towards them which has characterised the fishery policy of the last five years.

"In 1866 they, after a year's notice, voluntarily abandoned the Reciprocity Treaty, notwithstanding our efforts in the fall of 1865 to prevent that result."

"To do this, the undersigned would state our rights, as claimed by the Empire, and admitted by the United States in the Treaty of 1818, and also what were the rights of United States fishermen at the time the treaty was concluded.

"Article I of that treaty provided,—

"1st. Concurrent liberty of fishing within certain specified limits between the subjects of Her Majesty and those of the United States, subject to certain specified reservations.

"2nd. The privilege to American subjects to land, dry and cure fish in certain districts, also subject to certain qualifications.

"3rd. Limits reserved exclusively to subjects of Her Majesty, and comprised within bounds of a marine league from the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks—the line of exclusion and measurement on the three classes of indentations last above mentioned, being defined by straight lines drawn across from headland to headland.

"It may be stated that upon the construction of Nos 1 and 2, no serious differences of opinion exist.

"Regarding the interpretation of No. 3, the American Government advances peculiar claims,—the most important of which is the basis of measurement on the mouths of bays, creeks and harbors. This line of demarcation between exclusive and common water, the United States contend—as in the tracing of the general coast line three marine miles from land—should at all bays continue to describe the outline of the shores of these indentations as if they were sinuosities of the coast.

"This is in brief the main point involved in the dispute known as 'The Fishery Question.'

"Other minor differences, more or less tributary to this, have entered into the discussion, but this substantially includes the only disputable ground of the controversy.

"The argument of Great Britain on this point is twofold:—

"1st. That the accepted definition of bays, harbors, and creeks is that established by international law throughout the civilised world, which distinctly adopts a headland line, irrespective of the configuration of any part of the coast, or the formation or extent of its indentations.

"2nd. That the territorial and maritime jurisdiction of all nations, and particularly of the United States, is so clearly laid down as not to admit of any exceptional application such as that claimed in connection with these fishing privileges in British America, in derogation of national rights.

"Moreover, Great Britain maintains that in the article of the Convention of 1818, Americans expressly relinquished the liberty before 'enjoyed' or 'claimed,' to pursue their calling anywhere else within British jurisdiction than in the limits described in the treaty. The text thereof being as follows:—

I need not read the text because you understand it.

"The Americans have, up to 1854, persisted in arguing for an exceptional application of the law of nations, as regards bodies of water, such as the Bays of Fundy and Chaleurs, and other indentations along the sea-coast of the British North American colonies, in which United States fishermen were formerly wont to pursue and capture the fishes of the sea, or to which they still resort to take bait.

"Yet, while they desired exceptional construction of treaties, and were especially as applied to the Bays of Fundy and Chaleurs, their statesmen had to admit that the right of exclusion as claimed by us, existed. Secretary Webster, 6th July, 1852, writes thus:—

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article, fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages, and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea, entering from the ocean between capes and headlands, and the term is applied equally to large and small tracts of water thus situated; it is common to speak of Hudson Bay, or the Bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water.

"The British authorities insist that England has a right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture all American fishermen who may follow their pursuits inside of that line."

And for 40 years they did it, and captured lots of them.

"It was undoubtedly an oversight—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL:

"It was undoubtedly an oversight in the Convention of 1818 to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets or recesses of the ocean ought to be open to American fishermen as freely as the sea itself, to within three marine miles of the shore.

"Again, Chancellor Kent, in his able commentaries, lays down as a rule that bays, such as Delaware Bay (resembling in its characteristics and extent the Bay of Chaleurs) is wholly within the 'territorial jurisdiction' of the United States, while the States of New Jersey and Delaware each exercise jurisdiction to its centre, and for three miles seaward, from Capes May and Henlopen. The same rule applies to Chesapeake Bay, and the State of Maryland exercises jurisdiction over that tract of water, which is more than double the extent of Bay des Chaleurs. The same rule is applied to Massachusetts Bay, with an entrance fifty miles wide between Cape Ann and Cape Cod; indeed, the principle is applied in the United States universally, and however much American statesmen may regret the application of the rule on the bays of this Dominion, they cannot deny its strict justice, nor their own renunciation of all claim to admission by the 1st article of the Treaty of 1818. Yet from that time up to 1854 the fishermen of the United States accepted the fact reluctantly, and frequently infringed within our limits when they thought they could do so with impunity; but the British Government enforced our treaty rights, including the headland claims, up to 1854, with the exception of the Bay of Fundy, in reference to which they made special exception of a temporary character in 1845."

On that I will just explain as I go along. Why was the Bay of Fundy temporarily excluded? Sir, history repeats itself. The men of that day, the men in charge of the fleet of the British Government, had no other means to protect the fisheries. These were the men who enforced the treaty, the fishery rights; and these men seized the schooner *Washington* in the Bay of Fundy, but they were not

able to show, when the vessel was before the courts that she was within the points of land of the Bay of Fundy where it was British territory on both sides, as the Americans claimed that one of the points of land, which was outside of a line near Calais, was on the American territory and the other was on British territory, and upon that ground the vessel was discharged. Lord Aberdeen, then Colonial Minister, because that decision was made in a case which was not a parallel case to 99 out of every 100 cases that now occur, abandoned the whole Bay of Fundy to them, out of a desire to conciliate the Americans. Sir, there is a case of to-day. The *Adams* was seized upon a frivolous pretext, and she is now on trial before the courts; and though my hon. friend says that the delay is not entirely due to the Government, I venture to say that some of it is due to the Government. I am not in the secrets of the Government and do not know, but I know enough of American fishermen and vessel owners to know that they will not willingly allow one of their vessels to be tied up in the courts for a couple of years, without some good reason. The Bay of Fundy case was a weak case. It was a case that would not hold water, because one side of the bay was on a line with the headland, and the other was considerably outside that line, and the courts held that it was not exclusively a British bay for that reason. But had the vessel been seized ten miles further or five miles further this decision about the Bay of Fundy would never have been had, and the probability is that this trouble about bays never would have reached the point it has reached. Lord Aberdeen abandoned the right of the colonies of the Maritime Provinces and gave up the question of the Bay of Fundy altogether, with the exception of the smaller inlets or bays leading into it. I will proceed:

"It may also be here stated that the Province of Nova Scotia supplemented the British squadron by several vessels during the years preceding 1845, and that during that time many seizures of American vessels were made at points ranging from near the shore to a distance of upwards of ten miles from land, on the ground that they were within headlands, many of which vessels were condemned and confiscated for such violation of our rights. In State documents, No. 22, published in the American Senate in 1862-63, I find the following fact reported by the United States Consul at Pictou, viz.:—

"The seizures in the course of the year were numerous. The *Java*, *Battille*, *Mayflower*, *Charles*, *Eliza*, *Shitland*, *Hyder Ali*, *Independence*, *Hart*, *Ocean*, *Director*, *Atlas*, *Magnolia*, *Amazon*, and *Three Brothers* were among the number."

"The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 gave to the Americans the use, under certain restrictions, of our bay and inshore fisheries, and for which we were supposed to have received compensation by certain trade arrangements. This treaty the United States Government put an end to of their own act, professing to believe that it was more to the advantage of the colonies than their own. Doubtless the treaty, during its continuance, was beneficial to both countries, but it was not in Nova Scotia considered that they had received the equivalent in trade for what they correctly designated as 'their priceless fisheries.' See Minute of Council of that Province, 10th April, 1884, as follows:—

"At the same time it is proper that the undersigned should take this opportunity to express the unusual sentiment pervading this Province, that, in the construction of that treaty, fair consideration was not given to the interests whose inexhaustible fisheries of priceless value were given away without the coasting trade, or the right to register colonial-built shipping, having been secured in return to those British American Provinces."

"The treaty terminated in March, 1866, after the year's notice for which it provided had been given by the United States Government. The then Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, with the approval of Her Majesty's Government, sent delegates to Washington, to endeavor, if possible, to secure the continuance of the treaty, or else to effect some other arrangement which would meet the approval of both countries. In this they were unsuccessful. The delegation held several conferences with the Committee of Ways and Means, and the record of their proceedings proves that, there was really no desire evinced to renew commercial intercourse with the Provinces on any basis at all resembling the principles of reciprocal free trade. The efforts of our delegates proved fruitless, and they returned about the middle of February, 1866. On the 2nd of that month a Royal Proclamation was issued by the Governor General of Canada, notifying American fishermen and United States citizens of the termination, on the 17th day of the ensuing month, of the fishing privileges which they had enjoyed under the said treaty, and warning them of the legal penalties which they would incur by trespassing upon the inshore fisheries of British America belonging exclusively to Her Majesty's subjects. In the meantime, Her Majesty's Government, in despatches of the 3rd and

10th of March, 1866, urged upon these Provinces that it was desirable, from an Imperial point of view, to forbear from asserting the rights which recurred to them at its termination, and to avoid every possibility of difference between the British and American Governments, from any attempt to prevent encroachments by foreign fishermen. Her Majesty's Government felt disposed to allow the freedom of fishing that had prevailed since 1854 to continue for the season of 1866, on the distinct understanding that, unless some satisfactory arrangement between the two countries should be made in the course of the year, such privileges would cease, and all concessions made in the treaty just about to expire be liable to withdrawal. Mr. Secretary Cardwell, in a despatch bearing date the 17th of March, 1866, refers to the near probability of some concessions on the subject of the tariff being made through a Bill then under the consideration of Congress; the prospect of a satisfactory arrangement appearing to the Colonial Office an additional reason for deferring the matter to another season."

Just as to-day. They say we have concluded a treaty, but there are certain Bills coming before Congress and you may hope to get what you desire.

"The Colonial authorities, whilst assuring Her Majesty's Government of their earnest wish to abstain from any act which could possibly embarrass them, and although actuated by a sincere desire to deal with the actual situation in a spirit of conciliation and liberality towards their neighbors, irrespective of whatever inconveniences and injuries might attend deferment of the just and valued rights of colonial subjects, experienced much difficulty in accepting the conclusion to which their assent was invited. A Minute of Council was adopted by the Canadian Executive, on the 23rd of March, 1866, setting forth the grounds upon which they believed that the proposed policy could neither be carried out so as to avoid serious and lasting injury to the interests of the country, nor attain the purpose it was designed to effect. The intrinsic worth of the fisheries was pointed out, and also their value to the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, then in prospect, as a staple of extensive trade with foreign countries, a nursery for hardy seamen, and an inexhaustible resource for the industrial energies of our maritime population. The great and peculiar advantages which their exclusive working by British colonists would afford to the United Provinces was likewise dwelt upon.

"The memorandum in question proceeded to say that:

"The Canadian Government receive this expression of the opinion of Her Majesty's Government with the utmost respect; but they doubt whether its adoption would not in the end produce most serious evils. They fear there is no reasonable hope of satisfactory commercial relations being restored with the United States within the year. They think the prospect of attaining this result in the future will be greatly diminished if the United States fishermen continue to exercise the rights given by the late treaty. The withdrawal of their privileges a year hence will create more irritation than now, as having the character of retaliation. The step, if taken now, is plainly and publicly known to be the consequence of the act of the United States. They, and not Great Britain, have cancelled the agreement, and voluntarily surrendered the right of fishing. The course suggested would certainly be regarded by the American people as evidence of weakness on the part of Great Britain, and of an indisposition to maintain the rights of the Colonies; while it would disturb and alarm the Provinces. The determination to persist in encroachments, and in resistance to law, would be stronger by the impunity of the past year, and the danger of collision, when exclusion becomes necessary, would thus be much increased; while the value of the right of fishing, for the purpose of negotiation, would be diminished precisely in proportion to the low estimate which the Provinces would thus appear to have placed upon it.

"The committee would also respectfully submit to Her Majesty's Government that any apparent hesitation to assert an undoubted national right will certainly be misconstrued, and be made the ground for other and more serious exactions, till such a point is reached as neither country can recede from with honor."

That was a despatch worthy of the hon. gentleman of that day. I do not mean the Finance Minister, but the Premier; it did him honor and did him credit.

"Notwithstanding the strong opinions thus entertained, the Government of Canada reluctantly acquiescing in the suggestion of Her Majesty's Government, adopted the temporary expedient of issuing season licenses to United States fishing vessels, at a nominal tonnage rate, so as formally to preserve the right of sovereignty without occasioning any dangerous complications, such as were apprehended by the Imperial authorities. Under this provisional system any vessel attempting to fish without license, and refusing to procure them from the cruising officers, were to be removed from the fishing grounds and punished by confiscation.

"The Executive Government of Nova Scotia gave to this expedient an unwilling assent. In a Minute of Council, dated the 9th of May, 1866, it was stated:—

"The Council, after the most serious deliberation, and with a view to meet the wishes both of the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, are compelled to state that they are of the opinion that any concession at this moment of the admitted rights of British subjects to the exclusive use of the inshore fisheries of British North America would be most impolitic and disastrous to the interests of British North America.

Mr. MITCHELL.

"The privilege of using these fishing grounds has been deliberately abandoned by the Government and Congress of the United States, and abundant notice was given to the people of that country by the official announcement made more than a year ago which abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty.

"If under these circumstances, when the United States are exhausted by a four years' war, and paralysed by an oppressive debt, any indecision is exhibited in the maintenance of these undoubted and admitted rights, and a temporising policy substituted, which will be certain to be misconstrued, the Council believe that the prospect of obtaining a fair Reciprocity Treaty will be diminished, that the most injurious results will follow, and that the difficulties to be encountered a year hence in dealing with the question will be vastly enhanced.

"At the same time the Council entirely concur in the view enunciated by the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies recommending that, while firmly maintaining the exclusive right to the fishing grounds, the Local Governments should exercise all possible forbearance in pressing their rights, and the utmost caution in selecting the cases for enforcing the extreme penalty of confiscation. In this spirit the legislation of this Province has already been modified so as to remove any reasonable cause of complaint on the part of the Government of the United States."

"This expression of the views of the Government of Nova Scotia is referred to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in a despatch to Sir W. F. Williams, the Lieutenant Governor, under date the 26th of May, 1866, in the following terms: 'Her Majesty's Government trusts on further consideration, and when the Executive Council are informed that there are reasonable grounds for hoping that before next season permanent arrangements may be made with the Government of the United States, they will feel themselves at liberty to withdraw their objections to a temporary arrangement for the year which has received the cordial approval of Her Majesty's Government.'

"I must distinctly inform you that on a matter so intimately connected with the international relations of this country, Her Majesty's Government will not be disposed to yield their own opinion of what it is reasonable to insist on, nor to enforce the strict rights of Her Majesty's subjects beyond what appears to them to be required by the reason and justice of the case."

"A further Minute of Council was passed by the Nova Scotian Executive, on the 21st of June following, expressing entire concurrence in the views held by the Government of Canada, regarding the policy which they felt themselves constrained to adopt; and although adhering to the opinions already expressed, they recognised the necessity of accepting the suggestions of Her Majesty's Government, and accordingly withdrew all objections to the granting of licenses for that year.

"In New Brunswick the same feeling of reluctance to grant licenses existed, but that Province followed the example of Canada, and assented to the license system, entirely out of deference to the wishes of Her Majesty's Government. Her Majesty's Government believed then, as they even still express the hope, that some arrangement might be arrived at, whereby satisfactory treaty arrangements may be secured, and, notwithstanding that such a hope was at variance with the convictions of the Government of the other Provinces, they gave way to the wishes of Her Majesty's Government, on the understanding that the license system was to continue only for one year in order to give an opportunity to the American Government to renew negotiation."

There is the evidence by the records of the Council of the three Provinces where they expressly declared their determination to maintain their rights as they existed prior to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and urging upon Her Majesty's Government to enforce Canadian rights and to protect and maintain them. We will see how it was done, though:

"This license system continued throughout the years 1866 and 1867 with very unsatisfactory results. It proved quite inefficient in respect of enforcing compliance with its chief conditions, and equally ineffective with regard to the influence it was presumed to exercise towards inducing the United States Government to assist in merging it in some general measure of a permanent and satisfactory nature. The principal causes of its inefficiency and failure may be found in the extreme anxiety to avoid enforcing it wherever there was the least probability of United States citizens not voluntarily complying with it, the annotated instructions to the naval officers in command of Her Majesty's ships issued by the Colonial Office under date of 12th April, 1867, being conceived in this spirit. And also to the fact that amendments to the system suggested by the various naval commanders and particularly by Admiral Sir James Hope, in a despatch to the Admiralty, dated the 3rd of August, 1866, such as were calculated to render it real and practically effective, were pronounced inexpedient by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

"In order to illustrate the complete defeat of the license system, it is sufficient to note the simple fact of Her Majesty's cruisers not having during these four seasons, detained a single American vessel, although it was notorious that great numbers of United States vessels were continually invading our limits, even after repeated warnings, a large proportion of which vessels when afterwards boarded were found to be still unfurnished with licenses.

"American fishermen committed other infractions of the Treaty of 1818: such as frequenting our harbors to transfer cargoes and take supplies, creating riots and disturbances, and setting the law at defiance, as witness the scene at Paspébiac, in Bay des Chaleurs, in 1869, and

their refusal to pay harbor dues, at Magdalen Islands, during the present season, as reported by Commander Lavoie in May last."

My hon. friend the member for Gaspé will recollect the American fishermen landing and wrecking the place.

Mr. JONCAS. Yes, quite well.

Mr. MITCHELL—

"In his annual report for the year 1869, Commander Lavoie also says:—

"At Paspébiac there was a strong feeling against the crews of foreign schooners, who two or three times went ashore and committed all kinds of disorder; so much so that the inhabitants were obliged to put night watchmen to guard their property, and secure themselves against the outrageous conduct of these people."

"The effect of this system upon the American fishermen was practically a failure, as will be seen by the following statement, showing the number of licenses issued each year since 1866, and inclusive thereof:—

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| In 1866 there were | 354 licenses. |
| " 1867 " | 281 " |
| " 1868 " | 56 " |
| " 1869 " | 25 " |

"It will be perceived that in 1866, the first year of its adoption, the vigorous policy indicated in Lord Clarendon's despatch before referred to, and a lively recollection of the numerous seizures and confiscations made by Her Majesty's cruisers, and officers of the Nova Scotian Government prior to 1864, for violation of our fishery rights, induced a majority of the American fishermen who resorted to the gulf that season to take out licenses, notwithstanding that they required to have three warnings given them by Her Majesty's cruisers before seizure could be effected. The following year only about two-thirds of these took licenses, while in 1868, when it came to be understood that the effect of the instructions issued by Her Majesty's Government, requiring three warnings, was practically to nullify the whole system, the number taking licenses dropped, in 1868, to 56."

I may say here that one of the conditions of those protecting the fisheries at that time three warnings had to be given a vessel even when it was found she was acting illegally. This was one of the things enforced upon us and against which we afterwards kicked

"In 1867 the Canadian Government acted, as it also did in 1868 and 1869—called attention to this defective system,—and Vice Admiral Mundy in his despatch of the 15th May, 1867, spoke of it thus:—

"Since the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1866, the system of warnings to trespassers has not realised the anticipations of the Government by which it was established in that year. Hence the desire of the present Dominion Executive to resort to the more stringent steps proposed in the minutes of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.' The Admiral then gives the probable number of American vessels on the fishing grounds that season as 700. In 1869 Her Majesty's Government consented to the instructions being amended so as only to require one warning, and notwithstanding that if seizures were to be made at all the danger was immeasurably increased to foreign fishermen—during that year only 25 took out licenses, or about one in 28 of the estimated number of vessels on our coasts. On the 26th August, 1869, Mr. Vernon Lushington called the attention of the Admiralty to the fact 'That the Admiral reports that an unusual number of fishing schooners belonging to the United States had arrived on the north shore of Prince Edward Island, but that only a few licenses had been demanded by the masters, who objected to pay the license duty of \$2 per ton and prefer to run the risk of being caught within the three-mile limits.' The impression prevailed amongst the Americans that Her Majesty's Government in their great desire to avoid anything of an irritating tendency in the then temper of the American people towards Britain, arising out of their Alabama and other war grievances, would not make any seizures, and as a matter of fact, notwithstanding repeated violations, no seizures were made. Under such circumstances the system of licenses could not prove other than a most lamentable failure—and there was really no 'substantial protection.'

"This sort of protection was of no avail as affecting the interest of colonial fishermen, but simply ensured Americans in the practical enjoyment of the same privileges which they had enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty, and it saved the United States Government from all trouble and expense of maintaining a naval force in the Gulf.

"It was moreover, a manifest departure from the very terms on which the system was so originated, namely: 'That any vessel attempting to fish without licenses, will either be required to procure the license from the cruising officer, or will be removed from the fishing grounds,' (Vote Minute of the Executive Council of Canada, dated 23rd March, 1866) It also relieved Americans of any pressure such as might influence their Government to desire a settlement of the disputes which prevailed up to 1864; and while it injured the business of Canadian fishermen by affording facilities to foreigners, such as, together with a prohibitory duty on British-caught fish, enabled them to compete with our fishermen on unequal conditions, it also nullified whatever inducements to enter into a new commercial treaty would otherwise be held forth, by reason of an indirect counter-tax on their fishing and maritime industry.

"Another ill-effect attending this continued indulgence towards Americans is remarked upon by Vice Admiral Wellesley, in the following extract from a despatch to the Secretary of the Admiralty, dated 18th November, 1869:—

"Very few Colonial vessels are engaged in fishing, owing to the almost prohibitory Tariff imposed in the United States, on fish imported in colonial vessels, and the colonial fishermen therefore in considerable numbers man the American vessels.

"The Government of Canada should view with very serious concern the baneful effect on our maritime population of such dependence on American employers. It creates sympathy with foreign sentiments and institutions, and affords opportunities for instilling into the minds of our people ideas and expectations altogether inimical to British connection. There is actually presented to them the example of subjects of a Republican power and citizens of a foreign state prosecuting their calling at the very doors and in the exclusive limits of British subjects in Canada, who are themselves shut out of the markets of that country by a prohibitive tariff, adopted in the interest of their own fishermen, whilst ours cannot even enjoy their own exclusive privileges. Can the immediate influence of these circumstances be otherwise than seductive of the loyal attachment and personal enterprise of our sea-board population? It also discourages the independent employment of Canadian fishing craft, and provincial fishermen. It tempts our fishermen to catch and sell their fish clandestinely to United States owners of fishing vessels, who can afterwards market them in the United States, free of duty, as American caught fish. This practice demoralises our population, and accustoms them to violation of our own laws. The residents are induced to connive at other infractions of our treaty rights. The temporary and local advantages which these practices afford are of small account compared with the general injury done to our people. They militate also against our prospects of establishing an extensive fish trade with foreign countries, and others of the British possessions, and thereby developing the shipping and fishing industries of the Dominion, and creating a self-reliant and skilful class of fishermen and sailors identified in property and affection with our national existence, and attached by past and present associations to Imperial interests.

"A Committee of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, in a report submitted to that body during the spring of 1867, represented that 'the system of granting fishing licenses to American fishermen, adopted and practised during the last year by the Governments of this and the adjoining Provinces, is viewed with deep regret, as nothing could more injuriously affect the fishing interests of the Province; and they cannot in terms too emphatic express their disapproval of the injustice done to our industrious and enterprising fishermen, in allowing American fishermen, upon nearly equal terms, to fish in our waters, side by side with the former, while the American market is virtually closed by a high tariff to their products.'

"The undersigned would now refer to a despatch of the Earl of Clarendon to Sir F. Bruce, the then British Minister at Washington, under date the 11th May, 1866, covering a proposition of Mr. Adams, American Minister at the Court of St. James, in which he proposes the appointment of a Joint Commission to settle the point in dispute, in regard to the fishery privileges which the undersigned hopes will not fail to be secured in any re-arrangement of the treaty. Such was the opinion of Nova Scotia, and it was largely shared in by the other Provinces of the Dominion. To the main points of such proposal Lord Clarendon cordially assented, but asked explanations as to the concluding clause, which read thus:—

"Pending a definitive arrangement on the subject, the United States Government engages to give all proper orders to officers in its employment, and Her Britannic Majesty's Government engages to instruct the proper colonial or other British officers to abstain from hostile acts against British and United States fishermen respectively.'

"His Lordship in dealing with this paragraph, remarked:

"And Her Majesty's Government would hold themselves entitled to maintain, in pending the determination of the questions to be discussed, the principles for which they have heretofore contended, and to enforce all regulations and assert all rights which, previously to the conclusion of the Reciprocity Treaty, the British Government asserted and enforced. Therefore, if the purport of the concluding paragraph of Mr. Adams' paper is meant by the United States to involve an objection on the part of Her Majesty's Government to continue to allow, during the sitting of the commission, fishermen of the United States to enjoy in British waters the privileges under the Reciprocity Treaty which the Government of the United States have now renounced for their citizens, you will frankly state to Mr. Seward that into such an engagement Her Majesty's Government cannot enter.'

There is straight talk, and I would call the attention of the hon Minister of Finance to it. That is the talk of Lord Clarendon, who is something like a man.

"Her Majesty's Government are most desirous that the rights of the colonies should be so enforced as to give the least possible occasion for complaint or discussion. They have cordially approved and have recommended to the Governments of the other British Provinces a proposal made by the authorities of Canada, that American fishermen should for the present season enjoy, under special licenses, the benefits conferred by the Reciprocity Treaty, and they will be glad to learn that the Lower Provinces have adopted an arrangement intended to prevent the change of circumstances from operating suddenly to the injury of the fishing interests of citizens of the United States, but they cannot engage indefinitely to adhere to this system.'

"From this it will be evident that Her Majesty's Government at that time clearly decided—

"1st. That American fishermen should have only those rights which they had enjoyed from 1818 down to 1854; and

"2nd. That they were resolved to enforce for British fishermen the full privileges they enjoyed during that period, and which were put in abeyance at that time by the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty; and

"3rd. That the license arrangement was adopted only as a temporary arrangement at the instance of Her Majesty's Government, and but for one year. If further evidence is necessary in reference to the latter conclusion, I would beg to refer to the despatches of the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, under date the 12th April, 1866, addressed to the Lords of the Admiralty; also to the despatches of the same right honorable gentleman to Viscount Monck, then Governor General, under date of 21st April of same year, in which, referring to the Minute of the Canadian Council on the subject, he says:—

"I recognise in this Minute, with much pleasure, the moderation and forbearance shown by the Canadian Government.

"The suggestion that American fishermen should be allowed to fish during the current year in all provincial waters, upon payment of a moderate license fee, meets with the full approval of Her Majesty's Government; and I should inform the Governors of the Lower Provinces that I trust they will readily concur in it. In anticipation of this result, Sir James Hape will be instructed to act upon it as soon as he shall have been informed that the arrangement is concluded."

"To this arrangement the Province of Nova Scotia dissented in an earnest Minute of Council, which exhibits wonderful forecast of what has since occurred, and the Canadian and New Brunswick Governments assented only out of deference to the expression of Her Majesty's Government that it was a temporary arrangement for one year, and adopted in the belief that before the year terminated, arrangements would be made with the United States; but by the despatch of 26th May, of same year, hereinbefore quoted, Mr. Cardwell informed the Lieutenant Governor of that Province that the policy as expressed by Her Majesty's Government must be carried out.

"This brings the history of the matter down to 1866, when the Colonial Government adopted the policy of Her Majesty's Government as a temporary expedient for the then present year, and in the belief that there were reasonable grounds for the hope that they expressed of a permanent arrangement being arrived at with the United States.

"The colonies believed—as they had a right to believe—that as the American Government had voluntarily terminated a treaty under which they received certain concessions,—each party should revert to the *status quo* anterior to the treaty,—and from the text of My Lord Clarendon's despatch of 11th May, 1866, before quoted, it is clearly implied that Her Britannic Majesty would continue to demand for the colonial subjects the same rights and privileges which they had enjoyed previous to 1854. But it appears from the letter of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, of the 12th April, 1866, before quoted, that a policy of concession had even then commenced. It is therein stated, 'that Her Majesty's Government are clearly of opinion, by the Convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing not only within three miles of colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of any British bay or creek. But the question of what is a British bay or creek is one that has been the occasion of the difficulty in former times.'"

There was the first evidence of their weakening. From that time out we have nothing but a record of it.

"It is, therefore, at the present, the wish of Her Majesty's Government neither to concede, not for the present to enforce, any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question. Even before the conclusion of the Reciprocity Treaty Her Majesty's Government had consented to forego the exercise of its strict right to exclude American fishermen from the Bay of Fundy, and they are of opinion that, during the present season, that right should not be exercised in the case of the Bay of Fundy, and that American fishermen should not be interfered with, either by notice or otherwise, unless they are found within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width, in conformity with the arrangement made with France in 1839."

"The Right Honorable Secretary further adds, that in case of seizure for infringement of the limits, if 'it should become necessary to proceed to forfeiture, cases should, if possible, be selected for that extreme step in which the offence of fishing has been committed within three miles of land. Her Majesty's Government do not claim that the prohibition to enter British bays should be generally insisted on, except where there is reason to apprehend some substantial invasion of British rights. And, in particular, they do not desire American vessels to be prevented from navigating the Gut of Canso (from which Her Majesty's Government are asked that they may be temporarily excluded), unless it shall appear that this permission is used to the injury of colonial fishermen or for other improper objects. I have it in command to make this communication to your Lordships, as conveying the decision of Her Majesty's Government on this subject.'

"This despatch recedes from the rights claimed and exercised by British fishermen up to 1854, and from the position assumed by Lord Clarendon in his despatch to Mr. Bruce, in May, 1866, inasmuch as it—

"First, places in abeyance the headland question; and,

"Second, continues the exceptional permission granted in relation to the Bay of Fundy;

"Third, it fixes the bays from which Americans shall be excluded as those under ten geographical miles in width;

Mr. MITCHELL,

"Fourth, it requires that repeated warnings be given (fixed at three);

"Fifth, that when seizures or forfeitures are made there, 'it is desirable that they should be selected from vessels in which the offence was committed within three miles of land.'

"Sixth, that Her Majesty's Government do not desire that vessels should be prevented from navigating the Gut of Canso, except it shall appear to be to the injury of colonial fishermen, or for other improper objects."

Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to this fact, and to ask him to correct his statement that the British Government has never enforced its complete rights since 1854. Sir, he knows well that during the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty their rights were in abeyance, to be resumed in every particular when that treaty expired. Lord Clarendon admitted that, and the British Government admitted it, but by their despatches they tried to induce us to tone down and modify our claims.

"I would observe that these six points of concession or suspension of our rights were settled by Her Majesty's Government by letter aforesaid of 12th April, 1866, after Canada had reluctantly adopted their suggestions in reference to the license system, as may be seen by Minute of Council of 23rd March, 1866, without any previous consultation or approval of such policy by Canada, and against the positive protest of Nova Scotia, as before stated. The Island of Prince Edward and the Province of New Brunswick also acted in harmony with their sister Provinces in the feeling of opposition to the policy proposed.

"Mr. Secretary Seward proposed, through Her Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, on the 4th of June of the same year, to negotiate upon the basis of a reduction of the customs duties on fish imports from the Provinces, in consideration of admitting American fishermen and fishing vessels to the free and unrestricted use of our waters. Such proposition was rejected by the Government of Canada (see Minute of Council, 18th June, 1866), and the Government of the United States were informed that no engagements could be entered into which could at all connect the admission of American fishermen and vessels to the desired privilege with a remission of duties proposed to be levied by the United States on Provincially-caught fish. The licensing was continued at the request of Her Majesty's Government, during the year 1867, with the reluctant assent of the Provinces, such assent having again been given plainly out of deference to the policy of the Empire, and in the belief expressed by the Government, that there was still a prospect of arrangements being arrived at in reference to a trade treaty with the United States. On the 1st of July and 3rd of September, 1867, His Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, being then Colonial Secretary, addressed the Governor General of Canada, dealing with the question of a continuance of the policy of licensing and increase of the tonnage duty payable for such license; and, on the 21st of February, 1868, the then Governor General, by direction, submitted with these despatches a memorandum, containing four propositions as a possible means of dealing with the subject.

"1st. To maintain the small fee (of fifty cents per ton, merely as an assertion of title).

"2nd. To increase the fee to a sum representing the value of the liberty conceded.

"3rd. To absolutely prohibit fishing by United States fishermen in colonial waters.

"4th. To propose to the Government of the United States to admit their vessels and fishermen on condition of opening American markets to Canadian fishermen.

"While the policy of the Colonial Office favored the continuance of the license system at an increase of one dollar per ton, the Government, by Minute of Council, acting on the reports of the undersigned, respectively bearing date the 20th November, 1867, and 27th February, 1868, were clear and explicit in conveying their opinions that the first, second and fourth propositions should not be entertained, that the third was the course which should be adopted, and that by total exclusion the American fishermen could alone be made to realise the importance of the privileges which they were permitted to enjoy. It was also again clearly asserted in these papers that the consent of the colonies to the licensing arrangement of 1866 was obtained on the faith of its continuance only for one year, and in the belief that the faith of Her Majesty's Government was pledged to its abandonment, and that they would not ask its continuance if the Americans failed to enter into trade arrangements of a satisfactory character.

"In proof of this position, the undersigned may here quote a few extracts from the Minutes referred to in the Minute of 20th November 1867, where it is stated that—

"It was also remarked in this connection that the tonnage duty of 50 cents per ton then imposed was adopted for that year only, and must not, in any sense, be regarded as an equivalent for the advantages accorded."

"It was also distinctly understood, that unless some satisfactory arrangement between Great Britain and the United States, embracing the whole subject of reciprocal commercial relations, should be made during the course of the then current year, the special privileges thus allowed should be withdrawn, and in the same Minute the belief was expressed that it was upon the faith of that promise alone that Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island reluctantly gave their consent. It further states, in support of the same position, that—

"If there appeared at this juncture any near prospect of continued liberality and forbearance being exercised by the United States—if

there was evinced an active desire to re-establish a fair interchange of the staple productions of the two countries, the peculiarity of our situation might not press with so great urgency. But unless before the opening of another fishing season some more equitable and permanent arrangement be effected, the existing provisional system ought wholly to cease.

"In the Minute of 27th February, 1868, it was stated as an objection against continuing the license system, that besides its inadequacy it is liable to the grave objection mentioned by His Excellency of being likely to degenerate into a total relinquishment of the exclusive right of fishing. A continuation, even for another year, of this nominal license fee, which system, when established, was expressly limited to the first year, but has now extended over two years, ought, on no account whatever, to be proposed.

"The Minute further goes on to state that whatever may at present be determined on by Her Majesty's Government, unless before the advent of another fishery season some satisfactory arrangement shall be effected, the existing and any other merely provisional system ought wholly to cease, and all concessive liberties of fishing be absolutely withheld."

"This Minute in further stating the temporary character of the arrangement observes that,—

"Conscious of their rights, and equally anxious to obviate every possibility of estrangement between neighboring peoples, or of international difficulty between Great Britain and the United States, they would rather accept a further temporary arrangement for the current year, provided it shall be made contingent on contemporary enquiries by a mixed commission of the nature indicated in the Earl of Clarendon's despatch of 11th May, 1866."

"On several occasions during the year 1868, the subject was again brought under the notice of Her Majesty's Government, and by a Minute of Council of the 9th their attention was called to the fact that evils of a peculiar character were arising under the new system of licensing American fishermen, inasmuch as the Provinces finding that their interests were neglected, and foreigners permitted to enjoy their fisheries against their will, were in danger of becoming Americanised in their views,—in fact, the people of Prince Edward Island were, by permitting the Americans to ignore the enforcement of treaty obligations, bidding for the trade which our own fishermen should have enjoyed, but which Americans monopolised, and were thus injuring the neighboring Province of Nova Scotia, where the treaty was enforced. In the Dominion the natural rights of our people, so far as we had power, or would be permitted by Her Majesty's Government to enforce them, were enforced; and Americans, so far as related to the causes for which they had a right to enter our ports, were kept strictly to their treaty rights. Our Government precluded them from trading in our ports,—from transferring cargoes from the fishing vessels to the freight and passenger steamers of their country, which visited our ports for the purpose of receiving their cargoes,—while in the neighboring Island of Prince Edward they were permitted as much license and liberty as a British subject. They bought fish, salt and barrels, sold and trafficked in fishing outfits, landed and stored their fish, to be again re-shipped in the line of American steamers running from thence to Boston, and whose trade was built up by this illicit violation of treaty rights. Again, they purchased the fish of the island,—shipped them as American fish,—and thus got them into American markets free of duty, calling them American fish. The trade of the island was thus gradually becoming alienated, and the disregard of the authorities to the constant and continuous violations on the part of Americans of treaty stipulations, was doing much harm, as well to the trade of the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia, as in sapping the loyalty of the people of the island. So serious did this become, that it was made the subject of grave remonstrance on the part of Nova Scotians, and the Government of Canada despatched, as a Special Commissioner, the Honorable Stewart Campbell, M.P., to report thereon. His report fully maintained the facts as previously stated, and the subject being again brought under the notice of Council upon report of the undersigned, of 10th June, 1868, in which attention was called to the very unsatisfactory state of the fishery question, and suggesting that the attention of Her Majesty's Government be called thereto,—the Government availed itself of the presence in England of two of the leading members of the Cabinet, viz.:—Sir George E. Cartier, Baronet, and the Honorable Wm. McDougall, C.B., and directed them 'to secure a personal conference with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a view to the timely adoption of some permanent and satisfactory policy.'

"The report referred to, after giving a brief resume of the fishery question,—the course pursued by the British authorities and that followed by the United States, remarked upon the belief that was entertained by Her Majesty's Government, that the Americans would shortly resume their trade relations which they, in 1866, so hastily abandoned, and upon the fallacy thereof, it again referred to the fact that the license system was limited to the then current year, and stated 'that during three successive seasons the same system has been continued,—that it was each year renewed with manifest reluctance, attended as it has been by considerable loss, and many inconveniences occasioning impatient acquiescence on the part of the Maritime Provinces.'

"The burdensome continuance of a system, originated as an amicable concession towards the neighboring States, does not seem to have met with the slightest appreciation. The sole practical effect of it has been to admit foreigners to a free use of our fisheries, whilst imposing on the Imperial and Provincial Governments the material expense of regulating such foreign participation in lucrative advantages, and incurring the cost of protecting British subjects in the concurrent use of privileges exclusively theirs by the laws and usages of civilised nations, and at the same time guarding their own fishing grounds against substantial injury

by American fishermen. Under all these circumstances, it is respectfully but earnestly submitted whether the system of licensing United States fishing vessels, avowedly a provisional one, and implying no principle, should now be absolutely discontinued, and that it shall in future give place to a definite policy of exclusion agreeable to colonial interests, and consistent with national dignity and right.'

"The gentleman referred to brought the matter under the notice of the Secretary of State, but without resulting in any change of policy.

"The undersigned need not here especially deal with the despatch of Earl Granville of 21st June, 1869, as it is dealt with in the report to Council of 20th December of the same year, but would observe that, notwithstanding all the representations which the Government of Canada had made against licensing foreign fishermen, the system was still maintained, though at an increased rate, and he would especially recall attention to the report referred to, and also to that of the 16th of same month, on the subject of trade and fisheries, as bearing upon our relations with the United States. I may here state that some inducements were held out by the action of Congress leading to a belief that arrangements for trade might be secured, and a conference was held upon the subject by Mr. Fish on the part of the American Government and Sir John Rose on behalf of that of Canada, but with no practical effect; and though Mr. Rose was given to understand by the American Secretary of State that so soon as the opinions of certain leading statesmen could be obtained, he would invite the Government of Canada again to send delegates to meet him, no such invitation was sent; and notwithstanding the apparent change of sentiment indicated by the resolution of Congress alluded to, the President, in his annual address to Congress, on 4th December last, dispelled all hopes of such an arrangement, and the Government of Canada adopted the reports of the 16th and 20th of December, in which these remarks appear:—'But Her Majesty's Government cannot fail to be struck with the injustice to us, and the danger to the Empire which attend an indefinite and temporising policy; it is therefore respectfully recommended that, unless the course submitted in a former report of the 16th instant be pursued, the United States Government be at once urged to enter into a mixed commission, of the nature described in Earl Clarendon's despatch, of 11th May, 1865, founded on suggestions offered by Mr. Adams.' And that pending the recommendations of such joint commission, as may be adopted and confirmed by the respective Governments, an improved system of licensing American fishing vessels shall be enforced under regulations necessary to its effective operation, and limited positively to the ensuing year.

"In the event of the United States Government declining this proposal, the existing licenses which expire with the closing year should not be renewed, and a policy of entire exclusion from our fishing limits should be adopted and enforced."

"To this Minute no answer was received until the 5th May, 1870, when Mr. H. J. Holland for Earl Granville, under date 19th April last, sent a despatch to Sir John Young, of which the following is the text:—

"With reference to previous correspondence with respect to the protection of the Canadian fisheries, I have the honor to inform you that the Board of Admiralty have been requested to send to the Canadian waters a force sufficient to protect Canadian fishermen, and to maintain order."

"In the meantime, however, the Canadian Government had passed an Order in Council, under date 8th January last, to the following effect, viz.:—

"That the system of granting fishing licenses to foreign vessels under the Act 31 Vic., cap. 61, be discontinued, and that henceforth foreign fishermen be not permitted to fish in the waters of Canada. They further provided that six vessels similar to *La Canadienne*, be employed for the protection of the fisheries, in addition to the two already engaged on that service; and they also recommend that Her Majesty's Government be requested to maintain on the fishing stations of Canada a sufficient naval force to prevent riotous conduct, and to protect the officers of the police in the discharge of their duty. In reference to the proposal of Lord Granville to support the local force, by the presence of only one vessel of war, the minute stated that it considered this measure of support would be inadequate, and hoped that Her Majesty's Government may be instructed to increase it.

"In dealing with the latter point, the undersigned, in his report of 20th December last, before referred to, remarked:—

"With further reference to the concluding portion of Earl Granville's despatch of 21st June last, signifying the readiness of Her Majesty's Government to furnish for next year one vessel of war to assist in giving effect to regulations for protecting the fisheries, provided that the Canadian Government furnish at their own cost such other vessels as may be necessary, the undersigned would draw the attention of Council to the national character of this service as contra-distinguished from the municipal duty which it appears to be considered. It, in fact, involves important political considerations. The public right of fishing in the waters of British North America has been dealt with and disposed of in former times by Imperial authority, and has formed the subject of treaties or conventions with foreign powers. The differences which existed between the British and American Governments under the Treaty of 1813, arose from concessions of fishing privileges in colonial waters, made by the Imperial Government in favor of citizens of the United States; and the succeeding disputes which have arisen out of the Convention of 1818, resulted from the terms of an arrangement made entirely by the Imperial authorities. Those disputes were the same that would have been revived at the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, had not a temporary postponement occurred through the licensing system. The Government of Canada did not desire to avoid their settlement. If, therefore, they are now to be still further postponed in deference to the views of Her Majesty's Government, the people of Canada may reason-

ably claim that Imperial connection with the great question in suspense shall be fully represented by Her Majesty's ships. The purely local or municipal duties of guarding the coast and inshore fisheries within the limits of our territorial jurisdiction, the Canadian authorities do not hesitate to assume, and will amply provide for; but in support of those national rights on which the whole question depends, it is respectfully submitted that a sufficient Imperial force should be maintained in colonial waters."

The particular despatch to which this refers is brought out here. The Canadian Government inform Her Majesty's Government that they are prepared to fit out a fleet to protect Canadian citizens within three miles of the shore, and they ask Her Majesty's Government, instead of putting on one ship as they proposed, to protect the fisheries outside of the three-mile limit, to put on a sufficient number of ships, and they made this response:

"Hitherto the number of war vessels detached for this service has been, according to the testimony of the commanding officers, altogether too few; and should the inadequacy of the force be further reduced to the small measure of one ship, the moral and material effect would, it is feared, prove as injurious to our interests as it is possible to conceive. Were an increased number of cruisers to be employed, the undersigned is prepared to recommend that they be supplemented by a sufficient number of sailing vessels, armed and equipped by the Canadian Government as a marine police, to enforce our fishery laws and protect our inshore fisheries. These vessels would be similar in build to the foreign fishing vessels, and well manned. The schooner *La Canadienne*, now employed, is described by naval officers as very suitable to the duty, and has accomplished like duties for several years past in a most satisfactory manner. The others might be provided somewhat on that model. These auxiliary vessels could cruise close in shore, and accompany the fishing fleet, co-operating always with Her Majesty's ships, and furnished with licenses to be issued, if required, to foreign fishermen."

"In pursuance of the policy indicated in that report, the Canadian Government directed that the force employed for the protection of the fisheries and maintained by them, be supplemented by the addition of six vessels of the class of *La Canadienne*, a style of vessel which was considered suitable for that service, and such as was recommended by the officers in command of Her Majesty's cruisers, as most desirable, which was accordingly done, and the Canadian force was thus increased to one steamer and seven sailing vessels."

"The Canadian Government also submitted to Parliament a Bill in amendment of the Act 31 Vic., cap. 61, which was passed, intitled: 'An Act to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels,' which abolished the necessity of giving any warnings to foreign fishermen before seizure if found within our limits."

"The Government of Canada also submitted special instructions to be given to the officers in command of these vessels, under date 14th April last, based upon those which had been previously approved by Her Majesty's Government in former years, varying only when the altered circumstances called for change. To a portion of these instructions, exception was taken by Mr. Thornton,—at the instance of Mr. Fish—the correspondence in reference to which will appear in the report to Council, by the undersigned, under date of the 28th April last, and the Minute of Council thereon."

"After the instructions before referred to were issued, the Governor General submitted to Council, on the 2nd of May last, a copy of a cable telegram which he received from Lord Granville, dated 30th April last, in the following words:—

"Take steps to secure that American fishing vessels are not seized even between headlands, except within three miles distance of the shore," and he asked that he might be furnished with an answer to be sent the Colonial Office, with a copy of the orders which had been given or which might be given to the commanders aforesaid. To this Council by Minute of the 3rd of May, replied as follows:—

And here is perhaps the explanation of why Mr. Mitchell had to alter his orders.

"The Committee advise that Earl Granville be informed that steps have already been taken to provide against the seizure of American vessels under the circumstances above mentioned, and that the instructions to the officers in command of the vessels engaged in the protection of the fisheries (copies of which have been forwarded to the Colonial Secretary) contain special directions on the subject."

"In agreeing to the above report, Council naturally concluded that the telegram of the 30th April, had reference to, and was to be read in connection with, the instructions issued by Mr. Cardwell in April, 1866, and upon which the annual instructions of the Canadian Government were based for the past four years, and that if Her Majesty's Government had decided in any way to limit or abandon our rights to the fisheries of which we were in possession, that before doing so they would have consulted the Government of Canada upon the subject, or at least have explicitly informed them that they had so limited them, and in what particulars."

They actually reduced the limit from ten miles to six miles without consulting the Canadian Government, and that is the way in which Canada's interests are protected.

MR. MITCHELL.

"The Government was, however, somewhat surprised to receive on the 25th of May last, a copy of a despatch from Lord Granville to Sir John Young, bearing date the 30th April last, informing the Governor General that his Lordship had transmitted to him a copy of a letter addressed to the Admiralty, respecting the instructions to be given to the officers of Her Majesty's ships employed in the protection of the Canadian fisheries, and stating 'that Her Majesty's Government do not doubt that your Ministers will agree with them as to the propriety of these instructions to the vessels employed by them.'

"The letter referred to is as follows:—

"DOWNING STREET,

"30th April, 1870.

"In Mr. Secretary Cardwell's letter to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, of the 12th April, 1866, it was stated that American vessels should not be seized for violating the Canadian fishery law, 'except after wilful and persevering neglect of the warnings which they may have received; and in case it should become necessary to proceed to forfeiture, cases should, if possible, be selected for the extreme step in which the offence of fishing has been committed within three miles of land.'

"The Canadian Government has recently determined, with the concurrence of Her Majesty's Ministers, to increase the stringency of the existing practice by dispensing with the warnings hitherto given, and seizing at once any vessel detected in violating the law."

"In view of this change, and of the questions to which it may give rise, I am directed by Lord Granville to request that you will move their lordships to instruct the officers of Her Majesty's ships, employed in the protection of the fisheries, that they are not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed, and the vessel itself is captured, within three miles of land."

"This despatch the Council read also in connection with the named letter of Mr. Cardwell of 1866, and did not conceive, although the language of it was scarcely consistent with the latter, that Her Majesty's Government meant to convey a limitation in connection with the bays upon our coast, inasmuch as the Canadian Government was not advised of any alteration in that particular; and in the report to Council upon it, the text of which I have thought it desirable to give at length, it will be perceived that Council did not construe it to mean a restriction of the geographical limits of our jurisdiction, but mainly objected to that portion of the despatch which directed 'that they are not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed, and the vessel itself is captured within three miles of land.'"

We protected our fishermen within our municipal jurisdiction of three miles, and what did the British fleet do? Did they protect them outside that limit? No. The instructions they had in regard to their action outside were a sham, and, if we could get to the bottom of those instructions, I believe it would be found that they were not to seize any vessel at all. At least, that is what they did not do.

"To the latter clause of this despatch, as to the place of capture, the Canadian Government had decided objection; it was a new feature in the instructions to Her Britannic Majesty's officers which had never before been given, was a further limitation of the means of preventing these encroachments, which it was the professed object of Her Majesty's cruisers to accomplish, and my Lord Granville was in error in assuming 'that the Government of Canada would agree with them as to the propriety of these instructions,' as will appear by the following report and the Minute of Council thereon."

"Having reference to a despatch of the 30th ultimo, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, covering a communication of the same date from Sir Frederick Rogers to the Secretary of the Admiralty, directing attention to instructions given to officers of Her Majesty's ships employed in the protection of the fisheries of Canada, and desiring the Canadian Government to give corresponding directions to officers in command of the marine police vessels similarly engaged, the undersigned has the honor to submit that in certain respects, Lord Granville's wish has been already provided for in the special instructions adopted by the Governor General in Council on the 14th instant."

"The officers of Her Majesty's ships are, it is said, instructed 'not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed and the vessel itself is captured within three miles of land.'

"Attention is respectfully requested to a division of the instructions issued by the Government of Canada, headed 'Action,' by which it will be seen that exercise of the lawful power of peremptory and absolute detention is not contemplated on the first occasion, unless there be a wilful and persistent violation of the law; but such preliminary forbearance could not possibly be extended to any subsequent act of trespass. Another division of these instructions, headed 'Directions,' provides with great care against the possibility of any offending vessel seized by the Canadian officers, except actually within three miles of land, and unless the commission of the offence can be clearly proved."

"It is, however, intimated under the same head that any offending vessel which may resist or avoid immediate seizure within three miles of land, remains liable to capture for the offence committed by Canadian officers in the waters of Canada and by Imperial cruisers wherever she may be afterwards found in British waters, and in consequence, the Canadian officers are directed to communicate without delay the names

of any vessels they shall have notified and accosted, or any which may escape or resist seizure; this proviso is consonant to the Acts relative to fishing by foreign vessels, as, besides the offence of being 'found fishing,' it is unlawful to 'have been fishing, &c.' (Vide 31 Vic., cap. 61, sec. 1, and amending Act)

"The undersigned begs to express the hope that the instructions suggested in Lord Granville's despatch to the Admiralty may not be interpreted so as to affect such liability. It is also understood that the term 'offence of fishing has been committed,' occurring in the Admiralty instructions, to which the assent of the Canadian Government is invited, are to be construed conformably with the fishery laws, as, under these Statutes, 'preparing to fish,' inshore constitutes an offence.

"The undersigned would, therefore, respectfully observe that while recommending acquiescence in so much of his Lordship's suggestion as consists with these special instructions, it is advisable to guard against any further practical modification of the strict right of entire exclusion, and also of summary action, than what has been already provided for in the very considerate instructions issued by the Canadian Government.

"There should, as far as it is possible, be uniformity of procedure in these particulars between Her Majesty's ships and the subsidiary force employed by Canada.

"With reference, however, to that part of Lord Granville's suggestion affecting the order to capture any foreign vessel liable to seizure only when the ship is actually within three miles of the coast, the undersigned considers it open to serious objection.

"Both the Imperial and colonial statutes regulating fishing by foreign vessels, relate to jurisdiction in British waters. The system applied under them recognises certain conventional limits as the basis of actual exclusion. But it would seem to be inconsistent both with the provisions of these Acts, and the object of defence, to admit of offending vessels avoiding all penal consequences of their trespass by simply passing an imaginary line out of colonial bounds, and yet being still within British jurisdiction, after having violated the provincial laws, and infringed the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, and also the Imperial Act founded on the same. The peculiar facility with which foreign fishing vessels may cross and recross along this marine limit, renders it possible that under shelter of the exemption resulting from any instruction of the nature suggested, trespassers may present the anomaly of escaping from the marine police of Canada to the quasi-protection of Imperial authority. The existence of such a rule must really invite illegal encroachments on the part of foreigners; and the immediate effect would be to encourage intruders to quicken their efforts to avoid detention and evade seizure, knowing that the capture of their vessels is certain only when caught, as it were, in the very act of trespass. It will certainly weaken the moral influence of any demand made by the officers in command of these Canadian vessels, depending, as they are instructed to do, on the material aid of Her Majesty's ships in case of violence, they being themselves unauthorized to fire upon and disable any vessel either offering resistance or endeavoring to escape seizure."

"There is also to be considered the probable future reference to this exception in connection with any final settlement of the reserved question of headland lines. If, for instance, any foreign vessel having actually trespassed within three miles of the shore of the interior of the Bay des Chaleurs, and escaped from the municipal force of Canada, shall not be afterwards subject to seizure under British authority anywhere within the entrance to that bay, say inside of a line drawn across from Miscou to Point Maquereau (distant apart about 15 miles), and where, in all other matters of a civil or criminal nature, Canada exercises provincial jurisdiction, it may imply waiver of both Canadian and British control *quoad* exclusive rights of fishing. The Government having deliberated on and determined to maintain this essential point by several Orders in Council adopted since 1864, it is inadvisable to sanction any such dubious proceeding as might be in future pressed into service to support American views.

"Occasion is taken again to refer to reports from this Department, dated 15th and 20th December last, in which this disputed part of the fishery question is referred to at length, and other previous reports enumerated; and the undersigned begs leave again to urge that Her Majesty's Government may be requested to bring it to a speedy settlement in the manner proposed by Lord Clarendon in 1866, on the suggestion of the American Minister at London.

"The undersigned would respectfully, but most earnestly, represent the tendency of any restriction of the kind proposed by Lord Granville on the support of Her Majesty's squadron, to mar the efficiency of this important service, and begs leave to recommend that Her Majesty's Government may be asked to instruct the commanding officer to receive and act upon whatever definite and reliable reports (with satisfactory particulars) of actual detection or escape, may be made by the officers in command of the Canadian Government vessels employed in protecting the inshore fisheries of Canada.

"The action of Council thereon will appear by the Minute of 2nd instant, in which, after reference to the despatch, the Minute goes on to state that 'they have also had before them the memorandum from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whom the above-mentioned despatch and enclosure were referred, and they respectfully report their concurrence therein, and advise that a copy thereof be transmitted by Your Excellency to Lord Granville as containing the views of the Canadian Government on the question referred to in the said despatch.'

"It will further be perceived, by reference to Minute of Council of 8th inst., that immediately upon receipt of the instructions issued by Vice-Admiral Wellesley, under the directions of Her Majesty's Govern-

ment, a Minute of Council was passed in accordance therewith, and amongst other minor changes essential to secure uniformity, these words were added:—'It must be evident and susceptible of the clearest proof that the offence has been committed and the capture effected within the prohibited limits.'

"I need scarcely remind the Council of the great reluctance that they felt in thus narrowing our powers of protecting the interests of our fishermen, nor the feeling of doubt and distrust as to the real intentions of Her Majesty's Government in relation to these fisheries which was forced upon them. It became evident that a personal remonstrance ought to be made by a member of the Canadian Government to the British Ministry. This course was shortly thereafter resolved upon, and the Honorable Alexander Campbell was despatched to London for the purpose of remonstrating with Her Majesty's Government and urging them to insist upon a reference of the matters in dispute on the part of the Americans to a Joint Commission, or failing that, at once to enforce and secure the exclusive use of all those privileges and limits which British subjects enjoyed from 1818 up to their suspension by the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854.

"Council had hoped that until the mission of Mr. Campbell should have enabled them to judge what they might expect as to the course Her Majesty's Government might hereafter pursue, that at least they would not be called upon to make fresh changes, or submit to any further limitations of their rights, and were surprised at the receipt of a copy of a telegram of the 6th instant, forwarded to the Governor General in Council, from My Lord Granville to Sir John Young, in the following words:

"Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing, except within three miles of land, or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth."

"The Government were again surprised to find that a new and further limitation of the rights of the British people was resolved upon by Her Majesty's Government, inasmuch as in all former instructions, foreign fishermen were excluded from bays which were less than ten geographical miles wide, while the telegram referred to, limited the exclusion, for the first time, to 'bays which were less than six miles wide at the mouth.'

"The question which naturally presented itself to the Canadian Ministry was, where is this to end? and to what extent are these concessions to be made? They felt it to be a duty they owed alike to Canada, for whose Government they were responsible, as to the whole British people, to remonstrate with Her Majesty's Ministers before issuing the required instruction, and on the 9th instant they adopted a Minute of Council, concurring in the report of the undersigned of the 8th instant, and requesting that a copy thereof should be sent to Lord Granville for the information of Her Majesty's Government.

"This report states that precautions have been already taken against seizure by Canadian officers of United States fishing vessels outside of three marine miles from land on the coasts of Canada, and further remarking upon the despatch, observes that:

"The termination of the Reciprocity Treaty by the United States, and the consequent cessation of the labors of the Joint Commission embracing disputed points in the controversy suspended thereby, had the legitimate effect of leaving the inshore fishery rights just as they stood in 1854. The main point formerly in dispute, involving the definition of bays, &c., has never since been conceded by the Imperial or Colonial authorities. It, on the contrary, has been steadily asserted in all subsequent correspondence and transactions. The letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th April, 1866, expressly reserves it and sets forth the opinion of Her Majesty's Government as clear on this point. The Canadian Government was, however, desired to forego, 'for the present,' the strict enforcement of British rights in this respect, and 'during the (then) present season' to accept a conventional arrangement affecting bays or creeks less than ten miles wide at their entrance.

"It was so accepted as part of the temporary system at that time proposed, but has shared with kindred provisions the disapproval repeated on various occasions by this Government during four years past. The policy adopted this year by Canada, and approved by Great Britain, would in its entirety supersede all provisional concessions heretofore subsisting. But, in deference to the obvious wishes of Her Majesty's Government, this policy has been carried out in the spirit of Mr. Cardwell's despatch of 12th April, 1866, and the same conventional limit of ten miles will be again for the present observed. The Government of Canada ought not, therefore, to be now desired to recognise any further and fresh limitation of our exclusive rights, however temporary and guarded it may be intended to be made.

"This disputed matter has now been pending for upwards of twenty-five years, during which period the American Government has had frequent opportunities and has been specially invited to join in an equitable adjustment of the same. The fault that it is still unsettled and the source of difficulty attached to the United States Government alone. Great Britain and Canada are mere defendants, as in possession of a natural right existing in fact and in law.

"The Council is aware that, when the British Government in 1845 opened the Bay of Fundy to American fishermen, as an amicable relaxation of treaty rights, the act was officially regarded as 'a practical abandonment' by American authorities of the British construction of the Convention of 1818. It was immediately followed by a demand for general application to all indents exceeding six miles in width. This extraordinary demand appears to have been for the moment acquiesced in by Lord Aberdeen, for peace sake, but was soon afterwards rejected by Lord Stanley, on the earnest remonstrances of the colonies. Another

concession in the same direction, as proposed by Lord Granville (identical in the words of that ineffectual and unjust claim), may be similarly construed to our detriment. Thus the whole policy of exclusion would be gradually subverted, and component parts of a question vital to the future welfare and interests of Canada, become practically abandoned piecemeal.

"The peculiar concession now suggested would, it is believed, tend to create new differences with the United States instead of promoting any final settlement of the existing controversy.

"Reference is particularly requested to reports of the 15th and 20th of December last, in which the whole matter in question is fully set forth. The conclusions arrived at were, that, as the American Government had voluntarily terminated the Treaty of 1854, and ever since failed to consider any propositions regarding an equivalent for the use of our inshore fisheries, notwithstanding an intermediate license system which continued to United States citizens the same fishing privileges they had enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty, on merely formal conditions, all such concessions should be absolutely withdrawn and our rights duly enforced as they existed and were upheld anterior to that reciprocal compact.

"The undersigned, therefore, respectfully submits that the terms of the policy already adopted, and now in actual course of being carried out, should be strictly adhered to."

"The undersigned would further observe that this *resumé* of the fishery question need not be embarrassed with the correspondence on the points raised, through Mr. Thornton, by the American Secretary of State, Mr. Fish, in relation to the text of the instructions given to the fishery officers commanding the marine police vessels in connection with the Magdalen Islands, and Labrador, as it is not material to the main question, and has been already answered by reports and Minutes of Council, of the 31st ult., and the 8th, 14th and 27th inst. ant, it is necessary now to make reference to the Bay of Fundy.

"Upon the concession made in relation to the correspondence it will be found that, after the right of Americans to fish in that bay was discussed at length, the following conclusions were arrived at by the then Foreign Minister, the Earl of Aberdeen, in his letter of the 10th May, 1845, in which, after reasoning upon the merits of the question, he states that:

"The undersigned will confine himself to stating that, after the most deliberate re-consideration of the subject, and with every desire to do full justice to the United States, and to view the claims put forward on behalf of United States citizens in the most favorable light, Her Majesty's Government are, nevertheless, still constrained to deny the right of United States citizens, under the Treaty of 1818, to fish in that part of the Bay of Fundy, which, from its geographical position, may properly be considered as included within the British possessions."

"Her Majesty's Government must still maintain—and in this view they are fortified by high legal authority—that the Bay of Fundy is rightfully claimed by Great Britain as a bay within the Treaty of 1818; and they equally maintain the position which was laid down in the note of the undersigned, dated the 15th of April last, that with regard to the other bays on the British American coast, no United States fisherman has, under that convention, the right to fish within three miles of the entrance of such bays, as designated by a line drawn from headland to headland at that entrance.

"But while Her Majesty's Government still feel themselves bound to maintain these positions as a matter of right, they are, nevertheless, not insensible to the advantages which would accrue to both countries from a relaxation of the exercise of that right—to the United States, as conferring a material benefit on their fishing trade; and to Great Britain and the United States conjointly and equally, by the removal of a fertile source of disagreement between them.

"Her Majesty's Government are also anxious, at the same time that they uphold the just claims of the British Crown, to evince by every reasonable concession their desire to act liberally and amicably towards the United States.

"The undersigned has accordingly much pleasure in announcing to Mr. Everett, the determination to which Her Majesty's Government have come, to relax in favor of the United States fishermen that right which Great Britain has hitherto exercised of excluding these fishermen from the British portion of the Bay of Fundy, and they are prepared to direct the colonial authorities to allow henceforward the United States fishermen to pursue their avocations in any part of the Bay of Fundy, provided they do not approach, except in the cases specified in the Treaty of 1818, within three miles of the entrance of any bay on the coast of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

"This concession made by Lord Aberdeen in the interest of peace and in the belief that it would have been reciprocated by the United States, and that his suggestion of their taking off the duties from British-caught fish going into the United States would have been acted upon, was not realised.

"An American writer in dealing with this subject (see page 424 of the United States Senate documents of years 1852-53) says:

Mr. MITCHELL,

"The opening of the Bay of Fundy considered in itself alone, though nominally confirming the interpretation of the treaty which the colonial authorities had set up, was, in fact, a practical abandonment of it, and we have the highest assurance that the British Government contemplated the further extension of the same policy by the adoption of a general regulation that American fishermen should be allowed freely to enter all bays of which the mouths were more than six miles wide."

"This communication was frustrated by the strong remonstrance of the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, fortified by an able and elaborate opinion of the then Attorney General, now the master of rolls of Nova Scotia, on the legal rights of colonists, in which, after indicating the legal rights of the latter, he says:

"The colonists cannot understand the principle upon which concession in any form should be granted to the American people in a case avowedly touching the highest ground of national policy, even, although concession did not involve consequences, as it unhappily does in the present case, both immediate and remote, most injurious to colonial interests."

"He further says: 'We believe the treaty does not exclude them, and we but ask a judicial enquiry and determination before these valuable privileges are relinquished: the highest law opinions in England have justified our belief. Her Majesty's Government, in theory, avows and maintains it.'

"The case was finally submitted to the British law officers of the Crown in a case put by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. The Advocate General and the Attorney General of England gave as their opinion 'that, by the terms of the convention, American citizens were excluded from any right of fishing within three miles from the coast of British America, and that the prescribed distance of three miles is to be measured from the headlands or extreme points of land next the sea, of the coast, or of the entrance of bays or indents of the coast, and, consequently, that no right exists on the part of American citizens to enter the bays of Nova Scotia, there to take fish, although the fishing, being within the bay, may be at a greater distance than three miles from the shore of the bay; as we are of the opinion that the term 'headland' is used in the treaty to express the part of the land we have before mentioned, including the interior of the bays and the indents of the coast.'

"The colonies sent a delegation and strong remonstrance to Her Majesty's Government, and on the 17th September, 1845, Lord Stanley thus wrote to the Governor of Nova Scotia respecting the policy of granting permission to the fishermen of the United States to fish in the bay of Chaleurs, and other large bays of a similar character on the coasts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and apprehending, from your statements, that any such general concessions would be injurious to the interests of the British North American Province, 'we have abandoned the intention we had entertained on the subject, and shall adhere to the strict letter of the treaties which exist between Great Britain and the United States relative to the fisheries in North America, except in so far as they may relate to the Bay of Fundy, which has been thrown open to the North Americans under certain restrictions.'

"Mr. Webster, in notifying fishermen after the decision of Her Majesty's Government, and after dealing with this question and citing the above remarks, states: 'It is this construction of the intent and meaning of the Convention of 1818, for which the colonies have contended since 1841, and which they have desired should be enforced—this the English Government has now, it would appear, consented to do.'

"Yet, notwithstanding this amount of authority in support of the colonial claim, no sooner was the concession made as a matter of favor to the Americans to fish in the Bay of Fundy, than they claimed that the concession settled the question as a matter of right, and that in its operation it should be applicable to all bays, and the practical effect has been largely to encourage trespassers.

"It will be further seen, by reference to the despatch of Mr. Everett in reply to Lord Aberdeen's despatch of 10th March, 1845, as regards the concession in reference to the Bay of Fundy, that no sooner was that generous concession made, than a new and further one was demanded, viz.:—admission into the smaller bays of the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, within the Bay of Fundy; this, of course, was not conceded by Her Majesty's Government.

"This further concession, which is now, by the despatch of the 6th inst., temporarily made, limits the exclusion from bays only of less than six miles wide, in place of, as formerly, from all bays less than ten miles wide—is the same concession which was on the eve of being agreed to by the then Earl of Aberdeen, and

which was arrested by the late lamented Earl of Derby, then Lord Stanley, on the strong remonstrances of the colonists, and will, it is to be feared, if not at once withdrawn, be viewed by foreigners, not as an act of grace nor a concession of a temporary character, but will, in future years as in the Bay of Fundy concession, be claimed, and its continuance, demanded as a matter of right—and, under any circumstance, inure to our disadvantage if the reference asked for is obtained.

"The undersigned would now call attention to the question of the navigation of the Gut of Canso in connection with the fishery question.

"The points which present themselves are :

"1st. What are the national rights in relation to the navigation and user thereof by foreigners, and have British subjects the exclusive right thereto?

"2nd. Have the Americans ever obtained any treaty rights from Great Britain to use it in common?

"3rd. What have been the restrictions against foreigners in its user, and what jurisdiction has Great Britain or the Province of Nova Scotia exercised over it?

"In order to a clear appreciation of the case, it may be stated that the Strait of Canso is a narrow strip of water or arm of the sea, connecting the Bay of Canso, which opens into Chedabucto Bay on the eastward, with St. George's Bay opening into the Straits of Northumberland in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, its dimensions are described by Admiral Bayfield, in the report of his survey of the coast, volume II, as follows :

"The length of the passage through the Gut from the lighthouse at the north entrance to the lighthouse on Eddy Point at the south entrance is 14½ miles, and its least breadth between Bolache Point and Cape Porcupine is 4½ cables' (or under half a mile).

"It is bounded on both sides by counties which now form part of the Province of Nova Scotia, and in no portion of its length between the points referred to, is the width up to two miles.

"Under such circumstances, it would seem that, beyond any doubt, international law would vest the absolute control and the exclusive uses of such gut, strait, or arm of the sea, within the exclusive territorial jurisdiction of the country which controls both shores.

"The maritime territory of every state extends to the ports, harbors, bays, mouths of rivers and adjacent parts of the sea enclosed by headlands, belonging to the same State. The general usage of nations superadds to this extent of territorial jurisdiction a distance of a marine league, or as far as a cannon shot will reach from the shore, along all the coasts of the state. Within these limits (*i.e.* the ports, harbors, bays, and mouths of rivers and adjacent parts of the sea enclosed by headlands, with three marine miles superadded) its rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute, and exclude those of every other nation.'—*Elements of International Law*, p. 320. By Henry Wheaton, LL.D. Second annotated edition, by W. B. Lawrence, Boston, 1864.

"Navigable rivers, which flow through a territory, and the sea coast adjoining it, and the navigable waters included in bays, and between headlands and arms of the sea, belong to the sovereign of the adjoining territory, as being necessary to the safety of the nation, and to the undisturbed use of the neighboring shores.'—*Kent's Commentaries*, p. 25.

"The property and dominion of the sea might belong to him who is in possession of the lands on both sides, though it be open above as a gulf, or above and below as a strait, provided it be not so great a part of the sea, as when compared with the lands on both sides, it cannot be supposed to be a portion of them.'—*Grotius de jure belli et pacis*, L. 11.

"The exclusive right of dominion, and territorial jurisdiction of the British Crown, have immemorially extended to the bays or portions of the sea cut off by lines drawn from one promontory to another, along the coasts of the Island of Great Britain. They are commonly called the King's Chambers. A similar jurisdiction, or right of domain, is also asserted by the United States over the Delaware Bay and other bays and estuaries as forming portions of their territory. Other nations have claimed a right of territory over bays, gulfs, straits, mouths of rivers, and estuaries, which are enclosed by capes and headlands along their respective coasts, and the principle would seem to be pretty well established as a rule of international law.'—*International Law* by H. W. Halleck, A.M., San Francisco, 1861.

"Gulfs and channels or arms of the sea are, according to the regular course, supposed to belong to the people with whose lands they are encompassed.'—*Puffendorf Law of Nature and of Nations*, L. IV.

"All we have said of the parts of the sea near the coast, may be said more particularly, and with greater reason, of roads, bays, and straits, as still more capable of being possessed, and of greater importance to the safety of the country. But I speak of bays and straits of small extent, not of those great tracts of sea to which these names are sometimes given, as Hudson's Bay and the Straits of Magellan, over which the empire cannot extend, still less a right of property.'—*The Law of Nations*, by Mons. de Vattel, New Edition by Jos. Chitty, Esq., Annotated by C. D. Ingraham, Esq., Philadelphia, 1858.

"According to the current of modern authority, the general territorial jurisdiction extends into the sea as far as cannon shot will reach,* and no further, and this is generally calculated to be a marine league.'—*Kent's Commentaries*, p. 29.

*"When the United States, by the Treaty of 1818, solemnly renounced forever the right to fish within three miles of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of certain portions of North America, the stipulation was neither extraordinary nor extravagant. It is matter of common history that sea-girt nations claim peculiar rights within a league of their shores; and equally plain that, according to the maxims of international law, this claim is defined by lines drawn not only between the formation of bays, but from the headlands of indentations of the coasts.' *Memorial to Her Majesty*, 2nd, Sept. 1852.

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article, fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages, and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea entering from the ocean between capes or headlands; and the term is applied equally to small and large tracts of water thus situated. It is common to speak of Hudson's Bay, or the Bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water.

"The British authorities insist that England has a right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture all American fishermen who may follow their pursuits inside of that line. It was undoubtedly an oversight in the Convention of 1818, to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets or recesses of the ocean ought to be open to American fishermen, as freely as the sea itself, to within three marine miles of the shore.'—*Mr. Secretary Webster*, 6th July, 1852.

"No United States fisherman has under the Convention (1818), the right to fish within three miles of the entrance of such bays as are designated by a line drawn from headland to headland at their entrance.'—*Lord Aberdeen's despatch to Mr. Everett*, 10th March, 1845.

"Considering the great extent of the line of the American coasts, we have a right to claim, for fiscal and defensive regulations, a liberal extension of maritime jurisdiction; and it would not be unreasonable, as I apprehend, to assume, for domestic purposes, connected with our safety and welfare, the control of the waters on our coasts, though included within lines stretching from quite distant headlands, as, for instance, from Cape Ann to Cape Cod, and from Nantucket to Mauntauck Point, and from that point to the Capes of the Delaware, and from the south of Cape Florida to the Mississippi.'—*Kent's Commentaries*, pp. 29 and 30.

"It is difficult to draw any precise or determined conclusion, amidst the variety of opinions, as to the distance to which a state may lawfully extend its exclusive dominion over the sea adjoining its territories, and beyond those portions of the sea which are embraced by harbors, gulfs, bays, and estuaries, and over which its jurisdiction unquestionably extends. All that can be reasonably asserted is, that the dominion of the sovereign of the shore over the contiguous sea, extends as far as is requisite for his safety, and for some lawful end.'—*Kent's Commentaries*, p. 29.

"The preceding dicta should be borne in mind, with especial reference to the plea set up by American Ministers that the limit of maritime jurisdiction claimed by Chancellor Kent is with respect to 'belligerent purposes;' and that the principle of drawing lines from distant headlands does not sanction such a definition of marine bounds as affecting territorial jurisdiction and piscary. Is not fishery a 'lawful end,' and are not the fishing pursuits of citizens 'purposes connected with our safety and welfare'?

"For purely belligerent purposes Great Britain takes sixteen miles of outside sea as the limit, and the United States take much more, both estimating the distance 'from a right line drawn from one headland to another.'—*Chancellor Kent*, p. 30.

"In Nova Scotia, from 1825 up to 1854, much excitement pre-

vailed in reference to this question of the fisheries, and with it the navigation of the Gut of Canso.

"In 1841 the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia proposed the following questions for the consideration of Her Majesty's legal advisers, dated 8th June, 1841:

"I. Whether the Treaty of 1783 was annulled by the war of 1812, and whether citizens of the United States possess any right of fishery in the waters of the lower Provinces other than ceded to them by the Convention of 1818; and if so, what right?

"II. Have American citizens the right, under that Convention, to enter any of the bays of this Province to take fish, if, after they have so entered, they prosecute the fishery more than three marine miles from the shores of such bays; or should the prescribed distance of three marine miles be measured from the headlands, at the entrance of such bays, so as to exclude them?

"III. Is the distance of three marine miles to be computed from the indents of the coast of British America, or from the extreme headlands, and what is to be considered a headland?

"IV. Have American vessels, fitted out for a fishery, a right to pass through the Gut of Canso, which they cannot do without coming within the prescribed limits, or to anchor there, or to fish there; and is casting bait to lure fish in the track of the vessel fishing, within the meaning of the Convention?

"V. Have American citizens a right to land on the Magdalen Islands, and conduct the fishery from the shores thereof, by using nets and seines; or what right of fishery do they possess on the shores of those islands, and what is meant by the term shore?

"VI. Have American fishermen the right to enter the bays and harbors of this Province for the purpose of purchasing wood, or obtaining water, having provided neither of these articles at the commencement of their voyages, in their own country; or have they the right only of entering such bays and harbors in cases of distress, or to purchase wood and obtain water, after the usual stock of those articles for the voyage of such fishing craft has been exhausted or destroyed?

"VII. Under existing treaties, what rights of fishery are ceded to the citizens of the United States of America, and what reserved for the exclusive enjoyment of British subjects?"

"1st Query.—In obedience to Your Lordship's commands, we have taken these papers into consideration, and have the honor to report, that we are of opinion that the Treaty of 1783 was annulled by the war of 1812; and we are also of opinion that the rights of fishery of the citizens of the United States must now be considered as defined and regulated by the Convention of 1818; and with respect to the general question 'if so, what right' we can only refer to the terms of the convention, as explained and elucidated by the observations which will occur in answering the other specific queries.

"2nd and 3rd Queries.—Except within certain defined limits, to which the query put to us does not apply, we are of opinion, that by the terms of the convention, American citizens are excluded from any right of fishing within three miles of the coast of British America, and that the prescribed distance of three miles is to be measured from the headlands, or extreme points of land next the sea, or the coast, or of the entrance of bays, or indents of the coast; and, consequently, that no right exists, on the part of American citizens, to enter the bays of Nova Scotia, there to take fish, although the fishing being within the bays, may be at a greater distance than three miles from the shore of the bay, as we are of opinion that the term 'headland' is used in the treaty to express the part of the land we have before mentioned, including the interiors of the bays, and the indents of the coast.

"4th Query.—By the Convention of 1818, it is agreed that American citizens should have the liberty of fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and within certain defined limits, in common with British subjects; and such convention does not contain any words negating the right to navigate the Passage or Strait of Canso, and, therefore, it may be conceded that such right of navigation is not taken away by that convention; but we have now attentively considered the course of navigation to the Gulf by Cape Breton, and likewise the capacity and situation of the Passage of Canso, and of the British possessions on either side; and we are of opinion that, independently of treaty, no foreign country has the right to use or navigate the Passage of Canso; and, attending to the terms of the convention, relating to the liberty of fishing to be enjoyed by the American citizens, we are also of opinion, that that convention did not, either expressly or by necessary implication, concede any such right of using or navigating the passage in question. We are also of opinion that casting bait, to lure fish in the track of any American vessel navigating the passage, would constitute a fishing, within the negative terms of the convention.

Mr. MITCHELL.

"7th Query. The rights of fishing ceded to the citizens of the United States, and those reserved for the exclusive enjoyment of British subjects, depend altogether upon the Convention of 1818, the only existing treaty on this subject between the two countries, and the material points arising thereon have been specifically answered in our replies to the preceding queries."

"The Parliament of that Province took action upon the encroachments of the Americans, and an Address was forwarded to the British Government upon the subject of the Fisheries, as well as upon the navigation of the Gut, and the Attorney General of that Province was directed by Lord Falkland to prepare a report on the various questions referred to which he did under date 16th June, 1845. Again, on three separate occasions, prior to 1851, efforts were made to bring, under the notice of Her Majesty's Government, the desirability of exercising their right to close the Gut of Canso against foreigners. Again, in 1851, the same Parliament made a fourth report upon the subject of closing Canso, based upon the action of Mr. Stevenson, the United States Minister to England, in a letter addressed to Lord Palmerston, then Foreign Minister, in which he objects to the closing of the Strait of Canso against American fishermen upon the ground that, at the time of the Treaty of 1818, one side of it was divided by Cape Breton, and the other by Nova Scotia, and that the union of the two could not be held to vest the right in Nova Scotia. In reply to this assertion, Lord Falkland contended that Her Majesty's exclusive property and dominion in the Strait of Canso is maintainable upon the principles of international law already referred to, and which it is considered will equally apply whether the shore on either side forms part of the same Province or of different Provinces belonging to Her Majesty. The strait is very narrow, not exceeding one mile in width, and its navigation is not necessary for communication with the space beyond, which may be reached by going round the Island of Cape Breton.

"It will be seen by the authorities, hereinbefore quoted, that the opinion of Chancellor Kent, agreed with the opinion put forward by the British law officers of the Crown, and justified the conclusions at which they arrived, that 'no foreign power, independently of treaty, has any right to navigate the Passage of Canso.'

"Again, the Province of Nova Scotia, for upwards of forty years, has exercised a control over the Strait of Canso, and imposed a tonnage due upon all vessels navigating the same for the support of the lights upon her coasts, and enforced the payment of the same. Such exercise of authority has never been disputed, and Nova Scotia has by her enactments legislated both for the obstruction and the restrictions of the rights of foreigners in relation thereto. The object, on the part of the Americans, in inserting the article I of the treaty referred to, was to secure certain privileges in connection with the fisheries, to which they were not entitled by the law of nations. Those are enumerated—it covered certain rights of fishing under limitations—it gave the right to land, to dry and cure fish in certain inhabited districts, and gave permission to enter bays, coasts, and harbors, for the purpose of shelter, and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood and obtaining water; but in no part of the treaty is there any reference to their right to navigate the Passage or Strait of Canso, and as they have no right by the law of nations, and obtained none by treaty, they are clearly proscribed from setting up such a claim.

"That portion of the Convention of 1818, which relates to the fishery question, is in the following words:—

"ART. I.—Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States, for the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks, of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall have, forever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands, on the western and northern coast of Newfoundland, from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and also on the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks, from Mount Joly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belleisle, and thence northwardly indefinitely along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company; and that the American fishermen shall also have liberty, forever, to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks, of the southern part of the coast of Newfoundland, hereabove described, and of the coast of Labrador; but so soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or

cure fish at such portion so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose, with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground.'

"And the United States hereby renounce, forever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry, or cure fish, on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, not included within the above mentioned limits; provided, however, that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbors, for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatsoever abusing the privileges hereby reserved to them.'

"It will thus be apparent that no such right was created by treaty, and, therefore, no such right exists.

"In April, 1841, Lord Falkland in dealing with this whole fishery question, stated that 'the greatest anxiety is felt by the inhabitants of this Province (Nova Scotia) that the Convention with the Americans, of 1818, should be strictly enforced,' and, while stating the efforts of that Province in fitting out armed vessels to protect her rights, suggested that additional vessels of the navy be sent to supplement their efforts; and between that time and November, 1842, two additional reports of the Committee of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, upon the same subject, were forwarded to Her Majesty's Government, when the late Earl of Derby (who was then Lord Stanley) informed the Nova Scotians, that, 'as regards the fisheries, the precautions taken by the Provincial Legislature appear adequate to the purpose, and that being practically acquiesced in by the Americans no further measures are required.'

"It would, therefore, appear that the active enforcement of the headland lines, and the exclusion from the Gut, was, in November, 1842, in the opinion of Lord Stanley, acquiesced in by the Americans, and was, as a matter of fact, actively enforced.

"The foregoing statement brings the history of this question down to the present time, and the undersigned will now resume the consideration of the despatch of my Lord Granville to Sir John Young, of the 6th instant before referred to, and the memorandum of His Excellency the Governor General of the 22nd instant thereupon.

"It has already been stated in compliance with the command of His Excellency, by the directions of Lord Granville, that the instructions to the above fishery officers should be altered, and a report embodying that policy has been submitted.

"It is, however, the duty of Council carefully to consider the despatch referred to, and as it is one of so much importance, the points in which involve such serious considerations on the part of Canada, it is given at length. It states:

"In your despatch of 4th May, you state that you have laid before your Ministers, my telegram of 30th April, the effect of which, as of a written despatch now in your possession, was to modify in one respect the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866.'

"The instructions of 1866 were to the effect that the United States fishing vessels were to be excluded from bays less than 10 miles wide at the mouth, but that the forfeiture of such vessels was, if possible, only to be enforced when the fishing had taken place within three miles of shore.'

"It further states: 'That the effect of my despatch, or rather of the letter to the Admiralty which is transmitted for the concurrence of your Government, was, as regarded Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of forfeiture so far absolute as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized except within the three miles and for an offence committed within those limits.'

"It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that, as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced.'

"You enclosed, in reply, a minute of your Ministers, stating that steps had been taken to prevent the seizure of American vessels beyond the three-mile limit, and you enclosed certain special instructions of 1st April, 1870, as affecting this object.'

"But, in your telegram of 14th May, you inform me that those instructions conform, or are intended to conform, not to my instructions of 30th April, but to the Colonial Office paper of 12th April, 1866, which those instructions were intended to supersede.

"I am not quite sure whether you now perceive that the British and Canadian instructions are inconsistent with each other.'

"The Canadian instructions are inconsistent with the spirit of which I conveyed to you, in that they still require Canadian fish-

ery officers to exclude American fishermen from bays more than ten miles in width, and you will see, on perusal, that under the head 'action,' they are inconsistent with the letter of the Admiralty instructions, by directing the fishery officers, after certain warnings, 'instantly to seize' any person fishing within 'prescribed limits,' which, read with the preceding paragraph, cannot but be taken to include bays.'

"And under the head 'directions' it is implied that vessels are to be seized for coming into a Canadian bay (whether or not within three miles of shore), unless they are forced thither by violent winds or other unavoidable cause.'

"These objections to the instructions as they stand are not removed by the limitation implied in the words (p. 4), 'or seize it if found within three marine miles of the coast.'

"I further observe that the decision of Her Majesty's Government not to exclude American fishermen, except within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width, does not warrant their exclusion from that part of the Bay des Chaleurs which is not more than ten miles wide.'

"Considering the importance of the subject, and that your attention appears to have been especially directed to the sentence respecting that part of the Bay of Chaleurs, I am somewhat surprised that these points should have escaped your notice.'

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question what are Canadian waters? or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within these waters, except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818. But they do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries. With these objects they think it advisable that United States fishermen should not be excluded from any waters except within three miles of shore, or in the unusual case of a bay which is less than six miles wide at its mouth, but spreads out to a greater width within.'

"It will, of course, be understood and explained to the United States Government that this liberty is conceded temporarily, and without prejudice to the rights of Great Britain to fall back on her treaty rights, if the prospects of an arrangement lessens, or if the concession is found to interfere practically with the protection of the Canadian fisheries.'

"It would appear that Lord Granville contemplated by the despatch to convey—

"1st. That his telegram and despatch of the 30th April, were intended to modify the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866.'

"2nd. That though the instructions from the Admiralty to the officers in command of ships of war employed in the protection of the fisheries, and from the Canadian Government to their officers similarly situated, since April, 1866, were based upon Mr. Cardwell's letter of instructions of April, 1866, which prohibited foreign fishermen from entering bays less than ten miles wide at the mouth, and which instructions suggested that the forfeiture of such vessels was (if possible) only to be enforced when fishing had taken place within three miles of shore, yet notwithstanding the instructions, his Lordship now, for the first time, communicates to the Canadian Government the fact that it never was intended to be acted upon.'

"That if any doubt existed about the meaning of the instructions or the possible chances of a trespasser being taken by Her Majesty's cruisers, that doubt is now removed, inasmuch as his Lordship states:—

"That it never was the intention of Her Majesty's Government that their vessels should seize a trespasser under any circumstances, and for fear of such a possibility his Lordship now removes all chance of it by stating that 'the effect of my despatch or rather of the letter of the Admiralty, which it transmitted for the concurrence of your Government was, as regards Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of non-forfeiture as far absolute as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized, except within the three miles, and for an offence committed with those limits. It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced.'

"It may be stated that as the Canadian Government, by the approved report of the undersigned, of the 20th December last,

stood pledged to Her Majesty's Government to maintain an efficient marine police to enforce the law within the three-mile limit, in the belief that Her Majesty's Government, having declined to do that which they designated as strictly a police duty—viz., to command respect to municipal law within the three mile limit—would command respect to national rights outside thereof, and to which they are, in the opinion of Council, pledged, and as Dominion vessels by the limitation of the exclusion of foreign vessels to bays from ten to six miles wide, are precluded from, in any case, seizing beyond three miles—and as British cruisers are now positively directed not to seize unless the offence is committed and the vessel actually seized within three miles of land—the reasonable presumption is that Her Majesty's cruisers are not intended to seize at all, under any circumstances; and if further proof were required than the text of the despatch referred to, the fact is easily verified on reference to the reports of the commander of Her Majesty's vessels on the station, who, though they repeatedly boarded vessels within the three-mile limit, and which had no license, there is no instance of a single seizure having been made.

"3rd. That Her Majesty's Government had narrowed the limit of exclusion from bays more than ten miles wide to bays under six miles in width, and had done this without the slightest reference to the Canadian Government, who are responsible to the people of the Dominion for the protection of their rights, and this fact was communicated to the American Secretary of State before Her Majesty's Government ascertained whether or not it was satisfactory to the Government of Canada."

"4th. That it does not appear from the said despatch that there was any special reason for deliberately limiting and restricting the rights of Her Britannic Majesty's subjects in British America, nor that the Government of Canada was consulted thereon, nor indeed does it seem to have ever been considered necessary in the changes that have been resolved upon during the current year."

"5th. 'That Her Majesty's Government states that they are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question 'which are Canadian waters?' or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within these waters, except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818.' Her Majesty's Government have virtually done this act already, which they profess to disavow. In 1854 we were in active possession of the three miles limit—of the bays 10 miles wide—of the headland line of coast in which our rights were reinforced and practically recognised,—and it appears much like 'prejudging the question,' and to the disadvantage of British subjects too—for Her Majesty's Government, pending the settlement of those questions, to waive for the time all but the first of the positions, and so far as the acts of her own cruisers and their instructions to them are concerned, probably even that also. It is practically abandoning to United States fishermen privileges which they had not by the Treaty of 1818, when we allow them to fish in the Bay of Chaleurs, and on all of the best and most valuable fishing grounds which we possessed within headland lines. No such privilege was conceded to them by the Treaty of 1818, nor were they permitted to enjoy them up to 1854, yet our exclusive rights in them are for the present suspended; and in the despatch which thus deprives us of those rights, we are informed that Her Majesty's Government are aware 'that no step should be taken which should prejudice the question.'

"The undersigned would further observe that Mr. Boutwell, the Secretary of the Treasury Department at Washington, in his circular to the United States Customs Officers, dated 16th of May last, acting on the concession of the three mile limit so recently made, also prejudices the question, inasmuch as he says 'that the authorities of the Dominion of Canada have terminated the system of granting fishing licenses to foreign vessels, under which they have heretofore been permitted to fish within the maritime jurisdiction of the said Dominion—that is to say, within three marine miles of the shores thereof.'

"Here is a clear attempt at limitation of our treaty rights of 1818, 'by which Americans renounced the right to fish not only within three miles of the coasts, but of the bays, creeks, or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions in America,' while Mr. Boutwell's circular ignores that portion of the right which gives us jurisdiction over bays, creeks, or harbors and states our jurisdiction to be only three miles from the shore.

"6. 'The despatch further remarks, that they (Her Majesty's Government) do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of

this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute, so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries.'

"In this paragraph there are two probabilities referred to—

"1st. The probability of an arrangement (trade arrangement it is presumed) with the United States;

"2nd. The probability of the limits being fixed by arbitration or otherwise.

"In reference to the first of these it would have been much more satisfactory to the Government of Canada if the ground upon which Her Majesty's Government have founded the hope thus expressed, had been stated. Such hope, entertained by Her Majesty's Ministers, has been held since 1865; it was entertained by Her Majesty's Government when Lord Clarendon wrote the despatch of 1866, which so ably indicated the position of British subjects in relation to these fisheries. Mr. Cardwell expressed a confident belief upon this subject when he induced Canada to adopt his licensing system as a measure of expediency for one year. His Grace of Buckingham and Chandos entertained the same hope, and now My Lord Granville, though five years have elapsed since notice of abolition, does not seem yet to have abandoned the 'hope that some arrangements may be secured.'

"The Canadian Government regret that they cannot see either in the past, or in the immediate future, the same ground for believing that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at. On the contrary, the chances of a satisfactory arrangement are not so good as they seemed in 1866 and 1867, and that, so far from there being anything in the course taken by the United States to warrant the expectation of a fair trade policy being adopted by them, everything indicates the contrary result, and nothing tends more to encourage them in such a course than the spirit of concession towards them, which has characterised the fishery policy of the last five years. In 1866 they, after a year's notice, voluntarily abandoned the Reciprocity Treaty, notwithstanding our efforts, in the fall of 1865, to prevent that result. The licensing arrangement pressed upon us in the interests of Her Majesty's Government, and because of their hope of a trade arrangement gave to foreigners the principal thing that they cared for, which we had to give. By the liberal policy of England, they had already practically the free admission to our coasting trade, as between Province and Province—the privilege of navigating our rivers and canals—the advantages of registry for their shipping in our ports—almost everything in fact—that we had to give, that they desired except the enjoyment of our valuable fisheries, and this the despatch of My Lord Granville has practically permitted them the use of. How have our advances been met by the Americans in the last few years? The advantages which, through the liberal policy of the Empire, they have enjoyed in Canada have been responded to by almost prohibitory tariffs—their canals closed against us—their coasting trade confined to themselves, and their refusal to reciprocate the liberal policy of Britain in reference to the Registration of Shipping. 'Tis true that a resolution of Congress was passed in 1869 which induced many to believe that they had changed their policy, but this idea was much shaken after our experiences of that year. Canada soon discovered that the resolution referred to either meant nothing, or such terms as she could not accept. The utterances of Mr. Schenck, in referring to the resolution which induced the Government of Canada for a time to believe that a change of sentiment had been created in the public mind of the United States, are given in the *Congressional Globe* of the 3rd March, 1869.

"It states that Mr. Schenck was Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, a position analogous to that occupied by Mr. Morrill in the Conferences of 1866. In reply to a question put by Mr. Pike, when the resolution was reported to the House of Representatives, Mr. Schenck said: 'I do not believe we ought to enter into any relations of reciprocity with the British Provinces, either through negotiating with the Imperial Government of Great Britain or by direct treaty with the Provinces themselves, if that were possible. I believe the people of the British Provinces should be treated like all other foreigners, and made to pay the same duties on articles they export into our country that other foreigners are required to pay on similar articles.' He added: 'I am not authorised to speak for the rest of the members of the committee, but I am not aware of any difference of opinion between any of them and myself on that subject. But Mr. Schenck expressed himself in favor of commercial treaties 'in regard to the fisheries on the coasts of these Provinces, and in relation to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence River from its source to the sea.' In the course of this debate not a single member expressed himself in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. MITCHELL.

"Thus upon the *pro forma* submission of a resolution passed by Congress denying the right of the Executive Government of the United States to make treaties or conventions with foreign governments touching 'import duties,' the House assents to confining the scope of the resolution, although professing to renew negotiations regarding commercial intercourse,' to securing to Americans 'the rights claimed by them to the fisheries,' and 'in relation to the free navigation of St. Lawrence.' With a committee, through whose hands our proposition must be sifted, already committed to a circumscribed form of 'commercial intercourse' and avowedly hostile to any relations of reciprocity,—with a House of Representatives which (although supposed to contain some few members at least favorable to mutual trade relations somewhat less restrictive than they are) silently and safely 'recommends to the President' to negotiate for securing certain 'rights' claimed by the United States citizens,—and with an Executive which proclaims beforehand hostility to any reciprocal engagement,—what concessions can we hope to obtain as equivalents for the privileges we have to offer? Even these privileges of fishing and navigation which we might concede—in return for what?—must be first reduced, from an American point of view, to the extent of the 'rights' asserted in this resolution. With such enunciations before us, and the proceedings of the delegation at Washington, in 1866, still fresh in our memory, it is difficult to discover any ground for hoping that new trade arrangements can be secured on equitable terms, in pursuance of the resolution of Congress."

"But this matter may, for the present, be looked upon as finally postponed, from the official announcement of the President of the United States in his last inaugural message in the following words:—

"The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British Provinces on this continent, has not been favorably considered by the administration. The advantage of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer, except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections. No citizen of the United States would be benefited by the reciprocity. Our internal taxation would prove a protection to the British producer, almost equal to the protection which our manufacturers now receive from the tariff. Some arrangements, however, for the regulation of commercial intercourse between the United States and the Dominion of Canada may be desirable."

"On the face of such authority to the contrary, and in the absence of the grounds on which My Lord Granville rests his hopes of an arrangement, the undersigned cannot participate in the belief that the United States are prepared to offer any terms that Canada will accept. It is true, that the United States intimated a desire to admit coal, salt, lumber, and fish free of duty, provided we would do the same, and give them, besides, the free use of our fisheries, our River St. Lawrence, and our canals, and also consent to deepen the latter. Canada feels no imperative necessity, as she certainly has no desire, to enter into any such one-sided arrangement. When we do make an arrangement it must be on equal and fair terms, or it will not be made at all, and must be such an one as obtains for our people the same rights and reciprocity in trade, registry of shipping, and coasting that the Americans now have from us, and in the meantime, until public opinion so changes in America, as to bring about these results, Canada can afford to wait."

"This Government, prior to the meeting of the last Parliament, ceased to entertain the hopes expressed by My Lord Granville, and felt it to be their duty to deal with the great resources of this country quite irrespective of what might or might not be hoped for from the United States. This was clearly indicated in a report of the undersigned of the 11th December last, approved by Council in dealing with a despatch of My Lord Granville, covering two memoranda from the Board of Trade upon the subject of the colonial coasting trade, in which, while regretting the necessity of declining to act upon the suggestions of Her Majesty's Government by throwing open our coasting trade to the United States as Great Britain had done, while they continued to close theirs against us, the subject was there entered into at length, and a policy outlined which has met with the approval of Parliament and the public sentiment of this country."

"The following is an extract from such report:

"The Board of Trade in their memorandum state that it is to be hoped that the Legislature and Governments of the colonies will be disposed to co-operate with Her Majesty's Government in their attempt to secure the benefits of free navigation and cheap freights for Her Majesty's subjects, throughout the British Empire, and to strengthen their hands in their efforts to obtain from

foreign countries for the shipping of the United Kingdom and of the British colonies a reciprocal liberality of treatment."

"The undersigned is of opinion, as twenty years have now elapsed since the British Government extended to the shipping of the United States, in common with the shipping of all other foreign countries, the privilege of participating in their carrying trade throughout the British dominions on equal terms with British ships (with the exception of the local coasting trade in each colony), and as the recent Act first herein quoted has shifted the responsibility of legislating upon or dealing with the question of colonial coasting trade from the Imperial to the Colonial authorities, and as the liberal treatment of American shipping by the British Government has produced no corresponding reciprocity of sentiment on this subject on the part of the United States Government, that the time has arrived when it becomes our duty to define a policy which should be pursued towards our neighbors from the standpoint of Canadian interests, and which should apply, not alone to the coasting trade, but to all matters affecting navigation and the trade generally."

"The experience of the twenty years has, in the opinion of the undersigned, proved to the people of Canada, that concessions in matters of trade, navigation, and shipping, voluntarily conceded by us, have not been reciprocated in by the Government of the United States, and indeed, have not always been appreciated, nor the value of them realised."

"The United States Government put an end in 1865, after an existence of eleven years, to the Reciprocity Treaty, which was of such great value as well to them as to the several British American Provinces—they refused to renew or reconstruct it, except on terms which were not to be defended in the interests of our trade; and though the undersigned, in common with a considerable portion of the public of Canada, was led to believe from the utterances of their press and commercial centres of trade for the last two years, as well as the expressed opinions of some of their leading public men, that public sentiment was changing in favor of 'new arrangements,' whereby trade relations would be again re-established on principles of reciprocal free trade;—these expectations have been dispelled, and the existence of such opinions to any great extent in the Cabinet of the United States have been negated by the Message of the President, in which he distinctly states, 'that the renewal of the treaty with us has not been favorably considered by the Administration;' while he expresses a belief 'that the advantages of such a treaty are wholly in favor of the British Provinces, except possibly, a few engaged in the trade between the two sections,' he distinctly states that 'no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity,' and yet gives expression to the opinion that some arrangements for the regulation of commercial intercourse may be desirable,' and the recent action of Congress would tend to confirm the belief that no reciprocal arrangement of a satisfactory character can now be obtained."

"The undersigned would observe that there are numerous arguments which can be adduced from an American point of view in favor of the position assumed by their chief magistrate against the renewal of the treaty, and that while England has pursued a most liberal course towards foreign nations in relation to trade and navigation, and has offered the fullest opportunities for foreign competition, the argument which has done much to remove objections to such a policy in Canada, has been the belief, repeatedly expressed by English statesmen, that those foreign countries which enjoyed the benefits of that liberal policy, and that free trade would in time reciprocate; and such expectations have not been without their results in Europe. In America, however, no such results have followed the liberality of England, although a generation of our people have nearly passed away; and indeed national events have tended to make the adoption of such a policy on the part of the United States much more difficult, and while we go on making concessions, permitting them to have privileges, and giving them facilities which they decline to reciprocate, while in fact they possess the right of registry for their ships in our ports, and have practically enjoyed our coasting trade, and at the same time refused us similar privileges—while they have had the benefit of our canals and rivers, without corresponding concessions on their part—they have compelled our ships to pay a war tax of thirty cents gold per ton and other customs fees, without any such corresponding charges in our ports upon their ships (notwithstanding the 173rd section of the Imperial Act, 16 and 17 Victoria, cap. 107, to which I have referred in the Minute of Council annexed—we have not retaliated). Our fisheries, too, they have all opened to them on the most liberal terms, while British-caught fish is met with a duty which has closed their country as a market for our fishermen, and indeed they have

made their tariff in general almost prohibitory, and while their legislation tends towards exclusion, the construction they put upon their tariff laws, and their execution of them, bear most heavily upon our people. Under these circumstances, the undersigned regrets that he should, in viewing the past, arrive at conclusions different from those which seem to be entertained by the board of trade, viz., that a continuance of the policy of concession would, with that foreign nation in whose trade we are chiefly interested, lead to the result hoped for, and secure a 'reciprocal liberality of treatment'; and he thinks it would be unwise to force it on them unasked at the present time. He is of opinion that the true policy of the Canadian Government at present should be to retain all the privileges which it now possesses, until fresh negotiations take place for new trade relations between Canada and the United States, when the opening of the whole coasting trade of the Dominion to United States shipping can be included in any arrangements which may be made, if the Canadian Government should then be of opinion that it would be advisable and in the interests of Canada to do so.

"A copy of the report to Council made by the undersigned on the 2nd April, 1860, hereinbefore referred to, on the subject of tonnage duties and custom house fees, and other restrictions imposed on British vessels entering the ports of the United States, as compared with the charges and restrictions imposed on American vessels entering Canadian ports, and as to the advantages which American vessels have in the United States as compared with British vessels, is herewith attached, to which the undersigned begs to draw attention."

"The active protection of our fisheries was the first step in our National Policy—

Will the hon. gentleman observe that I initiated the National Policy, and I am sorry it has come to be a protective policy.

"—as viewed from a colonial standpoint—and has since been followed up by legislation which has imposed certain charges upon shipping and imposts upon articles of trade. It should, however, be clearly understood that these restrictions and charges we are prepared to remove whenever the United States are disposed to give us reciprocal treatment. Till then, the public sentiment of the country calls for vigorous action at the hands of the Canadian Government, and demands that this, the greatest and largest question of them all, and one which our neighbors most appreciate, shall be dealt with with spirit and vigor, and form part of an important National Policy—Council should, therefore, ask of Her Majesty's Government that which we feel confident the Empire will not refuse us, viz.: 'That our rights in the fisheries may be maintained and enforced as they were prior to 1854.'

"The second probability which I noticed, as referred to in the despatch of Lord Granville, viz., 'His hope that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise,' it would be pleasing to see realised in a satisfactory manner. If, however, this is to be attained, it will not be by pursuing the policy which has characterised the treatment of the fishery question on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

"In 1866, Canada reluctantly consented to the licensing policy for one year;—Nova Scotia was forced into it against her will, on the faith of what cannot be viewed otherwise than a condition or a pledge that it was only for one year; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island assented for the same reasons as Canada, and because she led the way in this policy.

"In 1867, the Council of Canada protested against its continuance, as it also did in 1868-69, when it further asked that the proposition so favorably entertained by Lord Clarendon, for a Joint Commission to settle the disputed points be again urged upon the consideration of the United States Government. To these propositions the Council have, as yet, received no reply, nor are they aware whether the proposals for a Joint Conference, have ever been communicated to the American Government, or, if so, with what result?

"The undersigned cannot but feel that this treatment of an important and vital question is not such as Canada had a right to expect, nor will its people be satisfied with such a result.

"As part of the Empire, Canada is entitled to demand that her rights should be preserved intact, and at least it cannot be considered that Council will have performed its duties if we silently permit ourselves to be divested of them by piecemeal, as is the case with our fishery interest; and the people consider that their valuable fisheries are a trust incident to Canada, and involve interests which Her Majesty holds for the benefit of her

Mr. MITCHELL.

loyal subjects, and which should not be abandoned nor their protection neglected.

The Government of Canada, therefore, now ask of Her Majesty's Ministers that they at once require of the United States the appointment of a Joint Commission, to settle the matters in dispute, and, in the meantime, that they should be requested to give such instructions to Her Britannic Majesty's officers on the North American stations as will secure:

"1st.—The exclusion of all foreigners from fishing within our bays, from which they are excluded by the Treaty of 1818, as interpreted by Her Majesty's Government.

"2nd.—The exclusion of all foreigners from fishing within the limits of three miles from headland to headland, according to the British interpretation of said treaty.

"3rd.—The exclusion of all foreign vessels from the use of the Gut of Canso.

"It is further advised that Her Majesty's Government be requested to make no concessions nor terms limiting the privileges to which we are entitled as British American subjects of Her Majesty, and more especially those which were secured to us by the Treaty of 1818, without first submitting them for the consideration of, and obtaining the approval of the Government of Canada thereto.

"The people of Canada have ever been loyal and true in their maintenance of the interests of the Empire, and feel deeply anything that would impair its material interests or create dissatisfaction amongst its population; and the undersigned cannot but express his convictions that the policy recently pursued in reference to the fishery question is not such as to meet the approbation of the people of Canada, and he would earnestly recommend that a strong remonstrance be submitted to Her Majesty's Government upon the subject.

"Respectfully submitted.

"P. MITCHELL,

"Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

"DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,

"OTTAWA, 4th July, 1870."

Now, Sir, in the record which I have read of concessions yielded year after year by Her Majesty's Government, I think my hon. friend will fail to perceive that any strong ground has been taken or any material support given, in the interest of Canada, such as he spoke of in his introductory remarks on Tuesday last. Sir, I think it is a record which is a discredit to Great Britain—to have the interests of a great colony, the greatest in the Empire, and one she is proud of, frittered away by piecemeal, as I have said. It is a record of concessions which have been made step by step without even consulting the people who are interested in them. I think the record of the last thirty years, at least the last twenty years, is a disgrace to the British Empire and the British Government. In saying what I do, I do not intend to cast any reflections on the action of my hon. friend and his colleagues at Washington. He has very patriotically and very magnanimously taken the blame for the shortcomings in this treaty on himself. It is natural for him to do that in such cases; but I know him too well, I know the facts too well, and I have had too much experience in dealing with the fisheries, not to know that what he did there he did under pressure. Although he spoke of the largest power in the world being behind him, as a matter of fact that power was not there. It was there in name, but not in power; and if there has been an act since the formation of this Dominion which has tended to loosen the bonds between Canada and the Empire, if there has been an act which will tend to produce dissatisfaction and to promote distrust in the British Empire with reference to the affairs of Canada, it is this last act of hers in abandoning us and taking away our fisheries, in the face of the fact, as I have shown from the despatches I have read, that she stood pledged to maintain the interests of Canada as they stood when they were suspended in 1854. When the treaty lapsed by the act of the United States, where was the British Government? Read Sir Edward Cardwell's, Lord Kimberley's and the Earl of Aberdeen's despatches.

The only man among the whole of them who has fairly stood by us was the Earl of Clarendon. Yet everyone of them, one after another, assured us that England intended to stand by us in maintaining the exclusive rights which the British Government claimed and enforced up to 1854; and, Sir, everyone of them save Lord Clarendon went back on his record, and left us to see our rights taken away from us by piecemeal. That is the position of the British Government for the last twenty years—and I speak of it with regret, for I have ever been as loyal a subject as any that stands in the Dominion of Canada. I have been loyal in fact, I have been more loyal in sentiment, but the sentiment is knocked out of me, and I fear that a great many others feel as I do; and when we see the interests of Canada frittered away as they have been in this case, I fear that any desire to create a more permanent loyalty will ooze out of us, and we will become a dissatisfied people. They talk about the federation of the Empire—the veriest rot that ever was spoken. What interest have we in common with the other side of the Atlantic? We owe to England our existence as a semi-nation, it is true; we owe to her our language and our laws, and we are proud of both; but while England has been one of the greatest colonising nations of the world, there is no nation has worse administered her colonies. Take the case of Cape Colony, a record of years of mismanagement, misrule and misgovernment, and what would Canada have been without the administrative powers of the Canadians themselves?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Without the rebellion?

Mr. MITCHELL. Look at the record in this case. I, who was intimately connected with the whole affair and felt deeply the necessity of standing up for our rights; I, who spent day after day, and week after week, pressing these claims on the British Government and keeping them up to the mark, found them always receding at the first opportunity—and now everything is gone. My hon. friend speaks of the advantages this treaty has given us; he speaks of the limit of space which is described by the points of the treaty; he speaks about the delimitations which are named in the treaty. Sir, let any man take up a map—and I regret that my hon. friend should have made the excuse he did about not producing a map—for it was his duty to produce one. His excuse is, that there is a provision made for the delimitation on the treaty. True, there is; that is the official delimitation. But it was the duty of the Cabinet to have prepared a map and to have it submitted to us, so that we could appreciate and understand these advantages my hon. friend has so eloquently described, but which I cannot see. I may tell my hon. friend that, looking to the contentions of Canada and England, as propounded in 1818, and maintained up to 1854, when they were suspended for twelve years under the treaty of Lord Elgin, after which they were urged to be enforced again and recognised by the British Government from that time out, until they were again suspended in 1871 by a new treaty. I say if a map based on those contentions, was taken from headland to headland, and those exclusive rights of the bays delineated upon it, this House would see what the difference is between the delimitation in that map and the concessions given up by the Americans. If I can understand the meaning of the statements in the pile of despatches which I have had to wade through in order to define and maintain the interests of Canada, I should say that the men who made them were bound in honor to have stood by Canada and enforced those rights. If they had done so, we would have stood to-day either with our headland system maintained—because all that was wanted was a little firmness some twenty years ago—we would not be in the position of having to beg for reciprocity. About the inshore fisheries, it was never disputed that we had an absolute right to them, and yet my

hon. friend comes here with his eloquent tongue and persuades us—he knows he can do anything in this country, for he can do what none of us can do, he can control the First Minister—he comes with his eloquent tongue and persuades us that in this delimitation, which the treaty provides for, we have obtained a great concession. Sir, we have abandoned everything, and while we have done that, my hon. friend has forgotten one thing. Did he know there were two ends to the shores of America on the Atlantic? Where is the provision in the treaty to give the Canadians the same rights in the Delaware and Chesapeake, in Boston Bay, and Narraganset, and Albermarle, and from the Cape of Florida past the mouth of the Mississippi? Do we find that the interpretation which they set upon the shores, bays, and coasts is the same as they ask us to set upon ours? Have they not rights which they claim from headland to headland, and which are enforced even among themselves? It is true it is the separate states own them there, but that does that alter the law or right on the question. Where has my hon. friend provided in the treaty that we should have the use of those bays to the south of where our boundary terminates? Let us have the same privileges in the American bays, straits, and headlands, that they demand in ours. There is no such provision in the treaty. Let a Canadian fishermen go down to Delaware and Boston or go down amongst their oyster bays and attempt to fish, and he will soon find himself in prison. Did my hon. friend forget all about that? I am sure not. But my hon. friend found himself there with instructions in Mr. Chamberlain's hands to make a treaty, and as to what that treaty was, neither Chamberlain nor the British Government cared, and the only man who did care was Sir Lionel Sackville West, but he had to obey his instructions as a servant of the Government. He was handicapped, weighed down and overborne by the influence of that greatest Empire of the world. I feel I have taken up too much of the time of the House to-night, but I felt it to be my duty, even at the risk of boring the House, to place upon record the history of this fishery question, not for the purpose of *éclat* to myself, but as a duty I owe the country, that we may be able to find in some available way the history of the iniquitous way in which the British Government has treated this colony of ours. I am as loyal a subject as any man, and I hope to remain so, but I will remind the House that the time is fast coming when, if the British Government continues to allow our interests to be frittered away in this way, she will find the colony itself frittered away before long. It is as well some plain speaking should be heard. I do not wish to be understood to express the opinion that I desire it. I should regret it notwithstanding this treatment, and I feel proud of belonging to a colony of England, but Canada cannot and will not always remain a colony. Children do not always remain in their father's house, and we are gradually growing into the position when the interests of Canada demand we should branch out for ourselves. I do not desire to see this, but a few more cases like this and I would not give much for the power of England in this colony of Canada. There are a great many points I wanted to talk upon, but I have taken up so much time in the proof of these matters that I think it would be trespassing too much on the time of the House for me to continue. I will, therefore, not take up the time of the House any longer in discussing this matter. I felt I had a duty to perform, and I only regret that I have performed it so inefficiently. Of course this treaty will pass; there is no doubt about that, but I disapprove of it entirely, as I think the Americans have got everything and we have got nothing. I speak with knowledge of the subject when I say that we have got nothing. The delimitations that are spoken of are simply allowing us to retain an infinitesimal part of what Britain has over and over again declared we

had an absolute right to, and has for forty years enforced before the treaty put them in abeyance. Our rights revived when that treaty ceased, and what did we find? We found that taken from us by the commission which sat under the authority of the British Crown. I regret very much that England should have so much humiliated herself before her children here, and it is a humiliation, and I regret that it should be done by a nation which professes to have kept faith, especially with her colonies. I regret that I have to speak as I am now speaking of England, but I say this as a duty to my country, as a duty to myself and as a duty to this House.

Mr. FOSTER. After the long discussion which we have had on this subject and the exhaustive and able speeches which have been made on this side of the House by the mover of the Bill and the Minister of Justice and other gentlemen who have spoken, I should not have considered it necessary to have said one word on this question had it not been that for two years past I have been charged, in my position as Minister of the Department of Marine, with the duty of carrying on the protective service and looking after the rights of Canada as far as her fisheries are concerned. Occupying that position, I feel that, before the debate closes, I will have to ask the indulgence of the House for a brief time while I make a few remarks. Certainly this debate has not lacked in variety. We have had all the phases of opinion expressed by the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I think an attentive observer of this debate must have been struck with three things in this particular. First, the large amount of effort which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have directed to make a case against the Government; second, the small amount of effort which has been directed towards the discussion of the treaty itself, which is at the present time before the House, and as to whether or not it would be better in the interests of Canada and in the interests of the Empire, that the treaty should be now adopted; and, in the third place, I must say that disingenuous arguments and assertions have been made with a view to discredit the Government and to discredit the treaty. We have had every phase of assertion and of argument, and all varieties of opinion. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said we would occupy a proud and happy position if we had given up this position and had made these concessions two years ago. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), declares in equally strong terms, that the Minister of Finance, who sat as commissioner at Washington, should have held on to all these matters and would have got further concessions if not now, at some future time. Some other hon. gentlemen have taken the Government to task because bait has been allowed to American fishermen under this treaty. Other hon. gentlemen have taken the opposite side in regard to that matter. So we have had almost as great a variety of opinions as there have been persons who have spoken, or have made their opinions known, outside or inside of this House. Without criticising the individual opinions of hon. members, if the House will kindly bear with me, I will state the positions which have been taken in the main against the Government. The first was that the Government wasted a valuable opportunity in delaying to take advantage of what they said was a favorable condition of public sentiment in the United States to make arrangements for the continuation of the treaty some two or three years before it was denounced. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was especially strong in his indictment of the Government on that question. In view of the facts of the case, I believe I can challenge the sentiment of the House and the country for the negative of that position. From 1878, when the Halifax Award was made public, until the time of the Fisheries Treaty, I contend that no

Mr. MITCHELL.

body of public opinion in the United States, either congressional opinion, executive opinion or other opinion in the United States of America, warranted the assumption that a proposition made to the United States Government for a continuation of the Washington Treaty would meet with a fair reception. Where did my hon. friend find that favorable sentiment in the opinion of that country during the period from 1877 to 1885? Where can he find any resolution of Congress or any public utterances of their public men, or any action of the Senate or of the House of Representatives in that direction? He cannot put his finger upon one prominent expression of opinion in the public press, or amongst the public men, or in the Congress or from the Executive of the United States, which favors the idea that there was a favorable opportunity for the continuation of the Washington Treaty, and the very first moment it was possible to give notice to terminate the Treaty of Washington, that very moment it was done by Congress, and on the 3rd March, 1883, that resolution passed unanimously. It had previously been brought before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and had passed unanimously. It had passed the Senate. It went to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives, and this is what they stated. Chairman W. Rice was instructed by the committee, and gave his reasons:

"So that the matter stands by itself, or else we enter upon another term, for which England may demand ample payment from the United States, according to the enormous and unjust award of the Halifax commission for privileges which nobody in the United States, who has investigated the subject, considers worth keeping. The Senate's Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously reported this resolution. It was adopted by the Senate without an objection; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, having fully examined the matter, unanimously instructed me to move the adoption of the resolution by the House, which I now do under that instruction. With this explanation, I trust that no objection will be made to the consideration of the resolution, which, I am very sure, I can satisfy everybody ought to be adopted to avoid liability to further payment of an extortionate sum to Great Britain for that which is not considered worth anything to us, by parties who are interested in the matter, and who have examined into it."

Well, Sir, the President's message came shortly after that, on the 4th December, 1883, that great message that my friend has characterised as being the outstretched hand, the message in which the President suggested that a commission should be appointed. What kind of a commission was that? It was not a mixed commission, it was not a joint commission; the President did not so propose. He says:

"That Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries, and the means of opening to our citizens, on just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

That was not a joint commission to which members were to be invited from the British Government, or from Canada as being represented upon it. It was simply a suggestion of the President that a commission of their own country, to enquire into their own rights, should be granted. That message was sent to Congress, Congress did not even notice the suggestion in the message. So far from there being a favorable opinion toward the continuation of that treaty, when it was brought to their attention by their executive head, Congress did not even give it the courtesy of a consideration. So, Sir, at the very earliest possible moment, the treaty was denounced, and denounced in the way I have stated. Where does my hon. friend find a favorable sentiment, with the executive opposed to it, with the House of Representatives and Senate opposed to the continuation of the treaty, with no public sentiment in the country, so far as expression went, in its favor, with the fishery interest strongly against it. My hon. friend would have had this Government, in the face of all that opposition, make a proposition for the continuation of a treaty which the whole people, through their Congress and their representatives, had denounced, and declared that the privileges contained in it were not worth having, and they did not want them. So, I think,

my friend's proposition, that the Government was guilty of delay, and lost the favorable opportunity for having arrangements made for the continuance of that treaty before it was denounced, falls to the ground, and I think this case in that respect is not proven. The next proposition that was taken by my hon. friend is this: That the policy of the Government was fickle and contradictory. He says, at one moment there was the giving away of the fisheries to the United States for six months; the next, there was a strong and almost tyrannical enforcement of protection in the jurisdiction of Canadian waters; then, again, there was a year of less strong enforcement, and afterwards the concession and giving away; and he tried to draw an inference from that, and asserted that the policy of the Government was a fickle and inconstant policy, and that it had no consistency in it. What is the test by which we are to judge of the policy of a Government, the policy of a party? It is two-fold. It is by the motive which underlies it, in the first place; and it is, secondly, by the methods by which that underlying principle is carried out. What was the policy of the Government with reference to the fisheries? Sir, the policy of the Government was to maintain the fisheries of Canada for the advantage of the people of Canada, by what was preferable, a mutual and amicable arrangement made between the two parties; or, failing in that, by a strict and prudent recognition of, and enforcement of, the rights of Canada in the premises. That, I think, may be stated as the policy of the Government, as the motive which underlaid the policy of the Government; and if that be taken as true, I hold that the policy of the Government was thoroughly consistent on that point. How were these fisheries to be maintained for the country? They were to be maintained, first, if possible, by having an amicable, mutual arrangement between the two countries interested, by which Canada's fisheries could inure to her own advantage and to the enjoyment of her own people. In order to obtain that, the Government of the country, at the first favorable opportunity, when there was a change of Administration, when the Administration that succeeded the Republican Administration showed that it was more favorable to open negotiations; and so the proposition was made and acceded to, that a period of six months should be given United States fishermen for the enjoyment of our fisheries, and that in return a commission should be recommended by the President to Congress. Was it not worth that trial? Was not the prospect of a commission, and the settlement of this question by a commission, in an amicable way, worth the while of holding out the olive branch, worth the while of holding out a friendly suggestion, that, instead of interrupting the operations of the fishermen in the middle of the season, thereby causing certain irritation, and perhaps putting off what was wished for by the whole country, a commission representing both countries should sit down together and come to a mutually amicable arrangement which should be for the advantage of both countries? I say it was worth the while to give that advantage, to make that proposition, for the sake of the prospective gain. Well, Sir, they enjoyed half a season's fishing, and the President, true to his promise, the Executive, true to their undertaking, sent down to Congress the suggestion for a commission, and the Congress went against that. The proposition was not acceded to; by a vote of 30 to 15 in the Senate, the proposition was negatived, and the Senate gave its voice that no commission should be appointed to settle this question. Now, then, my hon. friend says that the policy of this Government was fickle, because the Government changed from the proposition which they had made to allow free fishing in our waters for half a season, in order to gain thereby a commission to settle the question, because they changed that, and introduced a policy of a prudent but strict enforcement of the rights of Canada. What else could

be done, consistent with the underlying principle of Canada's rights, when the means at first adopted in order to bring about an amicable arrangement, had failed, and Congress and the Senate had stated that they were against a commission, that there was no prospect of an appointment at that time? Sir, it then became a duty to carry out the policy of the Government, to protect the fisheries of Canada, and to protect the rights of Canadians, so far as their territorial waters were concerned; and that policy was introduced. In the years 1886 and 1887, it was carried out, consistently carried out, and my hon. friend is quite wrong in stating that the policy was carried out differently in 1886 and 1887. The very same instructions that were sent out in 1886 were continued in 1887; the very same policy of protection, and the very same form of protection was carried out in all its important features. And it is not true to say that there was any important material change in carrying out the protective service with respect to the fisheries in 1886-87. Well, Sir, that had its effect. I believe that both the holding out of the offer of a proposition respecting the fisheries in 1865-86, and the prudent, strict enforcement of the rights of Canada in those years, both had their operation and their effect and both contributed towards the negotiation for the commission which was ultimately obtained towards the settlement which has resulted therefrom. I believe that both of those lines contribute to the success which has ultimately accrued. So much then for the fickleness and inconsistency of the policy. My hon. friend and others on that side of the House with him have said: Well, yes, your instruction and interpretation of that treaty was all right; we agree with it. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said: I have read over the minutes, the reports of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the report of the Minister of Justice, and I agree with everything that is contended for in those reports. He will correct me if I have misstated his position. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) took occasion in this House not many days ago to declare that he agreed with every word, with every contention embodied in those Minutes in Council. He will correct me if I have misstated his position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is correct so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so far as the interpretation and construction put upon the law and put upon what grows out of that, so far as the laws were concerned in those Minutes of Council, based on reports made by myself and the Minister of Justice, the hon. gentlemen as co-leaders of their party and as strong men in their party say: They agree with every word, with every construction, with every position taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. They agree with the construction. What was the construction? The construction was, in the first place, that the Treaty of 1818 was mutually binding. They agreed with that construction. In the second place, the contention was that we had a right to pass our own laws and to carry out the direction of our own tribunals with respect to them. They agreed with that. Again, the contention was made that we had a right to refuse commercial privileges to the United States fishing vessels. They agreed with that. Again the contention was that we had a right to refuse the purchase of bait by American fishing vessels. They agreed with that. Again our contention was that we had a right to construe and carry out our own customs laws with respect to foreign fishing vessels, United States or others. Those were the constructions, those were the contentions, and those hon. gentlemen say they agree with those contentions to the letter. Then why do they find fault with the Government? Is

the hon. gentleman in this position: that he ardently professes a creed but that he stolidly refuses to practice it, that he is most energetic in favor of a law, but is most stubbornly and absolutely against the enforcement of that law? If those contentions were correct, and if this Government carried out those contentions strictly, why do they find fault with the Government so far as that was concerned? They must admit so far as their agreement with all those contentions is concerned that the Government have strictly carried out those contentions, if they were sincere in their belief of those constructions and in those interpretations. Ah, yes, says my hon. friend, we would not object to your strictly carrying out those contentions, but we do object to the manner in which you did carry them out. That is the position which the hon. gentleman opposite has taken. That is to use his own language, that the manner in which those constructions and interpretations were carried out was tyrannous, harsh and cruel, and I do not know how many other adjectives the hon. gentleman used, but almost all that could be gathered from the dictionary. That is the objection, if there can be any objection, of my hon. friend. He stated that the manner in which they had been carried out was harsh, irritating, persecuting, that they showed the jingo spirit that they arose—he did not quite fully express it but he expressed it sufficiently to carry his meaning—that they arose from an idea that the Government were going to show the United States people what they could do, that they were going to use power upon them and that they were glad to have an opportunity of using power upon them. Now my hon. friend must be honest in his reasons, and he must show where he finds any proof of that desire. Does he find it in the spirit of the Government as shown in its action before the protective service was put on? Why, the Government had the right to have undertaken this system of restriction and protection on 1st July, 1885, in the very midst of the fishing season if they had chosen to do it, and if they had been filled with that spirit of jingoism that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), spoke of they would have jumped into the fray at once on 1st July, put on the protective force and come down into the ranks of the fishing vessels which were all about our coast. Instead of evincing such a spirit they made the proposition of which I have spoken, that they would not pursue this irritating course, but for that reason they would allow them to fish on our coasts and would try to come to a mutual arrangement with respect to the fishermen. Is it shown in the instructions which were issued to the officers of our protecting cruisers? No. If you will look at those instructions you will find they have been framed in a spirit the very reverse of that. First, with regard to the Magdalen Islands it is stated in those instructions that—

"Although the liberty to land, to dry and cure fish there is not expressly given by the terms of the convention to United States fishermen, it is not at present intended to exclude them from those islands."

With respect to operations upon coasts that are unsettled or partially settled it is stated:

"It is not desired that you should put a narrow construction on the term 'unsettled.' The general conciliatory spirit in which it is desirable that you should carry out these instructions, and the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the rights of exclusion should not be strained, must influence you in making as fair and liberal an application of the term as shall be consistent with the just claims of all parties."

Then further there is a direct caution given to them not to exceed the limit of their power and not to go too far even in taking a technical advantage of United States vessels which may have got within the three-mile limit from unavoidable circumstances, such as storms or accidents. And the instructions close with these words:

"It cannot be too strongly urged upon you nor can you too earnestly impress upon the officers and crew under your command that the service in which you and they are engaged should be performed with forbearance
Mr. FOSTER.

and discrimination. The Government relies on your prudence, discretion and firmness in the performance of the special duties entrusted to you."

There is no jingo spirit shown in those instructions, there is no undue irritating spirit shown in those instructions. If my hon. friend will take up the instructions which are issued in the second year he will find that they are still further broadened and made more liberal, and beside liberal provisions having been made for the reporting of vessels to the captains of those cruisers who are on the grounds in their ports, there were direct and positive instructions issued that in all cases they were to extend all possible courtesies with reference to United States fishermen. The second instruction ends with the words:

"The Government rely upon your judgment actuated with a spirit of forbearance to undertake the delicate and important duties with which you are entrusted."

Now, Sir, there is nothing of that sort shown in the instructions which were issued, neither, Sir, was there anything of that kind shown in the way in which our cruisers and their captains acted under the instructions that the Government gave them with reference to United States fishing vessels. It has been stated by men in this Parliament; it has been stated by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite; it has been thrown broadcast through the United States press that no courtesy and no leniency was shown to United States fishermen, but that every pretext was taken advantage of in order to harass and provoke them. I hold in my hand a list, and not by any means a complete list, of the courtesies that were shown and of the mild and generous treatment which was accorded to United States fishing vessels for all infractions of the rules which were not considered to be important infractions. The *Joseph Storey*, a vessel that was detained in the very first of the protection service, had bought supplies and did not report to the customs. When the report was made to the Minister of Marine, it being her first offence, she was ordered to be at once released, with a warning. The Government had just the same right to take that vessel, under the custom laws, as they had to take any other vessel that violated those laws. But there was a different course pursued in reference to them. The schooner *Hereford* was detained for shipping a man, and was released immediately with a warning. The *Boyton* was allowed to land an injured man from her vessel for medical attention. The *Fanny Starling* was allowed to purchase provisions for her homeward voyage. The *French* was allowed to ship a crew to take the vessel home when he discharged her own crew, and was detained for repairs quite a long time. The *French* and *Argonaut* were seized within the three-mile limit and their crews allowed to be shipped home in United States fishing vessels. Technically we could have insisted that they should not have this privilege, but we gave the privilege and gave it heartily. The schooner *Perkins* had shipped a man illegally and was detained, but she was released after discharging the man. The schooner *Gracey* was allowed to ship men to take the vessel home. The schooner *Perkins* was extended the same courtesy. The schooner *Pendragon* whose crew had sickness on board, was, under medical advice, allowed to purchase fresh provisions and meats of all kinds just as long as the doctor gave a certificate that it was necessary for the health of the crew. The schooner *J. W. Day* was allowed to ship men to replace those who were taken ill. The schooners *Mary Steele* and *John S. Quinn* were allowed to buy provisions for the homeward voyage. The schooner *Oscar Hatton* was allowed to take a new set of sails, as her own through disaster had become useless, and the vessel, in consequence, was rendered partly unmanageable. The *N. H. Fry*, the *Senator Fry*, the *Rice*, and other vessels were allowed to purchase provisions and take them on their homeward voyage, their own provisions having been casually exhausted. The collector at North

Sydney gives a list of a large number of vessels to whom he allowed such courtesies, and besides that, vessels which met with disaster at sea and had been driven in by heavy storms and which were obliged to put in the slip for repairs, were allowed to sell the fresh fish which they had on board, which would otherwise have spoiled and put the parties concerned to loss and inconvenience. These, Sir, are a few of the courtesies among the many that, in 1886 and 1887, were freely given to United States fishermen, and given with the best of spirit. This, I think, is enough, strong enough, and ample enough to disprove the assertion that there was a spirit of malice and a spirit of desire to irritate and provoke which actuated the carrying out of this service. Let me go one step further. I can give an answer, and I think a sufficient reason, to the charge that 1886 and 1887 the protection service was carried out in a spirit of undue interference with the rights and privileges of United States fishermen. We must recollect that that service was new in 1886, and that new men undertook it. Of all that had been connected with our previous protection service, only Captain Scott was concerned in the protection service of 1886 and 1887. The captains of our vessels were new men, the service was new and we must recollect as well that in that first year, 1886, United States fishermen came down upon our coasts in very different spirit to what they came in 1887. They came not knowing exactly what treatment they were to receive, or what rights they were to have or what privileges they were to claim in our waters. They came down from Gloucester and other fishing towns where there was an idea that they would not be treated in the same strict way that they had in 1870 and 1871. Their own papers had favored the idea that commercial privileges would now be granted and that "touch" and "trade" permits would carry them into all the ports of Canada and carry them safely through. So with all those things was it to be wondered at that collisions had taken place? Was it to be wondered at that interference, lawful and proper interference, had to be taken with reference to those vessels? The wonder is, and the only wonder, that under such circumstances the protection service could have been carried on for those two years without more causes having occurred of interference and undue interference than did actually occur. The captains of the fishery protection vessels boarded in 1886 780 vessels and in 1887 1,362 vessels.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says "hear, hear"; let me draw his attention—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me ask the hon. gentleman whether they were boarded in the harbors or outside?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend a year ago, I think, tried to make a strong point in this House because our fishery protection vessels did not overhaul and board them outside of the three-mile limit, where they had no right to overhaul them. We are under no right to overhaul them or board them there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will bear with me, I am sure. I did not intend to make a point that they did not board them outside the three-mile limit, but that they confined their boarding to the vessels while they were lying at anchor, and did not attempt to board them while they were within the three-mile limit but outside of the harbor.

Mr. FOSTER. There again my hon. friend is wrong. The fishery protection vessels board the vessels inside the three-mile limit wherever they think it necessary to do it, and they board them outside the harbor as well as inside the harbor; but my hon. friend knows well enough that in one port, for instance, in the port of Souris, a fishing fleet

of sometimes 200 vessels will lie at anchor at night, and the cruiser is there with them, and goes out with them in the morning to cruise about them during the day and to watch that foreign vessels do not come within the three-mile limit. If they do, the cruiser has a right to overhaul and seize them. The boarding takes place wherever it is necessary, and the captain of the cruiser is the judge as to where it is necessary. Well, Sir, as I was stating, 1,362 vessels were boarded in 1887, and 700 in 1886; and of all the vessels that were boarded in those two years only 30 cases have been brought to the attention of this Government by the Executive of the United States, and it is certain that everyone who had a fairly grounded complaint made that complaint to the Secretary of State for the United States and that the complaint was investigated and forwarded to the Canadian Government through the British Government. But thirty-two cases in all of United States vessels were dealt with by the Dominion of Canada in those two years. Now, Sir, will you listen to me for a moment, while I detail the circumstances of these thirty-two cases, to see whether or not the statement is borne out that undue interference, arbitrary, harsh, unwarranted interference, has taken place with respect to those vessels? The complaint with reference to five of them was that they were refused commercial privileges. Will my hon. friend say that that was harsh treatment, to refuse a United States vessel commercial privileges in our ports? That is the contention to which he gave his adhesion; consequently, the carrying out of that contention is no grievance to a United States vessel, and no evidence of harsh treatment on the part of this Government. As to four of those vessels, the complaint was that they were warned off a head line. When the complaint was investigated the collector of Customs charged with having given the warning denied that he had given any other warning to them than to hand them the printed warning issued from the Department. With reference to three of them, he said they had not been in the port, as was alleged in the grievance. There was no hardship. One was refused the purchase of bait or to ship men. That was no grievance; it was within our right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that because it is within his right to refuse to let a vessel ship men, therefore it ought not to be allowed to ship men? Is that his contention?

Mr. FOSTER. It is my hon. friend's contention, if consistent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he not give his adhesion to this contention, that we had a right to refuse the purchase of provisions, the shipment of men and the purchase of bait?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to say that I have not spoken on this question, and I have never pretended to give my adhesion to anything. I have neither spoken for nor against the policy of the Government. I have spoke of the legal contention, nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman approve of the legal contention made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that Canada under the Treaty of 1818 had a right to refuse commercial privileges to United States vessels?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Had the power to exclude—certainly I said so. How far should we act on the right or the power is a different question, and that question I propose to discuss when the hon. gentleman gets through.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, then, is exactly in the position of a gentleman who is in favor of the law, but against its enforcement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has under-

taken to defend the Government by saying that they did protect their rights in four cases. Now, he mentions a case of one sort, and he says the Government acted properly because they did not allow those parties to ship men. Surely the hon. gentleman must see how he is himself arguing on both sides of the policy, although he is on one side of the law.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite wrong. He has probably misunderstood me. I mentioned the cases of four vessels with reference to which the complaint had been made that they had been warned off a head line which extended from point to point some forty or fifty miles, and I simply stated that the collector denied that he had warned them off from that extended head line, or had given any warning to them except simply to do, as his duty was, to give them the printed warning sent him by the department. I did not argue on both sides as to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but that is not the case to which I referred. I referred to the case of the shipment of men, obtaining supplies and making repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated the facts with reference to both of those cases. In the case of one vessel, the grievance was that she was warned off from fishing in the Bay of Chaleurs. In the case of another, the *Marion Grimes*, the complaint was with regard to interference with her flag, and the fishery correspondence will show that the regrets of the Government were immediately sent—not that there was a technical wrong, but it was thought that such action on the part of the captains of the cruisers should not be countenanced. One vessel had some trouble about the salvage of a seine that gave rise to a complaint and a very strong remonstrance from the Secretary of State; but after having received the answer of the Canadian Government, the Secretary of State wrote to the gentleman who made the complaint, to say that from the evidence which was given, it was clear that his case was not one relating to the fisheries or international rights, but that it was simply a case of salvage, and he could get his seine by complying with the laws of Canada with reference thereto. Another case was on alleged refusal to grant the sale of provisions for the homeward voyage. When this came to be investigated, it was found that the statement was untrue. One was for illegal fishing, and the vessel was forfeited. Another was for buying bait. Six were for minor violations of customs regulations where no penalty was mentioned and the vessels were discharged with a warning. Nine cases were for violations in customs laws and for smuggling and the like, in which penalties were imposed, and a part of the penalties were afterwards remitted. That makes up the whole list, and after careful investigation of these cases, I think they fairly disprove the assertion that there has been unnecessary harshness, undue influence, or any desire to stretch the authority of the Government with the view of irritating the United States fishermen or people. I wish to call the attention of the House to two facts. One is that the Government of Great Britain, which has been described to-night as sensitive on that question, has renewed all the correspondence and reports with reference to these cases, and in no single instance has the Government of Great Britain found fault with the action of the Dominion Government. Further, and this is also important, these grievances were forwarded by the Secretary of State for the United States to the Dominion Government, and the report as to the facts after investigation was sent back, and in only one instance was there an attempt made to refute the facts. In only one instance was there any further correspondence had as to the facts of a case reported upon to the United States by the Dominion Government. It cannot be said that in the course of the two years during which this protection service has been in operation, any man was

Mr. FOSTER.

deprived of his liberty or that any strong or undue interference took place with reference to the subjects of the United States. Taking the whole history, as given in the fishery reports which are before Parliament, and in this additional information which I have been glad to give to-night, I think it is fairly well known that there was no desire shown by the Government to unduly interfere with American fishermen in any spirit of retaliation, but that, on the contrary, in the carrying out of the protection service for the two years, a wise, prudent and generous policy on the part of this Government was carried out. I wish briefly to deal with the oft-repeated assertion that this treaty is a complete surrender. Nearly every hon. gentleman, who has spoken on the opposite side, has said that the United States have obtained everything they asked for, and that the concessions have been entirely on our side. The record, I maintain, entirely disproves that assertion. What were the contentions of the United States? First, with reference to the headland limit, the American contention from the earliest date of this controversy down to the present time, notwithstanding the iron exception of Mr. Webster as Secretary of State, which was a qualified exception, I maintain has been always for a restricted interpretation of the headland question. They have almost uniformly contended that their vessels should approach to within three miles of the shores, and as to the bays their limit was not more than six miles wide. The proposition, one of the very latest propositions made by the Secretary of State for the United States in 1837, was that the extreme limit should be three miles from the shore and ten miles as regards bays. That is the contention of the United States, as laid down in the fishery correspondence, and embodied in the proposal for a commission to settle this question, which was made by Mr. Secretary Bayard. The contention of Canada was, in its broader terms, that the line should be drawn from headland to headland, and that it should be three miles from the shore in other respects. Well, a commission was held to settle the difficulty. It has been stated that the Government opposed very strongly a settlement on the ten mile bay limit when it was proposed to them. They did oppose it, because, as they stated, if that were carried out, it would take out of the jurisdiction of Canada, bays such as the Bay of Chaleurs, which are peculiarly Canadian bays, and which ought not to be opened to the United States fishermen. Neither side has had its extreme contention, so far as the headlands line is concerned, agreed to. Both have made concessions, but notwithstanding the strong remarks made by my hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Mitchell), I hold that you may take the map of Canada, you may take your compasses and you may take in the extreme western point of the Bay of Fundy and go around the whole coast until you come to the coast of Labrador, and you will find that Canada's construction has not been so very far departed from. You will find, notwithstanding the statements that have been made, that Canada's concessions have not in any very important and essential particular taken away from her the fishery privileges and the rights she practically enjoyed during the series of years that have passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nine-tenths of the water area for which she contended has been given up, and nineteen-twentieths on the coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a point on which my hon. friend and myself cannot agree.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am perfectly willing to accept the measure of any competent surveyor who will undertake to compare the two lines.

Mr. FOSTER. And we will abide by that measurement, if you get a competent man to make it. With reference to the bait question, the statement is that Canada has given

up everything to the United States. You will find throughout the whole correspondence, the contention was made by the Americans that their fishing vessels should have the right to buy bait, and that they also claimed the right of transshipment, and backed that claim up by the very strongest arguments. On the other hand, the Canadian contention was that, under the Treaty of 1818, transshipment could not be allowed. Let my hon. friend read the treaty, and he will find whose contention has been in the main carried out. In reference to that it was the declared contention in the United States that the penalties were excessive. These have been moderated to a certain extent, and that is a concession to the United States, so far as that goes. On the other hand, the penalties that have been retained are sufficient for the purpose. With reference to the customs laws, the Americans claimed that when their vessels entered our ports for any of the four purposes mentioned, they should not, no matter how long they staid, be subject to our customs laws. Canada contended that they should, and in that respect there has been a concession on both sides. But the large concession has not been on the part of Canada. Commercial privileges were claimed by the United States in their papers and despatches, and their arguments all went to show that they had their right now, under the changed order of things brought about by widened commercial relations, to commercial privileges in our ports for their fishing vessels without touch and trade permits. That is a contention which was directly adverse to the Canadian contention. Will my hon. friend find out which contention has been given up in respect of that? With reference to the harbor dues and other dues, the United States contention was that their vessels should not pay them. It was the contention of Canada that she had a perfect right to demand payment, and payment has been made. These dues have been given up. That is a concession by Canada, but the harbor regulations have been kept, and that is a concession to the principle that those laws hold good. So, if you take these different controverted points and look at the contentions of Canada and the contentions of the United States, and read the treaty fairly and candidly, you will find that the treaty itself is a record of mutual concessions and that it is far away from the truth to say that the United States have had all their demands granted and that the concessions have been altogether on the part of the Dominion of Canada. At this late stage of the debate, I do not intend to take up the time of the House much longer. I was anxious to make this simple statement with reference to the carrying out of the protective service, and there were one or two points in reference to the treaty in regard to which I thought some misapprehensions should be corrected. I do not think it is worth while to seriously attempt to controvert the positions taken by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) with reference to the interpretations of articles 10 and 11 of the treaty as it stands. The wording is plain. It does not seem that a fair and candid reading of it can lead to any other conclusion than what is stated by the words themselves as to what is meant and what will be carried out if the treaty comes into force. In the first place, the validity of the harbor regulations is affirmed. United States vessels, putting in for shelter or repairs, are not required to report if they remain only twenty-four hours, provided they do not communicate with the shore, but, if they remain more than twenty-four hours, or if they communicate with the shore, they are to report to the customs, and at any rate they are under customs supervision. That is far wide from the statement of the hon. gentleman that the customs laws are given away entirely, and that we have no customs supervision over United States vessels. My hon. friend tried to make a strong point in regard to these vessels being allowed to come in for supplies, and he said that

would practically open the three-mile limit inshore to these vessels, and would practically give them the fishing inshore. I noticed that that statement was applauded by many hon. gentlemen on the other side, but would that be a whit worse than the condition of affairs at present? My hon. friend said that, if a cruiser overhauled a vessel, she would say she was going in for supplies, and under that excuse the three miles would be in reality opened up to the unrestricted use of United States vessels. Why, to-day United States vessels have a perfect right to go into our ports for wood, water, shelter or repairs; and what is there to prevent a United States fishing vessel doing the same thing? If a cruiser overhauls her, she may say: I am going in for wood or for water or for repairs. The same excuse exists to-day as would exist under this treaty, and, if it were possible now to protect the inshore waters, it is equally possible to protect them under this treaty. Another hon. gentleman was exercised because, under this treaty, the price of bait would be raised to the deep sea fishermen, and yet he stated directly afterwards that what was especially needed was a free market for our productions in the United States. Well, for free fish in the United States markets, as it was under the Treaty of Washington, it is plain that we must give as a compensation the right to buy bait. The hon. gentleman finds fault with this because it gives the right to buy bait by giving a fee and so enhances the price of bait to the deep-sea fishermen, and yet he is in favor of a treaty which would open the markets to these fishermen in the United States, when the same effect would be found, to make bait dearer in the same way. The *modus vivendi* would go out of force the moment the privilege of free fish is given, and it is the same in regard to the price of bait. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have made a great deal of the inconsistencies of the Government and the inconsistencies of the positions which have been taken. I think it comes with a rather poor grace from gentlemen on the opposite side to speak of inconsistencies with reference to this fishery question. When in 1871, the Washington Treaty was brought about and was before this House for ratification, gentlemen on the other side opposed that treaty by might and main. They were especially opposed to that treaty because it proposed for a money consideration, to give the use of our fisheries to the Americans. They said it was selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. Yet, in 1877, when the arbitration was held at Halifax, they plumed themselves, when the award was made, on having gained that award themselves, and from that time to this they have not ceased to make out of it something that they should gain credit for. They have attacked the Government for taking the first opportunity which was given them to secure a commission. They have then attacked the Government equally for enforcing the laws, when they failed to get the commission which was at first proposed. Sometimes it seems to be a wonder, in view of all the statements that we have heard from the other side, that we should have been able to get a treaty at all; and it is still more a wonder that the commission should have been able to obtain the treaty which it framed. The difficulties which were created, so far as the Opposition were concerned, were not favorable conditions in the United States towards the consummation of a treaty. For some years back the people of the United States have been sedulously creating the feeling that harshness has been used by us in the treatment of their vessels, and a great deal of the feeling in the United States of unnecessary harshness on the part of Canada has taken its rise from utterances which have been made in Canada itself, in the newspapers of Canada, which have gone to the United States, and their statements have been accepted as authoritative statements as to the position of Canada in this regard. They have sedulously created the opinion in the United

States that Great Britain would not back up the contentions of Canada, and so have striven to weaken us in what should be, and is really, the strongest point in Canada's claim for getting a treaty with the United States in reference to this matter. They have given currency to the idea that Canada is falling to pieces, that she is disintegrating, that the different parts are separating from each other, and that in time it will fall to pieces, and then it will become gradually a part of the United States. The idea that there was no future for Canada in herself, but that annexation or absorption by the United States was her ultimate destiny—that sentiment has been created and has been spread in the United States, from the utterances of men in the Opposition, and papers in the Opposition, and that has been a very great difficulty in the way of the proper sentiment, on the other side, for granting us the advantages of a treaty. It has been stated here to-night that Canada has been deserted by the British Government, that Great Britain is but a name behind her; and my hon. friend, in solemn tones and sad, gave voice to his opinion that Canada need no longer look to Great Britain for support and for aid with reference to this great question, but that Great Britain had so acted in this matter as to put the finishing blow to his loyalty to the mother country, and that in the future, he would owe little of that spirit to the mother country. Sir, the only sentiment which was strongly applauded in the speech of the hon. gentleman, was that sentiment he uttered with reference to Great Britain, and with reference to the oozing out of his loyalty to Great Britain. I do not wish to stand here, as a Canadian citizen, as well as one who knows something of Great Britain's course with reference to this fishery matter during the two years that have passed—I do not wish to stand here and let that assertion pass without giving it, so far as I am concerned, my denial. I say that Great Britain has stood well by us in these two years that have just passed; I say that every contention that has been put forth has been backed by the Government of Great Britain, and that in all respects she has fairly, and consistently, and continuously given force to our contentions, and has stood at the back of Canada in this matter. Sir, an attempt was made to make it appear that Mr. Chamberlain was not the proper person to be entrusted with the commission, and his commission had not been made public a day before influential journals in this country and influential men in this country, set themselves to work to undermine his influence with the people of the United States, and to raise prejudices there against him. That did not look very much like aiding towards the settlement of this question. The attempt to arouse prejudice against Mr. Chamberlain, to arouse race prejudice against him in the United States, in order that his mission might be defeated, was an attempt which will not bear scrutiny, and which will not gain the approval of fair and candid men in this country, or in any other country. Sir, I do not think so of the people of the United States, I do not think so of the Irish people, either, who are a generous people, whose impulses are generous. Whatever love they may have for their own island, whatever desire they may have to see her gain privileges and advantages that they think she has not now, I do not think that Irishmen are made of that kind of material that they would try to break down the influence of Mr. Chamberlain, or to oppose the settlement of a question with which he was entrusted, simply because they and he did not agree with reference to Irish matters, and the policy that should be pursued by Great Britain with reference to Irish affairs. I believe, Sir, and I take pleasure in stating here what my hon. friend has so well said with much greater authority, that Mr. Chamberlain did his duty nobly and well, so far as Canada was concerned in this matter, that he stood by her contentions, that he loyally supported them, and that, though he started out for the purpose of getting a treaty,

Mr. FOSTER.

he would not have started excepted for that purpose; he started, I believe, with the firm purpose of getting such a treaty as would be honorable to both countries, and as would be fair to the rights of Canada as the party greatly interested in the settlement of the question. Now, what will hon. gentlemen opposite do with reference to this treaty? All through the country their papers have denounced this treaty in the strongest terms. Sir, the head lines that have been printed with reference to this treaty ought to be preserved. "Canada lies a-bleeding," says the *Mail*.

Mr. MITCHELL. And truly, too.

Mr. FOSTER. "A complete surrender," says the *Globe*; "Secretary Bayard's victory," says the *Mail*; "A complete give away," says the *Halifax Chronicle*; "Canada betrayed," says the *Ottawa Free Press*; "So far as the United States are concerned, they have got everything they ever contended for," the Hon. Peter Mitchell; "The great Tupperian surrender," *Halifax Recorder*; "A base, beggarly blundering surrender," Attorney General Longley. These are some of the statements made by the party opposite outside.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to use my name in connection with this?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did Peter Mitchell say?

Mr. FOSTER. "So far as the United States are concerned, they have got everything they ever contended for."

Mr. MITCHELL. So I say now.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I did not misrepresent the hon. gentleman. This is what they have said outside, and we who have listened to those speeches inside, have heard every hon. gentleman who has spoken in opposition intimate, if they did not use the words, that it was a "base and beggarly surrender," that it was a "complete give away," that it would be completely injurious to the fisheries interests of this country; and yet, with all these strong assertions outside, and with all these strong assertions inside, to back him up, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), after framing this indictment, and declaring that it was disgraceful to Canada and injurious to her interest, declared in the same breath that he did not intend to oppose the treaty. What will hon. gentlemen do? Are they honest in what they are saying? Are these head lines candid? Are they carrying out the real feelings of their hearts, or is it simply a something that they are putting before the people for party purposes which they do not sufficiently believe in to back up by their votes in the House? Now, Sir, in closing, I have just this to say in reference to the treaty. Everyone knows the length of time that this controversy has existed; everybody who has read the history of this question knows the difficulty which has surrounded it, the irritation which has been provoked. Sir, I believe that the Dominion of Canada, in its large and broad heart, from end to end, will be in favor of this treaty, not because it holds every contention that Canada has made, not because it carried out everything that Canada could wish had been carried out, but because it is, as stated by the President and Secretary of the United States, a fair and honorable arrangement on both sides, in which neither country gets the full of its contention, but in which neither country suffered great injury by the concessions that have been made. Taking into account the future of Canada, her future interests as well as her present interests, taking into account the fact that we are to live beside a great and powerful neighbor, that we form part of a great and powerful empire, and that we have conserved our interests to a very large degree, and that there is a prospect for the future of a permanent settlement of this question, I believe that the great heart

of Canada, notwithstanding the head lines and the strong assertions, will beat with this one sentiment, that after all this long controversy of year upon year, it is a happy, a fair, a good settlement, one that has been made in the interests of peace and in the interests of the two great countries which ought to live beside each other in amity and good feeling. Sir, the executives of the four countries of Newfoundland, Canada, Great Britain and the United States have brought this question from its tumultuous condition, have taken it out of the arena where it has been discussed as an irritating question for seventy years, and they have come to a final and permanent solution, so far as they are concerned. They say that this arrangement is fair to all parties concerned, and they relegate it now to the Parliaments and Congresses of the great nations. Notwithstanding all that may be said for party purposes and all that may be argued for interested purposes, I believe that if the voice of the country could penetrate to the halls of all those Parliaments and Congresses and have its way, that it would result in an approbation of this treaty and of this instrument as a conclusion, final, honorable and on the whole advantageous to all parties concerned. It is in that view that I support the treaty, and it is with those feelings that I hope the treaty will be finally ratified by all the powers concerned and will put an end to a vexed and troublesome question in what I consider a truly honorable and happy way.

Mr. KIRK. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. On this motion I desire to offer a few observations in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I certainly did not expect from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the remarks which he has made about myself. He has chosen to drag my name into this debate in a way which I think is quite unwarranted. I think the course I adopted in this debate was one of forbearance, and I refrained from speaking of the hon. gentleman's conduct, not referring to it throughout my speech except in one instance in regard to the *Adams*. I have said that history repeated itself, that the taking up of a weak case, the case of the schooner *Washington* seized in the Bay of Fundy, when it was doubtful whether she was in British territory or not, led to the loss of the Bay of Fundy and the opening up to the Americans of that bay and the subsequent claim on their part of right of access to all other bays. History indeed repeats itself. I have forborne to speak as plainly as I could have spoken, and I have not touched upon some points I might have dwelt on in regard to the hon. gentleman's administration of the department; although I have expressed myself frankly it has not been in hostility to the administration of the day, nor do I desire to defeat their effort to get this treaty carried elsewhere. I have foreborne; but I tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that through his misconduct and his want of efficiency in raising the question of these treaties and the rights of Canadian fisheries in the case of the *Adams*, seizing a vessel when there was a doubt about our right to seize her, releasing her and subsequently seizing her on customs grounds, these acts show that the case of Canada has been placed in a similar position to what it was when the case of the Bay of Fundy was raised on the seizure of the *Washington*. This whole question has arisen on account of the misconduct, mismanagement and maladministration of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides. If bad feeling has arisen, as he has described, with the United States, when did it arise? Did it exist before 1885? No. No such feeling existed in the United States at that time. That ill-feeling has existed since is true. Does the hon. gentleman want the proof? Let him take up—I did not think he would be so discreet to bring it up at this time of the evening—Mr. P. Phelps's despatch to the British Minister, and he will find that was the cause of the

ill-feeling in the United States. It was due to the senseless seizures for petty offences. Mr. Phelps in addressing Lord Roseberry says:

"It would be at most, under the circumstances, only an accidental and purely technical breach of a custom house regulations, by which no harm was intended, and from which no harm came, and would, in ordinary cases, be easily condoned by an apology, and perhaps the payment of costs."

He further says:

"Can it be reasonably insisted under these circumstances that by the sudden adoption, without notice, of a new rule, a vessel of a friendly nation should be seized and forfeited for doing what all similar vessels had for so long a period been allowed to do without question?"

"It is sufficiently evident that the claim of a violation of the Customs Act was an after-thought brought forward to give whatever added strength it might to the principal claim on which the seizure had been made."

Again:

"I submit to your Lordship that a construction so harsh, so unfriendly so unnecessary, and so irritating as that set up by the Canadian authorities is not such as Her Majesty's Government has been accustomed either to accord or to submit to. It would find no precedent in the history of British diplomacy, and no provocation in any action or assertion of the Government of the United States."

Again:

"Of the obvious conclusion the Canadian authorities seem to be quite aware. I am informed that since the seizures they have pressed, or are pressing, through the Canadian Parliament in much haste, an Act which is designed, for the first time in the history of the legislation under this treaty, to make the facts upon which the American vessels have been seized illegal, and to authorize proceedings against them therefor."

Still again:

"The practical construction given to the treaty down to the present time has been in entire accord with the conclusions thus deduced from the Act of Parliament. The British Government has repeatedly refused to allow interference with American fishing vessels, unless for illegal fishing, and has given explicit orders to the contrary."

In the face of that this vessel was seized. Three examinations were held. She was allowed to go, and because she drifted on the bar in Digby harbor she was seized and held—after she was seized for preparing to fish and was released she was seized under customs regulation, and the First Minister knows that it was upon that he contended for the conviction of that vessel. Yet his Minister of Fisheries dares to attack me because I have expressed my opinion. Both of them know they seized that vessel illegally, and on that illegal seizure, the first of a number of illegal seizures for trifles, this great question of the fisheries has come up, and our case has been given away at Washington.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not. I think I know as much about it as you do.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not wish to know, but the *Adams* when she was seized was never released and continues unreleased up to this moment.

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Adams*, after she was seized, was released, and when she was sailing out of the harbor she was seized again.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I am right.

Mr. THOMPSON. The *Adams* when she was seized was never allowed to go. She was visited by one of the officers of the *Lansdowne*, and the statement made by the captain justified the captain of the *Lansdowne* not seizing her. It was ascertained before she got very far that that statement was entirely untrue, and she was then seized for the first time, and has been seized ever since.

Mr. MITCHELL. Say what you like, she was visited by the officers and seized for a breach of the customs regulations. She got away and was stranded on a bar and could not get out, and she was seized a second time. Those

are the kind of acts that brought about the concessions in the treaty.

Mr. THOMPSON. She was never seized until she was seized on the first occasion, and has never been released since. It was not because she stranded on the bar, but she was seized for two offences—buying bait and evading custom dues.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has the faculty of making words suit himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will have order. I rise to an explanation. I am not going to be misrepresented, even by the Minister of Justice. What I have said is this: I said the vessel, after having been twice visited—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order, and you had better keep quiet and you will get away quicker. I say that vessel was twice visited by those officers and they did not seize her, and it was after they had failed to be able to find any act for which to seize her that the vessel was going out of the harbor when she accidentally grounded and she was then seized. I say that this is true.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is an entire mistake. If the hon. gentleman reads the book he has under his hand he will see he is wrong from beginning to end.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know what I am talking about.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the motion for adjournment was made to allow the hon. gentleman to make the statement he has made. I hope there is no object in pressing it.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; that was my object.

Motion for adjournment withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman rose I did rise to move the adjournment of the debate. It is now one o'clock in the morning and I wish to address the House upon this subject. There are several gentlemen here who also wish to address the House, and I am quite sure that on a matter of this importance the Government, anxious as they are to carry the Bill confirming the treaty, will not insist upon the second reading of the Bill to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that there was a distinct understanding with the other side that this discussion should close to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would correct the hon. gentleman. He will remember that it was an informal conversation and not an official understanding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I told him that we were quite willing, if we could, to close the thing to-night, but he will recollect that I told him I could only speak for the gentlemen around me, and I expressly excepted the hon. the leader of the third party. There is no doubt whatever but that that hon. gentleman had a perfect right to speak when he pleased. Had the Minister of Marine replied to my friend from Halifax and had the debate been confined within the limits of the Ministers and the parties who are more especially conversant with the matter like my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the debate might easily have closed. Certainly the hon.

Mr. MITCHELL,

gentleman will not pretend to say that I entered into anything like a formal agreement with him to close the debate to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I certainly understood that the hon. gentleman was quite prepared to have the discussion close to night. It is quite true that he intimated that he and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had some remarks to make, but that they would not be very lengthened, and he did not know what time would be occupied by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). As the hon. gentleman is aware, there has been very little speaking on this side, and the greater portion of the time has been occupied by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. MITCHELL. And the Finance Minister, too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of the discussion to-day. The hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), who represents a fishing county, made a few brief remarks, and the speeches generally were brief. It could hardly be expected that the debate should close without the Minister of Marine making some reference to his administration which was referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the pressure of public business, and with the questions which I have myself to bring before the House, which will require a great deal of attention, I must ask the hon. gentleman to allow the second reading to take place to-night. There will be no difficulty at a further stage of the debate, for if hon. gentlemen wish to deal with any particular subject they will have abundant opportunity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman cannot attach importance to the second reading to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I attach the greatest importance to the second reading or I would not press it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that the third reading would be a matter of importance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the second reading of the Bill to which I attach importance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) wishes to speak.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall be happy to hear him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I also have some remarks to make on this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will listen to both with great patience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is perfectly unreasonable and unfair. We are quite willing to expedite public business, but at the same time when you have a great question like this—a question of first-rate importance—undoubtedly members should have an opportunity of speaking on it, and undoubtedly they should have an opportunity of speaking at a reasonable time in the morning. Now, the House is quite exhausted listening attentively to this discussion since three o'clock this afternoon. I was about to make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman which I thought would facilitate the business and that was that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should move the adjournment on the understanding that the second and third reading might be taken on Tuesday, which would give the hon. gentleman all the expedition he could possibly obtain. The debate, if it were forced must go on the third reading, which would lead to a greater delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely anxious not to defer the second reading of this Bill until Tuesday. I think I may say further that my hon. friend knows the anxiety I have to get the second reading of this Bill. I attach the greatest possible importance to have the second reading of this Bill take place now, and at the same time I am extremely anxious to avoid anything that would cause undue personal inconvenience. If the hon. gentleman will consent to make it the first order of the day on Monday, I will consent to the adjournment, otherwise I must ask them to allow the second reading to take place to-night. I think I am as unable as any other gentleman in this House to remain here for any longer period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want to meet the hon. gentleman's views also, and suppose we do this. We can get through the unopposed notices of motion in an hour or two on Monday, and let us resume this debate on Monday evening at 8 o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the distinct understanding that we take the second reading at that sitting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to state definitely when he expects to make his Budget statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope to be able to make it this day week. I shall make a great effort to reach it by that time.

THE BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. First Minister again whether he will be prepared to propose an address to confirm the award of the Judicial Committee

34-1888-7

of the Privy Council and the arbitrators with regard to the boundaries of Ontario. I make the inquiry, because, if it is not the hon. gentleman's intention, I desire to bring a motion on the subject before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that communications have been had with the Government of Ontario and draft bills have been interchanged, we proposed a draft Bill. An Order in Council has been passed, and will be sent by the first mail tomorrow to the Government of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can the hon. gentleman say whether he proposes in that draft Bill to deal with the boundaries as fixed by the arbitrators in 1878?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, the draft Bill is to confirm that portion of the answer of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which refers to the boundaries between Ontario and Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That of course will embrace the boundary of Manitoba as contended for by Manitoba and the counsel for the Dominion, that is, to a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, which leaves a part of the Province of Manitoba north of the Albany River. The hon. gentleman will remember that the award of the Judicial Committee fixes the boundary on the west and the north. He proposes just to follow the award of the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, that portion of the answer which settles the western boundary of Ontario, which is the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I think I must go on with my motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, go on.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.15 a. m. (Saturday).

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, April 16, 1888.

No. 35.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. LAURIER moved that Mr. Meigs be added to the following standing committees: Railway, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Standing Orders, Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the second report of the Committee on the Official Debates be concurred in. He said: The object of this report is to render justice to some officials who have been charged with responsible duties in connection with the Debates Committee and the publication of the official report. The first is in regard to Mr. Boyce, assistant to the Chief Reporter, who is recommended to receive an increase of salary. Mr. Boyce has been employed the whole year, and his duties are very responsible and are of a multifarious character. He has to see that copies are sent to members for correction, and that those corrections are made in the revised report; he has to keep track of matters connected with the printing, and in fact he is frequently compelled to remain two or three hours after the rising of the House. Every member of the committee is of the opinion that he fully deserves the increase recommended, and no one has found fault with the manner in which he has performed his duty. Moreover, he prepares the index of the Debates after the session. The second recommendation is in regard to Mr. Brewer, who is accountant of the committee, and who is charged with the performance of duties of a special and technical character. He has to measure the type and make up the accounts on which the printers are paid. This requires a special knowledge of printing, and after enquiry by a sub-committee it was found that his duties were of such a nature that he fully deserves the recommendation of \$50 a year and \$100 for past services. Mr. Hartney is also recommended to receive \$100 for past services and \$50 a year as clerk of the committee. He has to keep the records of the meetings of the committee, carry out the correspondence and everything connected with the meetings. We, therefore, considered it would be fair to acknowledge his services as well

as the services of the others, and the committee has therefore made the recommendation I have named. He has acted as clerk of the committee since 1878. These are the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. LANDRY. As I have not the report under my hand at the present moment, I should like to ask if it contains anything respecting nominations to fill vacancies caused by the dismissal of three of the translators.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Not at all; it only contains a recommendation respecting salaries to be paid to old officers.

Mr. DAVIN. In rising to support this motion I may say that we went into the question of the claims of these gentlemen, not once but several times. We had Mr. Brewer before us, and I confess when I saw the responsibility that was cast upon him I felt inclined, and many other member of the committee felt inclined, to give him more than is recommended in this report. The responsible duties discharged by Mr. Brewer, that of measuring up the matter, as any man who knows anything about printing is aware, are such that if he was not a man on whom this House could thoroughly rely the country might lose thousands of dollars in a year. In Mr. Brewer's case, therefore, there cannot be the least doubt that the recommendation of the committee is most moderate. I can speak, if I may use that term, with authority as to the claims of Mr. Boyce, because I had him associated with me on two occasions, during which I was able to measure his ability, his attentiveness, his accuracy and the reliability of the man to do any work he undertakes and to carry out with a skill I have never known equalled recommendations that might be made to him. Mr. Boyce is engaged in work requiring great care and great skill: one had only to explain to him what was needed and he entirely carried it out. In connection with the *Hansard* his duties are of an onerous and also of a responsible character. He not only corrects the first proofs but he sees that the corrections made by members are ultimately inserted in the speeches, and in addition to that he does work which is of the greatest importance so long as we have a *Hansard*, and that is to make an index. Unless that index is made well, I need hardly say that the value of that volume is greatly decreased, and one might also go so far as to say that the index is so far like a chain as a chain is not stronger than its weakest link, so the index is not valuable unless it is altogether complete and accurate and a sure means of reference. It seems to me that Mr. Boyce discharges his duties thoroughly and well, and if he discharges them thoroughly and well the amount suggested by the committee is a small sum for work so onerous and at the same time requiring so much skill. In regard to the other recommendation I am not so fitted to speak, because I do not know the circumstances; but, so far as I have had them explained to me I think that the recommendation is one also that the House should be ready to grant.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a member of the Debates Committee I rise to heartily endorse what has been said by the chairman of the committee and the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) especially with regard to the services of Mr.

Boyce, and to support the motion that an addition be made to his salary. I believe that even then he will be an underpaid servant. He is a most valuable officer and has served the House in the capacity which he follows at a very low pay indeed. Mr. Boyce most richly deserves the increase of salary proposed to be given to him.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister will allow me before closing the debate, I simply wish to add a few words to fully endorse all that has been said in regard to the value of this gentleman's services, and my endorsement leads me to the statement that even if this addition is made to the salaries of Mr. Brewer and Mr. Boyce with whom I am best acquainted, they will still remain rather underpaid than fully paid for the great services they render. They are both competent officers and discharge their important functions in a manner which has given great satisfaction to the House since they have been appointed, and I have known them both since they were appointed. I have great pleasure in endorsing, even this moderate measure of justice to those gentlemen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the chairman had this report moved to-day, as we did not expect it to come up. I do not say he is wrong in doing so, but we did not expect it as it is not mentioned in the Order paper, and we had no time to consider it. I would ask, therefore, that the hon. gentleman postpone it to another day, so that the Government may have a chance of looking over the matter. Besides that, I must call the attention of my hon. friend the chairman, and the other members who have followed him in supporting the report, of the fact that this mode of increasing the salaries of officers of this House is hardly a proper one, and I do not think it will meet with the approval of the House. The officers of the House are put under the control of the Clerk of the House, with the Speaker over them all; but then the Committee on Internal Economy is appointed also according to law, by the Governor in Council, every year. They are members of this House, with the Speaker as chairman, and their duty is exactly to look over appointments and have vacancies filled. Some three years ago that committee made a report to the House, and classified the officers of the House and determined the salaries, which were acknowledged by the House as proper. Now, this committee can enquire if those officers are deserving officers, and if their pay is too small. If, by a report to the House of Commons, a committee can obtain this increase in salaries, will they not by that means do an injustice towards other officers who may be as deserving, but who will not have a chance of having their case brought before the attention of such a vigilant committee as the committee of which my hon. friend is chairman. I see that one of the officers whose salary is recommended to be increased is Mr. Hartney. I think Mr. Hartney is one of the clerks of the Railway Committee and of the Banking and Commerce Committee as well. He has been appointed the other day by the Railway Committee to be the examiner of all the Bills that are presented, in order to see that those Bills are exactly in accordance with the rules adopted by Parliament. This is extra work, and so that officer, finding that he can have an increase here, may come to the other committee and ask for another increase. We may have from that other committee a report in that direction. Those officers would then be increasing their salaries without any reference being paid to the Clerk of the House or to the Speaker. I certainly think that the best mode in a case of this kind would be that a recommendation on the part of the committee might be referred to the Commission on the Internal Economy of the House, of which the Speaker is the head. Then the matter would be according to the rules and would be more just to other officers of the House of Commons. If the hon. gentleman does not object, I would move the adjournment of the debate so that we may have time to consider the matter, unless he wishes to withdraw the motion.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I thought it had been understood that the report would come up for the concurrence of the House as soon as the other discussions had been finished. Last week I moved the adoption of the report, and the hon. the Minister asked me to postpone it until after the debate that was going on would be terminated. The matter has already been called to his attention and I understood that he would be ready to-day to consider the report. I have no interest whatever to press the adoption of the report before the House of Commons is ready to consider it. In the meantime I might observe this, that the committee is making this recommendation now in the way that they have always made such a recommendation and according to the practice that has been always followed. For my part, I am ready to accept the recommendation made by the Minister of Public Works, that it be referred to the Commission of Internal Economy or to the Speaker, as it can be done in such a manner that no injustice will be done to any other officer of the House. We are just following the practice now which has been followed since the creation of the official Debates.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no doubt whatever that the principle of the contention of the Minister of Public Works is right, but there is no doubt also that the officers connected with the Debates of this House have always been treated in a different category from other officers. This was contended for some few days ago by this side of the House, and my hon. friend, the chairman of the committee, did not support the views we took then. However, it is better late than never, and I am very glad to see that my hon. friend has resumed his privileges as chairman. For my part, I am ready to support him in the position he takes to-day. I would not support such a report with regard to any other officers than the officers of the Debates; but I come back to the position I laid down a moment ago, and also a few days ago, that the officers connected with the Debates are a special class, and have always been treated as such since the commencement of the Debates, and this report is only one of a long line of similar reports which from time to time have been adopted by this House.

Mr. SCRIVER. As a member of the committee, I desire to repeat substantially what my hon. leader has just been saying, that the committee have always looked on the persons connected with the Debates as in a somewhat different position from the other officers of the House, and what we have done in this instance is only in the line of what we have been doing in the past. Indeed, the present recommendations are of very much less importance than many that we have made before, especially that relating to the permanent translators, in which we recommend not only that their salaries should be increased, but that they should be employed permanently, and that was accepted by the House as a matter of course.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may also say that some three or four years ago the committee recommended to the House that the salaries of the reporters should be raised, and that report was adopted by the House. In fact, in every instance in which any change has been made in the emoluments received by any person connected with the *Hansard* staff, that change has been made on the recommendation of the committee; and I do not see how the committee could exercise control over the Debates, or could be made reasonably responsible for the proper conduct of the Debates, unless they had that power of making recommendations to the House. Here is a case where three officials on the *Hansard* staff are acknowledged to be underpaid, and that is especially the case with regard to Mr. Boyce. The increase for Mr. Boyce was recommended by the committee

last year, but the report was not acted on, and during a year or more Mr. Boyce has been serving at a rate of pay which the committee last year reported was insufficient. If the matter now goes before the Commission of Internal Economy it will perhaps be laid over for another year, and cause considerable hardship to Mr. Boyce; for even if the recommendation of the committee is adopted, he will still be an underpaid official. Although, as a constitutional question, the Minister of Public Works no doubt takes a correct view of this matter, I think it will be better to continue the practice which has been in vogue hitherto, and allow the committee to exercise that jurisdiction over the officers of the Debates which they have exercised hitherto, and in this case to act on their recommendation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What I ask is to have the report postponed in order that we may consider it for a couple of days, after which the chairman of the committee may bring up his motion again. My remarks about the Commission of Internal Economy apply specially to Messrs. Hartney and Brewer, who are officers of this House. The other officer, Mr. Boyce, as I understand, is an officer under the committee, and not a regular officer of the House, and that would make the circumstances different. Under these circumstances, we would like a little time to look into the matter, and the House will perhaps agree to my motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is understood that I shall be able to bring it up again in the same way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, in the same way, but the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to let me know when he intends to bring it up.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPRESENTATION OF BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from Mr. Justice Bélanger, one of the Judges selected for the trial of controverted elections, his judgment relating to the election for the Electoral District of Beauharnois, by which judgment the sitting member had been declared to be duly elected.

THE CRIMINAL LAW.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) respecting the application to Canada of the Criminal Law of England. He said: In each of the Provinces there is a date at which the criminal law of England ceases to have application, and the result is a want of uniformity in the criminal code of Canada. The object of this Bill is to fix as the date the 1st of July, 1867, and to provide that the law of England, except in so far as it has been amended or repealed by any Provincial Act then in force or an Act of the Parliament of Canada subsequently passed, shall be applicable to Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would not that make a number of decisions on matters of criminal law that have been given by the different courts of the Provinces no longer applicable, and unsettle as well as settle? It would make a very slight difference, if the criminal law of England should be applicable; but at a subsequent stage, I will bring down a table showing the changes this would make.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHERY BOUNTY CHEQUES.

Mr. FLYNN asked, Whether the Fishery Bounty cheques have been distributed to the fishermen yet? If not, when will they?

Mr. FOSTER. In some districts they have been already distributed; in others, they are being distributed. They differ for different districts.

MEGANTIC POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. TURCOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish postal service between the villages of West Broughton and Lemesurier, in the County of Megantic, in view of the fact that while the said villages are but six miles apart, communication sent by mail must traverse a circuit of two hundred and sixty-two miles each way, and that there is a comparatively large business between the two places?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the intention of the Government to establish such postal service.

UNOCCUPIED LANDS—OLD LEASES.

Mr. DAVIS asked, Whether the lands covered by old leases, which have not been stocked or occupied, are to be kept closed to settlement for an indefinite period?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, these leases are being cancelled as rapidly as possible.

POSTAL SERVICE—VICTORIA COUNTY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Has the Government received petitions from the public in the vicinity of Uphill, in the County of Victoria, asking them to establish a daily postal service between Uphill and the village of Victoria Road? If so, when was the first petition or request in that behalf received? What answer was made to the petitioners, and what does the Government intend to do in the premises?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has received petitions for a daily mail service over this route. The first petition received was dated 19th, October, 1886 and addressed to Hector Cameron, Esq. The reply given was that the Postmaster General would not accede to the petitioners' request.

INDIAN TREATY, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make treaty with the Indians north of Treaty Six, in the Peace River and Athabasca District. If so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to make such a treaty now.

EMPLOYMENT OF SNETZINGER.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. BARRON) asked, Whether one Snetzinger was at any time employed as carpenter or otherwise in the Government shops at Cornwall? If so, was he dismissed? What was the date of his dismissal, and what was the reason of such dismissal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Snetzinger was first employed on the Cornwall canal from January, 1885, until the end of that year, and also during the year 1886. He was also employed in January, February, March and April, 1887, and ten days in May, after which he ceased to be employed. His wages were two dollars per day.

INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to submit to the proper party the draft of an international regulation, compelling the trading vessels of the Dominion of Canada to take the necessary precautions in the direction of making themselves distinguishable,

during the night-time, from vessels of war; these vessels being thereby obliged to proclaim their non-belligerent character by some distinctive mark, most easily seen, by some mode of placing the masts, the yards, or form of hull, about which it would be impossible to make a mistake?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to submit to any party the draft of such an international regulation as is described in the question.

PROTECTION OF FISH.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint for the Gulf of St. Lawrence and for the Canadian waters of the Pacific, magistrates provided with the necessary powers for the protection of the fish within the limits reserved to us by treaty; and also for the protection of sea fowl and their eggs; these magistrates being obliged to reside on the coast itself and in the neighborhood of the places where the greater part of the depredations are committed?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has its fishery officers appointed in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as well as for the Canadian waters of the Pacific. These officers have magisterial powers, and they will be added to as is necessary for the proper protection of the fisheries. With reference to the sea fowl and their eggs, that is a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Local Government.

WHALE FISHERIES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to prevent the whale fishery from being carried on during a certain period in Hudson Bay and vicinity? In case permission is granted to foreigners to engage in such fishery in Hudson Bay and vicinity, whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a license fee upon each vessel so engaged, and to prescribe the method in which such fishery shall be conducted?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the intention of the Government to take any steps in that direction at present.

COLLISIONS ON THE HIGH SEAS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, with the view of preventing as much as possible collisions on the high seas, to propose a law which will include the following provisions:—1. Prescribing to passenger-carrying steamships one track for the outward and one other track for the homeward passage, in order to divide what is now one course into two parallel courses; 2. Laying down a maximum speed in narrow channels in foggy weather; 3. Increasing the power of the lights carried, and bringing them more into harmony with the present high rate of speed possessed by these vessels?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter which is under the consideration of the Government.

HUDSON BAY SALMON RIVERS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lease out the salmon rivers emptying into the Hudson Bay or in its vicinity?

Mr. FOSTER. That is under the consideration of the Government.

POSTMASTER, VICTORIA, B. C.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether Robert Wallace, late postmaster at Victoria, B. C., has been superannuated? If so, what is his annual retired allowance under the Superannuation Act? Has time been added to his term?

Mr. AMYOT.

of service? If so, for what reason? What was his salary at time of retirement; who has been appointed in his place, and at what salary?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Wallace has been superannuated. The amount of his annual retiring allowance is now under the consideration of the Treasury, upon an appeal. No time has been added to his term of service. Mr. Webster has been appointed. His salary on retirement was \$2,400. Mr. Noah Shakespeare has been appointed in his place at \$2,000.

ALBERT RAILWAY COMPANY LOAN ACCOUNT.

Mr. ELLIS asked, What is the total amount of the Albert Railway Company loan account? To whom was the money paid? What security has the Government for the advances paid? Is the Albert Railroad now in operation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount voted as a loan was \$15,000. There has been paid direct to the company on account of the loan, on reports of the chief engineer, and authorized by Order in Council, \$13,778. The Government holds as security a mortgage on the road executed by the president and secretary of the company. I am not aware whether the road is now in operation or not.

SUBMARINE CABLE FROM PELEE ISLAND.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and reports respecting a submarine cable between Pelee Island and the Mainland.

He said: Although this public improvement for which we ask is in a portion of the country from which I come, still it is a matter of public interest, and one which all those who are interested in our inland marine should heartily support. Most of the wrecks which occur on Lake Erie occur in places which, if they were served by this cable, would not witness so many wrecks, and a great many more lives and property would be saved, and these lives and this property would have been saved if this cable had been laid down a few years ago. I hope the Government will see their way to going on with this work during the present summer. It is a matter of great importance to our vessel owners and to those engaged in our lake trade, and I think that all the details have been in the Department of Public Works for some years. I would be glad to see that the Government would deal with the matter without further delay. Last autumn some work was proposed to be done, and I do not hesitate to say that the construction of a submarine cable would be paid three times over by the cost of the loss of property which takes place. When a wreck takes place, the sending over to Windsor or some other port, and the cost of telegraphing from that place to the port where relief can be found causes a great deal of difficulty before the relief can come to the vessel which requires it, but if we have a submarine cable to the nearest wrecking point, a great quantity of property will be saved by the expedition with which the saving party will arrive at the wreck. I urge this question on the favorable consideration of the Government. It is not a local matter but it is a Dominion matter. It is a matter which should engage the attention of the Government at once, and particularly in view of the fact that the American Government are now improving at the rate of millions of dollars the navigation of their waters and are building lighthouses. The whole expense for the construction of this cable is a few thousand dollars, and I believe it would be greatly appreciated by our sailors and our fishermen. Just before I came here for the Session, I had to receive a deputation of lake captains, who urged me to bring this matter again before the Government. It has been brought before them from year to year, and the persuasive style of the Minister of Public

Works has not been sufficient to catch the ear of his colleagues. It is possible that more experience in this matter may enable him to obtain a favorable result this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has gone before my colleagues, and I hope this time that their ears will be opened.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government through specially appointed officers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was understood that we would simply take the unopposed notices of motion first, and then go back to the others. Otherwise this motion might block every other motion.

Mr. JAMIESON. I thought this motion could not be opposed.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. WELSH moved for:

Return of all correspondence, telegrams and reports upon the *Northern Light* (including hull, machinery and boilers) for the year 1887, and from 1st January to date; also, all correspondence, telegrams and reports relative to the steamer *Alert*, and her fitness as a winter boat in the Straits of St. Lawrence; also, all estimates and expenditure proposed to be laid out in the attempt to fit *Alert* for the winter crossing.

He said: I want to offer a suggestion to the hon. Minister of Marine which will save him some trouble. Sometime about the 1st March, I moved:

For a return showing the names and salaries of all Captains in charge of Government steamers, together with the salaries and allowances at present payable to and received by them, together with all petitions, correspondence, telegrams, &c., relative to the paying of the Captain of the *Northern Light* since 1st January, 1878. Also for a return showing the names and number of men employed in or about the *Northern Light* during last summer, from the time she ceased running in the spring of 1887, until she again resumed in the autumn of the same year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the Minister of Marine that I hold in my hand the return to this motion, but it does not contain the number of men employed about that steamer since she was laid up last spring until the ensuing fall. What is the meaning of sending in half a return when this House ordered a full return? I intend to have a full return, and if it is not brought down, if the Order of the House is not attended to, I intend to make a motion for a commission of enquiry in this matter. I can assure the Minister of Marine that he will not find an hon. gentleman on the front Government benches that will support him in this act.

Mr. FOSTER. I instructed my officers to comply with the Order of the House, and that report was handed in, and I supposed it thoroughly complied with the Order of the House. From the excited manner in which the hon. member made his remarks to the House, I inferred that his chief grievance was with reference to the number of men employed. It may be that the number of men employed was not given. If there is any omission it can be very easily remedied, and could have been just as easily remedied if my hon. friend had shown less feeling. I can assure him that there is no intention of depriving the House of full information. In fact, if my hon. friend will wait a little while we may make him a present of the *Northern Light*.

Mr. WELSH. I know there was a great number of men employed on the steamer last summer, making repairs, when

there was no captain in charge of her, and without any one to superintend their work; and I wanted to know the number of men so employed, and the amount of money paid to them, in order that the House might see the manner in which the business of that department is conducted. That was my motive. There is no feeling in the matter, so far as I am concerned; although the matter may appear to the hon. gentleman one to cause a little excitement. The truth is, I feel sore about this matter, and if I don't get this return, I will make the hon. gentleman feel sore, if I am not very much mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. That is undoubtedly the way in which the mistake has arisen. My officers have given the number of the crew and the officers of the ship that were employed, and not the others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said that if my hon. friend had a little patience, perhaps in a short time they would make him a present of the *Northern Light*. Is it the intention of the Government to supersede the *Northern Light* with any other vessel?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If so, have arrangements been made for the purchase of another vessel, and where and when will they be carried out?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the intention of the Government to supersede the *Northern Light* by a new vessel, and arrangements are now being made with that end in view. I will be able to explain the matter more fully to the House later on.

TRAVAUX POUR LA DESCENTE DES BOIS ET BILLOTS SUR LA RIVIÈRE OTTAWA.

M. AMYOT: Je demande—

Qu'une humble adresse soit présentée à Son Excellence le gouverneur général pour prier Son Excellence de vouloir bien faire transmettre à cette Chambre un état indiquant le coût total de la construction des divers travaux exécutés pour la descente des bois et billots sur la rivière Ottawa et ses tributaires jusqu'au 30 juin dernier; aussi un état indiquant la dépense annuelle de l'entretien de ces ouvrages pendant les cinq années antérieures au 30 juin dernier, sous les différents chefs de reconstruction, réparation, et frais d'administration, à chacune des stations, avec le nom de la rivière ou du tributaire où la dépense a eu lieu; et copie de toute demande reçue de particuliers ou de compagnies à charte pour l'acquisition par voie d'achat ou autrement de tout ou partie de ces ouvrages et améliorations sur la rivière Ottawa et ses tributaires.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Il y a un ou deux renseignements demandés par cette motion qu'il sera peu facile et probablement impossible de donner. Néanmoins je tâcherai de les fournir aussi approximativement que possible.

M. AMYOT: L'honorable ministre pourrait-il nous donner une idée du temps où nous pourrions avoir ces documents. Il serait très avantageux d'avoir ces renseignements avant la discussion sur un bill qui est actuellement devant le comité des chemins de fer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Dans ce cas, je crois qu'il faudra diviser le rapport en deux, parce que je crains qu'une bonne partie des documents que l'honorable député demande ne pourront être préparés à temps. Je comprends parfaitement ce que l'honorable député a en vue en faisant cette motion, et je ferai tout en mon pouvoir pour faciliter la production de ces documents.

Motion accordée.

PROHIBITION IN THE TRAFFIC IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation

and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government through specially appointed officers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a resolution in reference to the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors has been twice introduced into this House within the past few years, and there has been a full discussion of the whole question on each occasion. Consequently, I do not deem it advisable on the present occasion to make anything like an exhaustive address in support of the resolution. In fact, it was and is not my intention to say more than a few words, and I shall be perfectly satisfied, so far as I am concerned, if we can reach a vote on this question within the next half hour. I think it will be advisable to dispose of the resolution this afternoon, as I am informed and observe by the Order paper—I was not here on Friday evening—that if it is not disposed of by six o'clock, it will have to pass over in order that the arrangement in reference to resuming the debate on the Fishery question this evening may be carried out. I am not aware of anything new having come up in the country on the question of the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors since last Session, when I submitted to this House a resolution in similar terms to the one I have just proposed. I am not aware that the evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors since that time have abated in any way, and I am still as fully convinced as I was on that occasion that it is the duty of this House to provide by legislation, not for the regulation, but for the entire prohibition of that traffic. It may be said that we have a local option law, and that it is the duty of those who are opposed to the traffic in intoxicating liquors to try that law which is already upon the Statute-book. Well, it is quite true that we have a local option law, and it is also true that that law, to a very large extent, has been laid hold of by the people, and adopted in a large number of counties and cities in this Dominion. But I have always contended, and I now contend, that the Canada Temperance Act is not a fair test of the question of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. I am not aware that either in this or any other country has any law yet been passed which can be said to be a fair test of prohibition. In the United States, I believe, several States of the Union have passed a prohibitory liquor law, but their power is limited, and, after all, it is only partial prohibition. Although the sale and the manufacture is prohibited by these States, it is beyond their power, as has recently been held by the Supreme Court of the United States, to prohibit the importation, inasmuch as that would be an interference with trade and commerce. Now, it is well known that the Canada Temperance Act, in the counties in which it is adopted, is only directed to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors. Consequently, it is only partial prohibition. I believe we should go further, and enact a law which will not only prevent the sale, but get at the root of the evil, by prohibiting the importation and manufacture of intoxicating liquors. We have dealt, since this House assembled, with some very important questions bearing upon the trade and commerce of the country, but it is my contention that the question now before the House, however lightly some members may be disposed to treat it, is the most important question which has been before the House since we have met this Session. I am not sure that it is merely the duty of the representatives of the people to deal with questions of trade and commerce alone, or what may be called purely secular questions. I believe it is the duty of the Parliament of this, and every other country, to deal also with questions affecting the morals of the people. I know of no traffic which, to the same extent, affects the moral condition of the people as the liquor traffic. In discussing this question, I am prepared to concede that it has a very important bearing upon some interests in the country which are regarded as of very great importance. I am quite aware that those engaged in the manu-

Mr. JAMIESON.

facture and on this sale of intoxicating liquors would be most materially affected, were a prohibitory measure passed by this House, but in my judgment it is the duty of Parliament to pass every law which it deems to be right, and to have that law enforced in the interests of the people. I am not now going to discuss the question as to whether it would be right or not to grant compensation to those engaged in the traffic, but will simply give expression to my own opinion on that point, and that is that if the option were given to me at the present moment of securing the prohibition of the liquor traffic and doing away with the great evils which flow from that traffic, I for one would be prepared to put my hands in my pocket, as a ratepayer of this Dominion, and contribute my share in compensating these parties. However, I am not prepared to admit that those engaged in the traffic are entitled to compensation. Notice after notice, intimation after intimation, has been given to those parties, from time to time, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors was considered by the people as inimical to their interests. The passage of the Temperance Act of 1864 by the Parliament of Canada was a notice, the passage of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 was a notice to those parties that the people and Parliament of this country considered that the traffic was inimical to the best interests of the country. Consequently, if parties, since the passage of those Acts, have gone into the manufacture or into the traffic, or have taken up the selling of intoxicating liquors in any way, they have done so with the notice to them upon the Statute-book of this country. Now, I trust that this resolution will receive very careful consideration at the hands of the representatives of the people. I know that those who are endeavoring to rid the country of this great evil are not looked upon with favor in certain quarters. I know they are regarded, and sometimes spoken of, as cranks, and as parties who want to destroy the peace of the country, and we are told that we are endeavoring to entrench upon the liberty of the subject by prescribing what men shall eat and drink. I know that very serious objections are urged in certain quarters to the passage of what are called sumptuary laws. But I believe that those who are advocating the prohibition and abolition of the liquor traffic are acting, not only within their rights as citizens, but in the best interests of the country. It may be true that men have an abstract right to eat and drink what they please and as they please, but when men who drink intoxicating liquors not only injure themselves but injure those who are dependent on them—and it is not alone those who drink that suffer, but every interest in the community suffers—I believe it to be the duty of Parliament to step in and prohibit this traffic. I believe that the pathway of this traffic is strewn with the ruined lives and wrecked hopes of thousands and tens of thousands of the best citizens of this and every other country. It may be that Parliament is not yet prepared to give its sanction to a prohibitory liquor law, it may be possible that even the people of this country are not yet prepared to carry out such a law, if it were placed on the Statute-book. But I expect to live to see the day, and I believe many other members of the House will live to see the day when we shall have on the Statute-book a law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors; that the people of this country, in consequence of the great evils flowing from this traffic, will revolt from it and will put the ban of the law upon it. Now, although I have spoken much longer than I intended to in introducing this resolution, I have a few more words to say. It may be said, in reply to the remarks which I had to make and the resolution which I have had the honor of submitting to this House, that it was entirely unnecessary to submit another resolution during this present Parliament; that, in the first Session of this Parliament, when it was fresh from the people, we had a resolution on this

subject submitted and we had the deliverance of the House upon it, and that therefore it was unnecessary again during the continuance of the same Parliament to submit another resolution on the same subject. I may say that, when that resolution was presented last year, there was a very thin attendance of the House, and it was not a fair expression of the views of the House. I may also say that, since last Session there has been a serious change in the *personnel* of the House in consequence of vacancies which have taken place and have been filled by bye-elections. In addition to that, it is the desire and it is the determination of the promoters and friends of temperance in this country to keep this question before the Parliament of Canada and before the country at large. We are resolved that we will keep the question to the front, that we will educate the people and that we will agitate the people in regard to this question, and will agitate in Parliament in reference to it until we secure what we are striving to obtain, the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic. With these few remarks, I submit to the House the resolution which I have proposed, and I trust that it will receive that attention from the House which its merits demand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has brought this motion forward for the second time. Of course, if the hon. gentleman was prepared to propose a Bill to carry out the motion which he has submitted to the House, in case the majority supported him, there would be no objection to his putting a motion of this sort before the House, but it is hardly consistent with parliamentary practice that the hon. gentleman should ask the House to assent to this as an abstract proposition. The hon. gentleman has had some propositions before Parliament to amend the Canada Temperance Act, but that is somewhat different in principle from the motion which he has made now. The principle of the Canada Temperance Act is very different from the principle which is embodied in this resolution, or in any Act which could be founded upon it if a majority of the House was found to favor it. The principle of the Canada Temperance Act is the principle of local option. It recognises that, in regard to any matter dealing with the licensing laws, each locality should decide for itself. When you come to legislate in regard to what may be regarded as a sumptuary law, you find that it is wholly inoperative unless it is sustained by a majority of the people in a particular locality. The measure to which I have referred was put on the Statute-book ten years ago by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). That Government assumed the responsibility of putting that Act on the Statute-book, and assuming that responsibility they followed the principle which was laid down in a resolution proposed by the leader of the present Government, that it was the duty of the Government to assume the responsibility. They did assume the responsibility. The question whether we should place a prohibitory law on the Statute-book was made the subject of enquiry by the Government. They enquired into the operation of the law in the State of Michigan, and into the operation of the prohibitory law in the State of Maine, and also in regard to the operation of the prohibition law which was put on the Statute-book in the Province of New Brunswick, and afterwards repealed, and the Government came to the conclusion that it was in the interest of temperance and in the interest of prohibition to adopt the optional law and not to adopt the law looking to total prohibition. I have myself always been in favor of prohibition, but I have never been in favor of the adoption of a measure that the majority of the people did not sympathise with. That would be inoperative, that would not in any degree suppress the habit of drinking, that would leave that habit as much in force as it was before, and would turn the sympathy of any district away from the cause of temperance and lead it in a direction where it would

try to set the law at defiance. For that reason I did not support the motion which the hon. gentleman proposed before. It seems to me that, before undertaking any legislation of this sort, we should know the opinion of the country on this question, and how are we to know whether the people in a particular locality will support the principle of prohibition or not? The hon. gentleman knows, or at least I know, that in my own constituency the Canada Temperance Act is in operation, and that there is no measure which it is so difficult to efficiently carry out as a prohibitory measure; and I know that, unless the overwhelming majority of a people in the locality favor the measure, it will do as little to suppress the habit of drinking to excess as if there was no such law at all. What we want is that the public sentiment should be in favor of prohibition, and then to follow it up by legislation which can be efficiently carried out. The Canada Temperance Act leaves it to the people in the locality itself to say whether they want prohibition or not. I know that in the rural districts, where it is tried, it works admirably. The farmers know that when their sons go out, they are not gathered in a drinking hole, they are not acquiring habits of dissipation, and that even those who are not total abstainers are not violating the law in any respect. But the towns and cities present a wholly different state of things. I am not at all sure that if you were to-morrow to try a measure of prohibition in any one of our cities, you would have as little drinking as you would have under a strict license law. Now, what the hon. gentleman ought to desire, and what the House ought to desire, is not simply and formally to put upon the Statute-book a law that is never put into operation, or that remains a dead letter, but it should be to put upon the Statute-book such legislation that the people themselves will sustain and will carry into operation, a law that is operative in favor of sobriety and good order, and not a law that excites opposition in a very considerable section of the community, the violation of which the people wink at, that will rather tend to a demoralisation and to a want of respect for law, than to good order and good habits in the community. Sir, holding this view, I would not support the motion of the hon. gentleman, not because I am not in favor of the principle of prohibition wherever the people are willing to carry it out, but because I am not in favor of putting upon the Statute-book a measure that would do away with existing restraints, and that would leave a very considerable section of the country exactly in the position as if there was no legislation at all. Now, when the hon. gentleman proposed to amend the Canadian Temperance Act with a view to making it more efficient, I think he was taking a step in the right direction; he was proposing to amend a law that is based upon wholly different principles from the resolution which he is now proposing. If, Sir, it were found that the people throughout a Province generally favored prohibition, I think the measure ought to be carried in that Province; if it were found to be so in several Provinces, then it would be well it should be carried in those several Provinces; if it should be found that the public sentiment of the entire Dominion were in favor of the measure, then it should be carried throughout the Dominion. But, Sir, it does seem to me that when in some of those localities in which the measure has been optional, it has been carried and afterwards repealed by a majority where it was formerly put into operation by a majority, it is scarcely a fitting time to propose to the House a measure of prohibition. This whole subject is entirely in the hands of the people themselves. Why, Sir, we know that the hon. gentleman proposed here amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and they were kicked out in the Senate. The hon. gentleman said: "I will vote for an elective Senate." Well, Sir, I proposed in this House a resolution in favor of that view, and the hon. gentleman helped to vote it

down. Then, when the hon. gentleman saw that the Senate was opposed to his measure, and when he saw that a majority of the Senate held those views, and we proposed that the Government, who can control the Senate, that exercises a potent influence over the Senate, should assume the responsibility of those amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, and there was a chance, not only of carrying them through this House, if the hon. gentleman had been in favor of it, but there was also a chance, upon that line, of carrying them in the Senate—did the hon. gentleman support my proposition? No, Sir, he voted it down. And when last year the hon. gentleman had a motion upon the paper, and it was proposed to put it upon the Government Orders so as to give an opportunity for legislation of the sort desired, what did the hon. gentleman do? Why, Sir, he assured hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that he did not want to put it upon the Government Orders, that he was a Government supporter first, and a temperance man afterwards.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman is stating what is not true—if I may so so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the hon. gentleman appear in his place.

Mr. JAMIESON. Whoever said that in reference to my conduct last year, said what was not true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I put this question to the hon. gentleman: Did he not know there was a proposal to be made to put his motion upon the Government Orders so that there would be an opportunity of reaching it?

Mr. JAMIESON. I will explain to the hon. gentleman, if he will permit me. There was some conversation in reference to that matter, and the friends of prohibition on both sides of the House were called together and the matter was submitted to them, and they decided not to force the question in the manner indicated by the hon. gentleman, and I submitted to the action of that meeting.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were at the meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. The member for Broome (Mr. Fisher) was one; there were about a dozen at the meeting, representing both parties in this House, all temperance men. I may say that I never saw the hon. member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills) at any meeting or on any occasion when it was necessary to advocate temperance in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not undertake to prostitute my position as a member of Parliament by doing what the hon. gentleman has done in this House upon that question; I did not profess to support a motion that I took the earliest opportunity of opposing afterwards—that is what the hon. gentleman has done. I do not profess to give an opportunity to the Government to put it out of my power to put a motion that I desire to make, or to decline to allow a motion to be put upon the paper along with Government Orders. That is what the hon. gentleman did on that occasion last year.

Mr. JAMIESON. I deny it again, and I insist that the hon. member for Bothwell is wrong in the statement he is making with reference to my conduct last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Sir, we know the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JAMIESON. The House will remember that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the present constitution of the Senate, and on entering the Government, for five long years, he never did anything towards reforming that body.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he never saw me at one of those temperance meetings.

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, Sir, he did not. But I happened to be a member of a Government that assumed

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the responsibility of putting the only measure upon the Statute-book on this subject that is to be found since the Union, and Sir, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman in that undertaking, we did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman's political allies in that undertaking. I remember, Sir, that there was a prominent temperance man, a member of the Government, that preceded us in office, the late Finance Minister, the Hon. Mr. Tilley; I remember that he was seven years a member of the Government, and never proposed legislation on the subject. I remember that the moment the Hon. Mr. Tilley returned to office, the political associates of the hon. gentleman, and some of those who pose as temperance men with him, met Mr. Tilley here and complimented him upon the progress of the temperance work—not work that had been done by Mr. Tilley, or through his instrumentality, because it was done by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Did they thank my hon. friend for East York for what he did, for the sacrifices which he made, the opposition which he incurred? No, Sir, nothing of the sort was done. Why, Sir, it is well known that the hon. member and the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) hunt in couples. The hon. member from South Lanark appears here as an opponent of temperance, and receives the support of the hon. member for North Lanark, (Mr. Jamieson), who is the advocate *par excellence* of temperance; and so the one secures the liquor support for the temperance candidate, and the other secures temperance support for the liquor candidate; and we have the temperance candidate for North Lanark and the anti temperance candidate for South Lanark. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman will find that that policy is pretty nearly played out in this House, and he will find that it is very nearly played out in the country. The hon. gentleman has appeared for two or three Sessions as a legislator in favor of temperance; but he has, instead, been its impeder, he has stood in the way of legislation. The hon. gentleman forced himself to the front in undertaking to amend a measure put upon the Statute-book by a Government that the hon. gentleman has always opposed, while the hon. gentleman never dared to ask the men who sit on the Treasury benches, whom he hourly supports, to take up this question and to amend a measure which a former Government put upon the Statute-book. Sir, that is the position of the hon. gentleman. And the public will thoroughly understand it. What does the hon. gentleman do now? He brings up his measure within one hour of the adjournment when he knows that another subject is to be taken up after recess, and that in all probability his motion will not be reached again this Session. He has taken precious good care not to permit this measure to occupy a foremost place in the notices of motion; he took precious good care last year that his motion should not occupy a foremost place, and the result was that last year his motion was never reached, and a vote was never taken on it, and so seeing how eminently successful he was last year in preventing legislation of a practical character, giving the people an opportunity of acting in accordance with their moral conviction, he comes here now, and leaves the measure proposing to amend the law—it has not yet been reached or dealt with—and he proposes to take up an abstract resolution which may secure him certain temperance support in his constituency by those who do not take the trouble to ascertain exactly how the business of the House is conducted. I think the hon. gentleman has succeeded eminently well in showing exactly where he stands upon the temperance question. He has said that he is ready to support a measure of prohibition. He proposes to ask the House to vote on the subject of prohibition—certainly he does. He says that when the people favor a measure we place it on the Statute-book. So we do. When men are guilty of forgery the public are ready to punish them, and

so it is with regard to theft. Is such the case in regard to the subject of prohibition? Does not the hon. gentleman know that it is not? If he wishes a measure of prohibition to be practical it must have the sympathy and support of at least a majority of the people in the locality where the law is to be operated, and it is therefore unwise and highly inexpedient in the interests of really genuine temperance to propose a measure with which public opinion does not sympathise and which it will not support. We have on the Statute-book a measure of prohibition. There is nothing to prevent the people from making it law throughout the entire Dominion from one end to the other. If there are defects in this measure let them be pointed out, and they can be corrected, and the people can be given an opportunity of saying whether they will have prohibition or not. Does the hon. gentleman propose to force prohibition down the throats of those opposed to it? Does he suppose such a measure would be operative? Does he not know what is done up the Ottawa just beyond his own constituency, where the Act was carried by a narrow majority, and does he believe that in the large lumbering districts where the vast majority of the men are opposed to prohibition such a measure will be operative? He knows it will not. What the hon. gentleman proposes is merely buncombe, and the reign of buncombe is over; it was a reign of usurpation, and we trust this the last opportunity in which any of its friends will exhibit themselves in this House.

Mr. JAMIESON. As I have a right to reply I will now avail myself of the opportunity to do so. I do not like to appear before the House again so soon, but the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been such as to call upon me to reply. If the hon. gentleman had discussed the question on its merits I would not at this stage of the debate have asked the privilege of again speaking in regard to the question before the House. It seems to me that the conduct of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is of a most extraordinary character. He, forsooth, is the great champion of the cause of temperance, at least he was a few days ago in this House when he sought to embarrass not only the Government but the friends of the Government. I am now glad, however, to find that he has shown his hand. I think not only the members of this House but the people of the whole Dominion will appreciate at its true worth the conduct of this new apostle of temperance in Parliament. The hon. gentleman has charged me with bringing up this motion at an inopportune hour. Every hon. member knows that this is the first opportunity I have had since the Session opened to bring this question before the House, and the hon. gentleman ought to remember that this debate will close at six o'clock simply for the purpose of giving the hon. member for Bothwell an opportunity to air his eloquence upon a certain important question. If he considered this question so important as he would indicate by his remarks, let him forego the opportunity of addressing the House to-night on the other question, and let us have this question discussed to the very bottom. I think it is most unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman to attack me for the manner in which this resolution has been brought before the House, because it was utterly out of my power to bring it forward at an earlier period of the Session, or on any other occasion than the present; but I apprehend that if I had refused to avail myself of the opportunity of bringing the question before the House at the present time, the hon. member for Bothwell would have been the first member to have risen and charged me with endeavoring to shirk a duty that had been placed in my hands by the Dominion Alliance. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Canada Temperance Act, which was placed upon the Statute-book by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was at the head of the Government. I am quite pre-

pared to give the Government of that day due credit for anything they did in connection with the temperance question.

Mr. MILLS. But you voted against them all the same.

Mr. JAMIESON. But the principle was admitted before the Canada Temperance Act became the law of this country. In 1864 a Conservative Parliament placed on the Statute-book of the country another measure, the Temperance Act of 1864, which was the first measure ever introduced and placed upon the Statute-book which conceded the principle of local option. Although I am quite prepared to admit that the Canada Temperance Act was an improvement on the old Temperance Act of 1864, still the principle of the two measures was identical, and I do not know that the Government were entitled to so much credit for that measure after all. I will tell the House why. In 1874 the temperance people of the Dominion, representatives from every Province of the Dominion, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and I believe Manitoba, met in convention in the city of Montreal in order to devise the best means for promoting the cause of temperance in the Dominion. They passed a resolution giving a committee authority to approach the Government of that day for the purpose of securing a measure under which a popular vote would be taken upon the question. But when the committee reported at a subsequent meeting that was held for the purpose of receiving that report, it was found that the Premier of the Dominion at that time refused to grant what the temperance people asked, a plebiscite on the question, on the ground that there was no constitutional precedent under the British Crown for such a procedure. So that the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did not concede to the temperance people of the Dominion at that time what they asked; they did concede a half-way measure, the Canada Temperance Act, and although we were thankful at the time to get it, still it was not what we asked, and I would prefer to-day to have this question submitted to the popular vote of the Dominion rather than have the question tested by a measure of partial prohibition which necessarily is unsatisfactory as a proper test of the question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has attacked me for the course I pursued two years ago on the motion which he submitted to the House in regard to a reformation in the constitution of the Senate. Allow me for a few minutes to point out the course of the hon. gentleman on that question a few years ago. In 1874, when his friends were in power, he submitted a resolution to the House with the same object in view. Did he pursue the same course as he pursued on the last occasion? Not at all; the circumstances were different, his own friends were in power, and instead of moving his motion as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply, he moved it as a substantive motion. The *Hansard* will show that on the last occasion on which that gentleman submitted that motion to this House I rose and said that if the hon. gentleman would place the motion before the House on that occasion in the same manner in which he did on a former occasion, I would support it; but he did not do anything of the kind, because on a former occasion his own friends were in power and he did not want to embarrass them. On this occasion his political opponents were in power and his action was for the purpose of embarrassing them and for nothing else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know that the proper time for moving a motion relating to any defect is when going into supply, and it is not regarded as a vote of want of confidence?

Mr. JAMIESON. If it were the proper time to take it up why did not the hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, bring it up in the same way? What is more, Sir, he

charges me with insincerity upon this question. It will be recollected by every public man in this country that notwithstanding the fact that the House gave assent to the proposition which he submitted in 1874, to reform the constitution of the Senate, that he not only did not look for further action on the matter but that he entered the Government of the day and remained a member of that Government for four long years, and we heard no more about the reform of the Senate. Let me ask what did the hon. gentleman ever do with a view to carry out the spirit of the motion which had received the sanction of this House? I do not desire to enter at any great length into this question of his references to me. The hon. gentleman charges me with insincerity because a few days ago I voted against a motion which he submitted to this House. I think it is due to myself and to the temperance Conservatives on this side of the House, that I should enter into a further explanation in reference to this matter and give to the House my reasons for pursuing the course which I did. It is well known that a body of temperance men in this country called the Dominion Alliance, for the suppression of the liquor traffic. It is organized of non-partisan members, and Reformers and Conservatives meet there on a common ground for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance. I am and have been for years a member of that Alliance, and it has been a principle acted upon in that Alliance that any temperance legislation to be brought before this House ought first to receive the sanction of the Alliance; that every movement in reference to the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act, or with reference to the prohibition of the liquor traffic, should originate with the Dominion Alliance. On the very day and up to the very hour that the hon. gentleman made the motion to this House, I had been acting in the Dominion Alliance and in accord with the temperance Liberal members on the other side of the House. We had been sitting at a committee meeting around a table that very day discussing questions in reference to the action we would take in the House on the question. What was my surprise to find the hon. gentleman who never yet manifested any zeal for the cause of temperance, except on an occasion when it was likely to embarrass those who were opposed to him, and who has never yet appeared at a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, or any other organization for the purpose of promoting the cause of temperance in this country, get up in his place and place a motion before this House under circumstances which he must have known would call for a condemnation of the resolution at the hands of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why so?

Mr. JAMIESON. Because at the time he knew it would be voted down by the members of this House. I would not vote against it simply because it was a vote of want of confidence in the Government, but I voted against it because it was a breach of the fundamental principles on which the Dominion Alliance was organised.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is of the kind, and not only have the Liberal members of the Dominion Alliance who are not represented in this House endorsed the course which I took but they have said I could not take any other course.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not they. Name.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, among others Mr. Spence, the secretary of the Dominion Alliance, who is as good a Liberal as the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is. He said the resolution was an untimely one to be submitted to the House. The *Montreal Witness* whose sympathies are altogether with the Liberal party condemned the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) for the circumstances under which he put that resolution to the House and every

Mr. JAMIESON.

fair-minded temperance man in this Dominion has taken the ground which I took on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes, they did; and I am prepared to submit my conduct to the people of this Dominion on that question. I believe so far as this question is concerned that the people of this Dominion have more confidence in myself as a representative than the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am bound to characterise the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell a few moments ago in reference to my conduct last year as a—well—I do not know what to characterise it as that would be within the rules of Parliament, but I will say it is a wrong statement from beginning to end, and whoever gave that information to him I suppose they were “guying” him because they thought he would swallow it in the manner in which he did. There is not one word of truth in it from first to last. When we found we could not get a measure before the House last year—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why?

Mr. JAMIESON. An old parliamentarian asks why? On a former occasion I forced this question through this House, but was the cause of defeating several other measures. I am satisfied now that this is not a proper course to pursue and that it is not a course which is recognised by the House as a fair one. I do not know whether we could have succeeded last year in forcing the question to the House or not. I called together the men from both sides of the House; we called them to confirm our actions and a similar question was submitted to them as last year, and the decision of that committee was that it was too late in the Session to press temperance legislation and it would not be fruitful of any good to us if we had pressed it, because we would not be able to get the question disposed of in such a manner as to have it complete.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he notified all the temperance men of the House to go to that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who were selected?

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on his side of the House and I undertook to notify the members favorable to temperance on my side of the House. In that way the meeting was brought about.

Mr. FISHER. What meeting are you referring to?

Mr. JAMIESON. The one that was called last year to bring up this question. You recollect it?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of any meeting at which it was decided that we should not push the temperance question as fast as we could.

Mr. JAMIESON. Well, I am, and I think there are gentlemen in this House who were present at that meeting.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the hon. member how many members he invited from his own side of the House to attend that meeting?

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not prepared to say at the present moment, but possibly about a dozen were invited. There are a certain number of gentlemen who are connected with temperance movements and temperance organisations, and who are favorable to prohibition, and we generally invite them. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has been invited, but I am not sure that he ever attended. Now, I am sorry that this discussion has assumed the character that it has, but I think the hon. members of this House will at least excuse me for the course I have taken.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, we will not.

Mr. JAMIESON. Then, I suppose you will sustain the course pursued by the hon. member for Bothwell, who instead of urging this question on its merits, used it as an opportunity of making a personal attack on myself. But I can say this—my own constituents, and I believe every honest man in this Dominion, will give me credit for being at least sincere on this question, and doing what I can for the purpose of advancing this policy.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is now so near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that it is very evident that this question cannot be disposed of before you leave the Chair; and, under the rules of the House if the debate is not adjourned, the order will disappear from the paper. Therefore, with the view of keeping the question before the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the House is very thin this afternoon, and as the question has not come to a vote, I think the debate should be adjourned, so that the House may have an opportunity to consider the matter and deal with it as they think proper.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CLAIM OF WARREN ALLEN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Return of all papers and correspondence relating to claim for compensation by Warren Allen for an ice-boat burnt to save the lives of the crews and passengers of the ice-boats, in the month of January, 1885, while crossing from Prince Edward Island to New Brunswick; and also for the use of an ice-boat and a crew, engaged in search of the missing boats.

He said: As the hon. gentleman will see, I am making a motion in relation to the claim preferred by one of the ice-boat men, who, during the year 1885, lost his boat in a storm. It will be remembered that one of the members of this House was among the passengers on that unfortunate occasion, and although this man was not in the employ of the Government in any sense of the word, but was the owner of a volunteer boat which was making crossings at the time, still the circumstances strongly favor his claim. The Government boats carrying Her Majesty's mails and a number of passengers were caught in this awful storm, and Mr. Allan's boat was accompanying them. In order to save the mails and the lives of the passengers, the boat, in the last extremity, was broken up and burnt. No doubt the heat thus obtained was the means of saving the lives of the passengers and of saving the mail. I think altogether the claim is a very good one, and is based on the highest grounds. Mr. Allan's property was burnt for the preservation of Her Majesty's mails, and also for the preservation of the lives of the unfortunate passengers. I do not know whether the hon. member for King's County is in his seat or not, but I know that he was one of the passengers, and he can bear personal testimony to the facts I have stated. My hon. friend's life was in danger, and he was many months recovering from the effects of the trip. I am aware that the Government were not themselves in charge of the boat, and the only ground on which I recommend this claim is that this boat was burnt in order to afford warmth to the passengers and crew, and thus enable them to weather the storm. I think, therefore, the claim, small as it is, should recommend itself to the just consideration of my hon. friend, and I sincerely hope he will see it in his power to satisfy it. I have heard this claim urged by a great many gentlemen irrespective of politics. I do not know what are Mr. Allan's politics. In fact he is not a constituent of mine at all, but is a resident on the other side. Everybody speaks favorably of the claim, and I sincerely hope the hon. gentleman will give it his attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will let the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries know what the hon. gentleman has said about the case. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that this is not a question of politics. There cannot be any politics in a matter of this kind, that saving the lives of the passengers and the mails. I am sure my hon. friend will consider the case if he has not already done so.

Motion agreed to.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

FISHERY TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper: That Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States, be read a second time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The subject which the House has under consideration this evening is one of unusual importance. In matters which concern ourselves and ourselves alone, if we make a mistake, it is possible for us to retrace our steps. Our blunders may impede our progress for the time being, but they cannot put ultimately any obstacles in our way. But that observation will not apply to the Bill which is now under consideration. Every step we take is a step in a direction from which there is no return. Every act that we do is final. And if a blunder is made, if we do something that is detrimental to the interests of the country, it will wholly be beyond our power to correct the errors into which we have fallen or the mistakes we have made. It is therefore of very great importance that we should carefully consider the subject now before us. It is important that we should not hastily come to the conclusion, and I confess that I am wholly unable to understand the extreme haste with which the hon. the Minister of Finance and his chief are disposed to press forward a matter of such vital importance to the country. We know that the concessions we are called upon to make are of very great magnitude. We know that the concessions are wholly upon the one side; we know that we are not in this matter standing as the aggrieved party. The complainant is the United States. It is the country to the south of us that has demanded concessions from us, and we, at all events, before we are called upon to approve of what has been done by those who claim to represent us—we ought to know whether they are prepared to accept the extraordinary concessions which have been made or not. Now, I understand that within twenty-four hours this subject is, in all probability, likely to be dealt with at the capital of the neighboring Republic. In all probability, within the next twenty-four hours, the Senate of the United States will either postpone or reject the treaty that has been negotiated. Why, then, are the Government so anxious? Why is the Government so anxious to press this to a conclusion? Why should we commit ourselves to a proposition, which, if rejected, will simply be made the starting point for further concessions at a future period? If this question were allowed to stand over, if Parliament were not called upon to commit itself on it at this moment, should the Senate of the United States within the next twenty-four hours reject the treaty we would then be as free to start again from the point at which the hon. gentleman started a few months ago as he was at that time. But if this House, representing the entire country, is called upon at this moment to approve and does approve of what has been done, and if what has been done should be rejected by the party to whom the concessions are made, why, when we start again to negotiate with our neighbors to the south of us, we will have to start from where we left off in this

Parliament at this moment. We cannot, once the House has committed itself to the provisions of the treaty, take exception to anything there in conceded. A new embassy would say naturally: You, the representatives of the nation to the North—those for whom you speak have already agreed to concede what you now object to. This we knew you were ready to concede without hesitation, and we expect something more at your hands. And so the hon. gentlemen seem not to be satisfied with the humiliation which they have brought upon themselves and the humiliation they have brought upon the country by the propositions which are now before us for ratification, but, before they are at all sure, or, as I believe, when they are very sure, that these propositions will not be accepted by the Senate of the United States, they seek to commit this House to them. Why this indecent haste to commit this Parliament to the propositions of the Minister of Finance before we know whether the neighboring Republic, or those who represent the neighboring Republic, accept these concessions at our hands? Has Lord Salisbury importuned this Government to hurry the matter in this way? Is he afraid that the headland question may be raised again by the people of Canada, that these questions between the two countries may rise again in consequence of the exasperating regulations in regard to customs and in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries? Why do hon. gentlemen opposite press us to give an answer or to give an opinion on this subject before we know what opinion will be expressed by the Senate of the United States? We have everything to gain by awaiting the action of the Senate of the United States, and we have a great deal to lose if they should reject this treaty after we have affirmed it. What does the Minister of Finance want to gain by this House affirming that treaty? Does he propose, or is it his desire, to convince an exasperated nation that those who represented them on this commission made a bad bargain, and that the arrangement which was made is so satisfactory to the people of Canada that they have not hesitated to accept it immediately and without dispute? That is to call upon us to make an arrangement which we know to be false. We know what our position is. We know that it is one of humiliation, and we ought to be spared the further humiliation of having these extraordinary concessions rejected by those to whom they have been made. The Minister of Finance has told us in his speech that the protection of the fisheries has never been made a party question. I believe that is true. I believe that the protection of the fisheries was earnestly desired by both sides of the House, but the protection of the fisheries and the concession to another country of the sovereignty over our fisheries, or a common right to our fisheries, is a wholly different thing, and when the hon. gentleman speaks of the protection of the fisheries and then refers to the provisions of this treaty, he is referring to two things as far apart as they can be. This treaty does not provide for protection; it is a surrender. The conditions in this treaty which, possibly within the next twenty-four hours, the United States will either have postponed or rejected, are not provisions by which proper protection is to be given to our fisheries, but is a concession of more than half of the area which we claim to be within the jurisdiction of this country. There are many thousand of square miles, which we claim to be under Canadian jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, which are proposed to be surrendered to the United States under this treaty. Two years ago we were promised a vigorous police policy to protect our fisheries. That policy, we were told, was supplemental to the so-called National Policy. It was on the same lines, it was for the same purpose, it involved the same principles, it professed to be intended for the interests of the people of this country, but it proved to be anything but that. It was inefficient, it was exasperating. Why, we had before us last

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

year abundant evidence, furnished by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) showing that hundreds of vessels from the United States engaged in fishing within the three-mile limit; and that, while harsh customs regulations were in force, and while harsh and unjust police regulations were carried out, so as to irritate the people of the neighboring Republic and to give them an opportunity of exciting the resentment of their fellow countrymen, there was really nothing done to protect our own fishermen. Two years before the Washington Treaty was denounced by the United States, this Government were notified, and they were advised that it would be well, before that provision of the Washington Treaty came to an end, to enter at that time into negotiations with the United States, so that there would be no worrying police regulations, because at that time those fishermen had still the right to engage in fishing in our waters with the fishermen of this country. The same view was taken by Lord Derby, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies. That nobleman addressed three communications to the Government of this country without receiving any response. It was not until he sent the fourth that they gave him any answer and the concluding words of that fourth despatch were:

"In the face of these circumstances, my Government does not consider that it would be consistent with the respect which it owes to itself to appear as a suitor for concessions at the hands of the United States."

It was not necessary that the Government should appear in the position which they seemed to have considered it necessary for them to appear, as suppliants. It was only necessary for them to invite communication and negotiation; but hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches had a great idea of their own dignity, and one would suppose from the observations which I have read, that they had studied the diplomatic negotiations which were carried on two centuries ago, when the treaties of Osnabruck and Westphalia and Madrid were negotiated, when the ambassadors took different sides of the room, and watched others' legs when anyone moved, because the man who stepped first was supposed to be sacrificing his dignity. In one place, there was a special building put up for the ambassadors to assemble in, and in that there were as many doors as there were ambassadors, so that no one could have precedence of another; and there was also a round table provided at which they might sit so that no question of distinction might arise when their negotiations were being carried on. It seems to me that it is in this spirit that the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches have approached a great question affecting the friendly relations between this country and the neighboring Republic, a question of the most vital consequence to this country, whatever it might be to the country to the South of us. We find in the history of hon. gentlemen opposite a continuation of these lofty pretensions and this proud reserve. We find that they have passed these officious customs regulations which could not help us, but must exasperate the feelings of our neighbors to the South. Then, we have the fisheries regulations which in some cases were cruel and unjust as well as unwise and unnecessary. See what were the means employed by these hon. gentlemen to promote the well-being of this country and to secure friendly relations with those of the neighboring Republic? First, Sir, they proposed to be extremely generous; they said to the people of the United States when it was too late to carry on negotiations, when Congress had no longer an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon the subject, or of agreeing to any proposition that might be made: You may have free use of our fisheries for a season, if the President will permit fish to be carried free into the neighboring Republic. Well, Sir, the President informed these gentlemen of what they ought to have known before,

that he had no power to make any such concession, that he had no power to repeal an Act of Congress, that the proposition ought to have been made while Congress was in session, so that they would have had an opportunity of considering it. And so the American fishermen were given the use of our fisheries for a season without any compensation, and without any reserve. Then we were told that they cared nothing for the generosity that we had extended to them, that they were in no mood to make any concession, that the Gloucester fishermen were still opposed to the free admission of Canadian fish to the American market; and so they were to be taught by a policy of retaliation the power which this country possessed. Sir, we were told that Canada was the great maritime state of the new world, that our fleet was almost as large as that of the neighboring Republic, and that while we did not want to quarrel with them, while we did not want to adopt a policy of exclusion, while we were ready to trade with them if they were disposed to trade, we were quite able to live without them, and that we were quite able to show them that we were capable of protecting the fisheries that we possessed on our coast, and so the policy of Jingoism was begun.

"We do not want to fight, O no!
But, by Jingo! if we do,
We've got the men, we've got the ships,
And we've got the money, too."

It was in that spirit that the hon. gentlemen entered upon the consideration of this question. Sir, what defence did the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries make the other right? Why, it is that we were standing upon our legal rights, that what we did was within the undoubted rights that Canada possessed under the Treaty of 1818. He told us that he had not strictly enforced the provisions of that treaty; he said there were many cases in which the fishermen of the United States were allowed in our waters, privileges which they had no right to claim under the treaty. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman's policy was vacillating, it was capricious, it was arbitrary. It may have been that in every instance that he mentioned he made the concessions which he speaks of; but, Sir, there were many instances in which he did not make concessions. And what defence does the hon. gentleman make when it is complained that his conduct was occasionally arbitrary, vexatious and unjust? Why, Sir, he says: It is not in the bond; I complied with the law; I kept within our rights; I did not do to you any thing that the law did not authorise me to do; and so, because I did not violate the treaty of obligations between the two countries, you have nothing of which to complain. Well, Sir, I deny altogether that position. I say it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to act in accordance with the principle of humanity and of modern civilisation. It was his duty to do no harm, to put no impediment in the way of the fishermen of a friendly power, as long as he was not giving them facilities for violating the law of the land. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, I say, in many instances, did that which was altogether unjustifiable. I hold in my hand a report of some of the complaints of some of those fishermen, and I will read a few with reference to the action of the officers under the charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There was the case of the *Sarah B. Putman*, of Beverly, Mass., which was driven from the harbor of Pubnico, in a storm, 27th March, 1886. That was the complaint. Now, the hon. gentleman will not say that the Treaty of 1818 gave his officers a right to force a vessel to leave the harbor in a storm.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pointing out the charges that have been made by the people of the United States against the Department of which he was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom was that charge made?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, we will answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Please answer now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I will not. I purpose to make my own speech in my own way. We know that those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are the last parties who will submit to interruption, and I will, in this speech, follow their example. Now, I will say this. It does not matter whether that statement was well or ill founded. It was the kind of statement that was made to the American people, it was published abroad in their newspapers, it was that which formed public opinion in the United States, and it was that which compelled those gentlemen to make the discreditable surrender which we are this evening considering; and what I complain is that these hon. gentlemen, knowing the country with which they had to deal, knowing the jealousy with which they guard the interests of their fishermen, were not sufficiently careful to give them no case of complaint, and were not sufficiently careful to see that when a complaint was made, it should be redressed, or answered at the time, if untrue. Now, there was another case, the *Rattler*, which was a ship from Gloucester. It is complained that she was warned off at Canso, N. S., in June, 1886; that she was detained in the port of Shelburne, where she entered seeking shelter, and that she was ordered out from that port. Then again there was the case of the *Caroline Vought*. She was from Booth Bay, in the State of Maine, and was warned off at Paspébiac, N.B., and was refused an opportunity of taking water on board. Now, Sir, the right to take water is one of the rights under the treaty, and what I am reading at this moment are complaints of American fishermen, not that the Government had acted in a narrow and inhospitable spirit, but that they had acted illegally and contrary to the provisions of the treaty by which their rights were secured. Then again I will take a few cases of the next year. There was the case of the *Christina Ellsworth*, a schooner of Eastport, in Maine. The complaint of her master was that in every harbour she entered she was refused the privilege of buying anything, that she was compelled to enter at every custom house, that she found that the customs charges at every place, almost, were different from what they were at the preceding place. Then there was the case of the *Stowell Sherman*. She was ordered, in distress of weather, out of Cascumpec Harbor, P.E.I., after having entered it in a storm. Then there was the *Walter L. Rich*, a schooner of Wellsfleet, Mass. She was ordered out of Malpeque Harbor, P.E.I., in unsuitable weather, for fishing, and was compelled to return to her own port without having an opportunity of fishing, in consequence of the refusal of shelter by the Canadian authorities. Then the *Newell B. Hawes*, that made harbor at Shelburne, N.S., she was ordered out at 5 o'clock in the evening, in the face of a storm. Her commander refused to go, and at 7 o'clock the next morning she was ordered out to sea although there was a dense fog which made it quite impossible that she could leave the port safely. Then there was the *Helen F. Frederick*, of Cape Porpoise, Maine. She was ordered out of Port Latour, U.S., where she had gone for shelter and water. Now if those representations are all well founded, then all of those cases mentioned were in violation of the rights secured by the treaty. There are many other cases which show harsh and unnecessary police regulations, but I mention these that were brought under the attention of the Government of the United States and made the subject of diplomatic discussion between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain in consequence of the complaints set forth. Then there was another class. There are four purposes for which fishing

vessels of the United States may enter the harbors of Canada. There are other purposes that have grown up since for which they might fairly be allowed to enter without doing any injury to our fishermen, without in any way affecting them as competitors in the markets of the world. One of those is the occasional taking on board persons as mariners. In some cases where mariners were sick, where parties were disposed to leave the fishing vessels, where arrangements had been made for taking others on board, they were not allowed to ship seamen in ports of Nova Scotia, and the vessels were obliged to return to American ports and those who had engaged as fishermen or mariners on those vessels were compelled to take rail and go to some port in the United States before they could go on board and enter American service. The vessels that made complaint on this score were *William Keene*, *Pleiades* and *Margaret S. Smith*. Then there was a third class, such as the case of the *Neponset*. She was a schooner from Boston. On 27th August, 1886, she was anchored in Port Hawkesbury, Cape Breton, and immediately reported at the custom house. Being short of provisions her master asked the collector for permission to buy more food, but he was twice refused. He then expressed his intention of seeing the United States' consul at Port Hood three miles away. The custom house officer forbade his landing at that port to see the consul; but he did so in spite of the prohibition of the custom house officer. He saw the consul, and was informed that if he attempted to buy provisions in all probability his vessel would be seized. He asked permission, as he was sick, to return to his own country; that was refused, and he travelled through the woods to a station where he boarded a train in order that he might, contrary to the customs and police regulations of Canada in those matters, return to his own country for medical assistance. It is almost impossible to read these statements without feelings of indignation. It is a discredit to any Government to deal with fishermen of a neighboring country in so harsh and so cruel a way as those parties were dealt with under the vexatious regulations made. We know what the consequence has been. It has been, as the Minister of Finance has said, the union of 60,000,000 of people against this country. What is the testimony of the Minister of Finance on this subject? His hon. friends adopted their National Policy nine years ago. It has had nine years' operation on land, and it has been tried two years at sea, and we know the result. We have the testimony of the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman, in this discussion, said:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole political parties, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

How was it those people were so united, irrespective of party, against this country? How was it that the two Houses of Congress, the press of the United States, the people of the United States entertained such feelings of hostility to this country? It was in consequence of the regulations those hon. gentlemen made and which they attempted to enforce. It was intended to force the United States to come to terms, it was attempted to deal otherwise than on principles of common sense with those who controlled the Government of the neighboring Republic. The Minister of Finance has changed his position. He was at one time hostile to the present policy, and that not long ago. The Finance Minister perhaps had as much as any hon. gentleman opposite to do with the framing of the policy that has resulted in these disasters. Since the hon. gentleman visited Washington his opinions have undergone a change, and he has come back entertaining views much more in accord with those of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

than we have for a long time heard expressed by those occupying the Treasury benches. We remember that a few years ago the Finance Minister declared himself a free trader. He told us he was not a one-sided free trader. He declared that in order to bring about free trade we must do the people of the United States the credit of imitating them, we must adopt their policy. We know that Sir Francis Hincks when he held the position occupied by the hon. gentleman, came down one afternoon with a certain policy set out in his Budget speech, and at eight o'clock, after being subjected to the pressure of the hon. gentleman, receded from that position and adopted a policy quite different. The hon. gentleman approved it and defended it in this House. It was adopted; it continued twelve months and then met its death at the hands of its friends. The hon. gentleman at that time said: "Why, you see the very moment we propose to put a duty on coal the Congress of the United States removed their duty; you see what an extraordinary effect can be produced by imitating the United States in their fiscal regulations." It happened as was pointed out, that this action of the United States Congress was prior, in point of time, to the action of the Dominion Parliament, and could not, therefore, have been influenced by their actions, but although that was explained at the time it did not prevent the hon. gentleman from pursuing this argument. The hon. gentleman's visit to Washington has had a remarkably sobering effect, it has worked wonders in his political sentiment. He has come back entertaining wholly different views of the situation from those he entertained twelve months ago. The hon. gentleman, twelve months ago, was confident that if the United States adopted a non-intercourse Bill, if they carried out the policy to that effect, it would not, after all, do us great harm. It is true he deprecated the policy, but he told us some extraordinary advantages that we would derive if such a policy were adopted. I will read what the hon. gentleman said, so that it cannot be alleged that I have misrepresented:

"Deeply as we would deplore so mad, so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States, adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our lines of communication, and have the most complete means of communication from the furthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea. As I said before this cloud, this only cloud has a silver lining. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House, and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if the policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves, and that the commerce of Canada which to-day is building up New York—I am speaking of the through traffic—which to-day is building up Boston and Portland, would be carried through exclusively Canadian channels to Canadian ports, and would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand."

Now, Sir, I do not know whether the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canada Southern Railway would quite agree with the views of the hon. gentleman. I do not know what the traffic of those roads would in a large degree consist of if the policy of non-intercourse had not been carried out. I do not know what traffic would have reached those cities of which the hon. gentleman speaks if there were to be no traffic from the United States passing through Canada. But, Sir, I am not going to stop to discuss that question, because it is only remotely connected with the subject in hand. The hon. gentleman went on to say that:

"That policy (referring to this policy of threatened retaliation) has only to be carried a very short step further to lead Her Majesty's Government to the conclusion that they would owe it to Canada and to themselves, as being the power under which Canada is happy to serve to meet that policy of non-intercourse by such a different mode of treating the grain from the United States of America and the grain grown in Canada, as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the farming industries of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change of this Dominion."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman threatened the Government of the United States and the people of the United States not merely with a retaliatory policy on the part of Canada but with a retaliatory policy on the part of the United Kingdom. Was the hon. gentleman authorised to make that threat? Had he any communication from the Government of Lord Salisbury intimating to him that if the United States adopted a policy of non-intercourse—a policy of discrimination such as they here shadowed out they would adopt —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will read the passage that preceded that which he has read, he will see it does not stand in the light he has placed it at all. I gave my reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, he gave his reason but he told the House and the country that if the United States adopted such a policy that the Government of the United Kingdom would retaliate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not, and the hon. gentleman will see I did not when he reads the whole passage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read enough to show—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You garbled the passage in such a way as to make it say what I did not say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has said what is not a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read what I have here. If the hon. gentleman sends out and gets the *Hansard* I am ready to read it. I say that neither the beginning, the end, nor the middle nor any other part of the speech can alter the statement he has made here and I would like to know whether His Excellency the Governor General received any communication from the other side of the water in reference to this matter. I would like to know on what authority the hon. gentleman threatened the great Republic to the South with the indignation and wrath of the Government of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman was fond of using high sounding phrases and he may have thought after his return from the United Kingdom that he had something to do with the Government of that great country as well as with the Government of Canada. I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman had no authority to make that statement. I venture to say he had no authority to hold out such a hope or to make such a threat. We know the views the hon. gentleman has expressed in that passage are views as foreign as any well can be to those held by any political man of standing on either side of politics in the United Kingdom. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us the consequence of the policy that he and his colleagues have pursued. What did he find the state of things at Washington? He said in this debate:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a Non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press—Republican and Democratic—of the States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people numbering 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

That is the statement of the case as it now stands, and I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast what he said twelve months ago with what he said here last week. I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast the policy he shadowed out twelve months ago with the policy he is supporting to-day. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his progress. I congratulate him on the progress which he has forced his chief and those associated with him to make in connection with that question. Sir, the Minister of Finance last year professed to stand by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; to-day, Sir, in that paragraph which I have read the hon. gentleman stands by neither of his colleagues, but he stands by Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps

said the policy of Canada in reference to her fishery and custom house articles was barbarous, harsh, inhospitable, contrary to common law, contrary to common justice, and that it produced such a state of irritation on the other side that however anxious the President and his colleagues might be to carry out negotiations with Canada, the state of exasperation was such that it was quite impossible such negotiations could be successfully entered into. That was the exasperation produced twelve months ago by the course pursued by the Government. What does the Finance Minister now say on this question? Let me read the observations which the hon. gentleman made in his speech. He says:

"But what would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States loaded with mackerel or fish of any other description were driven by stress of weather and perhaps in a sinking condition compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if instead of allowing her to tranship her cargo or sell it on paying duty and go to a marine yard for repairs: We said no, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada under the Treaty of 1818?"

That, Sir, is the question put by the hon. gentleman. I ask whether any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has pronounced a more severe censure on the colleagues of the Minister of Finance than the hon. gentleman has himself pronounced. This is the very thing that was complained of in the case of the *Eliza A. Thomas*. The Minister of Marine justifies himself by saying: Such are the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, and the Minister of Finance justifies the provisions made in the treaty that is submitted to us for consideration by saying: That those are fair and proper provisions and that to have acted on different principles would have been harsh and ungenerous and would be contrary to the principle of natural justice. Sir, it did not require a treaty to enable the people of this country to act on the principle of natural justice. We did not require to bind ourselves by a formal document that we might act on the principles of humanity and common sense. We did not require to bind ourselves by a treaty to say to the American people that a vessel is wrecked on our shores, her cargo may be saved, her fish may be put on board another ship or on board a railway car and sent to the neighboring Republic. That was possible without a treaty quite as well as with a treaty, and it was in consequence of the inhuman and the impotent regulations made by the hon. gentlemen opposite that this state of things was brought about. Sir, there is this very extraordinary thing connected with those negotiations. Article 10 of the treaty provides that the fishermen of the United States may enter our harbors, that they may do so under certain conditions to tranship their fish, that they may do so to purchase certain supplies that they may do so without reporting every time if it were half a dozen times a day to the customs. And what did the Minister of Justice say in defence of these strict regulations in the memorandum which he prepared? Why, Sir, he said this:

"It is impossible to enforce the fishery laws for the protection of our fisheries without a strict enforcement of these customs regulations."

That is what the hon. gentleman said last year. The hon. Minister of Finance in this treaty says it is not necessary. He says these concessions may be safely made. He says it is possible to protect our fisheries efficiently, and prevent them being poached upon by the fishermen of the United States without any of those strict regulations which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for their protection. Well, Sir, who is right; the Minister of Justice in his memorandum, or the Minister of Finance in article 10 of the treaty? Now, Sir, I am inclined so think that the strict regulations were not so necessary as the Minister of Justice supposed. I am inclined to think that the Government had other objects in view than the protection of those regulations. The Government, find-

ing that they were not so very successful by the policy of delay in securing terms with the United States, thought they would see what they could do with a policy of vexation. Well, they succeeded admirably; they succeeded in exasperating sixty millions of people, and in being forced to concede what under other circumstances would never have been demanded. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that he had not met anybody at Washington who did not say that the Treaty of 1854 was mutually advantageous to both countries. He said that everyone he had met and conversed with on this subject entertained the same opinion as to the mutual advantages that were conferred by that treaty; and the treaty was repealed, not because it was not commercially satisfactory, but because of political irritation that existed between the two countries. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman would have led the House to believe that the political irritation to which he referred was due to the depredations committed by the *Alabama*. Sir, that was not the case. The treaty was repealed in consequence of the action of the Tory party in this country. Why, Sir, we know how the defeat of Pope was ridiculed. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Government led the Government at the time of the civil war. We know that when Parliament met at Quebec the hon. gentleman and his colleagues rose and cheered and sang "Dixie" when it was reported that Hocker was defeated at Chancellorsville. No American came to Canada and met the hon. gentleman or any of his supporters, who did not feel that he was in a country that was controlled by those who were hostile to him. So the American people took the first opportunity of putting an end to a treaty that was commercially satisfactory to both countries, in consequence of the avowed sympathies of hon. gentlemen opposite for the South. Why, Sir, we know the sentiments that were expressed at that time. Those hon. gentlemen told us that democracy was a failure, that the people were not capable of governing themselves, that they required an aristocratic or monarchical element as ballast for the political ship in order that it might sail safely for any length of time; and so they rejoiced at what seemed the disruption of the American Republic. Not because the people of that Republic had done them any wrong, but because they were hostile to a free government, and were anxious that their predictions as to its failure should be, as they apparently were, confirmed. Now, Sir, we have had a second exhibition of hostility, which had its origin in the policy of retaliation, of which I believe the hon. gentleman claims to have been the author; at all events, so far as I know, he was the first to suggest it. Well, Sir, I am glad the hon. gentleman has made progress; I am rejoiced to see that he now entertains views of a different character. The hon. gentleman is now inclined to believe that freer intercourse with the neighboring Republic would be of no disadvantage to this country. But the hon. gentleman told us that the Treaty of Washington was a wise treaty—that everybody now praised it, although we on this side at the time were violently opposed to it. I would like anyone to mention a single clause of that treaty which is now approved of to which we were opposed at that time. There is not one. We were opposed to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence being granted to the Americans without our consent and without our receiving anything in return. There is no river in Europe that is made navigable to those high up the stream through to the sea, that is not also navigable to those at the mouth as far up as the river is used for navigation. The same is true of every river in South America; but that was not the rule secured to us by the Washington Treaty. The people of Chicago have a right to use the St. Lawrence for all time to come for going to the sea and returning to Chicago; but we are not free to navigate Lake Michigan or to go to Chicago. He knows that we did not receive the free navigation of the River Columbia

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

or the rivers of Alaska. He knows that we surrendered the use of our canals without getting anything in return. There is not a provision of the Treaty of 1871 of which we complained then that we do not complain of to-day. The hon. gentleman has told us that we do Mr. Chamberlain an injustice in holding him responsible for the concessions that were made. I believe, Sir, that is not true. I believe Mr. Chamberlain was not more anxious to make concessions to the United States than was the hon. gentleman himself or the hon. gentleman who sits besides him. Mr. Chamberlain recently said, in addressing the people of Birmingham:

"The Canadian Government and its representatives were most desirous of terminating a state of irritation dangerous in its possible consequence to Canada."

Mr. Chamberlain says the hon. gentleman was anxious to terminate this state of irritation, but how came there to be a state of irritation? It is a mistake to suppose that in this case concessions were made simply at the demand of the Government of Great Britain. The hon. gentleman knows the state of exasperation in which he found the public sentiment in the United States; and knowing that it was dangerous to this country, knowing that the American Government could do us immensely more mischief than we could do them by a policy of non-intercourse, he was anxious to come to terms at any price; he was just as anxious to make concessions as Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain visited this city; he saw the Prime Minister and no doubt learned the situation. He ascertained the views of the First Minister quite as well as the Minister of Finance, knowing that he and his colleagues were responsible for the condition of things that existed in the United States, I have no doubt was quite as anxious to make concessions as was the British representative who came from Birmingham. The hon. Minister of Finance devoted a great deal of time in praising the commissioners; but there is one thing which he did not explain to us, but which he will perhaps explain before the debate closes, that is, how Mr. Bayard came to name him as the British commissioner. The hon. gentleman knows that in Mr. Bayard's letters, Mr. Bayard expresses, not only his readiness to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United Kingdom, with the view of coming to a better understanding, but also names the hon. gentleman as the British commissioner he was most anxious should carry on the negotiations. At whose suggestion was the hon. gentleman named? It would seem, from his statement, that the Imperial Government was rather inclined to name his colleague, Sir John A. Macdonald, but that hon. gentleman, with that modesty for which he is distinguished, gave up his right to the honor, and allowed it to be conferred, in accordance with Mr. Bayard's suggestion, upon his colleague the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman says that we owe a great deal to the right arm of Great Britain in this controversy. I do not think that the military power or the diplomatic resources of England were of the slightest use to us. On the contrary, I believe they have done us much mischief. I believe that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would scarcely have ventured to enter upon their policy so impudent, so offensive to the people of the United States, and so mischievous and disastrous in its consequences to the people of this country, if they had not supposed the Government of England would have helped them through the difficult crisis upon which they had entered. What has happened forces us to recognise the fact that the 60,000 of people to the South of us are supreme on this continent, that the Munroe doctrine, on the whole, is pretty well established on this continent, and that while the Government of the United Kingdom are ready to aid us by any amount of good advice, they will never be disposed to aid us with anything which can be of more effect. They recognise the fact that the Government of the United States is supreme, that whatever power or

liberty we possess, we enjoy in a large degree by sufferance and that it is necessary we should act with great care and prudence in order that we may tide over the difficulties by which we are surrounded in consequence of the action of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. They point out the necessity of making a new departure, of establishing new relations, of altering the course upon which we have entered, and adopting one more in consonance with the circumstances and facts with which we are surrounded. The hon. the Minister of Finance has told us that he made a proposition in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, that he proposed to leave the fishery question in abeyance by making other provisions by a collateral arrangement such as that which existed before. I have no reason to question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statement. But what puzzles me is this. The hon. gentleman's chief at Washington, Mr. Chamberlain, declared himself against such a policy before he left the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman's chief who sits beside him (Sir John A. Macdonald) declared himself against such a policy some time ago. Now, how was it that the hon. gentleman, in spite of the avowed declaration of Mr. Chamberlain in England, and in spite of the avowed declarations of the hon. First Minister here, offered unrestricted reciprocity to the United States? Supposing the American Government had taken up that proposition and accepted it. Supposing they had said: You have offered us unrestricted reciprocity, we are ready to accept it and to enter into negotiations on that basis. Was the hon. gentleman prepared to stand by his policy? Was Mr. Chamberlain, notwithstanding his declaration on the other side of the Atlantic, prepared to stand by his policy? I would like to know. There are a great many people in this House and on both sides of the Atlantic who would like to have a solution of this question. The right hon. the First Minister did not seem fully to realise the extraordinary change that had taken place. The hon. gentleman has been saying for a long time "heads up." But the hon. the Minister of Finance came back from Washington and said: "tails up"; and it was a most disagreeable position for the First Minister as well as for those who sit around him. I would like to know how it was the hon. gentleman obtained the consent of the First Minister to the policy that he did not seem altogether to realise, even after the hon. gentleman's return and after we had entered into these negotiations. I am rather inclined to think that the hon. gentleman had the assent of the First Minister to a proposition of the sort, but I am inclined to think the First Minister was disposed to give that assent, knowing the Americans desired that interpretation of the treaty, with a view of checkmating hon. gentlemen on this side. Let him take this side of the House for one moment into his confidence, and tell us whether he does think that the hon. Minister, who sits beside him, in making that proposition with his assent, did not, after all, bungle it a little, and produce an impression different from that which the First Minister intended to produce. I am sure if the hon. gentleman would make a clean breast of it, I am sure if he would freely avow the sentiments he entertained, I am sure if he would tell us what he instructed his Minister to do, and how far afield he was in following strictly those instructions, we would have a considerable amount of light thrown upon this proposition of unrestricted reciprocity by the hon. the Minister of Finance—the more especially that the hon. the Minister of Finance said it would be just as foolish to propose unrestricted reciprocity to the United States as it would be to undertake to construct a railway to the moon. Yet, notwithstanding the folly of the proposition, the hon. gentleman made it. Now, I shall ask the attention of the House for a few minutes to some of the provisions of this treaty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I think that the time I have occupied, I have applied to the discussion of some of the features of this question, which were brought under the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman's colleague.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The most important provision of this treaty is that relating to the surrender of our sovereignty over a large area of water, an area which must embrace in the neighborhood of 20,000 square miles. The hon. gentleman has but to look at the map to see what an extraordinary area of what we suppose to be a part of our Dominion, and in that I include Newfoundland as well, we have given up. I wish to call the attention of the House to the position taken by the United States on this headland question. The United States have never maintained that the contention we have put forward with regard to the bays and headlands is peculiar to the Convention of 1818. On the contrary, they admit that the Convention of 1818, in laying down the shore line, simply followed the rules of international law,—that, in fact, if there had been no treaty at all, and we had exclusive dominion over our waters, the same question would have been raised as has been raised in this treaty. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say that would be so. That contention, again and again, has been put forward by the United States. The United States insisted upon the maintenance of these rules, that is the rules relating to the headland question, believing them to conform to the well established principles of international law. They believed them to conform to the law of nations which treats of the maritime boundary of States as being three miles from any shore, bay, creek, river, &c., precisely as does the Treaty of 1818. The Convention of 1818 did nothing more than lay down the rule of international law in this particular. If that is so, and they themselves state that in the case and argue it before the Halifax Commission on that point, what is our position? It is exactly the position of the United States. Whatever right they have over the bays on their coasts, we have over the bays on our coasts. The maximum size of a bay in any other country cannot be greater than that in our own country. What have the Supreme Court of the United States and their Attorney General and the district courts decided in regard to the bays on their coasts? They have decided that the bays belong to the States in which they are situated, or are in common to the States which they may divide. Justice Storey, in a very important case, held that the Bay of Delaware was not a part of the high seas because, as he said, it was between the jaws of the land and was therefore a part of the land. That same rule has been recognised by the opinion of the United States courts, by the opinion of their Attorney General, and does anyone suppose that, if the Minister of Finance had said to the American representatives, if you dispute our pretensions in regard to our bays upon our coasts we must refer this to an international commission, and the rule on our coasts is precisely the same as the rule in regard to bays on your coasts, in regard for instance, to the Bay of Delaware, which is 15 miles wide, to Chesapeake Bay, which is 12 miles wide, to Massachusetts Bay, which is 40 miles wide, and we claim the same right to those bays as you claim to come into our bays, and if there is a dispute, it must be submitted to arbitration, and it will apply to your bays as well as to ours—does any one suppose that the American Government would, in face of the decision of their own courts, and the opinion of their own law officers, have insisted against us that we were not doing justice, or that we should have such an arrangement made as between the two countries? I believe it was in the power of the British commissioners to dictate their own terms on that matter, and that the Americans, anxious as they are to enter into our waters for

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is time.

fishing purposes, would never surrender their rights over their own bays in order to secure that; and it was impossible, after the line which they had taken before the Halifax Commission, for them to have successfully contended against us if we chose to stand out against that contention. Then I call attention to the decision which was given by the Queen's Bench in England. There was a case of murder which took place in the Bristol Channel, which is more like one of our bays than any other arm of the sea in the United Kingdom. I think it is 20 miles wide at the mouth, but it was decided by the Court of Queen's Bench that it was not part of the high seas, but was a part of the counties between which it ran. Then there is a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as to the dispute which took place as to Conception Bay on the east coast of Newfoundland, which is 20 miles wide. It was held that that was part of the island and not part of the high seas. In view of the decision of the Privy Council, in view of the decision of the Queen's Bench in England, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the district courts and law officers of the United States, in favor of the contention which we have always put forward, I say that it was only necessary to say to the people of the United States or to the negotiators on their behalf: If you dispute our contention, the whole question of the bays on your coast as well as the bays on ours must be referred to some impartial tribunal, and we are ready to abide by that; and I have no doubt whatever as to what would have been the result. It is utterly impossible that the American commissioners could have contended for a different rule being applied to Canada if our case had been fairly put on the impregnable grounds which were open to those who were the Canadian commissioners, if they had seen proper to insist upon those grounds. We have heard a reference made to the North Sea Treaty, for the purpose of defending the concessions which have been made in this treaty in regard to bays and headlands. There is no analogy between the North Sea Treaty and the treaty which is now spread before us. In the North Sea Treaty there were half a dozen parties concerned. There were Norway, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom. They were all interested. There were bays extending into the territories of each of these powers, and there was a provision agreed to that any bay which was more than ten miles wide at its mouth should be common property for fishing purposes. That provision was made because it was a matter of common convenience, because each party to the agreement had something to concede, and each had something to gain. The rule which was adopted was one which is not applicable to our case. It was not a treaty made under any international law, but for the convenience of each, and for the benefit of the fishermen of each of the different countries which were interested. Is that our position? What bays on the other side have been thrown open to us? What bays more than ten miles wide on the American coast have we obtained any right to enter? From the first to the last this has been a concession on our part. There was no analogy between this case, this treaty which we have now before us for consideration and the treaty which has been referred to in regard to the North Sea. I would like to ask the House for a moment to look at articles III, IV, and V. Article III declares that all bays less than ten miles wide are to remain the exclusive property of Canada, that bays more than ten miles wide are common fishing property until you reach a point where the bay is less than ten miles wide, and then the line is drawn. Article IV specifies certain bays which are more than ten miles wide, which are to remain the exclusive property of Canada, but there are many bays which are omitted, such as Placentia Bay, Hare Bay, Bonaventure Bay, Conception Bay, St. George Bay, and other bays on the shores of Newfoundland.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

which were formerly regarded as the exclusive property of the Crown and are now made the common property of all nations. I asked the hon. gentleman to give an explanation of Article V. He did not give an explanation of the article but he gave an example of a bay which would come within the provisions of that article. That is only one case. I think article V will come within a construction which will limit the provisions contained in article III. It is negative in its provisions. It simply says:

"Nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters such any interior portions of any bays, creeks or harbors as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within three marine miles mentioned in article I of the Convention of October 20, 1818."

Now, the hon. the Minister gave us an instance where there were two or three islands scattered in the mouth of a bay, and he said that, where that was more than six miles wide, that would be common fishing ground. But that does not appear in this clause, which says that "nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters any such interior portions of any bay, &c., as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within the three marine miles mentioned in article I." Take the Bay of Minas, that is twenty miles across, that has an entrance eight miles wide—does the hon. gentleman say that you could exclude American fishermen from that bay? I say that it is as clear as noon day that they are admitted under the provisions of that article. If a bay is more than six miles between headlands, and it widens out into a basin more than ten miles wide, then it becomes common fishing ground as long as the parties keep more than three miles from the coast. It is clear that under that article, the American contention of the Treaty of 1818, is allowed to operate in the case of a large number of bays upon the coast of Nova Scotia, and upon the coasts of Newfoundland. Now, that being the case, the hon. gentleman will see that, in the first place, he has restricted our contention by the surrender of a large number of bays, by far the greater number, that are over ten miles wide, and then he has further restricted it by surrendering all those that are more than six miles between the headlands, if they widen out into basins more than ten miles wide. I say it is as clear as anything can be that that is the construction which will be put upon that article, and it seems to me that must have been the construction that was intended. With no negative provisions such as are contained in that article, it is quite impossible that the hon. gentleman and those who advised him, could have failed to understand the scope of its provisions. I have sometimes seen it stated in the press which supports the hon. gentlemen, that it would be no use to raise the question as to the rights of the Americans to bays upon their coasts, because there are no fish in them. Well, Sir, this is not a peddler's question, it is a question of sovereignty; and there are other considerations besides merely the right of fishing, or the use of those bays for fishing purposes, to be borne in mind. We cannot expect always to be at peace, we cannot expect always to be just in the circumstances in which we are placed now, and it is of the utmost consequence to us that those large bodies of water upon our coasts which we have hitherto claimed to be a portion of our territory, should have remained such that our sovereignty over them should be maintained. Why, Sir, if the United States, in bays and harbors in which there are no fish, which have no value for fishing purposes, so tenaciously uphold their pretensions, of how much greater consequence is it to us to uphold and maintain our rights in the bays upon our coasts, when they are valuable for other than maritime purposes, and those of defence. Yet, the hon. gentleman has not in a single instance, so far as we know, raised the question of the pretensions of the United States. Sir, we know what the Americans are at this moment maintaining with regard to

Behring Sea. Here is a sea nearly 2,000 miles in length and more than 2,000 miles in width, of which they claim dominion to one-half; and at the very time when they are claiming dominion over a sea which, from point to point, is more than 2,000 miles across, they are denying to us our sovereignty and dominion over bays that are more than ten miles across, and that concession the hon. gentleman, by this treaty, has made. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman, in conceding some of the pretensions with regard to commercial intercourse, has made provisions that are detrimental to the interests of this country. I think that these might well have been conceded, I think they ought to have been conceded without a treaty at all. I think it was unfortunate for this country that these questions were raised. It was the meddling oversight of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs that raised these questions. I do not say that the responsibility wholly rests with them, for I have no doubt whatever that in this matter they had the support and approval of their colleagues; but I say that the exasperation which the hon. gentleman says he has done so much to allay, the irritation which he says, and which we saw from the negotiations, stood in the way of all negotiations for a time, the exasperation and irritation which the hon. gentleman makes the justification of the unnecessary concession he has made, are due to the action of those hon. gentlemen with reference to their commercial policy upon our coasts. If the hon. gentleman had not adopted his fishing regulations, if he had not undertaken vexatiously to worry and annoy American fishermen, if the hon. gentleman had not made vexatious customs regulations, which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for the protection of our fisheries, but which the Minister of Finance, with his new experience, declares were wholly unnecessary, and may be safely conceded, and are conceded by this treaty. I say it is unfortunate they were raised at all, because by raising them, they had not only conceded what ought never to have been denied, but they have also conceded that which was absolutely necessary to the due protection of this country in case of difficulty and of danger. Sir, the hon. gentlemen, while professing to feel great interest in the fisheries, have done little or nothing to furnish adequate harbor accommodation and protection to the fishing vessels which are engaged in the deep sea fishery. We know that is where the real difficulty exists, and from this treaty we know, if we did not know before, that it is the deep-sea fisheries which the Americans regard as of the utmost consequence to them. The hon. gentleman has proposed negotiations for our inshore fisheries. Have the Americans accepted the offer of the hon. gentleman? They tell us that they are very valuable, they are growing more and more valuable from day to day. But that is not the opinion of the American fishermen, because they have refused to negotiate for them, they consider them of no consequence; what they regard of consequence are facilities for engaging in the deep-sea fisheries, and the hon. gentleman has adopted a policy which has provoked retaliation and brought about concessions that will go a long way to put American fishermen in a better position for engaging in the deep-sea fisheries than they ever were before. What now does he propose to do? To equalise the condition of things and to improve the position of the deep-sea fisheries of the Maritime Provinces? The hon. gentleman has proposed nothing, he has suggested nothing, he has left those fishermen to take care of themselves. He first exasperated, then he conceded to the American fishermen what was necessary to allay their exasperation. And so we are in the humiliating position of being called upon here to-night to ratify what these hon. gentlemen have done in sacrificing a large portion of the territories of this country, of our sovereignty over that territory, without at all being aware that those sacrifices and

concessions will satisfy the people of the United States. Why, Sir, it would at least have been dignified if the hon. gentleman had waited a short time to see whether the American people would approve of what has been done. The hon. gentleman knows that to-morrow his treaty will be postponed or rejected, and before it is postponed or rejected he wants to commit this House to this proposition so that it must be made the starting point on all future negotiations. The hon. gentleman feels that the position of the Government is one of humiliation and that the Parliament of this country ought to be made sharers in the discredit of the work that has been done.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the close of the debate on the fisheries treaty on Friday night or Saturday morning when discussing with the Finance Minister the reasons why there had been a miscarriage of some arrangement for the closing of the debate during that sitting of the House, took occasion to administer a rebuke to those members of the House who were not sworn of the Privy Council or who had not special acquaintance with the fisheries question, because they had ventured, among the number being my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kinney), the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) to take part in this debate. There are eighty odd young members of this House, and I think it did not well become a Liberal leader to express this illiberal sentiment. Those of us who represent maritime constituencies, however young we are in Parliament and how ever unable we may be to debate those questions with older and stronger men, we yet feel it to be our duty and our right to speak on these questions as well as we may. I must to-night coming to the fishery question compliment the Minister of Marine who has for two and a-half years now held that portfolio on the happy termination of the long and arduous struggle in which he has been engaged. Last summer in the city of St. John the right hon. the First Minister took occasion to pay a splendid compliment to this young colleague in view of the courage and patience and the courtesy which he had shown in the most difficult duties during those two years, which more than, or certainly as much as any two previous years since Confederation, called for the exercise of the very highest qualities in the administration of the Department; and that compliment found a re-echo all through New Brunswick. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) opened his speech to-night by asking why it was that the Administration was in so great a hurry, why they were bound to close this debate, why they must come to a conclusion before we know what action had been taken by the American Senate. But here is a bargain, and if it is to be ultimately ratified by the Imperial Parliament, by the Dominion Parliament, by the Newfoundland Legislature and by the American Senate it will never be carried out if each one is waiting for the other, for some one must begin. We have had the present Bill on our Order Paper and we have commenced; and what could be more business-like and proper than that having begun we should conclude the matter? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says the treaty will be rejected, or he thinks the treaty will be rejected. He seems to share that feeling. Why will the Americans reject the treaty if it is on the part of Canada such a base and abject surrender, as the hon. gentleman says it is? There is scarcely an offensive adjective in the English language that the hon. gentleman has not applied to this treaty. The old ground has been travelled again. The hon. gentleman has repeated the old charges that we were harsh, exasperating, impolitic, irritating, in the administration of our laws for the last two years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Marine says so.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will not say, as the right hon. gentleman who leads this House said with respect to another Opposition member, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a perfect Bourbon, forgets nothing and learns nothing. The hon. gentleman is an imperfect Bourbon, he learns nothing, but he forgets everything. He forgets, if he was present in the House, the adequate answer which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave to those charges. He has not in substance made a new charge, but he has given the appearance of novelty to old statements by giving the names of five or six new vessels, and he has taken the responsibility, as a member of the Canadian Parliament, speaking to five millions of people and beyond, to say what the responsible Ministers of the United States never said and never dared to say, namely, that in the case of the vessels *Rattler*, *Caroline*, *Vought*, *Sarah B. Putnam*, *Newell B. Hawes*, *Stowell*, and *Sherman* we were guilty of cruelty and inhumanity. Let us go into this matter a little more fully. The facts are that specific charges of inhumanity against the Canadian Government in regard to those fishing vessels were actually distributed through the American press. What was the origin of the distribution of that news, what did it begin with, whence did it all come? It came from this. The American Senate appointed a committee to take evidence as to the extent of those illegal inhumanities on the part of the Canadian Government. Their commander, the late Spencer F. Baird, sent out a circular letter, which I will read to substantiate what I said, to his subordinates in these terms:

"UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FISH AND FISHERIES,

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 5th February, 1887.

"SIR: I forward herewith for your information a copy of a communication from Mr. R. Edward Earle, in charge of the division of fisheries of this commission, accompanied by a list of New England fishing vessels which have been inconvenienced in their fishing operations by the Canadian authorities during the past season; these being in addition to the vessels mentioned in the revised list of vessels involved in the controversy with the Canadian authorities furnished to your committee on the 26th January by the Secretary of State.

"The papers containing the statements were received from the owners, masters, or agents of the vessels concerned, and though not accompanied by affidavits are believed to be correct."

"Very,

"SPENCER F. BAIRD,"

Commissioner.

"HON. GEORGE F. EDMUNDS,"

"Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate."

I have here the letter of Mr. Earle, to whom Mr. Baird's letter was written. After stating:

"Some time since, at your request, I mailed circulars to owners or agents of all New England vessels employed in the food-fish fisheries."

He says as follows in the concluding sentence:

"I enclose for your consideration a list of these vessels, together with a brief abstract of the statements of the owners or masters regarding the treatment received. The statements were not accompanied by affidavits but are believed to be entirely reliable."

Evidence was not taken, witnesses were not examined or cross-examined, and there were none of the guarantees which the British law throws around evidence to prevent imposition, but, on the contrary, those unsupported, unsworn statements were sent throughout the United States, but I am proud to say the Secretary of State would not take on himself the responsibility which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), has taken to-day of distributing those infamous falsehoods broadcast throughout the whole country. To come to the question proper: It was to all of us a feeling of relief when we learned that the Finance Minister and his confreres had returned from Washington with a treaty. The one disturbing element in the relations of the two great powers, Great Britain and the United States, for a hundred years has been this fishery question. That was the devil, so to say, which the diplomatists would lay for a time but never exorcise. We adopted a measure in 1818, we obtained a temporary adjustment in

Mr. WELDON (Albert.)

1854, we had a temporary adjustment in 1871, but we have before us in the schedule of the Bill the draft of a treaty which, if ratified, will put an end forever to those quarrels of a century's standing. Let us very briefly clear our minds of all matters of detail and once more very rapidly turn our attention to the main substantial outlines of this matter. In all our fishery negotiations with the United States we have held in our hands three properties, and it is desirable that in considering this question we should keep them distinct. First we have exclusive fishing in the three-mile limit, and our legal right in this matter has never been contested. We have, secondly, our exclusive fishery in the territorial bays or in the words of the old treaty, "British bays" and, thirdly, we have the advantages of neighborhood to the fishing grounds. How are we to deal with these, one after the other, in this treaty? The policy of 1854 was to sell our rights in that matter for a market and we sold the rights of our fishermen in the inshore fisheries for a market, a market for our fishermen it is true, a market for the farmers, a market for the miners and a market for the lumbermen. You may say that was "robbing Peter to pay Paul" and the friends of the fishermen 30 years ago felt that way about it, but there is the fact. I will not dwell as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did on the cause of the termination of that treaty. No doubt he was in part right when he attributed the abrogation of the Washington Treaty to the ill will between the Northern States and ourselves. But that is not a fair statement of the entire cause in my judgment. I think the material reason why the Elgin Treaty of 1854 was abrogated in 1866, was that there was a profound jealousy in the city of New York and with the carrying companies west of New York, of the St. Lawrence route and the St. Lawrence cities. That had something to do with the abrogation of the Treaty of 1866. Now, I come to the record of this three-mile limit policy in 1871. Under the Elgin Treaty we sold our inshore fisheries for a market. In 1871, we sold them for gold. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that every view he had in respect to the Washington Treaty of 1871 he held to-night. I say again he is not correct and that he has a bad memory. If he will look back on a speech he made in 1871 he will find some predictions of his that certainly have not been verified. The hon. gentleman is much more successful in his historical than his prophetic utterances. The role of a prophet is dangerous to all men, and they who prophesy least have least to take back. At the time of the Halifax Commission the hon. gentleman made a speech in which he said it was utterly impossible for a commission to decide on the relative value of Canadian and American fisheries, leading us to suppose we could get nothing out of that commission. Well, we did get something out of the commission. We got a round five and a half million dollars. It may have been a small sum altogether, but it was quite a respectable sum and enough to falsify this prophecy so confidentially made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). What is our policy in this treaty with respect to the inshore fisheries? In one statement made the other night by the hon. the Minister of Justice, in his encounter with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies), and a statement which got a quicker response from this House than any other statement made, and which, in my judgment, there was no more statesmanlike remark made in the course of this debate—I refer to the statement that it was a wise policy for the Canadian people, looking to their future, to hold those inshore fisheries and to preserve the fisheries within this three-mile limit, and that we have pursued a wiser course here than we did in 1854 or 1870. Those marginal seas, as we call them, are, so to speak, the fisherman's farm. Our fishermen leave the shore at early morning before daylight, take their boats, lines and nets and go to their farms on the

sea and return with the fruits of their labor at night. Our farmers in the same way go out in the early morning to their fields and bring in their harvest in the harvest time at night. If we preserve this policy which is embodied in the Treaty of 1888, the result will be, Mr. Speaker, that we will keep our fishermen at home, that we will make our fisheries a productive and a permanent industry in the country, and when by-and-bye the day will come when we will have, as all growing people must have, to raise a navy and support a navy for her own defence we have there the nucleus of a fine body of men out of which a navy can be made. It is a statesmanlike principle to guard our fisheries for our own people, and just as necessary as to guard our forests, our mining area or our marsh lands and not sell them *en bloc* to a stranger. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that the headland question was the great question, and I quite agree with him. It has been the material cause of the quarrel between the two peoples. It has been in controversy since 1818, and I agree with him that the difficulty, however, is largely a difficulty as to a principle of law, for the words of the treaty are reasonably clear. Hon. members all know very well the several contentions on this question. The rule, of course, is that the high seas are free from the dominion of any one and that the property in the fish there is free to all. Everyone understands that some small bays are part and parcel of the State that has its headlands and strand lying between them, but the controversy lies as to how large a bay must be before it may properly be called a high sea. When the plenipotentiaries met last November in Washington they had before them the old Treaty of 1818, which simply says:

"Whereby American fishermen renounce forever their right to come into British seas."

The word "British" is not defined and the whole question has been how are we to come to the meaning of "British" or to its equivalent word "territorial?" The hon. gentleman said that in our administration of the law we had gone to the American Government in a spirit of 200 years ago and that our policy was a mediæval one. I tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that his law is mediæval law, and that he has quoted to this House on this subject exploded authorities of the last century. He has quoted here the opinions of Judge Story, which are opinions given many years ago. I wonder why he did not quote Chancellor Kent who was an authority on this subject many years ago. With his permission I will quote from Woolsey who has reviewed the opinions of those men who held that bays stretching from quite distant headlands such as from Cape Ann to Cape Codd and from Nantucket to Montauk Point and from that point to the Capes of the Delaware and from the South Cape of Florida to the Mississippi were within the limit. Woolsey holds that those are not territorial waters and he says:

"But such broad claims have not it is believed been much urged and they are out of character for a nation that has ever asserted the freedom of doubtful waters as well as contrary to the spirit of more recent times."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) quoted the Attorney General of the United States but he did not do us the favor to say what Attorney General. He did not tell us and the opinion may be as old and obsolete and mediæval as the opinion of Judge Story. The hon. gentleman proposed to deal with the opinions of the English court on this matter. He said the common law courts in England dealt with this matter and he spoke of a case where the English court claimed to have jurisdiction over a vessel in the Bristol Channel. That particular point of the Bristol Channel is in the county of Glamorganshire in Wales and the channel is properly speaking but the mouth of the river and bears no analogy whatever to any of the waters in controversy in this country, for example the Baie des Chaleurs. He dealt more fairly and stated more appositely the case when he

dealt with a decision of the Privy Council in the Conception Bay case, in which the question was raised as to the authority of the Newfoundland Legislature over a point of land 4 miles from the inner part of Conception Bay, where a cable company had placed a buoy. The hon. gentleman misled this House. I do not say that he deliberately and intentionally misled the House but he led us to understand that the English court in that case proceeded upon a rule of law, that a point four miles from the shore of Conception Bay was a part of the high seas. I say that is not the ruling of the court in this case and the ruling of the court is quite the contrary. They said that the British Parliament had declared that Conception Bay was part of the British waters and a British court is bound by the words of an Imperial statute whatever their opinion of the law may be. I will read what Lord Blackburn said in giving judgment on this Conception Bay case. Lord Blackburn had not made up his mind on this point but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems to have made up his mind on it if Lord Blackburn did not:

"It does not appear to their lordships that jurists and text writers are agreed what were the rules as to dimensions and configuration, which, apart from other considerations, would lead to the conclusion that a bay is or is not a part of the territory of the State possessing the adjoining coasts, and it has never, that they can find, been made the ground of judicial determination."

The hon. gentleman said that there had been judgment in different courts; Lord Blackburn says there has been no judgment with which he is acquainted.

"If it were necessary in this case to lay down a rule, the difficulty of the task would not deter their Lordships from attempting to fulfil it. But in their opinion it is not necessary to do so. It seems to them that, in point of fact, the British Government has for a long period exercised dominion over this bay, and that their claim has been acquiesced in by other nations, so as to show that the bay has been for a long time occupied exclusively by Great Britain, a circumstance which, in the tribunals of any country, would be very important. And, moreover (which in a British tribunal is conclusive), the British Legislature has by Acts of Parliament declared it to be part of the British territory, and part of the country made subject to the Legislature of Newfoundland."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this effectually disposes of that aspect of the case. By the law of nations, what are our rights in land-locked bays like the Bay of Chaleurs? We can only find the law of nations from two sources—the opinions of the great text writers and the courts, and the history and practice of nations. I do not know any subject in international law about which there is so much controversy, disagreement and confusion as the subject of the jurisdiction of nations in land-locked bays. I have obtained in the library the opinions of all the authorities on this subject that I could find, leaving out English and American authorities, and I will venture to give them to the House. Azuni, Vol. I, p. 46, after asking the question: How wide at the mouth a bay must be before the State which owns the two defining headlands and the intervening strand loses exclusive dominion over such bay, answers: "Nevertheless, there is no consensus of opinion, and no accord in national practice, respecting the extent of this sovereignty." Bluntschli, at section 309 of his book on International Law, says, "Where the width is but small." Reyneval, in his law of Nature and Nations, Vol. I, p. 299, says that there is great uncertainty, "but the extent of this property is not determined by a uniform rule." Prof. De-Martens states that there are conflicting theories, and seems to favor the range of a double-cannon shot, so that the bay could be defended from both sides. Fiore, Vol. I, p. 374, says: "We speak of bays of small extent, not those of great width." De Hautefeuille, Vol. I, page 93, says: "The authors, unanimous upon the principle of sovereignty, over the territorial sea, are far from agreed as to its extent." Some says "100 miles, some says 60, some 30 miles, and some the horizon." Vattel, a standard author of not so many years ago, expresses himself in similar terms. In the light of these opinions, who can say

that the great writers on the law of nations are agreed. The hon. gentleman says there is a definite rule, but they say there is not a definite rule, and that in the absence of public law, you are utterly at sea as to what your rights are in these land-locked bays. Passing away from the writers, we have but one other means of determining what are our rights, that is the practice of nations. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal with these matters, but I may be pardoned if I remind him that the practice of nations is reasonably definite and clear. We are not alone in our fishery troubles. The fisheries on the North Atlantic coast are not the only fisheries in which England has been interested. There are extensive fisheries on the eastern side of the British Islands, and there are fisheries in the North Sea, with reference to which England has a treaty with France, made in 1839. In determining with France what should be regarded as the maximum limit of her jurisdiction, England in that treaty had agreed to the ten-mile rule. In 1868 in a treaty with Germany with reference to the fisheries in the North German Ocean, she has also agreed to the ten-mile rule. Then there is the Treaty of 1862, to which the hon. Minister of Finance alluded, in which the same rule was followed. I call the attention of the House to these facts in order to show that while there is no consensus of opinion in the writers on international law, there is a uniformity in the practice of the great nations of Europe; and I do not see how our negotiators could have expected to obtain more than the ten-mile rule; yet article 3 closes all the small bays by the ten-mile rule, and article 4 closes all the large ones by individual delimitation. Hon. gentleman claim that Canadian fishermen have under this treaty been deprived of their lawful fishing grounds, but the only possible ones are the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy. The hon. member for Northumberland stated the case fairly the other night when he stated that all parties are agreed that the Bay of Fundy is regarded as part of the high seas, partly because of the great width of the bay, and partly because the northern headland is in the United States. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies) delivered a very interesting speech, a speech very highly prized by this House, not altogether because of its own inherent merits, but because of very spirited rejoinder which it provoked from the hon. Minister of Justice. I think, if the hon. member for Queen's would speak frankly to-night as to his feelings when the Minister of Justice had done with him, he would say with Sir Andrew Aguecheek, "Plague on it! had I known him valiant and so cunning in defense, I would have seen him damned before I challenged him." The hon. senior member for Halifax, (Mr. Jones) took high patriotic ground that was delightful to see. We know the hon. gentleman and respect him highly, but the patriotic role is not his normal role; and when he said that as a Canadian he was prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of the Empire, I was astonished. He takes the ground that this treaty and the interests of Canada have been sacrificed by the exercise of Imperial pressure and the same position was taken, and more strongly taken, by the hon. member for Northumberland. But, I desire, to impress this point on hon. members, that Great Britain, in negotiating this treaty for her Canadian people, has preserved to them the ten-mile rule, and has held for them bays much wider than ten miles, while in negotiating with reference to the rights of her own English people in the German Ocean she has not gone so far or secured such great rights. She has held out more strongly and stubbornly to protect us than she has done to protect her people at home. Mr. Speaker, I must apologise for occupying the time of the House so long. I shall sit down by saying that I share in all sincerity the feelings of the hon. member for Halifax when he said he was glad to see a cause of quarrel between the two nations removed. I think we all express the hope

Mr. WELDON (Albert.)

that this treaty will be ratified, we cherish the relief that this treaty will be ratified by the Canadian Parliament, and I cherish the hope that this treaty, in which undoubtedly we have made concessions, will be ratified by the Americans. It is a treaty that undoubtedly comes long below what we argued for; it is undoubtedly a treaty of concession. We hope the Americans will ratify it, and thus remove the cause of ill-will which has been standing for many years. But if they should not ratify it, our labor would not be in vain. Here is a treaty endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the Canadian Parliament and people, and the responsibility of putting which through their Senate has been accepted by the American executive. It commands the support of one powerful party in the United States, and with that enormous weight of opinion at its back, whether it be rejected or accepted, it will establish the rule that will hereafter control the conduct of both nations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was quite justified in insinuating that I was desirous of stopping the discussion the other night. On the contrary, we were anxious to prolong it, and to give himself and other hon. gentlemen on that side, as well as ourselves, an opportunity of expressing their views. It was his own leaders who were most desirous of shutting off that discussion on that occasion and depriving us of the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman. It appears to me there is really some little inconvenience in this present doctrine of dual sovereignty which appears to be exemplified on the other side of the House. No doubt there have been occasions in our own history, in the old relations between the two Canadas, when it was found convenient to have two heads to the Government; and, in older times, there were two consuls in Rome, but really on the present occasion it must be admitted this arrangement comes rather hard, particularly on what I may call, I hope without offence, the inferior members of the Ministry. These hon. gentlemen are, I am sure, desirous, as they ought to be, of keeping in accord with the powers that be; but, Sir, it is very hard indeed for even political vicars of Beay to render proper obedience to the powers that be, when the powers that be do not know their own minds, from week to week, and do not appear to agree with each other as they ought to do. Sir, I think that the First Minister in particular, ought to consider the feelings of his colleagues. He has been accused on various occasions of rather looking on most of his colleagues as his clerks rather than his colleagues. It is not for us to say how far that suspicion is correct, but I am bound to say that some of his proceedings of late do appear to give it a good deal of color. In the present instance, take the case of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who, I am sorry not to see in his place. How hard a case was his. He was called upon to reply on a recent occasion; and after he replied, we find the hon. gentleman the Minister of Finance coming down and riding ruthlessly over all his arguments. Well, perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance may plead there was not much argument to ride over. Indeed, I virtually agree with him there; but that made it none the easier for the hon. the Minister of the Interior. Then there is the case of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice was called upon to back up his leader in response to the attack made on the Government by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and he rose equal to the occasion. He not only expounded the law of the occasion, but he declared, with his hand on his heart, that he would be a traitor to the best interests of his country if he advised, or the Government advised, that we should bend to the caprice and suit our policy to the dictation of any petty demagogue in the United States Congress. I submit that after those patriotic sentiments, it was cruel to the Minister of Justice, who depends on his

character to a great extent, that within a week he should be compelled to draft a proclamation, and draft it very badly, declaring reciprocity in these identical articles which, but a week before, he declared could not be let in without treason to the constitution. I do not know how this constant diet of humble pie may agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. I am bound to say, as regards the hon. Minister of Justice, that it does seem to agree with him; but it must be a hard thing to have to swallow all the time, and all I can say with respect to these hon. gentlemen, is that it ought to be considered in their wages.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is the master of Dotheboys hall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am certain of this: I have known men occupying that position who would not have consented to play such a part for seven times \$7,000 a year,—aye, or for seventy-seven times \$7,000. Now, we have again the case of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He was obliged, like his colleagues, to devote great labor and great toil to compiling despatches, in which he set out at great length and with very considerable force how imperative it was for us to do all these things which he did, for the purpose of maintaining our fisheries. He showed us that our fisheries were perfectly worthless unless those customs regulations were enforced; and these identical privileges which we are now asked to concede were conceded to the American fishermen. The avowal was very hard on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think the hon. gentleman really ought not to call upon his colleagues, at any rate at such very short notice, to swallow their own words in this perfectly reckless fashion. I listened with some attention to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other evening, and I must say that his arguments savored strongly of fish. They were very fishy. There is no doubt, however, that the hon. gentleman, however well he may have succeeded in pleasing his friends on the other side, failed thoroughly to account for the language which he and the hon. the Minister of Justice had seen fit to use on a previous occasion with respect to these identical privileges which they now agreed to concede. I think in this case that there is no man here who has taken the trouble to examine those minutes and despatches which those hon. gentlemen laid on the Table, and to compare them, line by line, with the treaty which we are now called upon to adopt, who will not agree with me in saying that it is practically impossible for us, or for any men, to conceive that this is a treaty we can be proud of. It may be a necessary dose to be swallowed, we will discuss that presently, but most assuredly, after the stand which was taken by the hon. gentleman a year ago and two years ago, no human being can say that any Canadian can be proud of the attitude which this country finds itself to-day. Now, my main reason for desiring to speak to-night is that on the occasion of a recent debate, to which I may be pardoned for alluding, I called the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite and their colleagues and this House to the fact that there was practically no argument which they could bring forward to induce us to adopt this fishery treaty. I have been fully justified in the arguments that I have brought forward in defence of the right of Canada, to make her own treaties and her own terms with the people of the United States. Let me for one moment recall to the attention of the House the argument which I then addressed to them. I pointed out, in the first place, that the position of Canada in regard to the United States was entirely exceptional. I pointed out that strict right, strict legal right, must yield to the good of the Empire at large, and I pointed out that the Empire itself had adopted a totally different rule as regarded the United States from what it had adopted with regard to any other country under the sun, and therefore I drew the

conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity was an exceptional thing and was not contrary to the general good. What has been the argument advanced by the Minister of Fisheries? Why, point to point, step by step, that hon. gentleman has explained to this House that the position of Canada as regards the United States, is wholly exceptional, he has explained to us that our strict legal rights must yield to the general good of the whole Empire, that the English Government have, and have for good reasons I doubt not adopted a totally different rule in dealing with the United States from that which they have adopted in dealing with any other country under heaven, and therefore he drew the deduction that these unexampled concessions, as he rightly called them, might be expedient in this case. It followed, as I had warned the hon. gentleman and his followers that it would have to follow, that these unusual and unexampled concessions might be made in such a case. It is rather remarkable—I do not mean to say for a moment that it is to his discredit—to observe the isolation in which the hon. gentleman appears to stand in the present Cabinet. The hon. gentleman's arguments are not the arguments of his colleagues, the hon. gentleman's language is not the language of his colleagues, the hon. gentleman's ways are not the ways of his colleagues, and the resolution which he arrives at differs very widely from theirs. I observe that the hon. gentleman declared, and declared correctly in this particular instance, that the Canadians pay the duty, which is rather different from the doctrine which has been avowed by his colleagues, and not only by his colleagues but by nearly everyone who supports him on that side. He dwelt—and there I am in accord with him—upon the particular importance of the friendship of the people of the United States for the people Canada and the people of England. There again he was right, and it would be well if some of his colleagues had shown a greater appreciation of that great fact. The hon. gentleman told us, and he told us truly, that a Non-Intercourse Bill, or a Retaliatory Bill, whatever it might be called, would be a great injury to the people of Canada, but I do not hear that he took his colleagues to task, that he took them by the throat, when they proclaimed the opposite. The hon. gentleman told us also that he undertook to attempt to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, but he told us also that the Americans would not accept it. The hon. gentleman may or may not deserve well of his countrymen. There may be a difference of opinion in regard to that. But I will say that he has deserved exceedingly well of the party with which he is connected. There can be no doubt that he, and he alone, saved them in 1837, and I believe that he has saved them again in this negotiation from the consequence of their own ill-judged folly in almost dragging us into a collision with the people of the United States. My hon. friend who last spoke was quite right in saying that it was a very dubious question whether or not it was wise for us to proceed now to the ratification of this treaty. There are many reasons why we should not. There may be also something to be said in favor of our doing so; but in any case the Government must bear the responsibility. I have doubts whether we are doing a wise thing in ratifying this treaty at this moment, but I am aware of the differences which exist in political constitution between ourselves and the people of the United States, and it may be, as we are constituted, that we are nearly as much committed to the action of our Government now as the United States would be by the action of their Senate, so I am disposed to place the whole responsibility on the Government. They may be acting under pressure from the Imperial Government, or they may be acting under pressure from the Government of the United States, with whom they came to this arrangement. I am not going to press them for an answer in regard to that. The matter is one of grave doubt, and I am going to leave the responsibility resting upon

them. But there are other matters of grave doubt which are involved. First, it is better, on the whole, for us to concede these things, and, in the next place, how far has the action of the present Government deserved the approbation or the censure of the House in this matter? As to the first point, no one can dispute the fact which the Minister himself has admitted, almost in so many words, in his speech, that, by some misfortune or some blundering, call it what you will, this treaty or this negotiation was entered into at a time which was as inopportune in the interests of Canada as it could be. I say, and I notice the hon. gentleman has echoed what I said, that you could not have entered into a negotiation for the settlement of our fishery disputes at a more unpropitious time than this, just before a presidential election in the United States, and I think the Government were to blame for allowing the matter to drift so long when it was necessary to enter into the negotiation at a more opportune time. Then, in the second place, I believe, whatever quibbles may be used, that all the concessions are on the side of Canada. I have been unable to see from any statement which has been made by hon. gentlemen, that they have gained one single thing for which they have contended. Still further, I notice that all matters favoring Canada were carefully eliminated from the second Treaty of Washington as they were from the first. There were other matters affecting our fisheries which should have been dealt with on the north-west coasts of this Dominion as well as on the north-east, and, in dealing with any other power than the United States, the British Government would have insisted that the negotiations should have included all the fishery matters in dispute, including the fisheries action of the United States officers in the Behring Sea, of which we have as much reason to complain, at least, as the United States have to complain of the action of our officers in regard to their fishermen in the north-eastern corner of the Dominion. Why was not that allowed to be made a part of the discussion by the commissioners? I am afraid that it was eliminated for the same reasons for which the undoubted wrongs of Canada were passed over and were unnoticed in 1871, because it was not convenient for the American Government to be called upon to enter into that question at that time, because every argument which they gave in favor of the action of their officers in the Behring Sea would have been in antagonism with their contentions in regard to the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic fisheries. I fail to see where we have obtained any support from the British authorities on this subject. Undoubtedly, dealing with any other power on earth, the British authorities would have insisted that the negotiations should cover these points, but in our case these points were eliminated from the discussion, and even Mr. Chamberlain himself stated that our legal rights in Canada were surrendered in this matter, and he justified that on the ground of the vast importance of the friendship of the American people for the people of England. Sir, under these circumstances, it is utterly impossible for us to pretend that we had a right to any substantial assistance whatever from the presence of the English plenipotentiaries; and I heartily endorse the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that the interests of Canada would have been much more likely to have been attended to successfully if we had, in a matter which concerned us chiefly, been allowed to name our own negotiators and conduct our own negotiations, and until we have the power to do that, I do not believe, for my part, that we have any very great chance of carrying these negotiations to a successful termination. Then my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) called attention to the fact—I have as yet heard no answer whatever to his argument—that there would be very great practical difficulty in enforcing this agreement. He called attention to this fact: Now that you have admitted the Americans to traverse the three-mile belt, practically at

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

their own pleasure, unless you maintain an enormous fleet of cruisers at almost every point frequented by these fishermen, you will find it entirely impossible to prevent them, whenever they get an opportunity, from exercising their craft; the Minister of Finance himself admitted in so many words that the fishermen were an uncontrollable and intractable class of men, in other words, that if they get an opportunity of catching a few hundred barrels of mackerel within the three mile limit, they were perfectly certain to use it unless a cruiser were alongside. That, Sir, I take it, you will find to be the actual state of the case. You will find that under one pretense or another, American fishermen will traverse this belt at their own pleasure and will, as it was contended a year ago, under those circumstances, fully enjoy all the rights and privileges of the inshore fisheries which the last speaker was so anxious to preserve. Lastly, Sir, I point out that this is wholly and entirely at variance, be it right or be it wrong, with the pretensions which the Government advanced but a year ago. This treaty may be an honorable treaty or it may be a dishonorable one, but one thing is sure, that if it be right, the conduct of hon. gentlemen a year ago was the maddest folly, inasmuch as rather than yield concessions which they say now they can honorably yield, they persisted, as the Minister of Finance has told us, in exasperating a people whose friendship he rightly declared to be of the vastest importance, not only to us, but to the people of England as well. Well, Sir, what was the answer of the Minister of Finance to all this? Practically he admitted it all. He admitted, as I have said, that the treaty was negotiated at a very unfavorable time, but he went on to tell us that we must bow to the logic of facts, we must look at the situation, the hon. gentleman said, all round. It was a great mistake, the Minister of Finance thought, that we should have exasperated the Americans. He dwelt upon that repeatedly. He called attention to the fact that our policy had been such as to exasperate the Americans. He called attention again and again, it could not be too often emphasised, that in the minds of the English people the friendship of the United States was of immense importance to us and to the Empire, and he practically told us that on mature reflection—and I dare say he was quite right—we could not long resist a non-intercourse Bill. Last year he did not think so, but this year, after a visit to Washington, he has grown considerably wiser. I think that hon. gentleman, when he was brought face to face with the difficulties of the situation, showed himself superior in judgment to his colleagues, and recognised that they had made a tremendous mistake, and he prepared to execute his strategic movement to the rear at the earliest possible moment. Sir, he recognised, and we have got to recognise, that in matters of this kind, to a very great extent, owing, no doubt, to their position as a European and Indian power, the English people are, to a great degree, powerless to assist us, and that being so, for peace's sake, as the hon. gentleman truly said, we of Canada must be prepared to give up our rights. Now Sir, I am not disposed to contravene the position of the hon. Minister of Finance altogether, but what I desire to point out here, and what I shall point out elsewhere, is that from the whole tone and tenor of his apology for this fishery treaty we are now discussing, you must draw of necessity these two inferences: first of all, that the position of Canada toward the United States is taken wholly and entirely out of all ordinary categories. Sir, we have got the right to deal with the United States as we have the right to deal with no other nation. The plain truth of the matter is this, and it is time, and it is right, that that truth should be known, the suzerain state cannot practically treat as against the United States, and therefore that suzerain state has no right, as against the United States, to claim from us that allegiance which she would have a right to claim if she was able and willing to protect us, as

Mr. Chamberlain put it, in our admitted legal rights. Sir, we knew this before. Those of us who were not blind and deaf to the whole situation, saw that this was the case the moment the first Treaty of Washington was concluded, and the moment Great Britain informed us that she was unable to obtain compensation for Canada for the wrong which had been admittedly perpetrated on our territory by American citizens, although it was as clear as daylight that the Americans could advance no argument which would justify them, or justify any arbitrators in admitting their claims for damages in the case of the *Alabama* and her consorts, which did not go with tenfold more force to justify the people of Canada in demanding that their claims should be considered for wrongs done them in time of peace by Fenian marauders on our shores. Sir, I say that was clear from 1871, I say that is now beyond all possibility of dispute. I say that it follows, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is quite right, and that I am quite right, in saying that we must make, from this time forth, the best bargain we can with the United States, and that we must do it alone. Mr. Speaker, it is worth while, in this connection, to call attention to a very remarkable document which was laid upon the Table of the House, that is, the personal and unofficial letter written by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, under date, Washington, 31st May, 1887. I think, Sir, that this House will do well to ponder on what Mr. Bayard has there said:

"WASHINGTON, D.C., 31st May, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR CHARLES,—The delay in writing you has been unavoidable. In the very short interview afforded by your visit I referred to the embarrassment arising out of the gradual practical emancipation of Canada from the control of the mother country and the consequent assumption by that community of attributes of autonomous and separate sovereignty, not, however, distinct from the Empire of Great Britain. The awkwardness of this imperfectly developed sovereignty is felt most strongly by the United States, which cannot have formal relations with Canada, except directly and as a colonial dependency of the British Crown, and nothing could better illustrate the embarrassment arising from this amorphous condition of things than by the volumes of correspondence published severally this year relating to the fisheries by the United States, Great Britain, and the Government of the Dominion. The time lost in this circumlocution, although often most regrettable, was the least part of the difficulty, and the indirectness of appeal and reply was the most serious feature, ending, as it did, very unsatisfactorily.

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to."

I say that is plain common sense on the part of Mr. Bayard, who thoroughly well understood the position of Canada toward the United States and towards England; and I regretted to find that the Minister of Finance, whom I thought would have been disposed, as he appeared to be in his reply to Mr. Bayard, to have accepted and endorsed Mr. Bayard's statement, should, on the other hand, have declared that he thought it was infinitely more desirable for us to deal with the United States under the ægis and protection of Great Britain. I, for one, wholly and entirely repudiate that part of the contention of the Minister of Finance. I say that Canada has grown to that stature that in dealing with the United States she ought to be allowed to deal directly; and I say it will beten fold more to the interests of the people of Canada that we should deal directly without reference to Downing street or the British Ambassador at Washington either. There is another inference that must be drawn from the very striking words that the Minister of Finance has used, and that is this: It appears to me to be only too clear that Canada lost and the Government lost a very great opportunity in this matter. It appears to me the Government, besides losing a great opportunity, placed us in a most humiliating position, and they ran a very great risk. When I come to examine this correspondence which passed between Mr. Bayard and the hon. gentleman opposite, I cannot but feel that in all human probability, if we could pierce through the diplomatic secrecy which inevitably en-

shrouds these negotiations, the House would find that when the hon. Minister met Mr. Bayard, as I think he did in Easter, 1887—I think I am correct in that—several weeks before these letters were written, when the hon. gentleman was brought face to face with Mr. Bayard, when he realised where we were and whither we were drifting, he and Mr. Bayard must then have come to the conclusion, which Mr. Bayard announces in his letter, that the real and true means for the extrication of Canada from all these difficulties was a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity almost identically on the lines that I myself have proposed. Why, this is what Mr. Bayard indicates. Does any one suppose that Mr. Bayard on 31st May, 1887, five or six weeks after he had conferred with the hon. gentleman, would have made that proposition unless he had some good reason to suppose that it would be acceptable to the Minister of Finance at all events? Sir, I believe that the Minister of Finance in that respect was decidedly in advance of his colleagues, and that if they had given him a free hand, if they had allowed him in 1887, in April or May, when he met Mr. Bayard, to reply to the invitation which Mr. Bayard gave in that paper, we might have had unrestricted reciprocity to-day, and I believe that would have suited the hon. gentleman, who had, at all events, inclination enough, and who had intelligence enough to understand how vastly superior such a mode of settling the difficulty would have been to the one to which we have had recourse. But that opportunity passed, that opportunity was lost; and when later on, just on the eve of the presidential election, the hon. gentleman did then make a sort of proposition in that direction, then, of course, we could not be surprised that the American authorities should tell him under those circumstances they were not at liberty to undertake negotiations which they might have undertaken and might have successfully carried out some eighteen months ago. I have said this country is humbled. I do not mean to say that this country is necessarily humbled from concluding this treaty, but this country is humbled in this: That its recognised Government has advanced pretensions, has made declarations, has done acts which are wholly and utterly inconsistent with the line that they now call upon Parliament to take. Why, in the outset of the despatch we are told:

"The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbors, to post a letter or send a telegram or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood or pestilence or to buy medicine or to purchase a new rope."

In other words, if American vessels were allowed to enter the three-mile limit the Finance Minister declared that our fisheries could not be preserved and our inshore fisheries would be worthless. And then the hon. gentleman goes on to state on another occasion:

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trusts committed to their charge."

I might go on and multiply these quotations *ad nauseam*, but these are enough to show clearly and distinctly that the hon. gentleman took, during the negotiations, an entirely different position from that which the Government occupied twelve months ago. They have done the very things which they declared they could not do without surrendering the national inheritance of Canada. According to their own statements they have done those very things which they said would destroy the whole value of our inshore fisheries and, more than that, they have, as the Minister of Finance told us in so many words, performed this surrender and humiliation after first of all exasperating a very powerful neighbor, whom the Finance Minister tells us it is in the highest degree in our interest to conciliate and to keep on

good terms. Sir, among other things the hon. gentleman gave us a very curious bit of secret history. It appears—and it was a very remarkable admission to make, although it was only fair on the part of the Minister of Finance to make it—that this famous visit of Easter, 1887, made to Mr. Bayard did not originate from the Minister's own seeking. It appears there was a go-between, there was a third ambassador concerned; it appears that the Government of Canada and the Minister of Finance were indebted to the friendly intervention of Mr. Erastus Wiman for bringing the Secretary of State and the Minister of Finance together. Now, I am bound to say that I believe in so doing Mr. Wiman rendered this country a very valuable service. I have no doubt whatever from what has transpired that had not Mr. Wiman proposed and arranged that interview, had not the Finance Minister gone down to Washington or New York whichever it might be and interviewed Mr. Bayard, I have no doubt from the dangers which menaced Canada, from the dangerous complications that were ahead, a very perilous state of things might have ensued. I think it is only due to a man who has been much abused and much vilified by the hon. gentleman's colleagues, by his supporters and the press supporting those hon. gentlemen that attention should be drawn here and in the most public manner to the service that Mr. Wiman rendered to his native country on that occasion, and I trust both the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and supporters and the press supporting them now that the Minister of Finance has practically recognised this great service on the part of Mr. Wiman, will speak of that gentleman in future with the respect due to one who has rendered a very important service to his country. I believe myself the hon. Minister of Finance likewise rendered a valuable service in this, that although like his colleagues he had been misled into a very vicious policy, when he was brought face to face with the situation he then understood how critical it had become, and from that time he applied himself seriously and in earnest to extricate us from the dilemma in which we had been placed. I cannot but believe that the hon. gentleman in his heart of hearts had desired—and as I said I think there is no disguising the fact after what Mr. Bayard has said—that he at any rate informally acquiesced in the proposal which Mr. Bayard made to us, to close this difficulty on lines something closely akin to unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, made a very remarkable allusion indeed, and to which I wish to call the special attention of this House, to the subject of commercial union. The hon. gentleman told us that he did not meet a man of any party among American statesmen who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada, but he also told us that “the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity”—and mark those words—“of free trade with the United States, with the privilege to make our own tariff with the rest of the world,” he says, “I did not meet a man with an intelligent head on his shoulders who would talk about such a thing for a moment. Sir, they treated that proposition with scorn.” What was the proposition that those gentlemen treated with scorn, and what was it that the hon. gentleman had suggested to them as unrestricted reciprocity? The hon. gentleman continues: “They said: Do you suppose that we intend to make a free trade arrangement with Canada, to adopt free trade with England and to destroy the position that we occupy in relation to all the vast industries of the country.” Sir, does the hon. gentleman suppose that any man on this side of the House, or any sane individual, would be idiotic enough to suppose that the Americans would consent at the present moment to enter into an arrangement with Canada which involved free trade with England and all the world. Does not the hon. gentleman know perfectly well that if that was the construction he placed on unrestricted reciprocity; if, as appears from the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

very words he has quoted, he gave those American statesmen to understand that unrestricted reciprocity with Canada meant free trade with England and practically therefore with all the rest of the world of course they would refuse it. Sir, that is not unrestricted reciprocity. We know very well, and I was at pains to make it manifest, that if we get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States we must discriminate in a great number of articles against the mother country. Sir, I say that the hon. gentleman has shown conclusively here that no American statesman; not one of all those he met on the other side, had said the least thing in opposition to such a scheme of unrestricted reciprocity as was proposed from this side of the House or as any man here has supposed possible. What they declared and what appears from the hon. gentleman's own language in the clearest terms was, that they were not prepared for free trade with England and consequently as I have said with the rest of the world. I am a little at a loss to understand how the hon. gentleman could have so misrepresented the case as it is apparent from his own words he did misrepresent it. He must have done this I think for the express purpose of getting a refusal, and of being able to tell the House that he offered unrestricted reciprocity and that all American statesmen has refused it. He may have desired to obtain that reply or otherwise those men would never have replied to him as he states they have done. They did not reply: We cannot make a free trade arrangement with Canada; but they did say: We cannot adopt free trade with England, we cannot destroy the position we occupy in relation to the vast industries of this country. I have this to say that the speech of the Minister of Finance shows in the clearest possible manner the insincerity, to say the least of it, of the attacks that were made from that side of the House on the gentlemen on this side of the House with respect to this question of unrestricted reciprocity. If it was so disloyal, if it was so unreasonable and if it was so treasonable, how was it in the name of wonder that the hon. gentleman could have come to enter into negotiations with Mr. Bayard or to make a proposition which he himself says amounted to unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, the practical fact of the matter is that the Government has been at sea on this question as it has been at sea on almost every other question connected with our relations with the United States. Apparently the Government of Canada have adopted this one guiding rule and this one only “brag and bluster and bully,” and then when you are confronted with a determined foe haul down your flag. That appears to be the policy of the Government and nothing else. That was the policy pursued with the Province of Manitoba. Have we forgotten, Sir, how a year ago this House echoed with denunciations of the gentlemen on this side because they propose a course in accordance with right and justice to Manitoba. Sir, the concession was not made in answer to remonstrances, the concession was made in answer to threats, and not until those threats had assumed the most formidable proportions did hon. gentlemen relax their tyrannical interference with the rights of our sister Province. So, Sir, has it been in the case with those fisheries. There was bully and bluster and brag and various vexatious customs relations which irritated and exasperated the Americans as my hon. friend told us, and then, Sir, when they are brought face to face with the results of their own conduct, and when they found there was serious peril, they hauled down their flag and we are compelled to make this capitulation, for it is nothing else, and this surrender of our admitted legal rights. So it was, Sir, a week ago with respect to this statutory proposal which their Minister of Justice and First Minister declared could not be granted without treason to the rights of the people of this country. A week after when a retaliatory Bill was put on the Table of Congress we found those gentlemen issuing a proclamation granting the very concessions which they declared could not

be made without treason to the country. Sir, I venture to say that perhaps within a twelve month, at all events within no very distant period, will it be found—if those hon. gentlemen remain where they are—that they will deal with the proposal I had the duty to submit the other night. I have this one thing to say to them. I fear it will be found in that case as it has been found in many others, and as is apt to be found in all such cases that the longer they wait the worse our bargain will be. This is a simple repetition of the ease of the Sybil's books. The longer you delay a fair understanding the higher the price you have to pay and the worse your bargain will be. I am not going to detain the House any longer, I thank the hon. members for the patience with which they have listened to me, I trust that the hon. gentlemen who have found themselves in such a position as this will at any rate bear in mind the humiliation they are inflicting upon the people of Canada and will conduct the controversy in such a manner that if they are finally obliged to recede, they may not be confronted with their own declarations that to recede as they now propose to do is treasonable and contrary to the best interests of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat with his usual style has varied the discussion by forgetting the subject before him and attacking those who sit opposite him. He describes the policy of the present Government as a policy of brag and bluster. Has he not described exactly his own attitude at the time he made that speech? Was his speech anything from beginning to end but an exhibition of brag and bluster? He says the Government have also been at sea with their policy—they have had no guiding line. Mr. Speaker, we have been at sea three times, and we came safely to land each time. The hon. gentleman was at sea too, but he suffered shipwreck; that is the difference between the policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition. There is no pleasing hon. gentlemen opposite. We cannot know what their line of opposition is, because there are so many lines. The hon. gentleman who spoke last says that he does not think there was much humiliation in making the treaty, but the humiliation was in the pretences of the Government—in their various despatches of a year ago. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says it was one vast surrender, one vast humiliation. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) says that it was no humiliation—that those concessions ought to have been made two years ago. How are we to find out where we are wrong? We can justify ourselves by the views of any one member of the Opposition by quoting the speech of some other member of the Opposition. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) commenced his attack by repeating his statement, that he made a little while ago, that among the greatest blunder we had ever committed was having taken this inauspicious moment for attempting to make this treaty. But, Sir, the treaty is the consequence of the communication that passed a year ago between my hon. friend and Mr. Bayard. The hon. gentleman, after stating that it was the most inauspicious blunder that was ever committed by a government, commends Mr. Wiman, and says he conferred a great benefit on Canada by asking my hon. friend to go down and commence the negotiations which ended in this treaty. After the negotiations commenced a year ago, were we to stop them? We were either right or wrong. In following up the lead or the hint which had been given by Mr. Wiman, which resulted first in this semi-official communication between those two gentlemen, which was followed up in England, and which after long correspondence and long diplomatic delays culminated in this treaty—after the negotiations were once commenced, we should have been guilty of a

great rudeness in the first place, and a great diplomatic blunder in the second place, if we had taken any step either by laches or by positive refusal, to break off the negotiations which we had to a certain degree created under the wise instigation and advice of Mr. Wiman. But it is very singular, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman thinks it was a great blunder and stupidity for us to attempt to make a treaty in the immediate proximity of a presidential election; and yet, if you look at the hon. gentleman's own resolution, which we voted down the other day, you will find that he, in the immediate proximity of a presidential election, says:

"It is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted trade therewith."

The hon. gentleman actually lays it down as our duty to open negotiations at this moment, the most inauspicious time, just before the presidential election, when party strife and party rivalries would prevent any successful negotiations. It was all wrong in us to make any proposition a year ago and attempt to carry it out; it is all very right in the hon. gentleman to suggest that now we should commence *de novo* negotiations for a treaty. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile the position? I am sure he cannot.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He might try, but his success would be just as dubious as was the success of the whole resolution the moment before the vote was taken upon it. The hon. gentleman wandering away from the subject, takes up the old cry that we should make our own treaties, and he says that England dare not back us—that England would support her colonies against any other nation, but would not venture to do so against the United States. The hon. gentleman has read very carefully the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and he knows everything that is contained in it. My hon. friend took the opportunity of stating that he had received full support from the representatives especially chosen by England—to use a phrase fashionable now-a-days, unrestricted support from Mr. Chamberlain, the British ambassador—aye, and from the British Government that stood behind all three; and if there is anything wrong in that treaty, if there is any humiliation concerned in it, that humiliation has not been forced upon Canada by the British Government, or the British plenipotentiaries associated with my hon. friend; my hon. friend takes the whole responsibility or shares the responsibility of having made that treaty. After my hon. friend made that statement, there was no appropriateness in the hon. gentleman bringing in the old cry that Canada should make her own treaties. In effect, Canada has made her own treaties of late years, and will in future make her own treaties—

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And she will have this advantage, that when those treaties require to be enforced, she will have not only the moral, but the material support of the mother country at her back. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was exceedingly severe in his attack, first upon the conduct of the Government in the last two or three years, and then equally severe upon their abandonment of that course. The hon. gentleman quoted with approbation apparently, the statement made by fishermen who are caught in the act of poaching, in the act of breaking the law, and who of course at once complain to their Government. Why, Mr. Speaker, the smuggler who is caught in the act and whose goods are seized, always complains against the officer who seizes the goods. So the trespasser on our waters, who is caught preparing to fish or with a cargo of fish which he has just taken, always

complains to his Government; and it is a mistake and a mistake and a misfortune in the practice of the American Government that they do not do as England does and as Canada has always done—before they communicate the unauthenticated charge of the poacher or trespasser or smuggler inquire into the facts; but they assume it to be true with or without proof, they make it a matter of diplomatic correspondence, and send a complaint to the British ambassadors. England will not take that course, Canada will not take that course. Whenever a Canadian makes a charge of being illused by the American Government or officials, before we formulate the complaint, before we forward it to Her Majesty's Government or representatives, we take care to collect the evidence. We make sure that we have proof of the case before annoying the American Government by transmitting the complaint and claim for damages under it. We ascertain by a reasonable amount of evidence that there is a *prima facie* case before we formulate the charge or claim any damages. The American Government takes the other and the more unfortunate and more unwise course, and hence all this irritation. Every man, every rascal who has wilfully broken the law, who has been breaking the law with the knowledge and the desire to break it, makes, when he is caught in the act, his complaint; that complaint is published in the next newspaper, and the American Government without enquiry sends it on to the British Ambassador. Thus these complaints are sent to Canada and we have looked into them, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has shown, how utterly devoid of all semblance of truth these complaints are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, as I have already said, stated he does not see there is so much humiliation in the treaty itself; that it is a concession we ought not to be proud of, perhaps, but which we were compelled to accept. It was said of the treaty of Amiens, between England and the first Napoleon, that it was a treaty everybody was glad of but nobody was proud of. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, considers this treaty as being in the same category. The treaty of Amiens was, however, a treaty of peace, it was a treaty that gave England an opportunity to rest, and it was a treaty that enabled England to prepare and carry out successfully the more fierce contest that afterwards arose. However, this treaty is one that we may fairly congratulate ourselves upon. It is a treaty of mutual concessions. It is a treaty of peace, it is, a harbinger to be hoped, of years and years of peace, of friendly intercourse, of increasing trade, of developing commerce, and of friendly and social as well as commercial increase. It is emphatically a treaty of peace made between two peoples speaking the same language, and having the same principles of government, and the same principles of civilisation and of social intercourse and social position. If, at any rate, it be considered only as a treaty of peace, it is of the highest value, and we would have the right to be proud of such a treaty if it bring in all those results, unless there were any unworthy concessions in the arrangement which brought about those results. Is there anything unworthy in this treaty? It is one of mutual consent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is one of unconditional surrender, and that there is no concession on the part of the United States. In the first place, with respect to the question of the head land, that has been disposed of by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). When you find that the ten miles span between the headlands has been adopted by so many nations, there can be no humiliation in our adopting the same measure. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have yielded, that we ought to have left it to arbitration, and that we should have succeeded in our extreme pretensions. Sir, the system of arbitration is preferable to war, but I do not think Canada or England has found great ad-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

vantage by those arbitrations, that the hon. gentleman advocates for the first time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend said certainly that it ought to be left to a tribunal, and that a tribunal could not find otherwise than that our pretensions were well founded. We have had several arbitrations, and the complaint of Canada has been that they were unsuccessful. We would have to leave this question to be settled by some friendly power. What chance would we have to get justice against the United States and against this provision in a treaty among any of the nations, most of whom have already adopted the ten miles distance as the measure of the bays which belong to a country? Leave it to France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, which have already agreed that that is a reasonable provision and sufficiently indicates those bays that ought to be considered as belonging exclusively to the nation of whose country they form indentations, and we would not have the slightest chance of getting a favorable ruling against a provision and contention of that kind. The hon. gentleman says we have received no concessions. If the hon. gentleman will read those despatches that he speaks of carefully, he will find that the United States contended that, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1818, notwithstanding the restrictions of that convention, subsequent commercial treaties with England had so widened the principles of trade intercourse that those restrictions held originally with respect to the convention of 1818 were swept away. You will find Mr. Bayard contends that under the various commercial arrangements and treaties between England and the United States, the United States had a right to buy bait. You will find that contention in every one of his despatches. That contention was opposed in the correspondence of Canada, and in the various minutes prepared by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They also concluded that under a fair reading of the Washington Treaty of 1871, under the binding clause, they had acquired the right of transshipment of their fish. That was resisted and properly resisted by Canada. They had no such rights as they contended they had; the treaty arrangements between England and the United States had in no degree affected the construction of the Convention of 1818 and the restrictions in that Convention. Those were the contentions of my hon. friend, and those two points have been conceded by the United States. No concession, the hon. gentleman has said, has been made by the United States, but everything has been surrendered by Canada. The United States have had everything asked for. They contended that they had a right to buy bait and that the refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow the fishing vessels to buy bait was an infringement of the treaties between England and the United States for which they claimed redress. You find in this treaty that they give up that whole point, that they agree that no vessel can buy bait except by a license from Canada, and, if the vessel does not get that license, it is liable to all penalties of a breach of the law. Is that not any concessions? Then, they cannot get the right to buy it unless they give our fishermen the right to sell their fish in the United States. There was no concession in regard to the transshipment either. If you read the letter and the despatches of Mr. Bayard, you will find that the Americans claimed that they had a right to transship under the treaty between the two nations, and they claimed that this was not only a hardship but an irregularity, that we should refuse them the right to transship their fish, having adopted the bonding system. Now, under the treaty, they give up that system, and they ask us, and we give them the right to transship their fish so soon as we have the right to sell our fish to

them. In fact, this is a treaty of mutual concession. It is a fair treaty and a just treaty, a treaty which is honorable to both parties. The hon. gentleman says, why did you make such extreme pretensions if you were not going to carry them out? Are there any of these pretensions that the hon. gentlemen do not say now are legal? Do hon. gentlemen opposite say we were not justified in making these pretensions? Is not the charge now made that we have given away our just pretensions? Then, if that be so, we cannot be charged with acting with brag and bluster in making those pretensions which the hon. gentlemen opposite are obliged to admit were justifiable by the law of nations and by the treaties themselves. You will remember that there was a special reason why they pretensions or these claims of right, because they are not only pretensions but they are claims of right, were made. They were made at the initiation of this correspondence, at the initiations of these attempts to bring on negotiations and carry them to a successful result. At the time those negotiations were commenced, it was supposed by Canada, and it was in fact supposed by the United States as well, that the question of the fisheries would arise, and certainly when Canada was asserting all her rights, she asserted these extreme pretensions that the hon. gentleman speaks of, because it was supposed that the Americans would ask for the right to the inshore fisheries. We supposed, when negotiations were commenced, that, as in 1854 and as in 1871, the right to fish within the three-mile limit would be asked for by the Americans. How we were to be compensated, whether by an extension of trade or by a money payment, was in the future of uncertainty, but we supposed that would be one of the demands which the Americans would make. In that case, it was necessary for us to hold out the utmost of our claims against the possibility of their desiring to get the three-mile inshore fisheries, and to insist that these inshore fisheries should be protected under the strict terms of the Convention of 1818. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke about the humiliation of our giving away the territorial rights of Canada for money in 1871. I remember very well when that treaty was discussed in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I said nothing about giving away territorial rights in 1871. I simply spoke in reference to the territorial rights under the treaty which is now under consideration. I spoke of certain sacrifices which were made by the Treaty of 1871, but I said nothing whatever about the territorial rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman spoke about his objections to giving away the inshore fisheries for money.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I am much mistaken. Perhaps this is caused by the recollection of the fierce attacks which were made upon me in 1872 by the hon. gentleman and those who surround him, when I was called Judas Iscariot, when I was told that I had sold the territorial rights of Canada for thirty pieces of silver. I do not know whether some hon. gentlemen did not say that I was Benedict Arnold. At any rate I remember that the hon. gentleman's leader, who, I regret to see, is not now in his place, Mr. Mackenzie, declared that he looked with loathing upon that portion of the treaty which provided for an arbitration under which the Americans were to pay a money consideration for the difference between the value of our fisheries and theirs. That idea was rung all through the country, and I had some fear for my personal safety when I returned from Washington, because of the sacrifice which I had made of the honor of Canada, according to the statements of these gentlemen; but, after we went out of power, and those hon. gentlemen came in, their views

changed, they carried to successful completion that arrangement, and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is now no more, Sir Albert Smith, got his title for carrying to successful completion the sacrifice which they said I had been guilty of. That hon. gentleman got that honor for the work which was done, in fact, by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell.) The whole treaty at present is, as I have stated, honorable to both sides. There are mutual concessions on both sides. In the first place, in reference to the headlands, there is a reasonable arrangement, because all civilised nations have accepted the same limitation. Then, as respects bait, we have agreed to give bait to the American fishermen, if they allow our fish in. Of course, we give them all other supplies. We have allowed them to come into our ports and purchase supplies, also for their homeward voyage. That is a kindly and a humane thing to do, that, if a fishing vessel has exhausted its supplies, it should be allowed to come into our ports and purchase its supplies; and, on the other hand, we gain for our traders and merchants the sale of those supplies. It is the same thing in regard to transhipment. It is of great advantage to the fishermen to be able to tranship their catch by our railways, instead of being compelled to go far away from their fishing ground. On the other hand, our railways get the advantage of that transhipment, and a very considerable item it was in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway before it was stopped. So, Sir, you can go on with every one of the items of this treaty, and you will find that it is governed by a spirit of mutual concession, by a spirit of give and take. It is honorable to both nations, it is honorable to all parties, and above all things, it is beneficial to all parties, as it puts an end to all this irritation, it puts an end to all these quarrels and it makes us good neighbors instead of bad neighbors; and my hon. friend and the plenipotentiaries who acted with him, and the majority of this House, I am sure, will see, and justly see, the blessings that will be given to peacemakers.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not rise with the attention of adding to this already lengthy discussion. I frankly admit that upon this question I have not made such a study as would enable me to discuss it *ad libitum*. I rise simply for the purpose of stating for the fourth or fifth time, since it is not yet understood on the other side, what is the policy of the Opposition upon this question. Sir, in the course of a long parliamentary career the hon. leader of the Government has had to meet many different accusations. He has just told us that he has been compared to Judas Iscariot, he has just told us that he has been accused of being another Benedict Arnold. There is one thing, however, which the right hon. gentleman has never been charged, he has never been charged with dulness of intellect; and I am surprised, knowing his qualities as we see them exemplified in this House, that, after having heard the speeches which have been delivered on this side of the House on this question, he does not yet understand the policy of the Opposition in regard to it. Sir, it has already been explained by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and lastly, by my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I tell him for the fourth or fifth time now that the policy of the Opposition upon this question is simply this: That, while asserting that the treaty is a surrender of most valuable rights that belong to Canada, still, it is the duty of Canadians to adopt this treaty, because it will put an end to a most dangerous state of things. That is the only reason we have to advance for the course which we propose to take on this occasion. The treaty is a concession of rights that belong to us, that should have been retained to us; but still, Sir, in face

of the dangerous aspect which things have taken, it is better to adopt the treaty and have this vexed question settled forever. We agree altogether on this side of the House with the statements which were made the other day by the Minister of Finance when introducing this question, that the greatest calamity which could befall the civilised world would be an armed collision between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. When we consider that England and the United States to-day are the two foremost among civilised nations, that their trade exceeds the trade of all other nations, we are appalled at the results that would follow an armed collision between those two nations. I say further, it would not only be a fratricidal war, but it would be almost as criminal and as guilty as a civil war. There is no reason whatever why the two branches of the English-speaking race, the United States and Canada and England, should ever come to war, and if such an event were ever to take place I would look upon it, and everybody would look upon it, as the greatest catastrophe which could befall the civilised world. The position of things in reference to this question was such that an actual war between England and the United States was neither a remote nor an impossible contingency. Much more, Mr. Speaker, we are already threatened with imminent commercial war. A Bill had been passed by the American Congress which empowered the President at any moment to close all commercial relations between the United States and Canada. We all agree with the language of the Minister of Finance upon this question when, speaking upon the probable result of such a commercial war, he said:

"I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it announced much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in a relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war."

That was the position with which we were face to face and that is the position which this treaty would put an end to. Now, Sir, what was the cause of that unfortunate condition of things, that prospect of war between the two nations? The cause was no other than the harassing policy which had been followed by the present Government with regard to American fishermen. There was no other cause. It is to be noted that the American Government did not contend for any other powers under the treaty. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the American Government had advanced contentions from which they have receded under the present treaty, that they had contended under the treaty for the right to purchase bait. Nothing of the kind. I take direct issue with the right hon. gentleman, and I say unhesitatingly that the American Government never contended that under the treaty they had a right to purchase bait, and that point cannot be made clearer than by the language of the President himself when transmitting the treaty to the Senate. This is what he said:

"The right of our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818 did not extend to the procurement of distinctive fishery supplies in Canadian ports and harbors; and one item supposed to be essential, to wit, bait, was plainly denied them by the explicit and definite words of the Treaty of 1818, emphasised by the course of the negotiations and expressed decisions which preceded the conclusion of that treaty."

So, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the right hon. gentleman that the Americans, under the treaty, yield any of their former pretensions, falls to the ground. They get everything, we receive nothing in exchange. As I said, the cause which produced this unfriendly feeling between the two countries, the cause which threatened us with retaliation was the policy followed by the present Government with regard to American fishermen. We have been told to-day that the American fishermen were not subjected to any harassing process, that it was only the smuggler, only the

Mr. LAURIER.

poacher who complained and who was ever complaining under such circumstances. But that is not the view taken by the American Government. The American Government did not take the view that it was only the poacher and the smuggler that were harassed by the regulations of the Government; on the contrary they take the ground that it was nothing but the policy of the Canadian Government that had been harassing in every instance. Again I cite from the message of the president:

"The history of events in the last two years show that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors."

It was these customs regulations touching American fishing vessels, compelling them to make entrances and clearances on every occasion, which harassed the American fishermen and created intense indignation that resulted at length in the retaliation Bill. Take the Bill itself. What is the ground of the Bill? The ground is that American fishermen are harassed and oppressed by Canadian authorities, and the ground upon which the President was authorised to close commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada was simply this fact, that American fishermen were harassed and oppressed by Canadian authorities. The language of the Bill makes this very clear. It states:

"That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that American fishermen are visiting or being in the waters or at any ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law, or are or they lately have been unjustly vexed or harassed in the enjoyment of such rights, or subjected to unreasonable restrictions, regulations or requirements in respect to such rights; or otherwise unjustly vexed or harassed in said waters, ports or places, or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any such fishing vessels or fishermen having a permit under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places, in the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places, in the same manner and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most favored nations, or shall be unjustly vexed or harassed in respect thereof, or otherwise be unjustly vexed or harassed therein, or shall be prevented from purchasing such supplies as may there be lawfully sold to trading vessels of the most favored nation; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews so arriving at or being in such British waters or ports or places in the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied any of the privileges therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews of the most favored nation or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either or all of such cases it shall be lawful and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion."

This is the whole tenor of the Bill; there is no other ground for authorising the President to come to that unfortunate conclusion except this one fact, that American fishermen had been lately harassed by Canadian authorities. The retaliation Bill was passed, and then we had to face the most deplorable condition that perhaps at any moment the President would issue a proclamation which at once would close our ports to all trade between the two nations. The prospects were simply alarming when we consider the amount of trade done day after day between the two nations, a trade involving millions and millions of dollars for exports and imports, and we can well conceive that if that proclamation had been put in force by the President its effect would have reached every Canadian family and person in the country. The Government at last were alarmed, and as my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said, upon this occasion the Government did what they ever do—they always refuse to listen to representations, arguments and remonstrances, but they always yield to threats of violence. In the case of Manitoba not more than a week or two ago they yielded to threats of violence; and we had a very celebrated case three years ago when the half-breeds, who for seven years petitioned for redress and for seven years never received an

an answer. At last, when they not only threatened but resorted to violence, they obtained from the Government what the Government refused to grant them during seven long years. In this instance, I venture to say, that if the United States Congress had not adopted this retaliation Bill, we would not have to-day a treaty, but the question would have been in the same position it occupied in 1885-86; but when Congress adopted a retaliation Bill at once, the Government saw they had gone far enough and the time to yield had come. As the First Minister has said, they were glad to avail themselves of the services of the gentleman who has been attacked during the last six or eight months as a traitor to his native land. Mr. Wiman has received an ample answer to all the charges made against him by the Conservative press. During the whole summer he was assailed and now he has his answer, and that from the Finance Minister himself; and the Finance Minister has shown that Mr. Wiman has always remembered the interests of this his native country, and though he resides in a foreign country, his heart is always with Canada. After the mediation of Mr. Wiman, there was an interview between the Finance Minister and the Secretary of State of the United States. That interview was followed by correspondence, a correspondence of a most striking character. It was hoped that after the correspondence the question would be settled in a manner most honorable to this country and most satisfactory to the two nations, that is to say, by an extension of the trade relations between the two countries. The correspondence which has taken place between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard has often been quoted, but it can bear to be quoted again in the present discussion, and the view that the Opposition have taken, and still intend to take, on this question. Mr. Bayard, writing to Sir Charles Tupper, said:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Sir Charles Tupper replied in a similar strain, saying:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

The plenipotentiaries met, and no doubt the Canadian plenipotentiary had his correspondence in mind. He made a proposition upon this question, and the hon. gentleman has stated to the House that the offer he made to the American plenipotentiaries was an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. The language used by the hon. gentleman the other day was as follows:

"The hon. gentleman says the offer is unrestricted, and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity of stating just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocal trade to Canada."

I am sure every one was delighted to hear that the Finance Minister, when acting as a British plenipotentiary, had offered to settle this question in the direction of unrestricted reciprocity; that he wanted to enter into negotiations with the American plenipotentiaries to ascertain how far they would go in the direction of reciprocity. He had a right to expect, in view of the correspondence which had taken place with Mr. Bayard, an answer of the same nature. The American plenipotentiaries made an answer. We do not know what it was, and I will not discuss it; but we have it on the language of the Minister the other day that the American plenipotentiaries receded altogether from the

position which had been assumed by Mr. Bayard in the correspondence. Mr. Bayard had expressed his willingness and his desire to settle this question upon a broad basis and discuss the whole commercial relations between the two nations. The hon. gentleman has said that the Americans receded altogether from the position then assumed by Mr. Bayard. They receded, however, only from the position and not from the principle. As I understood the Minister, he simply said that the American plenipotentiaries considered—and this is what we would infer from the protocol laid before the House—that the time was not opportune or the occasion fitting to discuss that question, that the fishery dispute had to be settled by itself and that the question of commercial relations had to be settled by itself, and that the present occasion was not fitting to discuss the latter, leaving it open, therefore for other negotiations to follow regarding the commercial relations of the two countries as a question by itself. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the very proposal which my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made, what he wishes the Canadian Government to do. The language of my hon. friend in substance is this: Since you have not been able to settle the question in regard to more extended commercial relations between the two countries in connection with the negotiation respecting the fishery dispute, I ask you to send a commissioner to Washington in order to open up these very negotiations. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the policy which we intend to pursue. We want to approve the treaty and we give it our support, not because we approve of the treaty and think it is a good one, but because it puts an end to a vexed question between the two countries and that it will pave the way for entering into further negotiations to obtain reciprocal trade relations as we all desire. Now we are in the face of it is true of a presidential elections, but we have the fact that the most influential statesman in the Democratic party; a man who no doubt speaks not only for himself but for the President and a large section of the party, is already committed to that proposition and in favor of it. Therefore, I think that the occasion is most fitting to do the very thing which was moved the other day by my hon. friend; that is to say, the Canadian Government should at an early day send a Commissioner to Washington to meet Mr. Bayard on the terms has laid down in his letters to Sir Charles Tupper and discuss the question of more extended trade relations between the two countries and ascertain how far they are disposed to go in that direction. The occasion is most fitting and I invite the serious attention of the Government to this. I know it will not carry. The hon. gentleman has said that my friend made his motion in view of the presidential election. It is true but my friend knew the Government would not agree to that motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or he would not have made it.

Mr. LAURIER. He would have made it, and he will make it next year and the year after. We are entering into that war now. The hon. gentleman did well know from his experience in the past that his motion would not carry the first time. Sir, it is not in the nature of things and according to our experience that his motion should carry a first time. The battle has to be waged more than once before the principles we contend for are carried. This time we made that motion knowing that defeat was staring us in the face, at least so far as this House was concerned, but we are determined to proceed, determined to proceed even if it were defeated next year, and even if it were defeated year after year until this motion is carried, as it is sure to be carried some day. To make a *resumé* of the policy of the Opposition it is this: We will adopt this treaty because it is the best thing which can be obtained under the circum-

stances, because it puts an end to the state of things which had been created by the policy of gentlemen on the other side, and because it paves the way to obtain those trade relations which the whole people of Canada desire, although the Canadian Parliament may have voted it down for the present time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman denied the statements that the Americans had set up any claim to bait and he quoted me as having said that the President sent a message after the treaty was made. I did not say anything about the President. I said Mr. Bayard claimed it. If he refers to the papers he will see that Mr. Bayard claimed it in the strongest manner and so did Mr. Phelps in his representation to the Government in England.

M. JONCAS : M. l'Orateur, après les discours de maître qui ont été prononcés sur la question qui nous occupe actuellement ; après les plaidoyers éloquents que nous avons entendus d'un côté et de l'autre de la Chambre en faveur du traité que l'on nous demande maintenant de ratifier, ou contre ce traité, il est peut-être présomptueux de ma part de me lever dans cette Chambre et de prendre part au débat. Mais, M. l'Orateur, je représente, sinon le seul comté maritime de la province de Québec, au moins le comté maritime le plus intéressé à un règlement satisfaisant de cette question de pêcheries, et je croirais manquer à mon devoir si je ne faisais part à cette honorable Chambre de ma manière de voir sur ce sujet.

Je serai bref, car les arguments que l'on peut apporter en faveur du traité ont été complètement épuisés par ceux qui m'ont précédé.

Il est une chose qui m'a frappé dans le débat auquel j'ai assisté : c'est que les honorables députés de ce côté-ci de la Chambre qui ont pris part au débat se sont gardés pour ainsi dire d'aborder la question qui fait le sujet même de la discussion. Ils nous ont parlé de toutes espèces de sujets excepté du traité lui-même. Il nous ont parlé même du monopole du Manitoba. Mais la question sur laquelle l'on semble le plus tenir à revenir, c'est la question de réciprocité et de libre-échange. Ce n'est pas mon intention de répondre à ces arguments qui n'en sont pas, mais je traiterai cette question au point de vue pratique et au point de vue commercial, laissant à des voix plus autorisées que la mienne de la traiter au point de vue légal et international, ce qui d'ailleurs a déjà été fait avec beaucoup de succès.

Avant d'aller plus loin, je veux répondre à une question que vient de poser l'honorable député de Québec-Est (M. Laurier). Il nous a demandé quelle était la cause de la difficulté qui a existé entre les États-Unis et le Canada, et qui a nécessité la nomination de la commission de Washington d'où est sorti le traité que nous sommes appelés maintenant à ratifier. L'honorable député de Québec-Est a semblé dire que la faute de cette difficulté en était au gouvernement canadien. Je discute ce point, M. l'Orateur, et je crois que si l'honorable député se rappelle bien les faits, il admettra avec moi que la cause de cette difficulté est due aux Américains qui ont donné avis au gouvernement de leur non-intention de renouveler le traité de Washington. Et, M. l'Orateur, le gouvernement de ce pays a donné une grande preuve de sa bonne volonté et de son esprit de conciliation lorsqu'au 30 juin de l'année 1835, il a permis aux pêcheurs américains de continuer à faire la pêche dans les eaux canadiennes pendant six mois, afin de donner le temps aux deux nations, soit de nommer une commission, soit de prendre les moyens d'arriver à un règlement de cette question.

Mais on reproche au gouvernement du pays d'avoir été trop sévère dans l'application de la clause première du traité de 1818. Et pendant que quelques-uns des honorables députés de ce côté-ci de la Chambre s'élèvent contre la sévérité qu'a montrée le gouvernement canadien dans l'application de cette clause du traité, nous assistons en

Mr. LAURIER,

même temps au spectacle curieux d'autres députés de cette Chambre qui disent que le gouvernement n'a pas assez concédé et qu'il aurait dû concéder encore plus.

Je disais, il y a un instant, que je voulais traiter cette question au point de vue commercial et au point de vue pratique. Je prétends qu'au point de vue des intérêts canadiens, le traité que l'on nous demande de ratifier est un succès pour le Canada, le dénouement très heureux d'une question qui pouvait devenir la cause d'un conflit grave, et qui constituait un danger réel pour nos institutions nationales et l'avancement et le développement de notre commerce. Je dis que malgré toutes les considérations politiques que l'esprit de parti peut inspirer, il n'est pas un Canadien sincère, non préjugé et non disposé d'avance à condamner tout ce qu'a fait le gouvernement actuel, qui ne lui prêterait pas son concours pour en arriver à un arrangement final et satisfaisant de cette question.

Sur une question de cette importance, je tiens que les intérêts de parti doivent faire place à des vues plus larges, plus nationales et surtout plus patriotiques. Pour pouvoir avec connaissance de cause et sainement juger si le traité que l'on nous demande actuellement de ratifier est préjudiciable ou favorable aux intérêts canadiens, il nous faut remonter à la cause même de la difficulté qui a existé entre les États-Unis et le Canada et qui a nécessité le traité actuel. Cette cause reposait entièrement sur une interprétation différente que faisaient de l'article premier du traité de 1818, les gouvernements canadien et américain. Cet article que je ne lirai pas en entier, contenait ce qui suit :—

De permettre aux Américains d'entrer dans l'intérieur de nos baies et de nos havres pour y chercher un abri, pour réparer leurs avaries, pour acheter du bois et pour y prendre de l'eau, mais pour aucune autre fin quelconque.

Cependant, M. l'Orateur, les Américains prétendaient qu'en vertu de certains traités de commerce intervenus entre les États-Unis et l'Angleterre après 1818, ils avaient le droit d'entrer dans nos havres pour s'y ravitailler, y décharger leur cargaisons et même pour y acheter de la boîte ou de l'appât.

Si donc nous dégageons la question actuelle de tous les nuages techniques, politiques, légaux et internationaux qui l'entourent, nous arrivons au résumé suivant : les Américains prétendaient avoir droit, comme je viens de le dire, en vertu de certains traités de commerce intervenus après 1818, de se ravitailler dans nos ports et d'y acheter de l'appât. Nous, nous leur citions cet article premier du traité de 1818, et nous leur disions qu'ils devaient renoncer aux droits qu'ils réclamaient par ces traités.

Maintenant, on nous a répété à satiété que le Canada avait tout cédé et que nous n'avions rien obtenu des Américains. Eh bien ! nous n'avons qu'à lire la correspondance intervenue entre les autorités américaines et les autorités canadiennes pour bien se convaincre que le secrétaire Bayard a insisté sur ces faits—qui étaient pour les Américains la question la plus importante,—qu'ils avaient le droit de venir acheter de l'appât chez nous. Je ne dirai rien de la question des *headlands* ou pointes qui a été traitée mieux que je ne pourrais le faire par plusieurs députés de la droite, et surtout par mon honorable ami le député d'Albert (M. Weldon). Je veux seulement répondre à ceux qui ont prétendu que les commissaires canadiens à Washington nous avaient sacrifiés, qu'ils avaient abandonné tous nos droits. Comme je viens de le dire, il est facile de voir par la correspondance intervenue entre les autorités canadiennes et américaines que le secrétaire des États-Unis a toujours prétendu et toujours insisté sur le fait que les vaisseaux pêcheurs américains avaient les mêmes droits dans nos ports que les vaisseaux de commerce ; qu'ils avaient le droit surtout d'y acheter de l'appât.

Cette question de l'appât est une question vitale pour les Américains, parce que certaines pêches, et surtout la pêche à la morue qui se fait sur les grands bancs, ne peut être rémunérative si les pêcheurs qui la font ne peuvent se pro-

curer de l'appât frais. Or, comment le traité actuel règle-t-il cette question ? L'article quinze du traité va nous le dire. Le voici :

Lorsque les Etats-Unis aboliront les droits imposés sur l'huile de poisson, l'huile de baleine, l'huile de phoque, et le poisson de toutes sortes (à l'exception du poisson conservé dans l'huile), provenant de la pêche faite par les pêcheurs du Canada et de Terre-Neuve, y compris le Labrador, ainsi que sur les futailles, barils, barillets et vaisseaux (*cans*) ordinaires et nécessaires, et autres colis ordinaires et nécessaires contenant les produits ci-dessus mentionnés, les mêmes produits, provenant de la pêche faite par les pêcheurs des Etats-Unis, ainsi que les colis ordinaires et nécessaires les contenant, tels que ci-dessus décrits, seront admis francs de droits au Canada et à Terre-Neuve.

Et lors de l'abolition de ces droits, et tant que les articles ci-dessus mentionnés pourront être apportés aux Etats-Unis par des sujets britanniques, sans qu'ils soient frappés de nouveaux droits, le privilège d'entrer dans les ports, baies et havres des côtes susdites du Canada et de Terre-Neuve sera accordé aux navires de pêche des Etats-Unis au moyen de permis annuels, délivrés gratuitement, pour les fins suivantes, savoir :

1. L'achat de provisions, d'appât, de glace, seines, lignes, et tous autres approvisionnements et équipements ;
2. Le transbordement du produit de la pêche, pour être expédié par tous moyens de transport ;
3. L'engagement d'équipages.

Les approvisionnements ne seront pas obtenus par voie de troc ou échange, mais l'appât pourra l'être.

Les mêmes privilèges seront continués ou donnés aux navires de pêche du Canada et de Terre-Neuve sur les côtes de l'Atlantique appartenant aux Etats-Unis.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, nous disons aux Américains : vous insistez sur une question très importante pour vous ; une question vitale pour vos pêcheurs. Nous vous permettons d'acheter de l'appât dans nos havres lorsque vous permettrez l'entrée en franchise du poisson canadien sur les marchés américains. Et la clause 15^{ième} du traité que nous sommes appelés à notifier, ne me paraît, certes, pas une concession. L'honorable député d'Halifax (M. Jones), je crois, dans son brillant discours prononcé au cours de ce débat, a parlé de cette question d'appât. Voici ce qu'il disait :

The question with regard to bait is one of the greatest possible importance. It is one which lies at the root of the fishery question, and the Americans justly understood and appreciated its value when they secured the privilege of obtaining bait under this Treaty.

Eh bien ! l'honorable député fait ici une erreur. Les Américains ne se sont pas assurés, en vertu du traité, le droit d'acheter la boîte chez nous. Il est bien vrai qu'en vertu du *modus vivendi*, attaché au traité, les Américains auront ce droit pendant deux ans ; mais pour exercer ce privilège, ils seront obligés de payer \$1.50 par tonneau de chacun de leurs bateaux pêcheurs. Je dis, de plus, que ce n'est pas un droit concédé aux pêcheurs américains, mais seulement un privilège qu'on leur permet d'exercer.

L'honorable député d'Halifax continue :

"The result of the operation of this will be that the bankers going to the Western Banks commonly use clam bait, but those going to the Grand Banks, where they get the fish which are suitable for the larger markets, cannot expect to catch those fish without the use of fresh bait. They are a long way away from their own home, and their fresh bait will only last a short time, and if they are compelled to return to their own ports to get fresh bait if they can, and the supply is doubtful, and they cannot always get it, they would, practically, be almost compelled to give up the business altogether."

Ceci veut dire, M. l'Orateur, que si les Américains ne peuvent venir dans nos ports acheter l'appât frais qui leur est nécessaire, ils ne pourront faire la pêche profitablement. Et je crois que l'honorable ministre des Finances (sir Charles Tupper), et les plénipotentiaires anglais à la Conférence de Washington, ont sagement agi en insistant sur le droit que nous avions d'empêcher les Américains de venir acheter de l'appât chez nous.

L'honorable député d'Halifax dit encore, que cette disposition sera de nature à nuire aux pêcheurs canadiens, parce qu'elle aura pour effet de mettre l'enclenchement sur l'appât, et forcera les pêcheurs canadiens à payer un prix plus élevé pour la boîte. Eh bien ! l'honorable député a oublié deux choses : d'abord, que le nombre de pêcheurs canadiens qui font la pêche sur les grands bancs, et qui conséquemment ont besoin de venir renouveler leur provision d'appât péri-

diquement, est bien moins grand qu'il ne pense,—ne comprenant pas plus d'un quart de toute la population de pêcheurs,—tandis que la plus grande partie, c'est-à-dire les trois quarts au moins, n'ont pas besoin d'acheter d'appât, mais peuvent aller en puiser à quelques pas de leurs demeures. Il a aussi oublié cette autre chose : c'est que les pêcheurs canadiens peuvent librement pêcher de l'appât dans les eaux canadiennes, en dedans de la limite de trois milles, où est généralement pris l'appât ; tandis que les pêcheurs américains n'ont que le privilège d'acheter cet appât.

J'ai insisté sur ce point parce que c'était réellement la question en dispute ; c'était la cause véritable de la difficulté qui était intervenue entre les deux pays.

Je pourrais bien facilement, pour rencontrer des arguments que quelques honorables députés de la gauche ont fait valoir contre la ratification de ce traité, citer l'opinion de la presse américaine afin de démontrer que le Canada n'a pas tout concédé, et que les Américains pensent, au contraire, qu'ils ont été sacrifiés. Mais je me bornerai à citer un article de la *Tribune* de New-York, en date du 22 février dernier, qui se lit comme suit :

Le triomphe diplomatique du département d'Etat est un faible et incohérent compromis. Le texte complet du traité des pêcheries nous permet de comprendre la manière que le secrétaire d'Etat considère le truc stupide par lequel il s'est préparé un triomphe décisif. Il n'a jamais rapproché ce sujet au point de vue des intérêts des Etats-Unis. Il a traité cette affaire comme une querelle internationale causée par une phraséologie ambiguë d'un ancien traité et par un conflit de droits de pêche. Il a considéré cette affaire comme une simple controverse qui peut être réglée par de nouvelles et meilleures définitions de ces droits et par une phraséologie plus claire des clauses controversées du traité de 1818. Il a négocié une convention sur cette base définissant la limite des trois milles, réglant la question des points de terre et désignant certains privilèges commerciaux en addition au droit conféré aux pêcheurs américains, il y a soixante-dix ans, pour obtenir "l'abri, les réparations, le combustible et l'eau dans les ports canadiens." A son propre point de vue, il a réussi assez bien à ajuster ces questions techniques ; mais même s'il a fait cela, il n'a pas réussi à venger l'honneur de la nation en défendant les droits des citoyens engagés dans une controverse légale.

Il a manqué en cela parce qu'il n'a jamais compris que l'honneur de la nation était compromis par les outrages sur les eaux canadiennes. Il n'y a rien dans ce traité pour prévenir le retour de ces insultes dans les eaux canadiennes. C'est une convention qui sera aussi impopulaire au Canada qu'en Angleterre. Elle n'offre point de base à un règlement de la question des pêcheries. Elle devrait être sommairement rejetée par un sénat qui se respecte et qui est assez patriotique pour proposer une méthode plus complète afin de protéger les droits des Etats-Unis.

Eh bien ! tandis qu'on crie ici que le Canada est sacrifié, de l'autre côté de la ligne 45^{ième} le même cri se fait aussi entendre.

Voyons encore ce que le correspondant américain du journal *Le Mail*, de Toronto, écrivait au sujet du traité :

Les privilèges commerciaux dans les ports canadiens accordés aux pêcheurs américains ne doivent pas être considérés comme une concession ; ce sont des droits qui appartiennent aux pêcheurs américains, et on ne devrait pas les acheter aux prix de concessions, importantes ou non. La ligne frontière définie dans le traité va certainement exclure les pêcheurs américains du droit de pêcher en dedans de trois milles sur la côte sud de Terre-Neuve, et indéfiniment, au nord, sur les côtes vers le Labrador. Les pêcheurs américains soutiennent qu'ils ont droit aux pêcheries intérieures dans ces régions, et que ce droit n'aurait pas dû être livré comme une chose de peu de valeur. Le refus aux Américains par la Grande-Bretagne du droit d'acheter de la boîte est un abandon du droit que les Etats-Unis ont toujours réclamé pour leurs citoyens, non-seulement conformément au traité mais aussi conformément aux principes reconnus du droit international et des gens. Le droit d'acheter de la boîte, après tout, était la principale réclamation des pêcheurs américains, après le droit d'entrer dans les ports pour acheter des approvisionnements et transférer leur poisson, et, sans le droit d'acheter de la boîte les pêcheurs américains ont gagné peu de chose. Aucune invention n'a encore été imaginée afin de permettre aux Américains d'emporter assez de boîte dans leurs réfrigérateurs pour toute une expédition de pêche, et le refus de permettre aux Canadiens de vendre de la boîte ne sera pas moins dommageable à ceux-ci que le refus du droit d'en acheter, aux Américains.

On a cité au cours de ce débat, le nom de M. Wiman, l'apôtre du libre échange et de la réciprocité. Eh bien ! veut-on savoir ce que pense ce monsieur du traité actuel ? Voici ce qu'il disait au mois de février dernier, en réponse à un télégramme du *Mail*, lui demandant son opinion sur le

traité. Dans une dépêche adressée de Washington à ce journal, il dit ce qui suit :

Que le traité, en autant que ses clauses sont connues, est, dans son opinion, le meilleur règlement d'une vilaine querelle, qu'on pouvait faire, dans les circonstances. Quoiqu'à première vue on puisse prétendre que les intérêts du Canada ont été sacrifiés, on finira par reconnaître que la Puissance y gagne plus qu'elle n'y perd. Les provisions du nouveau traité, dit M. Wiman, vont tendre à développer les relations entre les deux pays, et vont faire disparaître un élément de conflit sérieux et dangereux qui les séparait gravement et menaçait leur paix.

Je termine ces remarques qui ont été un peu longues en disant avec M. Wiman que le traité actuel est le meilleur règlement possible et le dénouement heureux d'une vilaine question ; d'une question qui nous menaçait d'un conflit grave. Et l'honorable ministre des finances me permettra de le féliciter cordialement au nom des pêcheurs que je représente d'avoir pris leurs intérêts d'une main si ferme, d'avoir su les protéger contre les empiètements des Américains, et de nous avoir amené ce traité, qui, s'il ne met fin pour toujours au conflit nous mettra au moins sur la voie d'un règlement final.

Mr. ELLIS. I feel it my duty to speak on this subject and I would not have addressed the House at all were it not that probably I differ from gentlemen on that side of the House as well as my friends on this side on certain points. Several constructions have been put upon Mr. Bayard's letter, but the conclusion I come to with regard to that proposition to the Minister of Finance, was that this country should become an independent country :

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. * * *

"On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country ; and trust to do it worthily. The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the idea of commercial intercourse and commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was in that, but it does appear to me looking at events which are transpiring now and with regard to which the House has not been taken into the confidence of the government, that it is the policy that this country should be independent and that Newfoundland should unite in that independence, a process which is now going on at the present moment. He then said :

"Great Britain being the only treaty-making party to deal with the United States, the envoys of that Government alone are authorised to speak in her behalf and create her obligations. I presume you will be personally constituted a plenipotentiary of Great Britain to arrange here with whomsoever may be selected to represent the United States terms of agreement for a *modus vivendi* to meet present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all future disputes. It appears to me that as matters now stand the colony of Newfoundland ought to be represented and included, for a single arrangement should suffice to regulate all the joint and several interests involved. I should, therefore, be informed speedily through the proper channel as to the authorisation and appointment by the Imperial Government of such representatives."

But, Sir, I listened with great attention the speech of the Minister of Finance and I have read it over very carefully since with regard to what Mr. Bayard meant by commercial union. Taking into account the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance that he himself was disappointed when he got there in regard to Mr. Bayard's views it is impossible to get from the reference he made to that question any clear idea of what Mr. Bayard meant. It is true, reference was made to the desire of Mr. Bayard that we should follow in some way the commercial arrangement of the United States, or that there should be some reciprocity. But it is impossible to get any idea of what the Minister meant by what he did say. He said :

Mr. JONCAS.

"I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada. Why, Sir? Because he knows that I would give Canada to the United States ; he knows that you would occupy the degrading position of having a neighboring country make your tariff and impose the taxes upon you."

Mr. Bayard most distinctly declares that he has no desire to affect in any way the political independence of Canada. He says :

"I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, not to effect the legislative independence of either country."

It is impossible that Mr. Bayard has made that statement in the letter, and that he should reconcile it with the statement which the hon. gentleman has made in regard to it. However that is a matter for Mr. Bayard and himself to settle. Mr. Bayard made a memorable statement in reference to the matter and I think I might quote his words :

"I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice ; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which I am sure, no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence."

But at the close of the negotiations, Mr. Bayard said :

"As he had expressed himself before, he felt that as a result of the controversies of the two preceding years, the two countries stood at the parting of the ways, and it became necessary to determine whether their future should be in the direction of friendship and mutual convenience, or of unfriendliness and alienation. He hoped the work that had been done by the Conference would decide that question, and that the bonds of amity between the two countries would be strengthened by the ties of friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse."

There is no doubt whatever that the troubles which arose were troubles almost entirely of our own creation. The hon. Minister himself could not get beyond the treaty. He says :

"We offered to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries ; by an arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse."

To this the American commissioners replied that they declined to take up that matter :

"Because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

These circumstances were unquestionably the hostility excited by our acts, which compelled them in their own self-interest to insist on an arrangement on the lines of the treaty alone. So they declared that the proposed trade arrangement could not be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. They therefore insisted that the adjustment of differences must be had by agreeing to an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818. Now, Sir, at the very outset of the proceedings we were hindered and hampered by the difficulties which we ourselves had created, and which excited such a feeling in the American mind against us that Congress itself had declared in so many words that we were seeking, by the restrictions which we were putting on American fishermen, to drive them into freer trade relations with us, and they felt it their duty to declare distinctly and positively that we could not do that by the course we were taking. Take the hon. Minister's own statement :

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying to the south of us."

And again :

"They (the American negotiators) said that such was the expression of public men in regard to Canada, and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen that if to-morrow any relaxation of the commerce of the United States was made by an Act of Congress, it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operations so as to deny us its advantages."

And continues the hon. gentleman :

"We turned our attention to the only means by which we could avert what everybody would feel would be the greatest disaster that could befall this country."

Now, Sir, the position in which we were placed, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, was, that among a people of sixty millions we scarcely had a friend. Now, there are something like a million Canadians in the United States, and yet the hon. gentleman tells us that our position was such that there was not one of those to raise a voice for us. In the House of Representatives of Washington there are men of Canadian birth or origin, men who had lived in this country for a time, and who must have turned occasionally with some feeling of respect and affection to the land in which they had lived; yet there was not one in the national legislature to raise his voice for us. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the press, Republican and Democratic, were united against us. On that press there are many of our young men, too many, south and west, who are filling responsible positions on the press, and there was not one of those to say a word with voice or pen in the interest of Canada. The situation is so humiliating that it must have caused the hon. Minister of Finance quite a pang to make the statement to the House. Now, Sir, with regard to the concessions we have made, it will be well to remember that in 1818, when the treaty was made, there were very few custom houses, and very few ports of entry, and the American fishermen no doubt acquired by time and long usage privileges which they came in time to regard as rights. The whole situation was full of difficulty but immediately after the expiration of the old treaty we commenced to enforce with greater strictness and vigor than ever before the regulations—so much so that the Americans spoke of our action as unfair, ungenerous, and inhospitable, and what some would call inconsistent; members of Congress spoke of our passion and spite, and a prominent member of Congress described our enforcement of the treaty as humorous. The treaty was one intended to give American fishermen shelter, and it was intended that when they came into our ports or along our coasts, and when seeking that shelter, they should be just as much in the exercise of their rights as our own people. But we made it so difficult that many of them preferred to seek the open sea to entering our ports at all. The hon. Minister of Marine the other night, in an endeavor to satisfy the House that his treatment of these fishermen had been very humane, made this statement to show how lenient he had been :—

"The schooner *Hereward* was detained for shipping a man, and was released immediately with a warning. The *Boyton* was allowed to land an injured man from her vessel for medical attention. The *Fanny Starling* was allowed to purchase provisions for her homeward voyage. The *French* was allowed to ship a crew to take the vessel home when he discharged her own crew, and was detained for repairs quite a long time. The *French* and *Argonaut* were seized within the three-mile limit and their crews allowed to be shipped home in United States fishing vessels. Technically we could have insisted that they should not have this privilege, but we gave the privilege and gave it heartily. The schooner *Perkins* had shipped a man illegally and was detained, but she was released after discharging the man. The schooner *Gracey* was allowed to ship men to take the vessel home. The schooner *Perkins* was extended the same courtesy. The schooner *Pendragon*, whose crew had sickness on board, was, under medical advice, allowed to purchase fresh provisions and meats of all kinds, just as long as the doctor gave a certificate that it was necessary for the health of the crew."

And so on through a long list. Well, I think it is discreditable to the country that the hon. Minister of Marine should take credit for such things as these. Why, they are the ordinary things a man would give to his enemy under these circumstances. Along our coasts, where their vessels are conti-

nually coming, as our vessels are continually going along their coasts, there is a constant interchange of courtesies and civilities. The customs and coast guards of the United States have frequently towed our vessels through ice and other dangers and difficulties, have taken them into port and out, making no difference between the vessels of the two countries; and yet the hon. gentleman claims credit for himself and his department that they did these things. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman can have no soul—no official soul, at any rate. A case of a particular kind was mentioned last year by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), where a vessel came into port where he lived having lost a man overboard. The captain desired to land his effects and went ashore. During his absence, or, as was the common custom, the men went ashore, yet that man's vessel was seized and a fine of \$200 imposed upon him. He was in a strange place, had no money and had to go around and raise it as best he could. When the matter was represented to Ottawa, the Minister of Customs undoubtedly remitted the fine and allowed the vessel to go free, but the very fact that this imposition was put on the captain, shows how easy it is, by means of such imposition, to create the feeling which the hon. Minister of Finance described as existing in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend name the vessel?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know the name.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentlemen vouch for the accuracy of the statement?

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) made the statement last year in his place in the House, and the hon. gentleman did not contradict it then.

Mr. EDGAR. The vessel was the *Pearl Nelson* and the fine was \$200.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you vouch for that?

Mr. EDGAR. I have the blue-books which will prove it.

Mr. ELLIS. It is just possible that the Opposition itself in this House was rather too lenient with reference to the conduct and policy of the Government. I do not wish to refer strongly to the hon. the Minister of Finance because, in this matter, I am enjoying my little triumph over him, in a quiet way; but he went down to the constituency of St. John, in 1887, and made there an eloquent speech. One of his positions was that he had introduced in the House of Commons a Bill which made it forfeiture for a vessel to be found within the three-mile limit, except for the purposes of shelter and repair and obtaining wood and water. I do not know how to characterise such a boast in language fitted to characterise it, which would not meet, Sir, with your censure, but the boast is one that reflects no credit on the country, and which would naturally be taken hold of by the American people to show how ungenerous we were. It has been constantly announced by the Government up to the present year that there was to be no change in their policy. It was only last year that the Premier said:

"We stood simply on our rights, we stood simply on the Convention of 1818. We stated, and we hold to it, that the change of years and the commercial treaties that have been made between England and the United States did not and could not in any way, in the most remote degree, affect the terms of the Convention of 1818; that convention was made with due deliberations as a matter of mutual concession, and in which a good deal was given to the United States, as well as something given up by England. It was a bargain with consideration on both sides. We hold to that, and we hold further, that the contention that it has been in any way altered or given up, or that it could be altered, or could be in any way denounced, to use the diplomatic phrase, is out of the question. It could not be, and I have no doubt it will not be."

The treaty before the House which we are now discussing is pretty good evidence of the change that has come over the Ministry on that point. Take up the treaty itself, first eight articles relating to the headland question, and compare

it with what the First Minister said last year on that point. He said:

"There are only two questions in which there can be any contention. The first is the headland question, which we are all acquainted with. We all know what that means. We adhere to the position taken by the British Government from the time of Lord Bathurst until now, that the three miles are to be taken from the headlands and not from the sinuosities of the bay."

With regard to the headlands question, I observe that the treaty itself follows the proposition of the Mr. Adams in 1866, as modified by Mr. Bayard. That interpretation has been accepted by the Government. I do not propose to find any particular fault with the arrangement made. Some compromise was absolutely necessary, and this is perhaps not worse than any other that might be made. Mr. Bayard in supplementing Mr. Adams' proposal, proposed that bays and harbors from which American vessels are in future to be excluded are:

"Agreed to the taken to be such bays and harbours as are ten or less than ten miles in width, and the distance of three marine miles from such bays and harbours shall be measured from a straight line drawn across the bay or harbor in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten miles."

The Privy Council thus replied to that proposition. This provision would involve the surrender of fishing rights in territories which by the laws of nations:

"This provision would involve a surrender of fishing rights which have always been regarded as the exclusive property of Canada, and would make common fishing grounds of territorial waters which by the law of nations have been invariably regarded both in Great Britain and the United States as belonging to the adjacent country."

By the 10th and 11th articles we have receded very far from the ground originally taken by the public authorities and have undoubtedly placed the American fishermen in a better position to enjoy the rights and privileges they were to enjoy under the treaty of 1818. I have gone carefully over the treaty, and the contentions made by our own State Department, and I have made a summary, which I trust the House will permit me to read, of the concessions made:

"We have, by the very act of making this treaty, receded from the position maintained so long in practice, that Canada and Great Britain could impose their own interpretations upon the meaning of the Treaty of 1818, thus enlarging the instructions of that treaty. By doing this we have given the United States a precedent upon which to base new demands for the amelioration of the regulations applied to their fishing vessels should the need arise."

"We have almost wholly abandoned the contention that fishing vessels are a class by themselves and, therefore, not entitled to any commercial privileges."

"We entirely and forever abandon the three mile headland theory."

"We forever admit the right of United States fishermen to navigate the Straits of Canso."

"We no longer compel American fishing vessels to depart from our shores in twenty-four hours after arrival."

"We relieve them from the obnoxious operations of customs regulations enforced against them as fishing vessels, and which were specially severe, as the true intent of these laws was to regulate commercial trading only."

"We free them from harbor, pilotage and other dues which are sometimes inhospitably, and often capriciously imposed upon them, even in cases when they sought shelter, dealing with them in these matters as commercial vessels, though denying them the rights of commercial vessels."

"We have practically abandoned the course of ordering them to depart if supposed to be hovering within our waters; and also the plan of putting an officer on board of them as a matter of course."

"We permit them under certain circumstances to purchase bait, to replenish outfits, to ship men, and to transfer cargoes."

"We issue to them, free of charge, permits which enable them to purchase supplies in ports of entry, on all occasions, just as trading vessels, except that they may not do it for barter, and this applies both to the homeward voyage and outer voyages."

This section does not name bait, but there will be no difficulty whatever of purchasing bait under it.

"By 14th article we abandon our previous contention that preparing within Canadian waters to fish is evidence of intention to actually fish within Canadian waters, and we therefore recede from the position taken by the Act of 1886."

"We have limited, and defined, and reduced the severe penalties imposed by that Act for violation of our exclusive rights of fishing. Forfeiture of the vessel is no longer a penalty except for fishing within

Mr. ELLIS.

Canadian waters, or preparing within these waters to fish therein. In all other cases \$3 a ton is the highest fine which can be imposed."

"We have provided a summary process of law for dealing with arrested or captured vessels, instead of the old and slow process of the Admiralty Court."

"And, lest the punishment of an infraction of the new treaty, or that of 1818, should seem to be unjust, and to prevent the danger of giving offence to the United States, the Government of Canada can reverse the judgment of the court."

The United States negotiators, on the other side, recognise that we are not required by the Treaty of 1818 to sell their fishermen bait, ice or general outfits, to tranship cargoes, or to ship men, in ordinary cases, but by the protocol we give them the privilege of doing these things. Although the Minister of Justice said:

"If the Provinces are to be the judges it is most prejudicial to their interests that United States fishermen should be permitted to come into their harbors on any pretext, and it is fatal to their fishery interests that those fishermen, with whom they have to compete at such a disadvantage in the markets of the United States, should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait even for the pursuit of the deep sea fisheries."

Certainly the Minister has abandoned that position. And so going through the whole correspondence, through all the warnings, under all the rigorous custom house regulations, through the utterances of the press, through the declarations of the Ministers, and you will find a thorough and complete change of attitude on almost every point in this controversy. What we have lost by what we have surrendered I do not know. If we consider what we have lost by the efforts which have been made to prevent our coming to any arrangement, we must have lost a great deal. As to the jeopardy in which we are placed as it has been described by the Minister of Finance, I think we have made very good concessions indeed. I do not find any fault with anything which has been done in that particular. On the contrary, I rather approve of the treaty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ELLIS. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I think they might review their own conduct and see where they stand to-day and see where they stood one or two years ago. No doubt we have learned a good lesson. We have learned that, in dealing with an international matter, we cannot afford to set up these small restrictions, and treat the Government of the United States as some in this House appear to be inclined to do. The Minister of Finance made a reference to the power which was behind us when we made a treaty. There may be a great power behind us, but it did not stand by us in regard to this treaty, and, when the Premier said that we would have the British forces behind us, it is well to ask where we would be in regard to the carrying out of the Treaty of 1818. The British Government have not backed up, but have left us behind in that matter, and the same inference may be drawn in reference to the new treaty should it become necessary to defend it. While on this point, I might make a remark in regard to what was said by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on Friday last. The facts which the hon. gentleman stated may be correct, but I do not think we should find fault with England because she chooses to pursue her own way. I do not see that we should make complaint in regard to the mother country. I think that men of fair mind and large judgment must have been astonished at the position we took, I do not think that men with humane and generous minds could have defended the positions we took in regard to the vessels of a friendly power. If it is in the nature of things that we should pursue different ways, we should remember that England is and has been a model to the world, and should say nothing harsh about her. If this treaty stands in any jeopardy in the Senate of the United States, it is entirely due to ourselves. No doubt the Government is very anxious to carry the treaty. But you may understand the feeling in the United States as to the

treaty or as to any treaty under the circumstances. I think the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that since this treaty was abrogated, 2,200 American vessels had been boarded by our cruisers in our waters. If anything could be calculated to excite the antagonism of a people, it must be that sort of conduct. You may have a right to do it, but to exercise that right must necessarily excite the greatest hostility. You had all these complaints made. I think there were fifty vessels involved in one set of complaints, and seventy in another which were made to the Government of this country by the people of the United States as to the way in which we treated those vessels, and claims to the number of 150 or 200 were sent in. All this must have the effect of putting the people of the United States and the Senate of that country in a very unpleasant condition with regard to us. The Minister of Finance, in bringing down his statement, gave us no information as to the position of the claims for damages against us, but I understand, from a letter which has been published, that he is allowing them to stand over as against claims made for damages in the Behring Sea. With regard to the detention of vessels, I do not know how many there are, but I assume that these vessels are to be released. Now, Sir, if these vessels are to be released, it seems to me a very strong acknowledgment that, at any rate, our case is a doubtful one. With reference to the general question of the purchase of bait, referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) the other night, with regard to the purchase of ice and supplies, and wood and coal, and the transhipment of cargoes and crews, I think it would be better for the Government to make an open arrangement with the United States with reference to all these things. It is an utter absurdity in these times to say that we cannot sell bait. There are two sides to the question. Men who are engaged in collecting bait along the coast, whose business it is to sell bait, want to sell it. An hon. member said the other night that the effect of allowing bait to be sold would be to make it dear. Well, people who have bait to sell would like to have it made dear. Then, with regard to ice. When the Treaty of 1818 was made no such thing as ice was used. Why should not men along the coast be allowed to sell ice to any fisherman that comes along? Why should they not be allowed to tranship their crews? The hon. gentleman told us, as if it was something wonderful, that we were not to allow transhipment of crews, as if it was some great gain. It is absurd to make men who live in the towns along the coast in Nova Scotia travel by railway to the United States ports for the purpose of entering on board a fishing vessel. So with regard to the transhipment of cargo. Why should not cargoes be transhipped when there are on our coast railways to do the business? Now, I noticed in a paper the other day that there are 8,000 men in the New England deep-sea fisheries, and 60 to 75 per cent. of them are natives of the Lower Provinces. Is it not an absurdity to compel these men to go by railway to New England ports to join a fishing vessel, and then not allow them to be discharged at the port where the voyage ends? What will be the effect of this? The United States, a year or two ago, passed a Bill called the Labor Contract Act. These men, instead of paying railway fares, now ship as passengers on board passenger vessels, and sail to the United States port at which they are about to engage on a fishing and where they are to stop on their voyage. The United States have stopped them, have arrested these men. The other day in Boston a large number of natives of Yarmouth and Shelburne were arrested for violation of the Labor Contract Act, and they are subject to fine and imprisonment, because they go into that country under a contract to go fishing. The policy therefore, in this respect, is one that bears harder upon ourselves than upon American shipping. The whole object of the Treaty of 1818, and all its restrictions, have

passed away. There were two objects in that treaty, as there are two objects which underlie treaties of that description. One was the determination on the part of the British people of that day, backed by the leaders of the colonial people, to suppress democracy. It was supposed that we would be able to grow a power in the colonies which would check the power of the United States. Another idea was that the fisheries would become the nursery of seamen for the English navy with which to check the power of the United States and of France. Well, Sir, England herself has become more democratic than the colony, and as to her seamen, they never have shipped on board a British man-of-war. I do not know whether they have higher or lower aspirations, but at any rate the whole object of that treaty has failed. Therefore, it is better for the Government to take up this whole matter with a strong hand and open out the whole question. It is better not to make any restrictions at all, but to open them as a matter of trade, and say to the United States: We are willing to make the best trade we can with you, under the circumstances. We recognise fully that it is better to have freedom of trade, better to enter into a liberal arrangement with regard to the people of the United States as being beneficial to our own people and to ourselves. Now, Sir, with regard to the contention that the treaty gives us any thing, it is perfectly absurd. No one has shown where we get any advantage. The hon. member for Queen's the other night went over the ground thoroughly, and from his point of view he showed exactly what the position is. The hon. Minister of Justice tuned up his fiddle and played us a very pretty little jig, at which all of us could laugh, whether we were on the Government side or not; but he really did not meet the arguments of the hon. member for Queen's as to what the treaty takes away from us. The main ground upon which this treaty can be defended, the ground upon which I support it is that it is friendly to the United States. It is a treaty of peace. What we surrender may not be very great. It is absolutely necessary for us to live on the most friendly terms with the United States; it is a most desirable thing that all the arrangements between the two countries, and all the relations between them, shall be of the most harmonious character, so as to prevent trouble and discord among the two peoples. We are constantly, in winter and summer, the recipients of favors from the people along the coast. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this treaty because of its friendliness to the United States, because it sweeps away restrictions which are unnecessary, which are of no benefit to ourselves, and may be of great benefit to that people and to ourselves in the way of peace, both for this country and the Empire at large. Now, Sir, I must cordially congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his treaty. I do not want to express in as strong terms as I would like to, the appreciation I feel of the work he has done. Words of mine, would be only words of just praise for the work he has done, might seem to the House, perhaps, to this side at any rate, words of extravagant eulogy; therefore I will not use them. But I do say that he has done a great work for Canada, he has done a great work for England, and he has done considerable good work for the United States in this House, and I trust that in whatever way his reward may come, it will be satisfactory to him. But, Sir, it is well to note that in what has done, he has pulled forward the most important members of the Cabinet. He has swept away as with a sponge on a blackboard, the declarations of the Premier himself; he has wiped out the arbitrary regulations of the Minister of Customs, or at any rate, their application to the fishing vessels; he has swept away the pleadings of the Minister of Justice; and, Sir, with the breath of his nostrils he has extinguished the false lights put up along the shore by the Minister of Marine, which were luring the Ship of State to destruction. Therefore he is to be congratulated. I do not know whether

he likes this kind of congratulations, but they are such as I give, and I give them most heartily. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the treaty will be ratified here. I venture to hope that, as in this Parliament, so in the Senate of the United State, the able men composing that great deliberative body, will accept this treaty as an acknowledgment of our determination to do justice, too long delayed, as an olive branch of peace, as an evidence of our desire to continue, and to expand, and to make perpetual the friendly relations between England and her oldest child in America, and to cement more closely and more firmly the friendly relationship of England to the United States.

Mr. LANDRY. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Upon his rising to address the House I made up my mind that coming from New Brunswick and knowing him to be possessed of the intelligence that he does possess, knowing that he is as well informed on public questions as he is, the arguments he would use to this House might possibly require some answer to constituencies of New Brunswick, if not to any other constituency, and I listened with the object of replying to the arguments he might offer. But, to my great astonishment, when he finished he himself had answered his own speech. During remarks occupying fifteen or twenty minutes he condemned the treaty in every possible way, and he pointed out to this House all the concessions made, he pointed out their nature, in what respects they had been made and I expected him to find fault with the surrender of all those rights and privileges which we enjoyed and which had by this treaty been surrendered to the United States; but upon concluding he congratulated the Minister of Finance upon having made such an excellent treaty, upon having rendered such great service to the country and the people of Canada, but he did not forget to say also that he had rendered equally great service to the people of the United States. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman spoke very differently from other hon. members who have spoken on the other side of the House. It is true they have made some semblance of finding fault with the treaty; but upon the whole not one hon. gentleman has said he would oppose it by his vote. They have found fault more particularly in regard to what brought about the treaty; and yet what would they have done? they admitted by their argument that the treaty was brought about because of the regulations enforced by the Government since the abrogation of the last treaty. They say, or in effect they say, that the reason this treaty was brought about was because of the position taken in regard to those regulations, and most of them admit that we had a right to put them in force, that they were strictly within our right to pass, although they think the Government did not act discretely in enforcing them. I would answer them in this way; had the Government acted as hon. gentlemen opposite desired them to have acted for the last two or three years, we would not have had to-day this treaty of which they speak so highly. If we had allowed the United States vessels to have free use of our fisheries, if we had never opened our mouths to find fault with those who came within our waters and poach on our fisheries for years, obliging the Government to protest against those acts, as they did, no treaty would have been negotiated, and we would not have had this great blessing regarding which gentlemen opposite have congratulated the Government so frankly and so honestly. I, therefore, believe if we have a treaty to-night it is simply because when the other treaty came to an end the Government, understanding the interests of the Canadian people, endeavored to put in force that which it is not disputed we had a right to put in force. The only question respecting which I can to some extent agree with hon. gentlemen opposite when they spoke of having made a surrender, and I cannot help giving ex-

Mr. ELLIS.

pression to my opinion in this House, was that so far as I interpret what is given by us under this treaty, although the matters may not be very valuable in view of the interests of peace, good government and relationship which we hope will always exist between this country and the United States, and I say those matters were not a great deal to surrender to secure those objects—yet if there was anything surrendered I believe it was surrendered by us and not by the United States. It is true the United States have given up a great deal of their contention, that they contended for a great deal which they did not get; but according to my interpretation, they were imaginary rights whereas ours were real rights under the treaty, rights which under the interpretation of a proper tribunal would have been found to exist under the treaty. But not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has pointed out what we have lost by the surrender made. The hon. gentleman who last spoke pointed out thirteen or fourteen different things we had surrendered, but he did not point out that this country had lost anything by it, he did not show that we had made a surrender that injured our interests and in proportion benefited the people of the United States. On the contrary, he told us that he was not prepared to say it would be any loss to us. The only ground upon which he calculates the treaty might be an injury, was simply in view of the contentions made by the United States previous to the negotiations; but if we take the hon. gentleman's own contentions made before he spoke to-night in this House, we will see that his contentions were somewhat hostile to the contentions made by the Government. What did he say in the paper over which he has control. He said:

"There is a doubt whether an American fishing vessel has the right under the Treaty of 1818 to enter our harbors and buy bait. But an arrangement made 70 years ago will not work now. The Government of Canada in reviving a treaty 70 years old have done a thing which they will not be able to stand by, and which will make this country ridiculous in the eyes of the world."

That was his opinion in 1886.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my opinion now.

Mr. LANDRY. Then what does the hon. gentleman find fault with? He was only grieved because it did not occur sooner. If it had occurred sooner, there would have been no occasion for the treaty. He told us that the circumstances that brought about the Treaty of 1818 disappeared, and therefore, it was necessary to have another treaty. There was an absolute necessity, according to the hon. gentleman, for having a new treaty, because the reasons that led to the Treaty of 1818 had disappeared. If there were such reasons, was the Government wrong in negotiating a treaty? Certainly not. The next question is whether the treaty is one that we can approve. Not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has endeavored to point out that it is not one that we should approve. They all say we should approve it, and no vote will be taken respecting it. I admit that at the beginning of the debate if hon. gentlemen opposite had taken the stand that the Treaty should not be accepted as if was a base surrender of rights which it was our duty to guard and maintain and not surrender—and I take it that the Parliament of Canada still has it in its own hands, notwithstanding the negotiation that has taken place, the duty of determining whether the treaty shall be passed, and that we can still stay our hand and cry halt, and say we will wait for something better—if they had taken that ground I could have sympathised with them to some extent, because they would have believed we were surrendering valuable rights. They do not, however, take that position. On the contrary, they take this position: While they blame the Government and use very strong language, the late Finance Minister using very strong language indeed, stating that the Government had in a cowardly manner surrendered, that according to their own admission they would have surren-

dered long before they came face to face with the American Government; they would have surrendered when the American fishermen came to poach upon our fisheries, and they would have hauled down the flag at that time, to use the words of the hon. gentleman opposite. They found fault with that surrender, and at a time when it was, in my opinion, proper and right and fair to make surrenders, if the surrenders were called for, because when a treaty is being made surrenders have to be made on both sides. If surrenders have been made on both sides, it is in order to ensure the friendly relations which we say ought to exist between the two peoples. When the time comes for discussing those matters in a friendly manner face to face, it is the time to see what one can concede on one side, and what one can concede on the other, for the benefit of both countries. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite in what are our rights surrendered, or on what false position are we placed by those negotiations? I cannot see it, and I have therefore much pleasure in joining with the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), and with the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in giving my vote for the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, it was towards the close of last Session before the Government laid on the Table of the House the blue books which furnished the information upon which we have to judge very largely of this treaty. During the short time we had before the Session closed the correspondence was brought down but I did not do more than take a cursory glance at it and very little opportunity was afforded to discuss it before the House closed. I must admit that I did feel in reading it very much pained and surprised at parts of the correspondence which was laid before us. I however felt that as the matter was opened up for negotiation between Canada and the United States that even if the opportunity had presented itself it would not have been right for us to wash our dirty linen in public as it were and to take the ground which might be construed in favor of the American contention. I was not surprised however at the arguments of the Government. I dare say they were all correct and they were very able arguments indeed but what I was pained and grieved at as a Canadian was to see the hard and inhumane way and the most imprudent manner in which our Government had enforced the technical rights which they claimed under the old Treaty of 1818. The hon. the Minister of Finance has had to conduct his party a good deal recently and there was a remark which he made in his speech the other day which I think will apply admirably to the conduct of his colleagues in 1886 in reference to American fishing vessels. That is when he said:

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction and it is another thing to enforce it."

I do not find fault for the holding of a technical construction by the Government, but I do find fault with the manner in which they enforce it. I do not like to see this treaty carried by the House unless I for one protest against the many acts of the Government which have produced those causes of complaint and which I have no doubt the British commissioners in private during the course of the negotiations have had to admit and must have apologised for. I will give three or four instances which will illustrate the others. There was the case of the *Shiloh* in which the contention was made that Canadian fishermen who happened to be on this American fishing vessel in a port should not be allowed to step on shore to see their friends. They were prevented from doing so. Now I say if that can be justified according to the strict interpretation of the laws of the Medes and Persians it was the most unwise and improper and inhumane thing to enforce it against our Canadian fishermen. It has been alleged against us on this side that we take the contentions of the American law breakers. I shall go to the reports of the officers of our own Government

and prove from their own officials the injustice in the case. Capt. Thos. Quigley of the Government cruiser *Terror* reports:

"In the case of the *Shiloh* she came into the harbor about six p.m., on the ninth of August, at Liverpool, and a signal was fired in her case the same as the others."

Just as if she was a pirate.

"When she anchored I boarded her, and the captain reported he was in for water. I told him it was then too late to report at the custom house till morning, and that he must not allow his crew on shore, also that I would leave two men on board to see that he did not otherwise break the law and that my instructions were carried out."

"In the morning I called for the captain when taking the *Julia and Ellen* captain ashore. From there I told him as I did the other that his men could go on taking water while he was reporting, so that he could sail when he returned and not be delayed. This they did not do."

"I have reason to know that it was not water this vessel came in for, as several of the crew lived there and it was for the purpose of letting his men ashore and not for taking water that he put in. He afterwards emptied six barrels of water, stating they were sour, and fooled all day filling them, delaying the time that he might get his crew on shore. I refused to allow his crew on shore for any other purpose than to take water, after completing which, the weather being fine I ordered him to sea in the evening."

"In all cases, except when in for repairs, I place men on board to see that the law is not violated, as many of these vessels put in for the harbor and make taking water and seeking shelter an excuse either to get men or land them, or to allow them a chance to see their friends."

What a crime it was for several of the crew of the American vessels who lived in the port of Shelburne to desire to get on shore to see their friends. The officer complains that he came for the purpose of putting his men ashore and not to take in water. Here is the valiant commander of a Government cruiser who prevents his Canadian fellow citizens from coming on shore to see their friends on the ground of some technical regulations of the Government. I come to the case of the *Pearl Nelson* which I told the Minister of Marine just now when he interrupted the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Ellis) as to an enquiry regarding that vessel's name; I told him I would be able to show that the *Pearl Nelson* was fined \$200 by the custom house officer and that the captain of that vessel was refused to land the clothes of two Canadians at the port of Arichat until \$200 was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. We will hear how you will prove it now.

Mr. EDGAR. It will prove it just as I said I would prove it. I take in the first place the allegation of the American captain who says:

"I had lost a man on the Grand Banks named James Sampson, who belonged to Arichat, and I wanted to land his effects if the customs officers would allow me to. Some of my crew belonged in that neighborhood. William Batineau, my cook, and nine others of my crew took boats off the deck and went ashore without asking my permission. I saw them, but had never known that was any objection. I had been in this and other British and American ports frequently, and witnessed the landing from my own and other vessels' crews, but never before heard such landing was illegal or improper. These men took nothing with them from the vessel, nor carried away anything but the clothes they wore."

"From the time I left Provincetown I had been into no port anywhere. Next morning after my arrival in Arichat, at 8.30 o'clock, I went ashore to enter at the custom house and found it closed. I called at nine o'clock and it was not opened. I went again at ten o'clock and found the collector opening the office door. I made the regular inward report to him, and requested permission to land the clothes of James Sampson, who had been lost from my vessel on the Grand Banks."

"He told me he had sent a man for me. After I got there this man came into the office and was holding my papers, and told the man to go back and take charge of the vessel."

"I asked him why he held my papers. He replied he seized her because I had allowed my men to go ashore before reporting at the custom house; that all he could tell me was, he said he would telegraph to Ottawa and find out what to do with me, and he did telegraph immediately. About 5 o'clock p.m. the collector received an answer, and told me to deposit \$200, and the vessel would be released. The collector would not allow me to land this dead man's clothes until after I had paid the \$200 fine."

That is his allegation.

Mr. FOSTER. What day was that?

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the 18th of September. Now, what does the report of the hon. Minister of Marine say:

"The Minister also submits that it is clear from Capt. Kemp's affidavit that he was guilty of an infraction of the customs regulations in allowing men to land from his vessel before she had been reported, and the Minister of Customs having favorably considered Capt. Kemp's representations as to his ignorance of the customs regulation, requiring that vessels should be reported before landing either men or cargo therefrom, has remitted the fine of \$200 which had been imposed, in the case of the American schooner *Pearl Nelson*."

The enclosed shows that the report of Mr. Johnston, when the remission was made, was dated 22nd October, more than a month after the fine had been imposed. There is no contradiction to the allegation that this man was not allowed to land that dead man's clothes until he paid the \$200. He was fined for sending some men on shore with the dead man's clothes, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, they had them. I do not care how it was, he was not allowed to send that dead man's clothes on shore until he paid the fine. Let us take a case of another class—a case in which a vessel was refused permissions to buy a few trifling supplies. The captain says:

"On Tuesday, 5th October, we made Shelburne, N.S., and arrived in that harbor about 8 o'clock, p.m., on that day, short of provisions, water and oil to burn. On Wednesday, I sailed for the inner harbor of Shelburne, arriving at the town about 4 p.m. On going ashore I found the custom house closed, and hunted up the collector and entered my vessel, and asked permission from him to buy 7 lbs. sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, 1 to 1 bushel potatoes, and 2 lbs. butter or lard or pork, and oil enough to last us home, and I was refused. I stated to him my situation, short of provisions and a voyage of 250 miles before, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul and asked his assistance, and found him powerless to aid me in this matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning, although I asked for him as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say about one and a half hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. Immediately on receiving my papers on Thursday morning, I started for home, arriving on Sunday. I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scanty supply of provisions, we having but little flour and water, and liable to be buffeted for days before reaching home."

The answer of the collector of customs to that is that he had gone to an agricultural exhibition, and he went on:

"I had been on the grounds about 15 minutes when Captain Rose put in an appearance, and I at once came to the office, and he reported his vessel, stated that he was from the Bank bound home, and came in to fill water and wanted provisions as follows, viz., 7 lbs. sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, 1 bushel potatoes and 2 lbs. butter. This was all. I took a memo. and attached it to his inward report, and oil is not mentioned. Stated that he had plenty of flour, fish and other provisions sufficient for voyage home. I gave him permission to fill water at once, but as the treaty made no provision for purchase of supplies I would telegraph to the Department at Ottawa, and no doubt it would be allowed."

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right.

Mr. EDGAR—

"Captain Rose expressed his willingness to remain until a reply was received. He called at the office next morning (Thursday) at 6.30 a.m. and not finding I had received a reply, said as the wind was fair and a good breeze, he would not wait longer, and would take a clearance, which I gave him."

The hon. Minister of Customs says the collector was quite right to telegraph to the grand panjandrum at Ottawa. I will quote to the hon. Minister of Customs the words of the hon. Finance Minister again:—

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another thing to enforce it."

Perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs will tell us that the collector enforced these stringent regulations because the Americans did. I think I have heard that contention before, but I think the hon. Minister of Finance meets that very question in his speech, because he has surrendered rights of that kind; and as an excuse for doing that which I do not think required any excuse at all in this Parliament—he should have excused to previous acts of his administration—with reference to the concessions made in article 10, he said:—

"A great deal was made of the apparent injustice of subjecting vessels obliged to put in for humane purposes, such as vessels in distress and
Mr. EDGAR.

vessels under stress of weather to come under the clause of the treaty that allowed vessels to come in for those four purposes. A great deal was made of the difficulties that were thrown in their way, and the obstructions that were placed apparently by Canada, in the way of their exercising and enjoying those privileges that the treaty of 1818 clearly and distinctly provided they should enjoy. I think, Sir, that this House and the people of this country will agree with me that it was not undesirable in the interests of good neighborhood, in the interests of the good reputation of Canada for humane and friendly consideration to vessels in distress, obliged to put into our ports for shelter, and especially where they had under the treaty right a right to come in under such circumstances, that we should remove any obstructions or hindrances that lay in their way."

Then the hon. the Minister of Finance goes on to say:

"It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the commission to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port who had been collector for 10 years was examined and gave his testimony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked:

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?"

"His answer was, as I remember:

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

So that our Customs Department had not even the miserable excuse that the others were doing it to, and if they had that excuse two wrongs would not make one right. What was the opinion about this harsh construction of the treaties of Mr. Chamberlain himself. In speaking at Mr. Wiman's banquet, he is reported in the *London Times* to have said:

"This interference, whether justified by law or not, inevitably provoked great irritation and ill-feeling in this country, and it is not too much to say that for some time peaceful relations between the two greatest free nations in the world—or, if not peaceful relations, at any rate, friendly intercourse between them was at the mercy of officials acting at a great distance from the central authority, who might be hot headed or indiscreet or unreasonable in the exercise of extremely delicate functions." * * *

"Nations are often more apt to resent petty affronts and injuries than they are to resent serious invasions of natural rights."

Now I should think Mr. Chamberlain was right on that point at any rate. Let us see whether the Americans resented this or not. Let us see whether they quietly submitted to this interference. I will not say whether the Americans did not greatly resent this; I will not say whether they were not too touchy on the subject. But I want to show that our Government should have understood the people they had to deal with, and should have known how sensitive the Americans are with regard to any interference of that kind with their commerce; they should have understood what would have been the results of that interference. What were the results? From the beginning to the end of all the correspondence in this book, we see that there was the strongest feeling created; we see that Mr. Bayard, who is not usually supposed to be an ill-tempered or unreasonable man, used language with reference to vessels, all through the unfortunate summer of 1886, of this kind. Speaking of the case of the *Novelly*, he said:

"Against this treatment I make instant and formal protest as an unwarranted interpretation and application of the treaty by the officers of the Dominion of Canada and of the Province of Nova Scotia, as an infraction of the laws of commercial and maritime intercourse existing between the two countries, and as a violation of hospitality, and for any loss or injury resulting therefrom, the Government of Her Britannic Majesty will be held liable."

With reference to the prohibition of purchasing from Canadian weirs for canning, Mr. Bayard writes:

"Such inhibition of usual and legitimate commercial contracts and intercourse is assuredly without warrant of law, and I draw your attention to it in order that the commercial rights of the citizens of the

United States may not be thus invaded and subjected thus to unfriendly discrimination."

The Secretary of the Treasury was asked to report upon these subjects, and he speaks of "the unworthy and petty spite" of the Canadians in dealing with the Americans. He said:

"The Dominion of Canada brutally excludes American fishermen from Canadian ports. * * * I believe there never has been in the past and I hope there never will be in the future such passionate spite displayed by the officers of the Government, as has during the last summer been exhibited in the Dominion of Canada towards well meaning American fishermen."

That was from the Secretary of the Treasury. Then the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives made a report, and they reported in much the same line. They also suggest the motives of the Canadians to use these means in enforcing what they considered their rights:

"The motives and purpose of such denial have been openly proclaimed by Canada, and plainly avowed by Canada to be, first, the punishment of such vessels because the United States levies a duty on Canadian fish not fresh for immediate consumption, such as the Government levies on all such fish not the product of American fisheries and imported from any foreign place whatever, and secondly, to coerce the United States to exempt such Canadian fish from all customs duties, and to enter into other new reciprocal relations with the Canadian Dominion and Newfoundland. It is a policy of threat and coercion, which, in the opinion of your commission, should be instantly and summarily dealt with."

It was instantly and summarily dealt with and they showed in that report what it was they dealt with. It was this conduct of the Custom Department, which the hon. gentleman has said to-night was right, that they dealt with. Then came the retaliation Act. What language is used about that Act in the official correspondence brought down by the Government?

"The Senate rose to a high level of patriotism in defence of national honor. The series of unneighborly, brutal, and illegal outrages upon American commerce in Dominion waters has been resented with becoming vigor and dignity. The Senate, with only one dissenting vote—and that vote cast under a fantastic interpretation of the measure has armed the President with full, adequate and just powers of retaliation."

So I have traced, I think, that Retaliation Bill and all the possible and fearful consequences which it might have involved, directly and clearly to this indiscreet, ill-advised and unstatesmanlike action of our Government in 1886. Well, even after that our Government were not dismayed. No, Sir, like ancient Pistol they had brave words at any rate, and it was after that, it was on the 1st February, 1887, that we had the famous report of the Privy Council, which was sent over to England, and which purports to be the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know whether I have any right to pry into the authorship or not of that document; but I should judge from the terms of it, and from the turns of sentiment in that document that the Minister of Justice had more to do with it than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. In that grave State paper, they justify everything they have done, and they say:

"It is not to be expected that, after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights, and upon the respect due by foreign vessels while in Canadian waters, to the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are governed, in the absence moreover of any decision of a legal tribunal, to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments withdraw from a position taken up deliberately, and by doing so in effect, plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity, and bad faith, which, in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States."

Here is the heroical sentence which comes in now.

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who

were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trust committed to their charge."

These were brave words indeed, but they were sent home by His Excellency on the 1st February, in a despatch to the Home Office, and as soon as the Home Government had time to consider the situation, they promptly sat upon Her Majesty's Government here, and in a despatch sent by cable from the Colonial Secretary to the Governor General, they say:

"Her Majesty's Government, while endeavoring to procure this *ad interim* arrangement, feel it right to intimate to you that they are disposed to think, after much consideration of the entire subject, that the best and simplest settlement of the present difficulties might be arrived at if both parties would agree so as to permit the discussion of the more extended commercial arrangements—to provide for a term at least, if not permanently, the condition or things which existed under the Treaty of Washington, fish and fish productions being again reciprocally duty free, and the fishery being once more reciprocally thrown open. They are, however, of opinion that it would be the clear interest of the Dominion that no suggestion of a pecuniary indemnification should be made in proffering this arrangement."

And that was within two days accepted by the Governor General in a cable to England, so that the high words, and the still more high-handed proceedings of the hon. gentleman could not be tolerated in England, but, fortunately for Canada in that instance, were interfered with. I am not so much surprised that England could not, after that, trust Canada to negotiate a treaty. These gentlemen nearly got Canada, nearly got England, and nearly got the Empire into a war with the United States. It was, therefore, not surprising that England could not trust the Canadian Government to negotiate the treaty. But, though that is the case, I would not like to be in the House when any Canadian commercial treaty is adopted which has been made for us by representatives of Downing Street, without entering a protest against that, because I think British diplomacy in colonial matters has always been a failure. We had hoped that we had outlived that stage of Canadian existence ever since, in 1874, Mr. George Brown went to Washington as a delegate, not from Downing Street, but from Ottawa, to negotiate a treaty. Of course he was authorised in Her Majesty's name, as he had to be. Afterwards, we settled in Halifax the amount of the claims against the United States, and we did it most successfully, without any Downing Street agent to manage it for us, and I had hoped that the ground which was taken, in 1882, by Mr. Blake in regard to that matter, and which, I think, you, Mr. Speaker, will recollect, would have been followed for the future. I think it is unnecessary, in order that Canada may have a fair play with the United States, to invoke the warlike powers of Great Britain. That is all a piece of clap-trap. We know that the English Government will not send its ironclads and open fire upon the cities of the United States in our behalf. England might do that in Alexandria or in Burmah, but she will not do it in regard to the United States. That is the last thing she will think of in this world. But we have claims of our own, and we should go to the United States and say to them: it is worth your while to make a treaty with us at any time, because it will be immensely to your advantage to make that treaty, and not only to make it but to keep it. It is not the ironclads or the armies of Europe that keep treaties in the present age but it is the mutual benefits derived from them by the parties. If that were not the case, how could Switzerland, that little State in the midst of States in arms, successfully make treaties? But we know that she does, and that Portugal does, and that those treaties with larger powers are entered upon and honestly carried out. We do not need the assistance of England to make our treaties or to have them kept after they are made. I will just trouble you with a statement of the enormous value of Canadian trade to the United States as compared with other countries in the world. There are only three countries in the world that have a larger trade

with the United States than Canada, and those are England, Germany and France. We have a more valuable trade with the United States than that great Empire of Brazil or that fertile island of Cuba, both of which are her neighbors. We have double the trade of Italy, Belgium or the Netherlands; we have more than treble the trade of China, Mexico or Japan; we have more than four times the trade they have with Spain, more than five times their trade with Russia, more than six times their trade with the five Republics of Central America in the aggregate, and ten times the trade with Chili and Portugal. And to say in that condition of affairs that we should look for an agent to come from Downing Street to make a fair treaty for us is not reasonable. A few years ago, the present First Minister was in power, in 1868, and two of his colleagues were in London, looking after, among other things, the San Juan difficulty. They were Sir George Cartier and Mr. William Macdougall, who were at that time representing the Government very ably, and, in a letter to Lord Granville, dated the 29th December, 1868, they gave expression to these sentiments:

"Our experience of past diplomacy in the settlement of boundaries in North America, in which the disposition on one side to concede, and on the other to encroach was always present and always resulted disastrously to Canada, admonishes us that a similar disposition, and similar results, may be feared in the future."

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleagues nearly 20 years ago; and surely, Mr. Speaker, if they were right in their historical account of what had happened in the past diplomacy, they were right in what they were afraid would happen in the near future; for we know that San Juan Island was given away, we know since then the Fenian claims, in the Treaty of 1871, were abandoned, and I am not at all satisfied that if Canada had the negotiation of her own arrangements, about the fisheries with the United States, and was not interfered with one way or another, we might have done better than we have. Now, Sir, as to this treaty itself, the concessions do seem to be all on one side. There is very little in the treaty at all. It is spread over a good deal of ground, it is like very thin butter spread over a large slice of bread. It looks very much as if the plenipotentiaries, after spending nearly three months, came to the conclusion that for the credit of themselves, every one of them, they must do something; that it would never do for them to go home without coming to some settlement, and so they patched up a little arrangement about the headlines; they made concessions to the Americans about entries in the customs ports, and they gave nothing on earth to Canada except a provision, in the 12th clause, that Canada is to have the same rights for her fishing vessels in American fishing grounds, as were conceded to the United States. But even that, the Minister of Finance in his speech, had to admit did not amount to anything at all; he was almost ashamed for it, and he apologised for it. So, while not desiring to oppose the treaty as it stands now, I think it is comparatively harmless, but I think it contains, a great many provisions which should have been conceded without negotiations by the delegates at Washington. I am sorry to say that it does not contain free fish for our people down east, and that is one great desideratum that they all seem clamoring for. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, having made a protest against the action of the Government in 1886, and against the negotiation of Canadian treaties by Downing Street diplomatists, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McDUGALL. At this very late hour of the night, or rather early hour of the morning, I do not intend to detain the House very long. I would not trouble the House at this moment were it not for the importance of the treaty for the people whom I have the honor to represent. Ever since the negotiations between the United States and Canada the people of my county have been looking anxiously

Mr. EDGAR.

forward to this settlement, and so far as I have been able to learn the settlement which has been arrived at gives general satisfaction. A great deal has been said with regard to the treatment which the Americans have received at the hands of Canadian officials. Now, on this point I desire to read the testimony of a captain belonging to the United States who was engaged in the fisheries. In a letter to the *Boston Herald*, dated 9th November, 1886, he says:

"So much has been written and printed about the experiences of American fishermen in Canadian waters, and the indignities put on them, I wish you would open your columns and give your readers an insight into the other side of the story. I sailed from Boston for North Bay on 16th June, not knowing just what the cutters would do or how the law would be interpreted. I neared the coast with fear and anxiety. The first land sighted was Whitehead, and immediately cries came from aloft: 'Cutter in sight ahead!' I rushed to the deck, found the vessel which proved to be the *Houlett*, commanded by Capt. Lorway, nearing us rapidly. At time of sighting the cutter we were standing alone inshore. She hoisted her flags to let us know what she was, and we immediately 'about ship' and put to sea to get out of her way, for fear we might be put on the prize list of the captures. We finally headed up for Port Mulgrave in Canso, expecting to receive rough usage from the authorities, but to our surprise, found Collector Murray a perfect gentleman, willing to assist me as far as he could without encroaching on the Canadian laws. From there we put in at Port Hawkesbury and boarded the cutter *Conrad*, and asked the captain for instructions in regard to the three-mile limit, and what privileges, if any, we had. I was answered, in a courteous and hearty way, that he did not have them aboard, but would go ashore in a few moments and get me a printed copy of the regulations, which he did, and assured us that if we followed them we would be unmolested; that he was there to see that the law was not violated, but not to cause unnecessary annoyance. After receiving instructions from the captain, thanks to him, I went to the custom house and entered my vessel, paying twenty-five cents. I found a very pleasant gentleman in the collector, who did all in his power to relieve my mind and make us comfortable.

"Souris was our next port of landing, where we also reported, and were well treated. From there we went to Malpeque, where we found another gentleman in the collector. We met the cutter *Houlett* at Casumpec, and had several interviews with her commander, Captain Lorway, whom I found a quiet, just and gentlemanly officer. My vessel was one of the fleet ordered out of harbor by him. At that time it was as good a fish day as one could ask for, and the instructions were plain that at such times we had no right to remain in harbor. At no time is there much water to spare on the bar, and it is a common occurrence for vessels to ground in going in or out, and that some did touch was due to ignorance of the channel or carelessness on the part of captains. At the time the order was issued the weather was fair, but before all the fleet could work out through the channel, one of the sudden changes in weather, so much to be dreaded on such a coast, came, and the cutter rescinded the order and the fleet returned. It has been printed in a Boston paper that, owing to being forced to sea by the cutter's orders in bad weather, my schooner, the *Andrew Burnham*, fouled two Englishmen and narrowly escaped serious damage. If true it would look like a hardship. It was simply this: In getting under way, in a small and crowded space, finding I would not not have room, I dropped our starboard anchor. That not holding, we let go the other, and it brought us up all right; not much in this to point to as an outrage or danger from stress of weather. I believe Captain Lorway to be a man who would carry out all the requirements of the Canadian laws, but I saw nothing in my experience in those waters that could be considered as being arbitrary, or taking a mean advantage of his official authority to annoy anyone. Captain Lorway has been a master of vessels for twenty-five years, is a man of high reputation as a seaman, and as good a judge of whether the weather is favorable for a vessel to go to sea as any man who walks a deck, and when he ordered the fleet to sea he went himself, and I know he would not order a vessel to leave harbor if there was any danger of loss of life or property. We reported at Casumpec, and were treated the same as at all other ports we touched at. If our vessels would attend to reporting at the custom house, the same as they do in our ports, no trouble would be met with.

"If we had 'free fish' it would give the Canadians some recompense for what our fishermen want, viz., the right to go anywhere and everywhere, use their harbors, ship men, get provisions, land and mend our nets, buy salt and barrels, and ship our catch home by rail or steamer without expense or annoyance, the same as we have heretofore.

"If we had had this privilege last year, myself and vessel would have been \$5,000 better off this season, and all the fishermen in the bay would have been in the same boat with me. I do not say that I am too honest not to fish within the three-mile limit, nor do I believe there is a vessel in the fleet who would not, if the cutter was out of sight. I made two trips to the bay, both of which were very successful, and I lived up to the requirements of the law as well as I knew how, and did not find them obnoxious, or to interfere with my success, and everywhere I went I was courteously treated by the officials—especially so by both the cutters. Should it be a bay year next season, I hope to meet them again. Those who openly preached that they would go where they pleased, do what they wanted to in spite of law or cutters, shipped men, smuggled or openly fished inside of the limit, and indulged in the satisfaction of damning the cutter, the captain, the Government and everything else when they knew they could do it

with impunity, and that the men they were talking to could not resent it by word or blow, were looked after sharp and were not extended the courtesy that was shown so many of us.

"In the interest of fair play I could not help writing you and asking you to give this to your readers, if not taking up too much of your valuable space.

"Very respectfully,

"CAPT. NATHAN F. BLAKE."

This is what Captain Blake says as to his experience in dealing with our custom officers and captains of cutters, and it is far from being in accordance with the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think, however, that authority should be satisfactory to those gentlemen; first, because the authority comes from the United States, and, second, because the authority is named Blake. Here is an extract from the paper in which that letter was published:

"The letter of Captain Nathan F. Blake, of the fishing schooner *Andrew Burnham* of this city, which we published on Wednesday, would apparently indicate that the Canadian officials have not been disposed to push the requirements of their law quite as rigorously as some of our fishermen have maintained. Captain Blake says that he has experienced not the least trouble in his intercourse with the Canadian officials, but that, as he has treated them courteously, they on their side have reciprocated in like terms. There is, undoubtedly, a great deal of bitterness felt on both sides, and probably this bitterness has led both parties to be ungracious in their own conduct, and to exaggerate the wrongs they have endured, hardships frequently due to an unwillingness to observe the requirements of the law as these are now laid down. If all American fishing captains exhibited the same courtesy and moderation that Captain Blake has shown, we imagine that there would be very little trouble in arriving at an equitable and pleasing understanding with Canada."

I wish now to call the attention of the House to the condition of our fisheries, for they have been presented before this House as in an unsatisfactory state and particularly the fisheries from the part of the Dominion from which I come. In 1873 the value of Nova Scotia fisheries was \$6,500,000, in 1878 \$6,131,000. It will be remembered that in course of the discussion in this House a few days ago more than one hon. member contended that during the period from 1873 to 1871 the fishing interests in Nova Scotia made progress but since that date had declined. I find by referring to the fisheries from that time to the present that, although the value in 1878 was \$6,131,000 it had increased in 1882 to \$7,131,000, and in 1886 to \$8,415,000, or an increase of 15 per cent. The same may be said in regard to the Island of Cape Breton, although an hon. member, I think the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, stated the other day that there had been a great exodus and that the fishermen are in an unsatisfactory condition. I propose to give a statement showing not only that the fishing industry is in a state of prosperity, but that it is in a state of great prosperity. In 1882 the value of the fisheries of Cape Breton was \$1,080,000; in 1886, \$1,561,000, being an increase of 50 per cent. We also find the number of men employed larger than it was when hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. In 1877-78 we had employed in the fisheries 6,680 hands; in 1886, 77,591, or an increase of 11 per cent. I desire now to quote from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* an article on the subject of the fisheries and the operation of the Government laws against the American fishing vessels. It states:

"THE MACKEREL CATCH."

"The last number of *Bradstreet's* contains a number of elaborate tables, in connection with the trade of the United States, showing the production of wheat, cotton, fish, and a variety of other articles, during the year 1886, as compared with previous years. The table relating to the fish trade will afford the people of the United States the most convincing proof of the absurdity of the claim that our fisheries are of no value to them. If such figures were sent out from a Canadian source their accuracy might be challenged, and it would no doubt be pretended that they were cooked in the interests of our fishermen, for the purpose of securing the removal of the duty. The facts and figures given by *Bradstreet's* are open to no such doubt, and there can be no question that their wide circulation will have a strong effect in causing the Americans to see the folly of the course they have been led to adopt, in rejecting the opportunities which have been offered them of settling the fishery question on a fair and reasonable basis.

"The mere statement of the fact that during 1886 the primary industry of the New England fishermen, the catching of fish, has been unremunerative, fails to give anything like a definite idea of the result of their exclusion from our waters upon their business, but the figures in *Bradstreet's* are intelligible enough to be understood by any one, and show conclusively that the use of our waters is a vital necessity to the fishermen of the Eastern States, and is of immense importance to the trade and to the people."

"It appears that the mackerel fleet in 1886 only secured 80,000 barrels, as against 330,000 barrels in 1885, and as against a much larger quantity than last year's catch in every year since 1859. The effect of this short catch has been to raise the price and to check the consumption. The increase from these Provinces, notwithstanding the duty, has been larger than in 1885. It is further stated that the effect of the duty has been to change the course of the export trade, most of the fish now sent by Boston merchants to Hayti and San Domingo being packed in the Provinces instead of in the States. In respect to cod there is a reduction in the catch of upwards of 79,000 quintals, a falling off which may be attributed to the difficulty of procuring bait, or may be explained by natural causes, similar variations having occurred in previous years, but figures in relation to the mackerel catch are too remarkable and too uniform in previous years to be explained away. The number of barrels caught each year since 1881 is as follows:

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| 1881..... | 391,657 |
| 1882..... | 378,863 |
| 1883..... | 226,685 |
| 1884..... | 478,076 |
| 1885..... | 329,943 |
| 1886..... | 81,953 |

"If the cruisers sent out by the Dominion Government had performed their duty effectively there can be no doubt that the disparity would have been greater."

Our friends on the other side of the House say the cruisers have performed their duty too effectively and carried out the laws too rigorously against American fishermen, while we have the statement of the *Halifax Chronicle* to the contrary. This shows the effect that the fishery protection service had upon the catch of mackerel by United States fishermen and it proves conclusively that the fish usually caught by the people of the United States had been caught by the people of Canada and that the benefit accruing from the catching of this fish accrues to the people of Canada. I shall not take up any longer the time of this House except to say that I have much pleasure in supporting this treaty, and I am satisfied in doing so that it will be a matter of satisfaction to the people whom I represent, a people who are largely engaged in the fishing industry and a people who do not regard this matter in the same way as some hon. gentlemen have pictured to the House and to the country since the beginning of this discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to enquire if the Minister of Finance intends to bring down the Supplementary Estimates before he proceeds with the Budget statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope to be able to do so. I am afraid I will not be able to proceed with the Budget until a week from to-day (Tuesday). It may be convenient for the hon. gentleman to know but not so important as it would be if we were not able to proceed with the Estimates until that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What business will be proceeded with to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The ordinary business on the Order Paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you intend to go into Committee of Supply?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

MOTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou) for Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

A Select Committee to be composed of Messrs. Ives, Edgar, Wood (Brockville), McDougald (Pictou), Casgrain, Mills (Annapolis), Flynn, and the mover, to examine into and report upon the claim of James King, as set forth in his petition received by this House on 21st March, 1888; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all reports made by Commander Gordon, or any other officer engaged in the Fishery Protection Service, to Government, on the condition of the fisheries, the effects of the Protection Service, and the probable result of the continuance of the policy of excluding American fishermen from our ports and waters.—(Mr. Davies.)

Copies of all tenders received by the Government for fencing the Eastern Extension Railway in Nova Scotia, and the Intercolonial Railway, from Pictou Landing to Windsor Junction; and also, a statement showing the names of the party or parties to whom contracts have been awarded, if any have been awarded, and length of fence each has contracted for and amount to be paid for work.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Correspondence, reports, &c., in relation to damages sustained by Mr. John Knight, in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence, reports, &c., in relation to damages sustained by Mr. Allan Knight, in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence, reports, &c., in relation to damages sustained by Mr. Patrick Clancey, in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence, &c., in reference to the placing of a switch and platform at Mr. Albert Bryanton's on the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Correspondence between Mr. Samuel Russell and the Government of the Dominion, or any of its officers, with all communications and reports from such officer or officers, in reference to a claim for damages to his property in connection with the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Copy of all correspondence between the Government and any person or persons relating to the claim of the Mississauga Indians, under the various treaties in reference to unceded lands, together with any reports and plans in connection therewith.—(Mr. Madill.)

Return of all correspondence, petitions, reports of engineers, and others, regarding the construction of a harbor of refuge at Wellington, Lake Ontario.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return of all correspondence, petition, reports of engineers, and others, respecting the dredging of the Pictou Harbor, Bay of Quinté, not already brought down.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return of all correspondence and petitions respecting the construction of building for post office, Customs office and Inland Revenue office in the town of Pictou.—(Mr. Platt.)

Copies of all papers, writings and reports between Mr. Allan Bryanton and the Government of Canada, or anyone on his behalf, or between the officers of the Government and him or anyone on his behalf, or between the Government and their officers, in relation to the placing of a platform and switch near his place on the line of the Derby Branch Railway, in the county of Northumberland, N.B.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Return of all papers and correspondence relating to the location of the Experimental Farm at Grenfell, in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Return of all lessees of grazing lands under old form of leases; 2nd. The number of these who have fully complied with the terms of the leases; 3rd. The number who have partially complied, showing to what extent; 4th. The number in arrears for rent, showing to what extent; 5th. The number of old leases now entirely unoccupied.—(Mr. Davis.)

Copy of all correspondence, reports and recommendations having reference to the claim of Captain George H. Young, of Winnipeg, that he and Stretcher-men Bailey and King, of the 90th Battalion, rescued the wounded Priest, Rev. Father Moulin, at Ratoche, on the 11th May, 1885; and that the said rescue was not effected by Doctor Gravely, of Cornwall, as stated in the report of the Surgeon General of Militia as presented to Parliament in May, 1886.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Return of all tenders received by the Government for the supply of coal during the past calendar year, the names of successful tenderers and the rate per ton in all contracts for coal entered into by the Government during the past calendar year.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Return showing 1st. The date of Henry Symth's engagement by Department of Agriculture; 2nd. The date at which his services were dispensed with; 3rd. The amount per diem or month paid him for travelling expenses; 4th. The entire sum paid for travelling or other expenses; 5th. The entire sum paid for services of any kind, and travelling and other expenses from the 1st of January, 1887, to 1st of March, 1888.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of all Dominion Scrip issued for any purpose in connection with Manitoba and the North-West Territories; the dates and amounts of the several issues, and the purposes for which they were made; the mode or modes of redemption; the amount of each issue so far redeemed, and the balances outstanding on the 1st March, 1888.—(Mr. Wilson, Elgin.)

Return giving the names and dates of the appointment of each Colonization Inspector and Homestead Inspector in the North-West Territories, including Manitoba; the salary paid to each, also the travelling expenses per diem or month, the full amount for salary and travelling or other expenses, paid to each from the date of his engagement up to the 1st of January, 1888.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing separately in regard to companies doing business under Dominion license, the amount of fire insurance at risk on the 31st December, for each of the years from 1881 to 1887, both inclusive, the number of policies in force, the total amount of cash paid each year and the total amount of expenses for each year, the percentage of losses and expenses to premium income, and the expense per \$1,000 at risk.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Return of all tenders for militia clothing since the 1st of January, 1883, showing the name of each firm or party tendering, the amount of each tender, and the name of the person or firm to whom the contract or contracts were awarded.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Copies of the papers concerning the application of George J. Macdonald, in connection with the Centennial Exhibition of 1876.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.30 a.m., (Tuesday.)

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, April 17, 1888.

No. 36.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RETURN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the return of Joseph Gauthier, Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the County of L'Assomption.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate)—(Mr. Masson.)

JUDGES' SALARIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that to-morrow the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolutions on the Order paper with respect to increases in the salaries of judges.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JAMIESON. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to mention by way of privilege a matter which arose yesterday in connection with the debate upon prohibition. It will be recollected that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) charged that last year when I had charge of the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act that I refused to press the measure. In reply to that I stated that any action I had taken had been in accordance with the advice of the friends of the measure selected from both sides of the House at a meeting which had been convened for the purpose. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) when referred to by me stated that he had no recollection of such meeting. Of course in order to put myself right—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would request the hon. gentleman to state at once what is the question of privilege. He is now referring to a debate which took place yesterday and I do not see there is any question of privilege in that.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have simply to say that the meeting I referred to there are three members in the House now who attended it and which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) had forgotten. I wish simply to put myself right on this question as it might be considered a question of

veracity between myself and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman had no intention of misrepresenting the matter, but—

Mr. SPEAKER. I hardly think this is a question of privilege.

Mr. JAMIESON. My statement is this—

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member abandon the question of privilege?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has stated what I did not say yesterday and I wish to repeat what my statement was. My statement was this: That I had proposed—

Mr. SPEAKER. I have stopped the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). The hon. member when the question comes up again might have an opportunity to explain, but just now it will interfere with the business of the House.

EVIDENCE BEFORE THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. HOLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to repeat the question which I asked the Government last Friday, that is, whether it is intended to lay before the House and distribute to the members the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Railways. As I said then I repeat now, it seems to me that we cannot intelligently discuss this Bill without this evidence in our hands.

Mr. BOWELL. Immediately upon the question being brought before the House by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) the other day I saw the Clerk of the Printing Committee and asked him if they had not those reports printed. He said that they had but in very limited numbers. I then gave him instructions to have them printed immediately and distributed among the members and he promised to do so. Since then I have not thought of it.

Mr. HOLTON. I am asking Parliament with regard to the evidence. I know that when the Minister of Railways laid the report of the Commission on the Table on the 29th February last I think there were certain documents accompanying it, but not the evidence, and it is the evidence for which I am particularly asking now.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt that the Minister of Customs—

Mr. SPEAKER. Surely the hon. gentlemen do not mean to have a debate on this. The question has been put and an answer has been given, therefore a debate is not in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not allowable to point out the importance of having those papers on the Table? It has been allowed before, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been allowed by controverting the rules.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. MITCHELL. Before that clause is adopted, I wish to read a statement attributed to the American consul at Halifax, a gentleman who has taken a great interest in this question, as there seems to be some difference of opinion about this provision:

"United States Consul General Phelan, of Halifax, N.S., was in Washington the other day, on his way to his home in St. Louis. In speaking of the recently concluded Fisheries Treaty, he said:

"The advantages accruing to the United States under the provisions of the new treaty have been greatly under-estimated. New fishing grounds have been opened up to our fishermen and all doubts removed as to our right to avail ourselves of them. We are no longer fishing on sufferance. Under the existing treaty we can only enter Canadian ports for wood, water, shelter and repairs. Even then we are subjected to a disagreeable espionage. Under the new contract we are liable for no pilotage dues, and at the same time enjoy the benefits of light-houses and other safeguards of navigation. Our vessels can no longer be seized upon the trumped-up charges of 'hovering.' We can now enter Canadian ports for fresh supplies, provisions, &c., saving the necessity for returning home in the midst of the fishing season. Our vessels can sell or tranship cargoes, and can always enter the nearest port for anything they may lack.

"To my mind the Canadians have gained nothing. It may be said that the treaty might go further than it does, but it is certainly a vast improvement upon the existing agreement. While our fishermen may not be entirely satisfied, it would be a serious matter, as they would quickly realise, should the Senate reject the new convention. A convincing argument is the very general dissatisfaction expressed by Canadians with the provisions of this treaty. Without regard to party they are opposed to it. It is likely, however, to be ratified by those who are in duty bound to support the Government. The Canadian fishermen, however, will never be satisfied with it, while the practical operation of its provisions will make it decidedly popular on this side of the line."

I am not going to make any observations, but simply give this as the opinion of a gentleman intimately acquainted with the whole question from the beginning.

On section 6,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This clause, I have no doubt is a necessary provision, the necessity of which is shown by the correspondence which has taken place between the American Government and the Governments of the United Kingdom and Canada. It is a pity, however, that the Government did not recognise this principle and act upon it without being forced to do so by treaty, but exercised a meddlesome oversight by means of vexatious reports and impudent regulations made by the Customs Department that well nigh drove the two countries into war.

Mr. BOWELL. One would suppose, to hear the hon. gentleman repeat that story from time to time, that new regulations were adopted and enforced by the Customs authorities and the Government. For the information of the House, I can inform the hon. gentleman that no new regulations were enacted and no change was made in the law. The only thing done was to carry out the law in regard to fishing vessels, which were placed in the same position as vessels engaged in ordinary commercial transactions. We applied to them the same rules and regulations that were applied to all commercial vessels or all vessels trading in our ports. There were no new regulations, but the law as it existed, and has existed for years, was rigidly enforced in those as in other cases.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does my hon. friend forget that only two years ago the Government brought in a Bill in order to perfect a defect that existed in those laws, so as to enable the Government to make those seizures?

Mr. THOMPSON. That was not a customs regulation at all. There was no amendment of the customs laws, nor did any case whatever occur under that Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not enter into the question whether any case occurred, but I say that the statement of the hon. Minister of Customs that there was no new law with reference to the entrance of these vessels into our ports, was incorrect.

Mr. BOWELL. What I said I repeat, that no new law was passed and no new regulations adopted by the Customs Department. The Minister of Justice very clearly stated what the object of that law was.

Mr. MITCHELL. This House passed a law affecting the powers of the Minister of Customs, or the Government, to seize and delay vessels for certain violations that were not provided for before.

Mr. EDGAR. Whether new laws or regulations were passed or not, the hon. the Minister of Customs developed extreme activity in annoying and worrying the Americans, and in devising unwise means of putting those regulations into force against our neighbors of the United States during the summer of the year 1886. That is what they complained of; and, as I pointed out before—and I cannot point it out too often, until the hon. gentlemen and the country also understand the position,—he had not even the poor excuse that the American Government were enforcing their customs regulations against our fishermen in the same way. They were not doing so. As the hon. the Minister of Finance said a few days ago, the American Government expressly avoided doing so during the very time that the hon. the Minister of Customs was enforcing those regulations. The hon. the Minister of Finance said:

"It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the commission to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port, who had been collector for 10 years, was examined and gave his testimony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked:

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?" His answer was, as I remember:

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

Now, when that is a specimen given by the hon. the Minister of Finance, our plenipotentiary at Washington, of the evidence before the commission showing how the Americans treated our fishermen, I think the hon. gentleman would be far more justified in the eyes of the public if he would stand up and acknowledge frankly that during the year 1886 he led this country to the brink of war with the United States. He would stand better with the country if he would frankly acknowledge he was wrong, and there would then be some reason for excusing his action. But when we know that he enforced those regulations so as to prevent, under severe penalty, Canadian citizens who happened to be fishermen on American vessels landing at

their own homes, when their vessels were in Canadian ports, to see their families, under severe penalty, and when he even prevented the clothes of dead Canadian fishermen being landed until a fine of \$200 was paid, I think that the less the hon. gentleman attempts to justify his conduct the better for him.

Mr. FOSTER. While that assertion is still warm before the House, I wish to give it an emphatic denial. The hon. the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has said again to-day that the captain of an American fishing vessel had his vessel seized and a fine of \$200 imposed, and had to pay that fine, and that the reason for the seizure of the vessel and the imposition of the fine was that he came in to land the clothes of some dead seaman. The hon. gentleman cannot prove that assertion from the blue-books he cited. The captain has stated in his own affirmation that he landed under stress of weather, that ten of his men landed in boats, without having previously entered at the customs, and that the vessel was seized for that offence and that alone. The \$200 fine was deposited for that offence and that alone. It was the day after the offence had been committed and after the vessel had been seized and the fine imposed, that the captain himself came on shore and brought with him the clothes of the men, and he gave these clothes to somebody who delivered them to their friends. To say, therefore, that the seizure was made and the fine imposed for bringing these clothes ashore is to make a statement which is not true. Another statement was made by my hon. friend in the course of the debate last night, relating to Captain Medeo Rose. A charge was also made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). When I asked him to name the vessel he could not do so, but the hon. the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said it was the *Pearl Nelson*. So much for that charge. With reference to the *Laura Sayward*, the hon. gentleman read correspondence in which it appeared that the captain was badly treated. The hon. gentleman did not make himself sufficiently acquainted with the blue-books that were before him, for if he had, he would have found in the later correspondence that this same Captain Medeo Rose made an affidavit contradicting entirely the alleged statements which were read by my hon. friend. I will read his statement to the House, made on the 20th April, 1887:

"I called at the custom house early the next morning before seven o'clock; stated that, as the wind was fair and blowing a strong breeze, I would not wait for a reply to telegram, but take a clearance, which the collector gave me. I was treated kindly, allowed to enter my vessel after customs hours, and a clearance granted me next morning before the office was supposed to be opened. I was at the port again in November, on my way to the Banks, and the collector allowed me to report my vessel inwards and outwards and gave me a clearance at eight in the evening.

"The statements purporting to have been made by me to the effect that the collector refused to give me my paper when I asked for it, also that his treatment towards me was harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea, having but little flour, water, &c., are all untrue.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true."

The hon. gentleman's information in this respect was, therefore, not correct, and his statement based on it consequently not founded.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not take back a single word of what I said last night, and my hon. friend is trying to get out of the whole thing upon a quibble. As to the case of the *Pearl Nelson*, I state again to-day that these dead men's clothes could not be landed until the fine of \$200 had been paid. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the fine was imposed upon this captain for having landed some Canadians on shore to see their friends, but until the captain had paid that fine of \$200, which was remitted more than a month after, he was not allowed to land the clothes of the

dead fishermen, and that is not denied by any of the Canadian officers, from the beginning of the correspondence to the end. There are two things in that transaction which I complained of: One was the imposition of the fine of \$200 and the seizure of the vessel for allowing two Canadians to go on shore; and the other was that before that fine was paid, the captain would not be allowed to land the clothes. As to the *Laura Sayward* there is nothing in the statement I make in which I am mistaken. The hon. gentleman will recollect that in that case I complained, not that the captain did not get out his papers when he landed, because this was not material to the question, but that he was not allowed to buy for the American fishermen seven pounds of sugar, three pounds of rice, and a little oil and something of that kind. That was refused.

Mr. FOSTER. They were never denied any right.

Mr. EDGAR. This paper shows that the officer of the Minister reported that he did deny them the right, and that he telegraphed to the Minister of Customs twice in one day to know whether those people could buy a pound of sugar and two pounds of potatoes.

Mr. BOWELL. He did quite right.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister says that was quite right, but the Minister of Marine says he did not do that at all. He tries to make out that there was no refusal.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so. I say that the officer acted under his instructions. He had no instructions to allow commercial privileges to a fishing vessel, and, when he was asked for those privileges, he first did as an officer should do; he said, I will telegraph to Ottawa and see if I can get instructions to do that. That is what he did, and he did not make an explicit denial of the request made to him, but said, it is not in the line of my duty and I will telegraph to Ottawa. There was no lack of provisions for the preservation of life, and that is shown by the second affidavit.

Mr. EDGAR. I will leave it to the Minister of Customs, who has stated that the officer did quite right in refusing to give this relief.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that, if he did refuse, he did what was right.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister did not say that he did so. Mr. BOWELL. I did.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said that the officer did right. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he did not do it at all, and the Minister of Customs says he did it, and it was right for him to do it. The Minister of Marine says that, if he did it, it was wrong, and the other Minister says that, if he did it, it was right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am surprised that those two hon. gentlemen should remain in the same Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, after the views which he has put forward. Certainly, the inhuman acts which they have endeavored to justify have been denounced by the Minister of Finance, and that ought to lead those hon. gentlemen to retire from the Cabinet of which the Minister of Finance is a member. Why should they remain in the Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, who is marking out a different policy altogether from that which they are attempting to pursue? I would like the Minister of Finance to give us some explanation in regard to this clause. The Minister of Justice, in an elaborately prepared memorandum, informed the council that it was utterly impossible to maintain an efficient protection over our fisheries if such a rule as this, which was the principle contended for by Mr. Phelps, was recognised. I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance has fully considered that question, and will be able to give us a full and satisfactory answer to the declaration of the Minister of

Justice in that regard. I am sure that the Minister of Finance has no intention of throwing open our inshore fisheries to be poached upon, or to leave this Government utterly helpless to exercise police protection over them; and, as I have full confidence in the judgment of the Minister of Finance in this matter, I have no doubt that he will be able to satisfy the House that he is able to give that protection which the Minister of Justice said it was possible to afford.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). On a previous occasion, I called the attention of the Finance Minister to what appeared to me to be a clause providing for reciprocal advantages, but which, while giving the American fishermen the advantages claimed in our own ports, with regard to pilotage dues, harbor dues, light dues, and so on, did not give the same advantages to our fishermen in American ports. The hon. gentleman then pointed to clause 12, which says that—

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this Treaty to United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

As I claimed then, I claim now that this is not sufficient to give the reciprocal privileges which we should have. There are no exceptions in this, and I would suggest that after clauses 4, 5, and 6, the hon. gentleman should insert a clause to the effect that these privileges shall be given, provided similar advantages are given to the fishing vessels of Canada in the ports of the United States. That would set the matter at rest, I think, because, at present, I think it would be open to some doubt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not my business to alter the treaty. The treaty speaks for itself, and we are simply providing the legislation which is necessary to carry the treaty out, so far as Canada is concerned, and it will be quite time enough to call upon the Government of the United States or the Congress of the United States to take action when any case arises in which some privileges are not conceded which the treaty pledges them to concede.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I can hardly agree with the hon. gentleman in this matter. If we get into a misunderstanding at the outset, it will be very difficult to have it set right. I suppose the other party to this treaty, that is the United States, cannot take any objection to having this made clear. If it was the intention, as the hon. gentleman says it was the intention, to have it made clear at the outset, it would not change the meaning of the treaty if a clause were put in there securing the same privileges to the fishing vessels of Canada in the ports of the United States as the fishing vessels of the United States are entitled to in our ports. I mean in regard to the exemptions from pilotage dues, light dues, and the other dues which are mentioned. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that, in his judgment, this article XII of the treaty places Canadian vessels in precisely the same position in American ports as the American fishing vessels will be placed in in our ports under the operations of this treaty as to exemption from these dues?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You are quite clear on that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite clear on that point. That was the object of placing that clause there. It was placed there for that purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think the other way would have made it much more distinct.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had not my reference when the Minister of Marine spoke a while ago in relation to the *Sayward*, but, having sent to the *Hansard* office for the book, I find the affidavit of Medeo Rose, the master of the *Laura Sayward*, and I find it is to this effect:

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

"Being then on Western Bank on a fishing trip, and being short of provisions, we hove our anchor and started for home. The wind was blowing almost a gale from the north-west and being almost dead ahead, we made slow progress on our voyage home. On Tuesday, the 5th October, we made Shelburne, N.S., and arrived in that harbor about 8 p.m., on that day, short of provisions, water, and oil to burn. On Wednesday I sailed for the inner harbor of Shelburne, arriving at the town about 4 p.m. On going ashore I found the customs house closed, and hunted up the collector and entered my vessel, and asked permission from him to buy 7 lbs. sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, and $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 bushel of potatoes, 2 lbs. butter or lard or pork, and oil enough to last us home, and was refused."

I understood my hon. friend the Minister to contradict a statement made by the hon. member from West Ontario, and to say that no such thing occurred. The affidavit goes on:

"I stated to him my situation, short of provisions, and a voyage of 250 miles before me, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul, and asked his assistance, and found him powerless to aid me in this matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning although I asked for them as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say about $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. Immediately on receiving my papers of Thursday morning, I started for home, arriving on Sunday. I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scant supply of provisions, we having but little flour and water, and liable to be buffeted about for days before we came home.

"Mass., Essex, s. s., 13th Oct., 1886.

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and made oath to the truth of the above statement.

"Before me,

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public."

I merely read that in defence of the attitude assumed by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), to show that the statement he made in relation to the refusal to grant these trifling things to the vessel, was true. Now, while it is true, as the Minister of Customs said, that he was not acting contrary to his instructions, did any Government in the world ever refuse in such a case as that to supply to a vessel in distress a few necessities, and send her to sea without almost the necessities of life? Why, Sir, the thing is ridiculous. It is instances like these that have brought about that ill-feeling which the hon. Minister of Finance so vividly described in the able speech he delivered a few days ago when introducing this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to a subsequent affidavit made by Medeo Rose made 20th April, 1887, in which he states that a former statement was untrue.

Mr. MITCHELL. On what page of the book?

Mr. FOSTER. On page 110 of the United States Senate documents, No. 113.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have not those papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I have them.

Mr. MITCHELL. But you should furnish the House with them.

Mr. FOSTER. They were laid on the Table eight or ten days ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. Were they distributed?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MITCHELL. I speak from the evidence you have laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER.—

"It is stated to the collector that I was from Western Banks, bound home, and required provisions as follows, viz: 7 lbs.

sugar, 3 lbs. coffee, 1 bushel of potatoes, 2 lbs. butter, and to fill water. This was all. The collector told me to fill the water, but as there was no provision made in the treaty for the purchase of supplies of stores, he would telegraph the Department at Ottawa at once; that no doubt they would be allowed; and I consented to wait until the next morning for a reply."

Then he goes on with the extract which I read before, stating that he called at the Custom house the next morning, that no word had yet been received from Ottawa, and that he concluded, as the breeze was fair, not to wait. He then concluded:

"That is the second affidavit made by Medeo Rose."

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that statement contradict his statements? No, it does not. His affidavit is specific. He does not bring any complaint against the collector; he does not say that he was received harshly by the collector; he simply says that inasmuch as the collector refused to allow him the privilege of purchasing these things, the treatment of the Government was harsh. That was the meaning of his affidavit, not that the collector behaved ungentlemanly to him, but that the policy of the Government was harsh. That was Medeo Rose's statement of 13th October, 1886. Any later affidavit I have not been able to find in this book, and I have looked it over carefully. It may be here, but I can find no affidavit containing the statement the hon. gentleman has read. If the hon. gentleman has any additional papers connected with the fishery question, he should have laid them before the House in order that the House might be charged with the whole case as it appears to the country and as it appears to the American Government, and to our own Government at this moment. Medeo Rose's statement is quite clear:

"I stated to him my situation, short of provisions, and a voyage of 250 miles before me, and pleaded with him for this slight privilege, but it was of no avail. I then visited the American consul and asked his assistance and found him powerless to aid me in the matter. The collector of customs held my papers until the next morning, although I asked for them as soon as I found I could not buy any provisions, say 1½ hours after I entered, but he refused to give them to me until the next morning. * * * I think the treatment I received harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea with a scant supply of provisions, we having but a little flour and water and liable to be buffeted for days before we came home."

That is sworn to in 1886.

Mr. EDGAR. I am perfectly willing to accept the statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has read, though I have never seen it, as the subsequent affidavit on this point by Capt. Rose; because the statement, as he has read it, corresponds with the statement of the collector of customs which I read last night, and on which I founded this charge, and not on the original statement of Capt. Rose, which, however, was substantially correct. I made the charge, not of having been refused his papers, but of having been refused by the collector at the port, the right to buy seven pounds of sugar, three pounds of coffee, and so on, and that until they could hear from the headquarters at Ottawa by telegram, this man could not purchase even those little supplies; and I contend that was a harsh and unfriendly treatment of this captain. The collector's own statement, published in defence of himself, was as follows:—

"I gave him permission to fill water at once; but as the treaty made no provisions for the purchase of supplies, I would telegraph the department at Ottawa and no doubt it would be allowed. Captain Rose expressed his willingness to remain until reply was received. He called at the office next morning (Thursday) at 6:30, and finding I had not received a reply, said, as the wind was fair and a good breeze, he would not wait longer."

That is what I stated last night. I did not charge that the parties acted contrary to the treaty, but I charge that the

interpretation of the treaty was harsh and unfair. As the Minister of Finance stated:

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it."

I say that they did hold an extremely technical construction of the treaty, and they undertook not only to enforce it, but they did enforce it.

Mr. LAURIER. We have had so far two affidavits from Medeo Rose, but there is a third one which the Minister has not alluded to. The hon. gentleman will find it on page 111 of the book from which he quoted:

"I, Medeo Rose, of Gloucester, being under oath, do depose and say, that I was master of the schooner *Laura Sayward* during the year 1886, and that I am now master of the schooner *Gleaner*, of Gloucester.

"On April 18, 1887, I went into the lower harbor of Shelburne, Nova Scotia, in said schooner *Gleaner*, for shelter and water.

"On the morning of April 19, Mr. Atwood, the collector of customs, with two men wearing badges, which I supposed were Government badges, came on board. Their appearance filled me with fear, for I felt some trouble must be in store for me when Collector Atwood would leave his office and come so far (about 4 miles) to board my vessel. I invited him into the cabin, where he showed me a copy of my statement of October 13, 1886, in regard to the treatment I received from him when in schooner *Laura Sayward* (October 5, 1886), and asked me if I made that statement. I told him I did. Well, said he, everything in that statement is false. I told him my statement was true. He then produced a prepared written statement, which he read to me, which stated that my statement of October 13 was untrue, and told me that I must go on shore and sign it. Being nervous and frightened, and fearing trouble if I refused, I went on shore with him, to the store of Mr. Purney, and before Mr. Purney signed and swore to the statement.

"On the afternoon of the same day, realizing the wrong I had done, I hired a team, and with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers), went to the custom house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He did so, and I again told him it was wrong and that my first statement was true.

"He said I did not ask for all the articles mentioned in my first statement; that he did not refuse me my paper, and also that that statement might be the cause of his removal from his office. I told him I did not want to injure him, and I did not want to make myself out a liar at Washington.

"About the 3rd day of June last I went into Shelburne again solely to get a copy of the last statement. I went to the custom-house, taking the same man (Augustus Rogers) with me, and asked Collector Atwood for a copy of the statement.

"He refused to give it to me, and said my lawyers had been advising me what to do and that I need never expect a favor from him.

"The above is a true statement of the case. The statement obtained from me by Collector Atwood was obtained through my fear of seizure if I refused."

"MEDEO ROSE."

I find this affidavit is accompanied by another from Augustus Rogers:

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom-house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 19th day of April last, and also on the 3rd day of June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

"MASS., ESSEX, ss:

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and Augustus Rogers, and made oath to the truth of the above statements before me.

[Seal.]

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public.

August 3, 1887.

So the case is far worse than was stated by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Elgar).

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, when he read the statement of Medeo Rose, he was aware of the second communication being in

the book. If he was aware of it, and read the other statement alone, without communicating the whole matter, he was concealing from this House an important fact and was misleading the House. I am not saying he was doing that; but I ask him, was he aware when he read the statement a few minutes ago, of the subsequent affidavit of Medeo Rose?

Mr. EDGAR. In the same book, on the opposite page.

Mr. FOSTER. The only book was this, Senate documents, No. 113; and I read Medeo Rose's affidavit as given in that book, which flatly contradicted his first affidavit. I did not know what was in the book. I do not know the book yet.

Mr. EDGAR. It is on page 111 from which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) read; only the affidavit the hon. gentleman read was dated 20th April and the other was dated 3rd August.

Mr. FOSTER. I see it exactly. I did not know it was in the book.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. FOSTER. I knew there were other statements in regard to Medeo Rose. I have sent to the department for them, and I will have them all here in a few minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have them.

Mr. LAURIER. Are there others?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there is still a sequel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Then you knew it.

Mr. FOSTER. With the permission of the House I will read the sequel when I receive it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the tightest place he ever found himself in his life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. I take that back. I have no doubt, from our experience of the hon. gentleman in this House, that he has been in a great many tight places in his life, and he may have been in a tighter place than this. One thing, however, is certain: that he concealed facts which he knew, and that he was aware of an affidavit made by this Captain Rose subsequently, the one he read to the House. To-day he brought this affidavit forward as a surprise, as he thought we had not the documents from which he was quoting, and which he took care that we did not possess, and which contained the subsequent affidavit to the one he quoted, stating that the former affidavit, the affidavit which the Minister read, had been extracted from him, Captain Rose, by pressure exercised upon him by the officers of the customs of Canada, that he had been terrorised into giving that former affidavit to clear the Dominion Government and to clear the hon. Minister from accusations that might be brought against him. Then the Minister tells us that although this affidavit was on the opposite page to the affidavit he read, he did not know anything about it. One of two things is true: either he misled the House as to his knowledge of the subsequent affidavit, or he had not the common gumption or sense to look upon the opposite page to see whether there was something bearing on the case. He must confess to either ignorance or to misleading the House, and I do not know which is most damaging to an hon. gentleman occupying his position, and I think a confession of ignorance is about as damaging as anything. I do not accuse him of these charges. I only accuse him with that with which he must accuse himself, if he is to escape the accusation of telling the House an untruth—he must accuse himself of not wishing to confess to gross ignorance in matters connected with his own department. Now he tells us there is something else. When he sat down he

Mr. MITCHELL.

hinted in a mysterious manner that there was something else to be produced, some sequel. What is the card he has got under the table—has he got anything up his sleeve? He has said that there is something else; and if there is something else, now is the time to tell it to the House. But apart from the utter humiliation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which has resulted from this short debate, and I cannot call it by any other name than a confession of ignorance or falsehood on the part of an hon. gentleman in the position of the Minister, there is something else that requires to be noticed. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has pointed out the inconsistency between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Justice said some time ago, before the negotiations, that the privileges granted under this clause we are discussing, would utterly destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, and if they were granted we would not be able to prevent the United States fishermen from using them as they pleased. I believe the Minister of Justice is right, and I must confess he very generally is in a technical matter. But the Minister of Finance has taken the other line. He agreed to the clause as it now stands. And the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked for an explanation of the different views held by the hon. gentleman, and the Minister of Finance gave him an answer. And what was the answer? He said "carried." We all know the Minister of Finance is the controlling power in the Cabinet, that he has been working for and has attained to that position, but still under the circumstances we think the Minister of Justice ought to have received more consideration from his superior, from the virtual leader of the Cabinet, than was given to him and the rest of the Cabinet by simply uttering that word "carried." It was as much as to say: I have been to Washington and have agreed to this provision; it is none of your business whether it surrenders the inshore fisheries or not—I say "carried." This is the only argument the hon. gentleman advanced in regard to the question. It is cavalier treatment of the Minister of Justice and the rest of the Cabinet and of his venerable chief, to put the matter in that shape. It is due to the House and to the chief and the junior members of the Cabinet, that he should give some explanation as to how he reconciled the memoranda of the Minister of Justice with this clause of the treaty to which he has agreed. He must take one of two positions: either the Minister of Justice was wrong in his statement that the granting of those privileges to American craft would destroy our control of the inshore fisheries, or, if they would be destroyed, the hon. gentleman should state the reasons why it was necessary that we should grant those privileges. It is for him to speak now. "Carried" is not a sufficient argument in a matter of this national importance. It is for him to speak and explain why he said "carried," and why he sits on the Minister of Justice in the way he has done.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to say a few words, not at all in the way of removing the imputation which the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) has made. I do not feel in the least sat upon. I do not admit for a single moment that the privileges I objected to as being likely to be injurious to our fishing interests, are conceded by this treaty or by Bill now before the House without qualifications and without safeguards which will remove the objections I foresaw. I do not see how hon. gentlemen have made so much out of those affidavits of Medeo Rose. Let me call attention to what those affidavits are. I am sure that if they read them again they will hardly find a case on which to make an attack on the Government or the party for maladministration, or too severe administration of the custom or fishery laws. In the first place the gentlemen opposite who are opposing this treaty with great vigor this afternoon rely on the *ex parte* statement of a man who

has made at least three conflicting affidavits which have been already before the House, and who has also made a fourth affidavit, which, we understand, is contradictory to the other three. So that hon. gentlemen will see that in pressing this charge as they have, they are at least pressing it on the testimony of a witness which they would not ask even one of the humblest judges in the country to give judgment upon. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) read the third affidavit, and I would specially ask him to read that again. He will find that it is most craftily drawn and that the position of Medeo Rose in this matter is this: First he made an affidavit referring to ill-treatment on the part of the Government, or customs officials; next he made an affidavit stating that he had been well treated, that the officer had referred to Ottawa for instructions, but that he found it convenient to depart without waiting for a reply, and had no complaint to make. The third affidavit which he made in view of the other two and for the purpose of removing the second, strange to say, from beginning to end, although made with that view, does not state the second affidavit is untrue.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, it does.

Mr. THOMPSON. Let me remind the hon. gentleman what it does say and he will find that I am stating a fact. Medeo Rose says he went to tell the custom officer that it was untrue and that it was extorted from him by fears, but when he came to give his affidavit as to why it was untrue or false he does not dare to swear it was untrue. We have his assertion that the second affidavit was untrue, and we have that assertion corroborated by the custom house officer, but Medeo Rose does not dare to swear it was untrue from beginning to end of this affidavit. He says he made it from fear, without one word being alleged to show that there was a threat of seizure or the slightest apprehension on his mind that there would be any seizure or that he had been treated unfairly in any way whatever. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what the law was that the custom house officer was administering. It was the fishery law of Canada, enforcing the Treaty of 1818. It was no new law, no customs regulation, but that which had been the law of the Province of Nova Scotia in which this transaction occurred thirty years ago, and no custom house officer or no other officer of the Government could possibly dispense with the requirements of that law. It is not a question of whether Medeo Rose wanted or not the mere permission to buy a few pounds of tea or coffee, but having gone there and having remained there for purposes which were not warranted by the treaty, his vessel was liable to seizure and he was liable to a heavy penalty under an Imperial statute and a statute of the old Province of Nova Scotia passed thirty years ago. What he wanted the custom house officer to do what substantially to give him permission to say that the seizure should not be made and that the penalty should not be enforced. Would the hon. gentlemen entrust custom house officers, scattered as they are all over the country, to have dispensing power in penalties like that? All the officer could do in such a case was to refer it to the department, and when he did refer it to the department, Medeo Rose, according to his own statement, considering his position under the circumstances, took advantage of a favorable breeze and went to sea.

Mr. LAURIER. Just let me refer the hon. gentleman to this third affidavit. The hon. gentleman says that Medeo Rose did not say the second affidavit was false and the first true. This is what Rose says in his affidavit:

"On the afternoon of the same day, realising the wrong I had done, I hired a team and with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers) went to the custom house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He did so, and I again told him it was wrong, and that my first statement was true."

It will be observed if the first statement is true the second was not. He does swear he says he told Collector Atwood, and if what he swears he told the collector was true, I would take it, when he repeats the same thing under oath, he intended it to be true. After all it matters little what are the statements of Medeo Rose in this matter. What is the charge that is brought against the Government? The charge is that those customs regulations were harassing and oppressive, and is that charge true or not true?

Mr. THOMPSON. They were not customs regulations.

Mr. LAURIER. Call them customs regulations or any regulations at all. At all events they were the regulations of the whole Government, and the charge is that they were oppressive and harassing to the American fishermen. Is that statement true or is it not true? That is the charge, and the fact is that the Government have pleaded to-day that they were most gentle in their treatment of the American fishermen. The Americans do not want any more of that gentleness. They want to get rid of it, and the Bill we are passing now is to enable the Canadian Government to deal gently with the American fishermen. Henceforward they will be able to extend gentleness in their treatment, and henceforward they will be lenient with them and the American fishermen will practically have their own way.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no use in the Minister of Justice trying to make out that any of these affidavits or all of them refute the fact that this Government official refused the supplies and had to telegraph to Ottawa to get permission to give them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not deny that. I said he was obliged to do so by the law.

Mr. EDGAR. There is nothing contradictory to that in the affidavits of Medeo Rose or the Collector of Customs. That fact remains. But, Sir, if the Minister of Marine was unable to discover this affidavit of Rose upon the opposite page from the one that he read from, I wonder if he was unable to discover the letter from Secretary Bayard to Sir Sackville West which is upon the same page as the affidavit which he read; and in that letter of Mr. Secretary Bayard there is a reference made to this Rose dispute in terms which I think were directed in a statesmanlike manner to the extraordinary conduct of this Government in 1886. Mr. Secretary Bayard, in transmitting to Sir Sackville West this third affidavit of Rose, says:

"I should transmit the documents without further comment, but that, enclosing your note to me of July 13 last, you stated that you were further 'instructed to ask whether the United States Government have any observations to make thereupon.'

"In my reply to you on the 19th of July, I promised to comply with your request, and for that reason I now remark that the incident which had been the subject of this correspondence affords but another illustration and additional evidence, if any were needed, of the unwisdom of imperilling the friendly relations of two kindred and neighboring countries by entrusting the interpretation and execution of a treaty between them to the discretion of local and petty officials and vesting in them powers of administration wholly unwarranted and naturally prolific of the irritations which wise and responsible rulers will always seek to avoid."

That is the line we have been taking in criticising the course of the Government and their officials in 1886, and I am sure it is a broad and statesmanlike and correct line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say it appears to me a most extraordinary thing, requiring the attention of this House to be called to it, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not have made himself aware of the letter from Mr. Secretary Bayard to Sir Sackville West, under the date of October 21, 1887, and, if he had ever read that letter, how he could possibly have told us

that he was unaware of the existence of these three affidavits. It seems to me utterly incredible that a letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Sackville West should have escaped the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If it did escape his attention, all I can say is that his mode of conducting the business of his department is most extraordinary and unprecedented. If he did read that letter, he knew the existence of those three affidavits, and I think, in view of the existence of that letter, the hon. gentleman's explanation is very extraordinary indeed. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, who must also have seen this letter, whether our collector did or did not prepare a written statement, as this Capt. Rose alleges, and did submit it to this man to be sworn to. I think, after what Mr. Bayard stated, enquiry ought to be made into that matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should ask me. He is not an officer of my department, and I have nothing to do with the matter. But what I know is that the second affidavit of Capt. Rose, in which he states that he was well treated, was fully corroborated, not only by the officer himself, but by others as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think enquiry should be made as to whether our officer submitted the affidavit to this American captain to swear to it. I think that ought to be done in a matter which was of sufficient importance to be noticed in a letter from the Secretary of State to the British Ambassador. The whole circumstances are simply remarkable.

An hon. MEMBER. Fishy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, fishy in the extreme.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one extraordinary statement made by the Minister of Justice. He attempts to discredit the statement of Captain Rose by the allegation, but the second affidavit is against the statement in the first one; but when the third affidavit was made, contradicting the one made before, that ought to prove the man unworthy of belief. But the hon. gentleman fails to notice this fact, that the man swears that he made the second affidavit under fear that his vessel would be seized, and that he would be placed in the power of the officers of a British port. The hon. gentleman also fails to notice that the third affidavit is sustained by the statement of another party to the transaction. My hon. friend shakes his head, I presume to signify that I am stating something that is incorrect.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you will allow me, I will state what I mean. I explained, when on my feet before, that what had been spoken of as the corroboration of the affidavit was merely a corroboration of the fact that this man had stated to the collector that his former statement was untrue, but there was no corroboration of his allegations of fact. It is a mere corroboration of a witness who was present when Captain Rose said to the collector, My former statement is untrue; and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that he did not swear that the affidavit was untrue, but simply said so.

Mr. MITCHELL. He did swear that it was not true, as I understand. In addition to that, Mr. Augustus Rogers swore:

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Captain Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 13th day of April last, and also on the 3rd day of June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS.

"Personally appeared Medeo Rose and Augustus Rogers, and made oath to the truth of the above statements before me."

"AARON PARSONS,

"Notary Public.

"August 3, 1887."

How can the Minister say that it was not sworn to? Both of them distinctly contradict the statements made in the second affidavit, and Mr. Augustus Rogers confirms the statement of Medeo Rose that he did it from fear of arrest. The thing is as plain as can be, and I am surprised that a statement should be put before the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and confirmed by the Minister of Justice to the contrary. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he did not know of the existence of these papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then that makes the matter worse. If he did, he ought to have told it to the House. The Minister of Justice listened to the statement made by him, and he sat still, and allowed the Minister of Marine and Finance to mislead this House by the statement that Medeo Rose had contradicted the previous affidavit he had made. The thing is outrageous.

Mr. THOMPSON. All I can say in conclusion is that there is not one word in the statement of Augustus Rogers which is inconsistent with the second affidavit of Medeo Rose. He simply states that he was present when Capt. Rose made certain statements. The hon. gentleman perhaps knows how carefully devised some of these affidavits are drawn with the view of representing a certain state of facts, when they do not entail the penalties of perjury upon the person who makes them. Here is the second affidavit distinctly recalling the charges made in the first, and the third affidavit, in which he beats all around the compass, and does not say as a matter of fact that the statements he made in the second affidavit are untrue at all. But the person who drew the affidavit, and I venture to say it was not Medeo Rose, is very careful indeed to insert all kinds of statements that he had contradicted it, and eliminate altogether the statements contradicting it in the affidavit which was sworn to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I look on the explanation of the Minister of Justice as hair splitting. It is a nice piece of special pleading, and, from his well-known ability in that line, I can understand how he could mislead this House by such special pleading. He says there is no sworn statement that Captain Rose's second affidavit was false; I will read again what Capt. Rose said:

"On the morning of April 19, Mr. Atwood, the collector of customs, with two men wearing badges, which I supposed were Government badges, came on board. Their appearance filled me with fear, for I felt some trouble must be in store for me when Collector Atwood would leave his office and come so far (about 4 miles) to board my vessel. I invited him into the cabin, where he showed me a copy of my statement of October 13, 1886, in regard to the treatment I received from him when in schooner *Laura Sayward* (October 5, 1886), and asked me if I made that statement. I told him I did. Well, said he, everything in that statement is false. I told him my statement was true."

Mr. THOMPSON. He said so, but does not swear to it.

Mr. MITCHELL.—

"He then produced a prepared written statement, which he read to me, which stated that my statement of October 13 was untrue, and told me I must go on shore and sign it. Being nervous and frightened, and fearing trouble if I refused, I went on shore with him to the store of Mr. Purney, and before Mr. Purney signed and swore to the statement. On the afternoon of the same day, realizing the wrong I had done, I hired a team and, with one of my crew (Augustus Rogers), went to the custom house and asked Collector Atwood to read to me the statement I had signed. He

did so, and I again told him that it was wrong and that my first statement was true."

This statement was sworn to by Mr. Aaron Parsons. This is Captain Rose's statement:

"He said I did not ask for all the articles mentioned in my first statement; that he did not refuse me my paper, and also that that statement might be the cause of his removal from his office. I told him I did not want to injure him and I did not want to make myself a liar at Washington. About the 3rd day of June last, I went into Shelburne again, solely to get a copy of the last statement. I went to the custom house, taking the same man, Augustus Rogers, with me, and asked Collector Atwood for a copy of the statement. He refused to give it to me, and said my lawyers had been advising me what to do, and that I need never expect a favor from him. The above is a true statement of the case. The statement obtained from me by Collector Atwood was obtained through my fear of seizure if I refused."

Yet the hon. the Minister of Customs tells us that Capt. Medeo Rose did not, in this affidavit, declare his statement was untrue. I will read the words again: "I told him it was wrong, and that my first statement was true." The captain signed to the truth of this last statement, and is sustained by Mr. Augustus Rogers in the most complete manner possible, as I have already shown. Mr. Rogers made the following affidavit:—

"I, Augustus Rogers, one of the crew of schooner *Gleaner*, being duly sworn, do depose and say, that I went with Capt. Medeo Rose to the custom house at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, on the 13th day of April last, and also on the 3rd June. I heard his conversation with Collector Atwood on both occasions, and I hereby certify that the statements of those interviews, as made above, are correct and true.

"AUGUSTUS ROGERS."

What better evidence can be adduced. True, the hon. gentleman has chosen to assail the testimony of Capt. Rose because he made the second affidavit, although that affidavit was made under fear of arrest and seizure of his vessel, but the moment the captain had made his second affidavit he found out his mistake and at once tried to recall it, and his final statement is confirmed by the evidence and affidavit of Mr. Rogers, who was present the whole time, and swore to the truth of the captain's declaration and to the truth of the facts as stated in his first affidavit.

Mr. McNEILL. Where was that affidavit drawn up?

Mr. MITCHELL. At Essex, county of Massachusetts.

Mr. McNEILL. I should think we all have heard of hair splitting Yankee lawyers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. the Minister of Justice has a strong imagination. He has imagined a host of lawyers advising this Captain Rose, who has been giving so much trouble and drawing his affidavit so carefully that he might get out of it, no matter whether he was swearing to a lie or not. But it appears from the papers that it was not Captain Rose who was advised by the lawyers, but the collector of Shelburne, for he told Captain Rose that his lawyers had advised him about the matter. It was the affidavit which Collector Atwood coerced Captain Rose into signing, that was drawn by the lawyers for that particular purpose. That was the affidavit which the Government, through their officer, coerced this man into signing, and which he afterwards, when free from that coercion, declared under oath to be untrue. That was the affidavit drawn by the lawyers, and it appears that Captain Rose, when he signed it, did not know exactly what he was swearing to. There is no need to read over the documents again, for it has been clearly proved that Captain Rose made a declaration in the second place under coercion, and I submit it was forced from him with the approval of the Government, because these facts had been known to him for some time, and they have not yet dismissed Collector Atwood. This captain was coerced into swearing into

a lie in order to get the Government out of a scrape. The affidavit was a lying one, drawn out by the lawyers, and not the spontaneous affidavit of Captain Rose before other parties. But there is one point outside of that which has not yet been explained, and to which I merely wish to call attention without dwelling on it at all. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not yet explained—I do not know whether he can or not—the reasons of his ignorance of the affidavit which is on the page opposite to the one he read. How it was that he knew of the existence of the lying affidavit, the bulldozed affidavit which sustained his case, and in regard to which this Government are responsible, because they have maintained in office the man who forced that affidavit on Captain Rose—how it was he knew about that and did not know about the subsequent free, spontaneous, and amply corroborated affidavit, he has not explained. I say the subsequent affidavit was amply corroborated, because Augustus Rogers, who was present on both occasions—who was present when the collector terrorized Captain Rose into making the false affidavit, and who was present on the subsequent occasion—certifies to its truth. The hon. gentleman may take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. He may admit he was ignorant of the subsequent affidavit, and therefore unfit to be where he is and to have taken part in the conference at Washington, or he may admit that he knew of its existence and concealed it from the House by speaking as if no such thing were in existence. I do not know which horn of the dilemma would be more discreditable to him as a Minister of the Crown.

On section seven,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). When this Bill was under discussion on a previous occasion, I took the opportunity to draw the attention of the House to the concessions made to the American fishermen under this and the previous clause, showing, according to my judgment, that we had under these clauses yielded up the whole value of our fishing privileges and had obtained nothing whatever in return. I maintain that the use of our ports for the purpose of securing bait and supplies and the transshipment of cargoes is a privilege of unestimable value, so far as the American fishermen are concerned, and that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, and the other hon. gentlemen who spoke on that side have not been able to show a single advantage gained by the Canadian fishermen on our side. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, pointed to several articles in various newspapers showing the advantages of the treaty from our point of view. Now, I hold in my hand the New York *Herald* of Sunday last, in which an interview is reported with Mr. Phelan, the Consul General of the United States in Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) read every word of that interview, so that it is already in *Hansard*.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The interview he read was in the Montreal *Herald*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. Was my hon. friend in the House when my hon. friend for Northumberland read that interview?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then perhaps this is a different one altogether.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

"The advantages of the treaty," Mr. Phelan replied, are manifold. Among other things it opens up valuable fishing bays to us by removing all doubts as to our right to fish in them. This in itself is no small matter, inasmuch as Canadians had pre-

viously claimed that we were permitted to fish there only on sufferance. Under the Treaty of 1818 we had no right to enter Canadian ports, except for four things—wood, water, shelter and repairs. Even in these cases we were subjected to an unpleasant espionage and as carefully watched as if we were so many pirates. Again, the Treaty relieves our vessels entering Canadian ports for the purposes named in the treaty of all dues, pilotage and every charge whatever, and at the same time they enjoy the benefits of lighthouses, buoys and other safeguards to navigation, the same as Canadian vessels do. The treaty also eliminates the word 'hovering' from the Canadian statutes, under which some of our vessels have been seized and condemned. Under the treaty, an American vessel coming in damaged can repair and procure fresh supplies, provisions, etc., and refit and save the necessity of returning home for this purpose. All these privileges, you must understand, were denied us under the old treaty. Now our vessels can unload, sell or tranship their cargoes, and in case they are short of supplies at any time, they can enter the nearest port and get them. In short, we have surrendered nothing and gained a great deal. The Canadians have surrendered everything and gained nothing. All the gain is on our side. True, the treaty might go further than it does, but it is certainly a great improvement on the one now in force. The disadvantages under which we have suffered during the past two years in the way of seizures on technical grounds cannot be committed under the present treaty. It is my deliberate judgment that it would be a serious matter for our fishermen if the new convention should be rejected. To do so means a return to the old Treaty of 1818, under which our people have chafed so long."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date of that paper?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is the *New York Herald* of Sunday, April 15.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is marvellously like that interview in Montreal.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, but it goes a little further. At any rate, it is not of any importance whether it is the same statement or not. It corroborates the statement that we have surrendered all the advantages of which we were possessed under the old treaty of 1818, and have gained nothing from the Americans in return. I think that is an opinion from the American side of the case which will more than counterbalance all the quotations which have been read to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I would like to understand, if I can, the real meaning of this section. When the motion for the second reading of this Bill was made, I ventured to make some observations on the Bill, and especially with reference to the 6th section, which has been passed, and the 7th section, which is now before the House; and I submitted, with some humility, that I could not quite understand what was the meaning of those sections. I asked the Minister of Justice what was the meaning of those sections in his opinion, those sections being, to my mind, the key to the whole treaty, but the hon. gentleman was a little out of temper at the time, and he declined to give me the information I asked for. Afterwards, he delivered what was characterised as a most spirited address, which seemed to suit his friends on the other side of the House; but I had asked for that information with no object in the world except to obtain the information. It seemed to me, as I stated at that time, that there was no controlling power provided for, to determine when or when not the American fishermen could get the privileges which are accorded to them under that section. For instance, I stated that the privilege of transhipment was a great privilege which they sought, and that I felt that, under that section, although it might not be intended to give them that privilege, the section could be so constructed as practically to give them that right of transhipment. I pointed out that United States fishing vessels, according to the section, entering the

"Ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada, under stress of weather or in consequence of
Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

any casualty, may unload, reload, tranship or sell (subject to customs laws and regulations) all fish on board, when such unloading, transhipment or sale is necessary as incidental to repairs."

And I asked, as I now ask, who is to judge whether it is necessary as incidental to repairs or not? Nobody can judge. The captain may say, I propose to remain here two or three days, and, in my opinion, my fish are in such a condition that I must tranship them. It is not to be supposed that the collector of customs in each port is to have the right to interpret the treaty. That right is not vested in him. The result is, that that section will be so construed that the privilege of transhipment, the most valuable privilege that the American fishermen have asked for, is practically conceded to them. According to the 7th section, the master of any United States fishing vessel who has received a license may obtain

"Such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, and any such vessel, having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded, upon all occasions, such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

Now, the hon. gentleman says that this treaty does not give them the right to purchase bait. It seems to me that bait is a part of the outfit of a fishing vessel. At any rate, it is so argued, and I think can be successfully argued. If a captain says, "I have lost my bait in this storm and I want to purchase more," the treaty says that he may, and all I have contended for is that this treaty, which is said to be an interpretation treaty, which is said to be intended to make matters clear, has simply made them so confused and so difficult to understand that practically the right to purchase bait and the right of transhipment cannot be refused to American fishermen. Now, I have already called the attention of the Minister to the 7th section, and I repeat my request for information in regard to it. The first part of that section says:

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and any officers of the Government of Canada whom he may authorize for that purpose, shall grant promptly, and upon application, and without charge, licenses to United States fishing vessels to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

And the latter part of the section goes on to say:

"Any such vessel, having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

Now, the first part of the section would lead anyone who was seeking to find out its interpretation to believe that it was only after the master of the vessel had closed his voyage and was going home, and required some small supplies which he would need for that homeward voyage, that he would be entitled to obtain the necessary supplies, but the latter part of the section seems to have a different effect. It appears to state that any vessel which has once obtained a license, shall, in future, on all occasions, have the same facilities for the purchase of supplies as ordinarily granted to trading vessels. Of course there will be a great deal of controversy as to what "casual and needful provisions and supplies" are. My impression is that this treaty will receive at the hands of this Government, if it be adopted, and from the officers of the Government, a very broad and liberal interpretation. My opinion is, that the Canadian officers hereafter will not be very astute in examining the demand of the American fishermen under this treaty to purchase supplies or to purchase bait or anything else. They will practically give them what they want, but it seems to me that this clause is very curiously worded, and I ask whether a license once obtained is intended to inure for the following season, or whether,

when a license is obtained in the early part of the summer, the party is to be entitled to purchase supplies as he needs them from time to time. If that is the case, that will enable these men to do what the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Fisheries have declared would be fatal to the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces. I do not desire to prolong the controversy on these points, which I think have been put very fairly before the House and the country, but the quotations which have been put before the House from the Minutes and the State papers show clearly that, in the opinion of those Ministers, it would be fatal to the interests of everyone and especially to the interests of the fisheries in the Maritime Provinces if the American fishermen were allowed to come in there and make their purchases of bait, if they were allowed to make the harbors and shores of the Maritime Provinces the base for carrying on their fishing operations. Now, it appears to me that if an American fisherman can come into port and claims that, by casualty, he has lost his outfit, he may purchase a new outfit, as the 6th section says. I think I would say that that word "outfit" of a fishing vessel includes bait as a part of it. I may be wrong, because when a fishing vessel goes, for instance, to take cod-fish from the Banks, the outfit which she takes to enable her—and, as my hon. friend on my right remarks, almost all she needs is outfit—to carry on the fishery, is the fresh bait. In old days, these fisheries on the Banks were carried on by means of salt bait, but when the fishermen discovered that fresh bait was taken more readily, they have, of late years, used only that. No fisherman would presume to go to the Banks and say his outfit was complete unless he had sufficient fresh bait to last him for his voyage. My impression therefore was that the word outfit was intended to cover bait, fresh as well as salt. It would not be contended that it would not cover salt,—the bait seems to me to be in precisely the same category. Therefore if a vessel has gone to the Banks, providing herself with a supply of bait, in the first instance, to last a fortnight, and afterwards enters one of the ports of the Maritime Provinces, and the master says that from some casualty she has lost her bait, you have no means of testing the accuracy of his statement; and hon. gentlemen opposite, both to day and previously, have told us what their opinion is of the character of the men who man and control these vessels, and how they will make any statement that is necessary in their interest. If he goes there and says that from casualty, he has lost his outfit, he is entitled under this interpretation, to replenish it. But not as a matter of favor. He says under the treaty: I have come here and as a right I demand to purchase my outfit. Under the Act he will come in a very different way. He will not speak with bated breath, as he has been accustomed to do, when pursuing his fisheries under the Treaty of 1818. He will now come and say: I demand this as a right. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman, if he deems it necessary to reply to my observations at all, to answer me whether, in his opinion, it was intended that the license should be granted to American fishermen when they go into a bay in the early part of the season, and having got that license, which they get as a matter of right, does that entitle them to purchase, in the words of the 7th section, "such casual and needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels from time to time." If it was only intended they should purchase such casual and needful supplies as are required for the home voyage, then the hon. gentleman will see that the first part of the section concedes that privilege entirely—the latter part of the section was intended to grant something else—that on all occasions after having obtained his license, he comes into any port, he can obtain such casual or needful provisions as he requires. If that is so, you have given up everything, you have enabled them to make your harbors their basis for carrying on their fishing operations. If that is so,

I need not use any stronger language than the language used by the Minister of Justice himself, that such a concession would be absolutely fatal to the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces. If it is fatal, and if you have given this up, it is well that we should know it. I suppose this is the proper time to ask an explanation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like very much, indeed, to enter fully into this question with my hon. friend, and to give what I conceive to be the interpretation of the phrases in these two sections. The hon. gentleman, however, must bear with me if I decline doing so, not at all out of disrespect to the hon. gentleman, but because, as he is aware, whatever we may say here in favor of the treaty will be used against it elsewhere. Hon. gentlemen have perfect freedom to suggest the possible constructions that may arise unfavorable to Canada, without any injury to the treaty at all; and they are increasing the chances of its acceptance by the United States. But, on the contrary, if we defended the treaty as we might be disposed to do under every circumstance, and made a statement of our views and the construction of various points suggested to us, we are making a case for those who are disposed to find fault with the treaty in another direction. The hon. gentleman, however, will, I am sure, appreciate what I shall endeavor to say in reply to the remarks he has just made, in a general way. The hon. gentleman has correctly quoted me as saying that if we should do anything which will make the harbors of the Maritime Provinces a base of supplies for the United States fishermen, we would practically give up our whole case and adopt a measure which will be extremely detrimental to the interests of our own fishermen, at a time when they are hampered, to some extent, by an adverse duty in the markets of the United States. But I do not regard the sections which the hon. gentleman has referred to, as to any extent making Canada a basis of supplies for the United States fishermen. On the contrary, I think they contain but a liberal and fair extension of the right of shelter and repairs which are secured to the United States fishermen by the Treaty of 1818. Now, in the first place, as regards the question of transshipment. The hon. gentleman will remember that the treaty itself dealt generally with the subject of transshipment in that section of it which provides for the right of transshipment being given to the United States fishermen on certain conditions; those conditions being, principally, the admission of our fish free into the United States; so that the treaty deals with that particular subject and in that specific way. But when we come down to give, in section 6, the right of shipment in certain specified cases, we are dealing, not with the general right of transshipment, not conferring, I take it, the general right of transshipment of cargo at all, but we are ceding simply the right to tranship cargoes in certain cases, one of which lately occurred, but which have been of rare occurrence, and in which it would be most harsh to refuse the right of transshipment; these cases being cases of vessels coming in out of repair and in distress, and with their fish in such a condition that they would spoil or have to be thrown overboard, unless the master were allowed to tranship his cargo. He would be permitted by the treaty, even under this extreme circumstance, to tranship his cargo, or even to sell it in Canada, if he were willing to pay the duty upon it; but this simply allows him, under circumstances of that kind, where transshipment is necessary and incidental to repairs, simply allows him transshipment in that one case. I take it that instead of it being ambiguous or difficult to ascertain the condition of the vessel when she comes in to make repairs, under these circumstances it is very easy of ascertainment. The United States vessels are to be subject to supervision, and in addition there can be no transshipment affected without certain entries being made in the custom house. There

will be supervision at every point; first of all, when they enter the three-mile limit they will be subject to the inspection of our officers who will ascertain the *bond fides* in entering the harbors where they come, and if they tranship their cargoes they will have to make customs entries. A few words as to what the hon. gentleman said about licenses. I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite are rather inclined to believe that this construction might be placed upon the treaty: that a vessel going seaward towards the fishing grounds might early in the season obtain a license for the purchase of supplies. Now, I do not think that is the construction that can be applied. A vessel is only entitled to apply for a licence to obtain those provisions and supplies which are ordinarily sold to trading vessels for the homeward voyage, and I should think it very extraordinary if it were set up on the part of any of the American fishermen on going to the fishing grounds that they would expect to get a license in order to obtain the casual and needful supplies for a homeward voyage, when it would be impossible for them or for the person who gave the license to ascertain what supplies would be needed for the homeward voyage, or whether any would be needed. I do not think that construction is at all reasonable, that after a vessel had obtained a license she should forever afterwards be entitled to obtain those supplies, nor do I think any such contention will be made. I think the proviso in that section is simply to take care that the condition of the vessel having been established, the necessity of obtaining supplies having been established, a license shall be given, notwithstanding any provision in the law to the contrary, and that every facility shall be given to the captain of the vessel to make the purchases which the license authorises him to make. The section which provides for the right of making repairs and of damages or losses arising from disaster, is simply an extension of the provision of the Treaty of 1818. If a vessel lost a bowsprit or sustained any slight damage whatever, she had a right to come in for repairs, but if she lost her nets she would not have the right to come in and purchase nets, strictly speaking. It is simply, I say, a fair extension of the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, in regard to repairs, an extension which we were asked to make on some occasions, but which was beyond our power to grant.

Mr. DAVIES. With the latter part of the remarks made by the hon. Minister I quite agree. The hon. gentleman says that, under the Treaty of 1818, if a vessel lost her bowsprit, or some other part of her gear, she had a right to come in for repairs. It is perfectly true the vessel had no right to buy supplies, or tranship cargo. Her right was confined simply to repairing the damage which had been caused to some part of her gear. Now, the hon. gentleman says that, under this treaty, they have extended that right; I agree with him, and the only question is as to what extent they have extended it. It seems to me that, while there may be three or four constructions put upon the 6th section, the construction which American captains will put upon the section—and I make these observations without any desire to criticise the hon. minister too sharply—is that, when he comes in to repair running gear or bowsprit, the captain will say that, my fish are in such a condition that I must send them on, in order that the repairs may be made. Who is to question the right of the captain to land them, if it is incidental to repairs to land them? Who is to question his right if he also demands transshipment as incidental to the repairs? Formerly, under the old treaty, the vessel came in for a specific purpose, which was understood by the collector, and if he exceeded that purpose his vessel was liable to seizure. But this treaty confers on the captains of American vessels the privilege, when they come in, to repair losses which have happened to their vessels; and they may then tranship

Mr. THOMPSON.

their fish, unload or sell them if these acts are necessarily incident to repairs. The language is unfortunate, for no one can say what is incident to repairs and what is not incident. The American captains will put a broad construction upon this term. Any one acquainted with fishing knows what will happen. Suppose a fleet of 200 vessels are fishing off Margaree or Cheticamp on the coast of Cape Breton, or off East Point. They may come into harbor on the approach of a storm and one of the captains may say that he wants to make some repairs as he has lost some gear. He reports to the custom house, and states that as the repairs will occupy ten or twelve days, he desires to land his cargo and send it on. Who is to question his right?

Mr. THOMPSON. We can ascertain the fact, and he is responsible for the penalty.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. Minister say that a sub-collector at Cheticamp or Souris would dare to say to one of the American captains: You claim that right to do this under the sixth clause, we will seize your vessel and test your case in the courts. I do not think officers would dare to so act. I am talking of the practical construction and application of the section. It seems to me that when the hon. gentleman stated formerly that concessions of this kind would destroy the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces, he stated the truth. Again, the hon. gentleman claims that it would not be fair to press him to place a construction upon the words of the section. But that is surely not a fair contention on his part. It is not fair that this country should be called upon to ratify the treaty without knowing the meaning to be put upon the most important words in it? Surely we should understand what is the real meaning of the concessions we are making and that the United States should understand what is the real meaning of the concessions which they are receiving. If "outfit," as I contend it does, includes bait as well as salt, and if the construction of the sixth section is as I put it just now, everything for which the Americans have ever contended has been given up to them. The hon. gentleman, in referring to the seventh section, stated, if I understood him rightly, that American fishing vessels will only be entitled to purchase supplies when they are on their homeward voyage. But an American fisherman is only on his homeward voyage when he is leaving the last port in the Bay. What is the use of getting a license then? Surely the hon. gentleman must see that some meaning must be accorded to the last part of the section, which states that after they have obtained such licenses they shall on all occasions be accorded permission to purchase such casual supplies, etc., as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels. The meaning of the clause is this, that an American fishing vessel coming down to the Bay can obtain a license when she comes into the Bay. And after obtaining her license she, from month to month and from week to week, is entitled under the license to go into any Canadian port and purchase any such casual supplies as she may require from time to time. I cannot put any other construction on the last part of the section. It has no meaning unless it means that.

"She shall be accorded upon all occasions such facilities."

Surely it must mean that, and if it does mean that, the hon. gentleman sees he has made our harbors and bays in a position to enable them to carry out their fishery. If he has done so as the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Justice have said, he has struck a fatal blow at the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces. He says in his minute:

"If the Provinces are to be judges, it is most prejudicial to their interest that United States fishermen should be permitted to come into their harbors on any pretext, and it is fatal to their fishery interests that those fishermen, with whom they have to compete at such a disadvantage in the markets of the United States, should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait, even for the pursuit of the deep sea fisheries."

It is therefore fatal to the fishery interests that they should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait. It appears to me the broad construction of those two sections will enable them to do that which my hon. friend says will be fatal to our interests. That broad construction is the construction American fishermen will contend for—that is, the construction will give it, and that broad construction is the construction the American people will endorse. My own impression is that is the construction we will finally have to accept. The hon. gentleman says, truly enough, and it would be a very fair argument in answer to their contention, that the transshipment of their fish and the purchase of supplies and bait is provided for in another part of the treaty. Of course it is, but it is provided for in this part of the treaty too, under the circumstances mentioned in the section. The question is, who is to declare when those circumstances exist and when they do not exist? An American captain comes in and says: I have lost my outfit from casualty. There is nobody to dispute it. You must accept it and when you do he has the right to buy a new outfit, and the outfit if it embraces salt must necessarily embrace bait. If that is so we are giving away, by this section, everything he wants, and the latter part of the other section which gave him the right to tranship and purchase bait when they admit our fish duty free, will never be brought into operation, because practically he will have the right under the section we are now considering, if that construction I am submitting to the House is adopted, and I believe it will be. My own impression is, and I have heard it stated by some gentlemen, that the American Senate will not ratify this treaty. Personally, I do not think that would be an unmixed evil. I, for one, do not fear we will have a repetition of the disastrous state of affairs we had in 1886. We are not going to have that any more. There will be no enforcement by this Government of the obnoxious customs laws, whether this treaty goes into operation or not. There is no doubt about that. The language used by the Finance Minister and acquiesced in by the members of the Government puts that beyond doubt. We will have our rights under the old treaty and they will be maintained with a firm hand and not with the technical exactness in which the Minister of Fisheries in 1886 tried to carry them out. In 1887 a new state of matters was introduced, and I do not think that the Americans complained very much of their treatment in that year. I rose for the purpose, as far as possible, of getting light myself upon the meaning of those sections, and if anything I could say would add to the information of others, I thought it well to speak as I believed it desirable that this House should understand the matter thoroughly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman was making the treaty I could understand his action in this matter, but we are not doing that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I was trying to arrive at the meaning of this section and I think it is very important.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the course he has taken is the course that would be taken by the deadliest enemy of the Canadian fishermen.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and I will show it. We are not now making a treaty, Sir. The treaty is made and we are not deciding whether we will accept this treaty. That the House has already unanimously decided, and the hon. gentleman himself, after discussing this treaty, closed his remarks by saying he intended to vote for it. I say that we are not making a treaty and as we are not deciding whether we will accept the treaty, for that has been done

and done unanimously by this House, I say that every word the hon. gentleman is using in the criticism which he has offered to the House, he knows is impotent to change a line in that treaty, but he knows that all the weight and influence that his position in this House, his position as a member of the legal profession, will give him, will be quoted hereafter in opposition to the rights of Canadian fishermen and in support of the claims of American fishermen. I cannot understand a man who professes to be the friend of our fishermen taking this course. If his object, Sir, is to aid me, if his object is to aid Canada in getting this treaty adopted by the American Senate, then his conduct is intelligible; but from any other standpoint I say that I am astounded that a gentleman of the legal profession, a man having the knowledge of public affairs that the hon. gentleman has, should take up the time of the House, as he has, after the House has solemnly decided by a unanimous vote to ratify this treaty, when he knows he cannot change a line in it. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman standing on his feet here and for this length of time endeavoring to make a case for the United States fishermen against the Canadian fishermen, and throwing all the weight and influence of his legal opinion, whatever that may amount to, into the scale of the American fisherman against the Canadian fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I do not know what I have done to merit this extraordinary scolding at the hands of the hon. gentleman. When I first addressed the House I ventured to ask information on those most important clauses which the hon. gentleman has incorporated in this treaty, clauses which were susceptible of a broad meaning the result of which would be to surrender our fisheries entirely to the United States. I venture respectfully to ask the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice who accompanied him to Washington and who was a party to the construction of this treaty, I ventured to ask them what was the understanding come to by the plenipotentiaries at Washington as to the meaning of those words, and I was answered with a flippancy altogether unfair and unjust. I was not answered, in fact, at all. I was not told whether the construction I said those clauses were susceptible of was the proper construction or not in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen, or whether it was the construction generally adopted by the plenipotentiaries at Washington. The hon. gentleman did not tell me then and when I ventured to exercise my undoubted right in this House before I voted for the passage of that treaty and asked what it really means, I am sat upon by the hon. gentleman and lectured as if I had done something wrong. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he ask us to accept every word and clause of this treaty in ignorance of its real meaning; does he want the fishermen to believe that they have conceded nothing when it may turn out they have conceded all? Does the hon. gentleman want me to vote blindly for a clause of this treaty which the Minister of Justice has said admits American fishermen to outports and bays, carrying off our fisheries from us? What does the hon. gentleman take me for? I am here, Sir, solely and earnestly looking for information which I believe to be of the greatest importance, before this House adopts this treaty. I am asking it, too, at a time when the treaty is before the United States Senate. I say it is unworthy of this Parliament and unworthy of the hon. gentleman to seek to smuggle through a treaty under the assumption that it contains a secret meaning which he wishes to hide from the American people. I thought the day had gone by for any underhand dealings between the two great nations. I thought we were going to deal frankly and honestly with our friends to the south of us. I say it is in the highest interests of peace for this assembly of Canada and the Senate of the United States, if they adopt that treaty, to thoroughly understand what its real meaning

is. Does the hon. gentleman want that before the next season goes by, a construction should be put on that treaty by the Minister of Marine diametrically opposite to that which Mr. Bayard puts on it? Does he want us brought to the point of the bayonet, to which he says the administration of the Fisheries Department brought us two years ago? Does he want us brought to that condition of affairs which Mr. Bayard describes in that private and confidential letter he wrote to the hon. gentleman? I trust not; and if he does not, we can only bring about a better and more cordial state of affairs by dealing honorably and frankly with each other, and, if we have entered into a treaty, by understanding what the real meaning of the treaty is. If we have made concessions, in Heaven's name let us understand the full meaning of them; and if hon. gentlemen are going to vote, let them know what they are voting for. I will not submit to be lectured to by the hon. gentleman in the tone and manner which he has assumed to-day, when I ask what construction is put upon that treaty by himself and the other plenipotentiaries. I was within my right, and instead of being lectured to by the hon. gentleman, I was entitled to a fair and decent answer, which I have not got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know whether this whole business is a farce or not. If we are not to consider and discuss every line of this treaty, what is the use of putting you in the Chair? We have a right to know what we are doing. We do not approve of this treaty; we do not pretend to say that it is a good treaty or honorable to Canada. We accept it under compulsion, but we have a right to know what we are accepting, and that we propose to know.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of giving this treaty a most careful and deliberate examination; and with all its obscurity and defects, with all its want of clearness of construction or explicitness of statement, he knew that this House could not alter one jot or tittle of it. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will not pretend for a single moment that in discussing this treaty the House is in the position that it would be in if we had before us a Bill on any subject over which the House has perfect control. When we have a Bill before us in which we can alter clauses, hon. gentlemen may contend in the most vigorous terms for the construction of the law or the meaning of a phrase, because it is in the power of the House to alter the Bill upon such representations. But the hon. gentleman knows that that is not our position here. The treaty is made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is an alternative.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is that alternative?

Mr. MACKENZIE. To reject it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is precisely the position. That alternative was preserved to this House, so that not one line of this treaty can become operative or can affect the interests of Canada until the Parliament of Canada, having deliberately considered it in all its bearings, decides to accept and ratify it. But that is not the position of the hon. gentleman who has spoken. He would have been within the lines of his duty as an independent member of this House if, coming to the conclusion that this treaty was faulty, obscure, or that for any other cause it was undesirable that it should become binding on Canada, he had determined to give it the most unqualified hostility, and defeat it if he could; and even if he stood alone as a member of this House in taking that view, he was bound in the interests of Canada to vote for its rejection. But that was his only alternative, as it is not in our power to alter a line of the treaty or change it in any way. But what did the hon. gentleman do? After the giving the treaty the most care-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

ful consideration that he was bound as member of this House to give it, he said:

"The treaty has been agreed upon, and I for one hope that no action will be taken by this Parliament to throw it out. I am willing, Sir, that it should be accepted."

The hon. gentleman having taken that position, having come to the conclusion that he owed it to his constituents and to Canada that this treaty should become a binding treaty, I say that when he stands up here and takes half an hour of the time of this House in order to give the weight of his opinion as a lawyer in favor of the interests of the United States and United States fishermen, I say he is not fulfilling his duty to Canada or the fishermen of Canada. He asks, is it not desirable that we should know what the treaty means. When I submitted the treaty to the House, I explained as fully as I was able, the bearing and operation of each clause. I am not a lawyer, but I do not believe there is any such obscurity in it, or any such doubt calculated to be raised, and as the hon. gentleman alleges. Does he not think that if this treaty is to become law, he had better leave it to United States lawyers, fighting for the interests of United States fishermen, to take the ground he has taken this afternoon? And does he not think he had better reserve his great legal powers to fight for the interests of Canadian fishermen against those pretensions on the part of the fishermen of the United States? I am not disposed to lecture the hon. gentleman, I should be doing very wrongly if I were to attempt it; but he must allow me to say, not with a view to lecturing him, but in order if I can to stop a course which I deem more mischievous to the interests of Canada and Canadian fishermen than any course the hon. gentleman could take. It was with that view that I drew the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he was not making a treaty, and was not in a position to alter a line of it, and, that being so, he was not acting fairly in the interest of Canada in taking a line which the most extreme advocates opposed to Canadian fishermen would take. That was the reason I drew the attention of the House to the unwisdom and the unfairness, in regard to the rights and interests of our own people, of the hon. gentleman expressing opinions on the floor of this Parliament, which might be quoted in the courts and used by those endeavoring to get advantages over our fishermen under this treaty. So feeling, I confess I could not understand how an hon. gentleman who professed to be, and I have no doubt is, anxious to promote the interests of Canadian fishermen, could express such opinions and leave them to be quoted by parties at another time and in another place, against our country and against the interests of our fishermen. Now, I say that if the hon. gentleman holds the opinion he has stated to-day, if the hon. gentlemen around him hold these opinions, they have not discharged their duty in supporting this treaty. I have no hesitation in saying that. I am very thankful to hon. gentlemen opposite for the manner in which they have dealt with this subject. I felt I was justified in saying, when I submitted this treaty to the House, that it was not a question of party, and I felt no little pride and gratification in finding that, to a large extent, hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to recognise that fact to the fullest extent, and to feel that, under existing circumstances, they would be justified in giving this treaty their support. But I do trust that that support will not be affected by statements, made with the weight and authority which their position in Parliament give hon. gentlemen, which may be used to our disadvantage in any other place. Perhaps it is because I am not a lawyer that I am not able to draw these fine distinctions that gentlemen of the legal profession can draw on almost every question and every law, however plain and clear, that may be submitted to them for approval; and perhaps for that reason, I think this is a plain, clear

statement upon which there will be no difficulty whatever in arriving at a sound and just conclusion as to the meaning of the language in which it is couched. I have endeavored to give a frank, candid and explicit statement to the House of my views as to what the treaty contains, as to the effect of its various clauses, and as to the manner in which it was understood those should be operated; and I feel that hon. gentlemen opposite are scarcely fair in endeavoring to take the line that a very few of the members, I am happy to say, have taken, of forcing the Government into making such statements in its support as would be calculated to prevent its ever becoming operative.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented my position in this matter. The hon. gentleman has said that I addressed the House as a lawyer, and placed a construction on the treaty which was not in the interest of Canada—a construction calculated to affect injuriously in the future, as well as in the present, Canadian interests. The House will bear me out in saying that I have put no construction on the treaty. I have said that the language of the treaty was so loosely drawn that it is capable of such and such a construction, but I did not say whether I entirely agreed with the one construction or the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I pointed out most clearly to the hon. gentleman that the language used was capable of several constructions, and I asked him—and I had a right to have an answer—what was the meaning the British plenipotentiaries, at least, placed upon the treaty, and whether that meaning was accepted by the American Government or not? I am sick of hearing this argument cast against us from time to time that the truth cannot be spoken for fear it may affect Canadian interests. It is time the truth was spoken, and we should endeavor to get at the real meaning of this treaty before it finally passes the House. The hon. gentleman says that my mouth is closed because I told the House that I did not intend to move any resolution against the treaty, but that it ought to be accepted. I did say the treaty ought to be accepted, and I said that with the full knowledge, as the hon. gentleman repeats my words, that we could not alter a line of it. Why did I say so? The hon. gentleman knows well that in that very speech to which he refers, I pointed out the concessions which, in my opinion, Canada had made—concessions, which, if the opinions of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, the hon. the Minister of Militia, the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were correct, would be fatal to the interests of Canada. But I said this, that if the hon. gentleman's statement was correct; if the relations between Canada and the United States had become injured to the extent he said they had; if we were brought face to face with a condition of facts not far removed from war; if, to use Mr. Bayard's language, we had "entered upon a career of embittered rivalry staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility;" if, to use the hon. gentleman's own language, we had committed 65,000,000 people and their entire press in bitter hostility to the people of Canada,—I said then, as I do now, that such being the case, any settlement, which was not absolutely dishonorable, should be accepted in order that we might get out of the humiliating and dangerous position to which the policy of the Government had brought us. I pointed out as strongly as I could that the harassing and injurious exactions which the government of the day had inflicted on American vessels in carrying out our custom laws, had been of very great injury to our people, and had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about that irritable state of feeling on their part. I pointed out further that while, technically, hon. gentlemen opposite were, as I believe they were, right in their construction of the treaty, the manner in which they ad-

ministered it was fatal and suicidal, and the result of their administration was to bring us face to face with the determination on the part of 65,000,000 people that the manner in which we had acted towards them with regard to our fisheries should not be repeated except at the risk of war. I was not prepared, for one, to risk a war with the States; I thought any settlement would be preferable to a condition of things in which we would be brought face to face with war. And I say again, rather than revert to the dangerous condition of affairs in which we were only one year ago, when we had the retaliation Bill passed by the Congress and the Senate of the United States, we should accept this treaty. That, however, does not absolve me from my duty, as a member of this House, to enquire, as minutely as I can, into the meaning of the treaty. I repeat, that common courtesy demands at the hands of the hon. gentlemen and at the hands of the hon. the Minister of Justice, where two constructions may be found as to any important clause of this treaty, that they should say what is the correct construction, instead of denouncing those who point out to their notice these two constructions. They should tell the House what their opinion is, and what the opinion of the plenipotentiaries at Washington is, as to the proper construction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did so to the best of my ability.

Mr. DAVIES. When I raised the question here to-day, the hon. gentleman did not do so. When I raised the question the other day, in my remarks following those of the hon. the Minister of Justice, he did not do so, and I have the right now to call for an answer. I am not open to the attack of the hon. gentleman of being in any sense unpatriotic or of having advanced arguments which would be fatal or prejudicial to Canadian interests.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The warmth exhibited by the hon. the Minister of Finance can only be accounted for by two suppositions: First, that the hon. gentleman finds himself in a difficult position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly; I have explained that.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the next place, that he is unwilling to explain, because he desires to keep something back from the people of the United States. With regard to the first, I believe the hon. gentleman comprehends that perfectly. With respect to the second, I hope he has no such object in view, because I believe no hon. gentleman here desires, now or at any time, to keep anything back regarding the operation of the treaty, which is susceptible of a different explanation at a subsequent day. What is the position of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)? He recognises, as every one must, the difficulty of putting a construction on these two clauses, taken together, and he asks the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the hon. the Minister of Marine, who took part in framing this treaty, to be good enough to explain the privileges which the American fishermen would enjoy under the operation of these two clauses. And what reply has he received? He has received no reply from either of those gentlemen, but the Minister of Finance is sheltering himself under this pretext, this flimsy pretext, as I must call it, for it is nothing else, that he is afraid to give an explanation of the Act for fear it might be used in the United States. He knows that there is nothing to offer in defence of the Act, as far as Canadian interests are concerned, and therefore he is sheltering himself behind that pretext. The case which the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Davies) has suggested may easily arise. A fishing vessel obtains a license, and desires to know how long it can obtain fishing supplies. To whom is the decision to be left? Are the collectors of customs in

the different ports to give that decision, or are they to come to the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Customs? Why do not the hon. gentlemen, while this matter is fresh in the minds of the people, give the information to the country as to how this will affect the question when this treaty goes into effect? I say that every collector of customs along the coast of Nova Scotia, taking that Act and interpreting it for himself, will get into a difficulty and will have to apply to the hon. gentlemen for an interpretation which they are best able to give. Can an American fisherman when he comes to Nova Scotia, take his license and get his supplies and go to the fishing ground? That is one question which I would like those hon. gentlemen to answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentlemen reads the clause, he will see that they cannot.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I want the hon. gentleman to interpret that clause for me. I am merely paying that deference to the opinion of the hon. gentleman which he is entitled to from the position which he occupied on that commission. He is bound, I think, to give us the interpretation which he places upon that clause. Of course, we have heard what he has said, but those who have not had the benefit of listening to him will be even more at sea on this matter than I am. Suppose those American fishermen come here and require supplies, the Minister of Justice says they cannot get them, while the Minister of Marine says they can get salt and go on their voyage. I want that distinctly understood. Then, when they come to port with their cargoes, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred to the privilege which is given to them of transshipping their cargoes, who is to be the judge? Are the collectors of the ports to be the judges whether they are entitled to tranship their cargoes or not? The hon. gentleman knows that not one collector out of twenty along the coast of Nova Scotia, or, for that matter, in the whole of this Dominion, is capable of being a judge in regard to such a matter. To whom then are they to apply for the interpretation of this Act? If they were to apply to a harbor master or a port warden, or to some competent authority who would be able to understand the position of the vessels, and whether or not it was necessary for the vessel to obtain these supplies, I could understand it, but the hon. gentleman does not give us any information on that subject, in fact we have no explanation at all. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance have not answered the plain, practical question which was put by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) as to what the American fishermen can do. The American Consul in Halifax said, in reference to these clauses, when I was speaking to him: I do not know how I am to interpret them; how do you interpret them? I said: When we are in Parliament, and meet the gentlemen who made this treaty, we shall receive from them the explanation, as far as our contention goes, as to the interpretation of the meaning of the treaty, and no doubt you will have your own orders from your own Government; but at this moment I am just as much in the dark as I was before, because now, if anyone were to ask me, if this discussion was to cease now, what the American fishermen can do and what they cannot do, I could not tell them from any explanation which has been given by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I say, therefore, that it is, in my judgment, absolutely necessary that these gentlemen should tell us exactly the bearing which these clauses have in reference to the privileges of the American fishermen in our ports. If this opportunity is passed over without further explanation, they will have to give that explanation when each case is presented for their consideration, and it would be far better for them to do it

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

while the matter is fresh in the mind of every hon. gentleman here.

Committee rose.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Joseph Gauthier, Esq., member-elect for the district of L'Assomption, was introduced by the Hon. W. Laurier and Mr. Amyot, and took his seat.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

House again went into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I was out of the House during a part of the time that the discussion was going on this afternoon, and just as I came in I heard an utterance from the Minister of Finance which I regretted very much indeed to hear. It was to the effect that if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House felt that this was a bad treaty for Canada, they had not done their duty in allowing it to pass without putting it to a vote and endeavoring to defeat it, or something like that. I think I defined, the other night, pretty well, my attitude in relation to that treaty. I stated that I looked upon it as a complete give-away of the interests of Canada, but, notwithstanding that, knowing as I do the past transactions between England and this colony, where any conflict came up in regard to our rights as between the United States and this country, I felt, and I fear I shall always feel, that the interests of Canada are likely to give way, except under severe pressure. The hon. Minister of Finance stated truly the other day the lamentable fact of the existence of a hostile feeling in the United States that has grown up in reference to ourselves. Now, while I believe that that hostile feeling has been mainly created, indeed I may say entirely created, by the want of tact and judgment in the administration of our fishery rights under the Treaty of 1818, I must say that if the existence of this ill-feeling which has been so lucidly described by the Minister does exist in the United States,—and I regret to say that I believe it does, from what I see in their press, from the statements of their public men, and the facts recited in the correspondence and despatches of the Secretary of State and their representative at the Court of London—I say while I believe that state of things does exist, I must justify myself for not opposing this treaty, not because I think it is in the interest of Canada so far as regards the material concessions on either sides, but I justify my acceptance of it upon the ground that it is a means of leading to peace, and a settlement of a question which has long been a source of ill-feeling. Whatever may be the fate of the treaty in the United States Senate, England never can recede from that treaty made at Washington; she never can go back and claim the rights that we enjoyed before the unfortunate treaty was signed. Now, Sir, I say this in justification of myself, and to put my views on record in the *Hansard*, in order that they may go to the country. Whatever other gentlemen may do, and they can answer for themselves; whatever motives may have influenced them, and that is their business; for myself I want it placed on record that the reasons why I do not oppose this treaty are not that we have got the rights we were entitled to get under the Treaty of 1818, rights which were clearly recognised for many years in the correspondence and des-

patches between the Governments of England and the United States, but it is because I see in it a prospect of peace and more cordial relations. We never can go back to our old rights. If that treaty is rejected by the Senate of the United States, will England attempt to enforce the headland system for us, after what has been done at Washington? Will she attempt to enforce exclusion from bays along our coasts, after what has been done at Washington? No, Sir; we have got to confine ourselves and our pretensions in the future to the points and delimitations specified in the Treaty of Washington. Therefore, while I do not approve the treaty, while I cannot give it my cordial support on its merits, I say that the one great point in the whole matter in its favor is, that by it we may hope to secure peace, and that peace may lead to an extension of commercial intercourse between the two countries. Could it accomplish that I feel that it will have accomplished a very great deal. And that is the one point in its favor. I do not know what provoked my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to make the retort I heard as I came in, but I feel I must make this statement to the House before I withdraw my opposition to the treaty; I do so purely upon the ground of endeavoring to establish a friendly feeling with our neighbors on the other side of the border, and in the hope that once these friendly relations are restored, relations that never should have been ruptured, once they are restored this treaty may lead to more extended commercial intercourse, and to that greater prosperity which existed from 1854 to 1856.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the sentiments which have just been expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) with regard to the unfortunate existence of unfriendly feelings in the United States towards Canada. I must say that I think they are in great measure due to the course pursued by the Government in this very matter, who have first tried a spirit of reconciliation, and then turned round and used those harsh measures which, I must say, might have resulted much more seriously than they have done. Speaking for the Maritime Provinces, I think the people accept this treaty somewhat in the same spirit of the hon. member for Northumberland, for the purpose of getting rid of that feeling of irritation, and in a desire to attain to more friendly relations between the two countries; and also, I believe, with the object—certainly that is the desire in the Maritime Provinces—of securing more extended commercial relations. Therefore I am glad that a treaty has been made. I do not think it is necessary, at this stage of the debate, to go into particulars. I regret not having had an opportunity of being present while the debate was going on. I may say, however, that under the circumstances, I think it is about as good a treaty as could be made, considering the peculiar circumstances in the United States, and the unfavorable time when the negotiations were entered into. I think if our Government had been more anxious, they could have chosen a more favorable time, and perhaps have got a better treaty. But we have this treaty now before us. While it is true that we cannot alter it, that treaty is now between the two great powers of Great Britain and the United States—yet we have a right to discuss it, and to obtain explanations in regard to it; more especially since we are responsible for putting an Act of Parliament upon the Statute-book. As representatives of the people we have the right to examine, to criticise, and to require explanations. I have carefully read the treaty. I think there are some portions of it that might have been rendered more clear in its language, and I fear it may eventually lead to complications and difficulties. That portion of the treaty which is embodied in the 7th section contains a great difficulty, to my mind. I cannot construe it as to obtain any clear view with regard to it. With regard to the 6th section, and the word “outfit,” there is no doubt in

my mind, taking the whole text of the treaty, that it must include bait; and when we find in the other sections that they have a right to purchase provisions, supplies and outfits, we see that a construction has been given to the word “outfit” in other portions of the treaty which will include bait. But be that as it may, I believe it will be a benefit to our people as much as to the United States, because I think the more trade we can get, the better it will be for our people, and it will tend to more closer commercial relations. With regard to the 7th section, I was not present when the Minister of Justice gave his explanation, but I must say that if the construction is confined to the homeward voyage I cannot understand the meaning of the latter portion at all, because we must construe that along with the rest of the treaty. We find that a license may be granted when the vessel is on a homeward voyage. So far that is very clear. The vessel on a homeward voyage, may, upon application, get a license to purchase in established ports of entry, the necessary supplies it may require. Having obtained a license an American fishing vessel shall be authorized:

“To purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels.”

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, casual or needful supplies.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I must say it is a difficult matter, and I think it is one that we should discuss and see clearly what it involves. The section continues:

“And any such vessel having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels.”

If I construe that as a lawyer, and I do so with diffidence where I find other legal gentlemen may take a different view, it is that if a vessel gets a license she will be entitled to get all those supplies. I think it is a matter of regret that this should not be made clear, because I believe, I may say I am confident from my own personal acquaintance with some gentlemen connected with the American fishermen, that the spirit in which the treaty was approached was a most friendly one towards Great Britain and Canada, and the consideration was entered upon with a view of getting rid of the difficulties that have existed since 1818 in the construction of the treaty and the headland question. It seems to me that the language should have been a little more clearly definite, and we are fairly entitled to explanations. We can reject the Bill, but we cannot alter the treaty, which, however, cannot go into effect unless assented to by the Parliament of Canada; but when we come to discuss the provisions of the Bill we are responsible, as representatives of the people, for the language of the statute; and I say that in enacting these provisions we should do it in language that will prevent difficulty, remembering that this is an international question, not one between individuals but between two great countries, the Imperial power and ourselves on one hand and the adjoining republic on the other. I repeat that I entirely endorse the views of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that we should not oppose this treaty. I believe in the spirit which has actuated the framers of the treaty, and I hope, whatever the results may be, nothing may arise under it to disturb the friendly relations between the two countries, but that all action under it may be of such a character as to restore friendly feelings. I have very strong opinions on this subject, because it is one of very great importance to my constituents. In our hour of distress and trouble, when we met with as great a calamity as any city could meet with, the men who came to our succor at that time were the people of the United States, and we have a strong desire to

get rid, as far as possible, of all possible causes of irritation between the two countries, and more especially with a view to promote an extension of our commercial relations with the United States. I trust the result of this treaty will be such as I have indicated, and that all the efforts made will tend to accomplish that result; but it is our duty to weigh the question carefully, obtain all necessary explanations, and have the question discussed so that the people will thoroughly understand it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thank very sincerely my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Weldon) for the spirit in which he has approached this very important question, and I feel the more friendly expressions to which he has given utterance in reference to this treaty because, coming as he does from one of the principal ports of the Maritime Provinces, no member of the House is better able to speak on this matter, and perhaps no one is more interested than is the hon. gentleman in having this treaty one that will be fair and just to the great fishing people of Canada. I must remind my hon. friend, however, that expressions of opinion are not of much value, that in times past when plenipotentiaries or high commissioners who have been engaged in the construction of treaties have afterwards attempted to put a construction on what the treaty contained, they were told, and very properly told, that they had no power to give any construction to the treaty any more than any other individual, and if they were witnesses before a court of law and under oath testified as to what was the intention of the framers of the treaty, it would not have any weight, because it is held that the treaty must construe itself. If there is, therefore, vagueness, the hon. gentleman will see I cannot remove it; if there is any question of doubt that arises, my hon. friend will see that no explanation I could give would be of any avail. I have no hesitation in saying that my hon. friend is much better able to construe this treaty than I am, and for the reason that the construction of this treaty would not depend on laymen like myself, but on legal gentlemen whose profession naturally throws upon them the responsibility of giving constructions of Acts of Parliament. My hon. friend says we are throwing this treaty into an Act of Parliament; but that does not change it. My hon. friend knows that neither this Parliament nor the Senate of the United States, nor any party connected with this treaty, can in the slightest degree alter one of its provisions; the treaty will have, so long as it lasts, to speak for itself, and it is the terms of the treaty and not any construction I can give it that will be held to be operative. What might be of greater weight would be where members of Parliament, gentleman occupying high positions in the legal profession, hastily committed themselves to very strong expressions as to the true and legal construction of any clause of this treaty, for such opinions might be quoted afterwards in a court of law as giving a particular construction as to a portion of the treaty, this opinion being given at the time of its discussion by a member of Parliament; and I therefore think it is very much to be desired that we should as far as possible avoid, as we cannot alter the treaty, that being beyond our power, giving any construction of the treaty that would be held or might be held to be an unfavorable construction in regard to the interests of our own people. I put that to my hon. friend. But I desire to draw my hon. friend's attention to what I think has been overlooked by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and that is that this treaty must be read as a whole. It is not going to be a single clause in the treaty that will decide its meaning. We have provided in the absolute part of this treaty that certain facilities, rights and privileges will be conceded to vessels coming into our ports in distress. They have the right to tranship, but that does not give the right of

Mr. WELDON (St. John.)

transhipment to a vessel not in distress. There is not an hon. member in this House who has said we ought not to give the right to unload and tranship if it is absolutely necessary to the vessel in distress in order that she may make repairs. She may unload, she may tranship so far only as necessary. If the repairs that a vessel requires do not make it necessary that she should unload, she cannot unload. I am asked by an hon. gentleman, who is to be the judge in all such cases. You must bring the principles of common sense to bear upon a question of this kind. If any vessel comes in and claims the right to unload and tranship her cargo, you would bring professional men, shipwrights, who would say that the vessel was in a condition that made it necessary to unload or not. You would have the means of subjecting the matter to a question of evidence and it is upon that the decision would be made. She could not tranship cargo simply because she said she was in distress; she must prove it, and it must be perfectly obvious that she is entitled to the benefit and advantage that the treaty confers. Suppose she is loaded with salt fish, she could not tranship, she could not sell her fish, because she could unload the salt fish and after the repairs had been made reload without suffering injury. But if the cargo was fresh fish and it was necessary that she should unload for purposes of repairs, she was entitled to tranship that cargo or pay the duties and sell the cargo. Is that not right?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did I understand the hon. the Finance Minister to say that an American vessel with a cargo of salt fish could not tranship it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not. I say that coming in for repairs entitled the vessel to enter. The clause says that in consequence of stress of weather or any casualty she may unload, reload, tranship, or sell subject to the customs laws and regulations, all the fish on board, then such unloading or transhipment, or resale is necessary as incident to the repairs.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is no distinction between fresh fish and salt fish.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The distinction is this, that it is as far as necessary. If the cargo was salt fish, there was no necessity for selling or transhipping.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. If the cargo was salt fish she could unload and reload, but she may not sell or tranship if it is necessary, and that only would become necessary when her cargo was of fresh fish and for the purpose of avoiding the destruction of that cargo. That, I think, is perfectly clear and obvious. Then, Sir, I want to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to another point, and that is that you must construe this treaty not by a clause, but by the entire. You give these provisions to vessels coming in in distress. You say that a vessel if she is lost in a storm, or if she has lost her rigging or lost her sails, or lost her salt, or lost her bait—I will go to the length of that—and I will say that a fair and liberal construction of that clause would, in my judgment, entitle a vessel in distress, having by shipwreck lost her salt and bait, to such outfit as would enable her to be relieved from the consequences of that storm. That I do not hesitate to say, but my opinion, of course, is worth no more than that of any other gentleman in this House in reference to this matter. But I would not hesitate to give it such a construction as that because the object is in the comity of nations for the purpose of good neighborhood and friendly relations to succor a vessel in distress as far as the necessity of the case demands. That is the position and that is the object of that clause. But when you come to transhipment it is confined to that. You not only have to read that

clause, but to read the seventh clause in connection with casual and needful supplies, such as "trading vessels," not "fishing vessels" are entitled to. It is limited to casual and needful supplies. It does not outfit her for the fisheries at all. You can give her such supplies as will take her home, or having given her a license to purchase supplies to take her home, you give her such casual and needful supplies as the necessity of the case may demand. But, Sir, they are limited to these. If you come to the question of commercial privileges, suppose one of those fishing vessels demanded that they should be entitled to supplies and entitled to purchase bait, and to tranship their cargoes, the answer is that that is all provided for in the contingent sections, and the United States plenipotentiaries have agreed that United States fishing vessels shall only be entitled to those commercial privileges; to the purchase of supplies, to the purchase of bait and to the transshipment of cargoes when they make fish free, and when they take the duties off fish and enable the fishermen of Canada to go into the markets of the United States on the same terms as their own fishermen. You have not only to consider those two clauses but you have, in order to interpret them, to consider the broad, general principle laid down under which those commercial privileges that the advantage of transshipment shall be enjoyed by vessels that are in distress and that are driven in by stress of weather and obliged to be furnished with this relief in order to remove this inconvenience to them, and it is evidently the opinion of both sides of the House we should give this aid to vessels in distress. I will not take up the time of the committee further than to say that it is not in my power to give any explanation which will have any more weight or influence than that of any other person. The treaty is not to be construed by me, but it is to be construed by the principles of common law, which ought to be the principles of common sense. If there is a vagueness it is not in my power, or in the power of the House, to remove it. We have to take it as it is, or reject it. As I am happy to say we have by common assent agreed to take it, I do hope that we will not have a very extended discussion on nice points at this time which I think might probably be connected with considerable inconvenience.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). If the hon. the Minister of Finance had made this statement earlier, I think that a great deal of this discussion would have been avoided.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did make this explanation. Read my speech at the beginning of this question and you will find that I am merely repeating myself now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Minister of Finance in his speech is rather at variance with the principles he has laid down to-night. I think no one reading clause six under which the hon. gentleman provides that cargoes may be reshipped, would for one moment contend that it applies to any one class of cargo no matter what that vessel may have on board—whether it is fish or salt under the provisions of this clause as it has reference to an extensive character. They can reship this cargo and whether it is salt or fresh fish that is distinctly provided for in this clause. But the next question with reference to the procuring of their supplies was explained by the hon. gentleman on a previous occasion. After reciting that clause, he says:

"That was another concession. There is no doubt at all, Sir, that these were rights which under the strict terms of the Treaty of 1818 they could not demand, nor could they insist upon their being granted; but at the same time I think I am within the judgment of the House on both sides, when I say that in the case of a vessel which is homeward bound and requires provisions or needful supplies to take her home, if, for instance, she has some of her rigging carried away, or some of her salt washed overboard, and is obliged to lose her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit, a provision that she may obtain casual and needful

supplies of that kind was demanded in the interests of good neighborhood, and it was not going too far to say that we would allow them to enjoy those advantages."

Therefore under those circumstances she can come in and get supplies, not to take her home, but to continue her voyage without going back to the United States at all. The hon. gentleman also says:

"And is obliged to lose her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit. It was in the interests of good neighborhood and it was not going too far to say we would allow them to enjoy these advantages."

Here the hon. gentleman distinctly lays down the principle that any vessel losing part of her outfit may supply that outfit and may return to the fishing grounds without going back to the United States to purchase them. That is exactly the comparison which my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), laid down in the earlier part of this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is just one point that the hon. the Minister of Finance stated which I will refer to now. I am not going to take the time of the House discussing it at any length.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do not apologise.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not apologising. I never apologise to anybody as a rule, even when I am wrong. I follow the example of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and always claim to be right. I think the hon. gentleman went a little too far in his contention. He said that it would be impossible for any interpretation of his to have any effect in the construction of the treaty hereafter, and that gentlemen on this side of the House, who had a legal training, were better fitted to interpret the treaty than he was who made it. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that for a very considerable time after the Treaty of 1818 was made, in construing that treaty, constant reference was made to the opinions expressed and the discussions that took place at the time the treaty was made. We had an advantage in the case of the Treaty of 1818 that we have not in this treaty; the protocols which have been laid before us in connection with this treaty are not of the character of the protocols of the Treaty of 1818. We had in the latter the arguments used and the positions set up by the negotiators on either side, and the conclusions at which they arrived; and we know as a fact that United States statesmen, in construing that treaty, time and again referred to the opinions and arguments used; and will anybody tell me that if a question should arise five or ten years hence, they will not turn up those secret protocols which we have not got sight of, for the purpose of determining what the construction of the treaty is? I think the hon. gentleman has gone a little beyond himself in taking the position he has done. I regret that the ancient system of giving us in the protocols all the propositions and arguments that were presented was not followed in the case of the Washington Treaty. The more astute statesmen of to-day think concealment is the best policy, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has been astute in concealing what the propositions and arguments advanced by him and those opposed to him were. If we could only ascertain the positions taken by my hon. friend, and the able arguments which he no doubt used, with regard to getting extended trade relations, we should have an amount of information that would be valuable to Canada, and we should then be able to judge for ourselves, what the prospects of those extended trade relations are. Therefore I do not agree with my hon. friend in saying that any utterance of his would have no effect in the interpretation of that treaty. If it were given, that utterance would have a weight hereafter that if the American Senate ratified the treaty after that utterance was made, and with the knowledge that it was made, it would be in a measure bound, and the future

decisions of the two countries would be determined, by the interpretation my hon. friend should put on the treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the same rule does not apply to the construction of a treaty as to the construction of an Act of Parliament. In the case of an Act of Parliament, the courts do not refer to any expression of opinion given by any of the members who voted for it, in deciding what the meaning of the Act is; but in case of a treaty it is not so. It is an agreement between two contracting parties, and the words of one of those parties are very often receivable as the very highest evidence of what the meaning of the parties was at the time. I would give the hon. gentleman a historical and memorable instance of that. The hon. gentleman will remember the difference of opinion that arose as to the construction of the Treaty of 1818. A contention was put forward by the United States that their fishermen had a right to purchase bait notwithstanding that according to the treaty they could only enter our ports for the four purposes of purchasing wood and water, for shelter, and for repairs; and when the contention was put forward that within the words of the treaty they could also enter for the purchase of bait, what was the reply of the hon. Minister of Justice? It was, that cannot possibly be the construction of the treaty, and I will give you the very best evidence in the world that when the contracting parties sat down to make that treaty, the commissioners, on behalf of the United States, proposed to introduce into the treaty the very word "bait," but it was rejected, it is not open to you to say that the treaty includes it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman quite misapprehends me. I did not discuss the question as to what would be shown by the proceedings and protocols. That is not an *ex post facto* expression of opinion by one of the commissioners; it is a something of an entirely different character.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and he will recollect that when we were pressing him this afternoon for his opinion as to the construction of the treaty, we did not ask what his opinion as a lawyer was now on the construction of these words, but what was intended by the contracting parties at the time they drew that clause; and I maintain that the intention of the parties is the best evidence in the world as to what the meaning of the treaty is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is good evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the hon. gentleman this afternoon denounced me in right good set terms for having ventured to say, not that such was the construction of the treaty, but that it was open to such a contention; and after he had denounced me for saying that I had no doubt that would be contended for by the United States, what does he say to-night? I have no doubt, in the broad comity of nations, the word "outfit" will include the word "bait"—just what I was contending this afternoon when I pointed out that it was important that we should know exactly what the meaning of the treaty was before it passed. The hon. gentleman says that by this clause, in consequence of any casualty or stress of weather, the American fishermen may load, unload, tranship or sell, if transhipment, unloading or selling are incidental to repairs consequent on that stress of weather or casualty. We do not differ on that point, but the difficulty was in applying a practical construction to the clause. If a man reports that under stress of weather he has been driven into a harbor and contends that it is necessary to make repairs and to tranship, there is nobody who can control him, and it is therefore a matter open to endless litigation, difficulties and disputes. The hon. gentleman was right enough in calling our attention to the fact that under article 11 of the

Mr. MITCHELL.

reaty, special provision is made enabling the American fishermen to purchase provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfit, under a certain state of facts recited in that clause, and the hon. gentleman said that provision having been made in that article for the purchase of supplies and outfit, it is perfectly plain those articles can be purchased under the 6th section of this Bill. But the hon. gentleman is wrong, because while these may be purchased under the 11th article of the treaty when the contingency which brings it into operation arises, they may also be purchased under the 6th section. He admits that they may be driven in by stress of weather, and it is necessary, as incidental to repairs, that they shall purchase an outfit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says no doubt they can, irrespective of the 11th article, altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are two different cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman states the argument which I barely suggested, and for the suggestion of which he denounced me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, the hon. gentleman did, but I am not going to bandy words any longer. I am satisfied I was right in calling the attention of the House to the true meaning of these two important clauses of the treaty, and I am satisfied that the suggestions I made as to the possible construction of those two sections has received the endorsement of the hon. gentleman himself, and, so far as my remarks this afternoon were concerned, instead of denouncing me as he did in the extreme language he used, I deserved his approbation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before we read these two sections I would just say a few words. I do not think my hon. friend was open to the animadversions of the hon. the Minister of Finance when my hon. friend called the hon. gentleman's attention to the possible construction that might be put by the opposite party upon the provisions contained in these two sections. Nor do I think that because we have no power to amend the provisions of the treaty, we ought, therefore, not to discuss them or seek to ascertain precisely what they mean. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that we have no power to alter a single line or word of the treaty. There is no doubt of that, but we are called upon to ratify the treaty; and being called upon to ratify it, although we have voted once on the second reading, the very object of going into committee and taking another reading of the Bill, which the hon. gentleman proposes to ratify the treaty, is to give the House an opportunity of reconsidering that which is done; and if, upon examination, it is found that these provisions of the treaty were not what we for the moment supposed they were, but were of a different character and conceded more than we were willing to concede, this House would be altogether remiss in its duty if it did not avail itself of the opportunity afforded it, at the different stages of the Bill, to reconsider what it had already done. I do not think that the Minister was called upon to commit himself to anything when he was asked to state what was the intent of these sections. We did not ask the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, to state his views; we did not call upon him, as we might have called upon the Minister of Justice, to state his views. But the hon. gentleman was a party to these negotiations; he knows what propositions or counter-propositions were made; he knows what the protocols contained and the arguments accompanying them; and that being the case, what we supposed the hon. gentleman would do would be to put upon record his view of what was right, and of what was most favorable, if at all defensible, to this country. That, I think, was a legitimate demand,

and the hon. gentleman had no right to take exception to the question put him, because it would be in the highest degree preposterous to suppose that we should here go into committee to consider the various propositions of the Bill, and confirm what was done in Washington in negotiating the treaty, and, at the same time, refuse to consider the meaning and purport of each of its propositions. Now the hon. gentleman has stated the meaning, and I do not think he has imperilled the fate of the treaty here or at Washington by that statement. The hon. gentleman has told us under what circumstances the American fishermen might buy bait under this 6th section. There is no doubt that a certain contingency may arise when that may be done, and that it is not the universal application of the treaty, or else its other provisions would be wholly unnecessary. The other provisions preclude the possibility of putting a construction on this section other than this, that when the vessel loses part of its outfit by stress of weather and is obliged to put into port, it may have an opportunity of supplementing what remains by purchasing the necessary supplies. Well, the hon. gentleman might as well have said that without the indignant denunciation he made of my hon. friend as to say it now, we were quite right in endeavoring to ascertain precisely what was intended by this treaty; and it does seem to me that the discussion having thrown some light upon the intention of the parties to it, the hon. gentleman has nothing of which to complain in the criticisms of my hon. friend.

On section 9,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to ask what is the reason for the modification or limitation of the penalties which, up to this day, have attached to the offense of preparing to fish within the prescribed waters. The hon. gentleman says that under the Imperial Act the two offenses of fishing and preparing to fish were accompanied with forfeitures in both instances; and it seems to me that the offence of actually preparing to fish, the vessel being in prohibited waters, ought to be punishable with forfeiture just as much as actual fishing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is quite familiar with the fact that very great difficulties have arisen in connection with the question of preparing to fish, and he will observe that under this clause a vessel may be forfeited for preparing to fish. But this gives to the judge, if he thinks that the question is not sufficiently clear, that the preparing to fish had not gone to the extent of making it necessary to forfeit the vessel, the power to apply a lesser penalty; but, inasmuch as the clause still contains a provision leaving it in the discretion of the judge to forfeit the vessel and everything appertaining to her, my hon. friend will see, I think, that it is more calculated for the efficient and vigorous carrying out of the law than if it were left without giving the judge the discretion which is given under this clause.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the chief plenipotentiary on the side of Great Britain, in several speeches and representations in regard to this treaty, seemed to take great credit because the proceedings had been rendered more easy and more cheap than they were previously. What is the meaning of the words "shall be conducted in a summary manner?" Surely these proceedings must be conducted under the Vice-Admiralty Court, which every one knows has an exceedingly summary mode of procedure.

Mr. THOMPSON. Undoubtedly the proceedings must be conducted according to the practice of the Vice-Admiralty

Court, but the hon. gentleman will remember that that court has discretion in matters of procedure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see that the judges of that court can lay down any practice which is not prescribed by statute.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think anything further could be done by this Parliament than simply to enact the words of the treaty in this regard, whatever weight they may have, and it is possible that, if the procedure of the court is not found to be of sufficiently summary character, and if any further powers are required for the Vice-Admiralty judges to modify the practice, legislation elsewhere may be necessary, but, in the meantime, it is well that our statute should embody the words of the treaty. I have no doubt that, without any enactment of the kind, if the Vice-Admiralty judges are willing to do so, the proceedings can be made very summary and comparatively inexpensive. Practically, if the proceedings are made summary, they are inexpensive, and it is only when the proceedings are of a more formal character as regards the pleadings, which may extend to great length, as they sometimes do, that the expenses become large; but, if it is necessary to enforce upon the court any amendments to their practice, until we have legislation in England to transfer to us the jurisdiction over the Vice-Admiralty courts, it may be necessary to seek special legislation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The question is whether we have any power over the Vice-Admiralty courts.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think we have not.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The practice now is really as summary as it possibly can be. Does the hon. gentleman propose that the Vice-Admiralty Court should sit in any one place—for instance, in St. John for New Brunswick and in Halifax for Nova Scotia? I think the statute provides that these courts shall sit in those places. Now it is provided, as I understand, that the court shall be an ambulatory court, but I think that will add to the expense much more than if they sat in the same place, because we know that the great expense of these courts is incurred in the travelling of the judges and their officers. I do not exactly understand what is meant by the provision of this clause. Does it mean that if a vessel is seized at Pictou, for instance, the Court shall sit there?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, for the purposes of the trial, though the hearing might take place at the capital.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). At present the trial is mostly by affidavits.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not always now.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Of course, there is a *viva voce* examination also, but the great expense now is incurred by the travelling.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is contemplated that power should be given to the judge to go to the place of the detention of the vessel, but I quite agree that in most cases there would be less expense in trying the matter at the capital than there would be in trying it at the place of detention. It is easier for the vessel to go to the capital, where the people can get the advice and assistance of their consul and where they can get counsel; but it is discretionary with the judge on the application of the defence to go to the place of detention. That is, that the Crown shall not apply to fix the place of trial.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Must not that power be given by Imperial statute?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite possible that that will be so. In all probability, before long, we shall have jurisdiction over these courts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) As I understand, this gives to the American Government the right to make the subject of the constitution of the Admiralty Court for this purpose a matter of diplomatic controversy, and to ask the Imperial Government to simplify the proceedings of the court and make them less expensive. The American Government would have a right to complain if they thought there was unnecessary delay or unnecessary expense, and they might suggest what provisions they thought would be necessary to carry this article into effect.

Mr. THOMPSON. I concur with the hon. gentleman to this extent that, if it were found, under the practice of the Vice-Admiralty Court, that the proceedings were of such a character as not to fulfil the provisions of this article of the treaty, that they were not summary and inexpensive, the American Government would have a right to ask, and we would have a right to ask, that the practice should be simplified *quoad* those proceedings.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would it not be necessary to have additional legislation under any circumstance?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. I think, if prompt attention is given to it by the courts, the practice can be made summary and inexpensive. The great difficulty in the adjudication of these Admiralty cases is that the judges who conduct the business of those courts have a great many other judicial engagements, but we have power to appoint assistant judges if necessary, and, if those judges are overburdened with work, it will be very easy to appoint assistant judges with the approval of His Excellency, and in that way delay will be avoided, and the proceedings will be made summary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think some Imperial statute will have to be passed on the subject, because, under the treaty, every step, every action or proceeding, in every city, has to take place at the place of detention. I am under the impression, as the courts are now constituted, those cases can be heard alone at Halifax, or St. John, or Charlottetown, as the case may be, and the judge has no power to try a case, for instance, at Canso if a vessel is detained there, or at Pictou. I fancy the some Imperial legislation has got to take place to carry that section of the treaty out.

Section 12, sub-section 3.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) Will the hon. gentleman explain the reason for making an exception in favor of bait? Is he not afraid it will lead to smuggling along the coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That provision was introduced especially to meet the practice in Newfoundland. In Newfoundland, as I dare say my hon. friend knows, it is the practice of American fishing vessels to sell the small fish that they do not wish to form a portion of their cargo to take back, to the person who catches the bait on the shores of Newfoundland. The practice is to exchange one class of fish for the bait. It was in order to meet that difficulty that we provided not to interfere with a practice that has become very prevalent there, and we provided that bait might be subject to barter.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) Of course I can see the force of the explanation. But is the hon. gentleman not afraid that it will lead to smuggling all along our own coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, for the reason that no American fishing vessel can come into our waters at all, or be in a position to buy bait, without first obtaining a license, and the moment she obtains a license, she brings herself under the surveillance of the officers of the courts, and they can at once ascertain whether she has goods on board for the purpose of exchanging them with the inhabitants for bait. The fact that she has to obtain a license in order to buy

Mr. THOMPSON.

bait, will bring her into a position that will make it extremely difficult for her to violate the customs law.

On section 14.

Mr. JONES (Halifax.) With regard to this amount to be received for licenses, does the Government propose putting that into the revenues of Canada? It would almost appear that they are selling the privileges of the fishermen for the sake of getting a certain amount of money to go into the revenues of the country. Should there not be some understanding that the money derived in that way should be added to the bounty which the fishermen now get? It may amount to a considerable sum, and I think it would be a fair mode of disposing of the license fees received, to devote them to the use of the fishermen, because our fishermen certainly are going to be placed at a disadvantage if these people are allowed to come in, and the money received for licenses should be distributed among them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject has not yet received the consideration of the Government. It is an old adage, First catch your hare; and before we give ourselves a great deal of trouble as to the disposition of this money, it will be necessary to obtain it. It is not exactly as the hon. gentleman says. The tonnage fee that requires to be paid by American fishermen will correspond to the duty that our fishermen in the meantime have to pay in the ports of the United States; and the hon. gentleman will see that the fact that they are obliged to obtain these commercial privileges by the payment of this tonnage fee, does not give them the advantage they would otherwise enjoy in competing with our fishermen in the markets of the United States. But the suggestion the hon. gentleman has thrown out is one that he is quite aware would commend itself very much to the consideration of this Government, who have always exercised such a paternal care for the interests of the fishermen.

On sub-section 4,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This clause was really for the purpose of enabling a vessel running in for shelter and running out again, not entering for wood and water, but purely and simply for shelter, to avoid any detention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am rather inclined to think that the intention was not exactly carried out by the treaty. There are four purposes named, two of which are wood and water, and if American vessels come in for wood and water it is perfectly clear that they must communicate with the shore. So this proviso seems to nullify the concession so far as regards wood and water.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under this section it is competent for the Government to maintain the existence of the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish this to be understood clearly. We delegate to the Government the right to continue the *modus vivendi* for two years even notwithstanding the rejection of the treaty by the Senate of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We would have power to do it by avoiding a proclamation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Parliament delegates to the Governor in Council power to maintain the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For the two years only.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The *modus vivendi* is only for two years, and it would be for any such portion as the Governor in Council may see fit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the Government arrived at any policy on that question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, they have not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They have not come to any conclusion in regard to giving them the advantage of the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has not been considered. We simply propose to take power to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what possible combination of circumstances would the hon. gentleman think it desirable to continue the *modus vivendi* provided the treaty were absolutely rejected by the United States Senate? The hon. gentleman evidently has considered the question, because he retained to himself powers to maintain the *modus vivendi*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the spirit running through the whole of this treaty is to avoid difficulty as far as possible, and it will be quite possible even in the event of rejection of the treaty by the Senate to anticipate its adoption at a very early day; and if under those circumstances there was reason to suspect after the presidential election that the question would stand in a different position, it would be very desirable to have the means to avoid any friction in the matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the treaty were rejected by the Senate it would be practically dead.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Technically perhaps not. I am in hope, first, that that will not occur; and, second, even if it did, the hon. gentleman will see that if the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, having practically come to an agreement, found at an early day that the position was favorable to having the subject dealt with in a different way, that difficulty could be got over without much trouble.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman to take these powers is a reasonable one, and I do not think the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will object to it. If we were on the rejection of the treaty by the United States to drop the *modus vivendi*, it would be sure to revive those troubles which the hon. gentleman hopes are pretty well allayed, and I therefore think this is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the treaty is rejected, it is at an end and a dead letter so far as it is a treaty between the two countries, and if the hon. gentleman will reflect for a moment he will see that if these rights are continued for a certain period they must be continued for all time.

Mr. MITCHELL. No. We have reserved scarcely anything by the treaty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the contention I have made all through, and that is the conclusion I have arrived at. As the American people must see that they have gained everything by this treaty, it matters to us very little whether they enjoyed those privileges for the full two years provided by the *modus vivendi* or not. One thing is clear, that we would never be able to enforce our rights subsequently without the British Government behind us, and then it would arouse irritation and bad feeling. But I do not agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who contends that if the Americans exercise these privileges for two years, they will have them for all time; but if they enjoyed them during two years under this arrange-

ment, the privilege might be continued under a new treaty based upon the same lines.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This section immediately becomes law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope there will be no address from this House containing congratulations to Mr. Chamberlain and his other colleague, Sir Sackville West, for the great success they have had in giving away the interests of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in reply to my hon. friend that I shall feel that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries have had everything that they could possibly expect when this House by an unanimous vote has ratified their proceedings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have one statement to make. It does seem to me obvious that the last section of the Act which we have just passed by this House is really going further than the plenipotentiaries offered in their proposition for a *modus vivendi*. That *modus vivendi* of the British plenipotentiaries set out the following:

"The treaty having been signed the British plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland. In the absence of such ratification the old conditions which have given rise to so much friction and irritation might be revived and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned. Under these circumstances and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subjects of controversy the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

This was to provide for a state of affairs pending the ratification of the treaty, but there was no proposition, as I understand it, made by the British plenipotentiaries providing that the *modus vivendi* should remain in force in the event of the Senate absolutely rejecting the treaty. The hon. gentleman now has taken power, and if it should be rejected, from what has fallen from him it is perfectly plain that the Government intends to act upon this, that whether the treaty is ratified or rejected the *modus vivendi* remains in force for two years.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand it was only intended in the event of the treaty being held over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was what was intended, but we are going further now.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that a little too rapid? You taunted us with the fact that we had unanimously adopted this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will not taunt us again if we let it go?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

INCREASE IN SALARY OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHAS. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 87) to amend the "Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act," chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, the first clause of this Bill provides that the salary of the Auditor General shall be increased to \$4,000

per annum. In asking the House to consent to the proposed increase of salary to the Auditor General from \$3,200 to \$4,000 per annum, I think it but right to state that the present Auditor General, as hon. members are probably aware, assumed office on the 1st August, 1878, at which time the office, previously held in conjunction with that of the Deputy Minister of Finance, was separated from the Finance Department and established on a similar basis as is the office of Comptroller and Auditor General in England. The Auditor General has had in effect to organise an audit staff, and to reorganise the system of audit. Beginning with the audit of the appropriation accounts, he has year by year examined more and more closely into the expenditure voted by Parliament, the result of which, as hon. members well know, is set forth in the voluminous report which has been distributed under the direction of Parliament. He has from time to time, had in addition to the audit of the appropriation accounts, submitted to him for examination and audit, the bank accounts of the Dominion, the Indian accounts, and all the trust accounts and open accounts which the Government have opened with other Governments or with banks or financial agents. During the last year, as his office steadily progressed, the Government have delegated to him the power of auditing the receipts of the Dominion. In fact, it may be said, that at this moment every cent received or paid out on account of the Dominion of Canada is subject to the review and audit of the Auditor General. His duties have increased so much that the Government have felt it only right to ask for the increase named in the Bill and they are sure that it will receive the consent of members of both sides of the House. Perhaps it may be as well here to give to hon. members a sketch of what has been accomplished thus far by the system of audit established. Every item of the Dominion expenditure of over \$40,000,000 annually is examined in all its details, either before or after payment, and as has been alluded to before, the whole revenue is now being examined in the same way as is done in England, and this audit both of expenditure and receipts has tended to greater watchfulness on the part of the different departments. Apart from the keeping of the appropriation ledgers, both general and revenue, personal accounts have had to be kept of all advances made in all departments; bank accounts, railway subsidies, debt accounts, have all to be scrutinized, and coupons examined; the accounts of the election held in 1887 were reviewed by him and claims on that head reduced by some \$26,000; similarly on the franchise accounts, claims have been reduced by some \$61,000. Hereafter the stores accounts will be more thoroughly brought under examination. His annual report, containing as it does, a classification of every item both of revenue and expenditure, and containing statements and tables that require much more care than might be supposed from their size, is more complete both as to number of details and clearness of definition than any report, dealing with the same variety of accounts and equal magnitude of sums, published by any other country in the world. Hon. members who attend the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee will recognise the labor entailed in the production of all the statements and vouchers required by that committee. I think it will not be necessary for me to make any further reference to the onerous duties of the office, further than to say that all this has been accomplished by a staff of 25, including the Assistant Auditor and extra clerks. The few amendments to the Audit Act, composing the other sections of this Bill, are all introduced with the idea of making the Act uniform in its details, and in no way detract from the powers given by the original Act to the Auditor General. I have only further to state that the Auditor General, while informing me of what has been done in the matter of carrying on the business of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

his office, has asked me to mention that the loyalty to the office of all the members of the staff, from the Assistant Auditor downwards, and their zeal and intelligence, cannot be too highly commended. I have no hesitation in saying, as the head of the Finance Department, and so being brought in constant and frequent intercourse with the Auditor General, that I believe it would be impossible for members of either side of this House to overrate the careful and painstaking ability of that officer or his conscientious devotion to the duties of the most important office which he discharges. He is in every sense of the word an officer of Parliament. Although he has felt it occasionally to be his duty to differ with members of the Administration and with the conduct of the affairs of the public departments in carrying out the details of his office, I have no hesitation in saying that he has discharged his duties in such a way as to win the confidence and hearty approval of every member of the Government, as I am sure he has earned it of every member of both sides of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is intended to be the effect of section 2, which provides that the Auditor General shall be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. At the present time the Auditor General can only be removed by an address of the two Houses to the Governor General, but under the provisions of this clause he would be placed at the mercy of the Government after he has reached a certain age, and would be removable at any time after that age by the Governor in Council. If that would be the effect of this clause, that certainly was not the intention when the Auditor General was appointed. It was intended to make the Auditor General here, as the Auditor General is in England, absolutely free from Governmental influence or control, in order that he might be as free as a judge to discharge his duties in accordance with the law. I do not object to his having a retiring allowance if he should retire, but I do not think it is necessary to extend to him in special terms the words of the Superannuation Act. A retiring allowance could be granted to him in some other way, allowing him to remain the independent officer that he is at the present time.

Mr. EDGAR. The 8th section of the Civil Service Superannuation Act would seem to place it in the power of the Government of the day to enforce retirement on the Auditor General, and surely it is not contemplated that that should be the case, because, as I understand, the Auditor General is supposed to be a statutory officer, entirely independent of the Government of the day. The Act gives the Government power, in the case of civil servants who have entered the service after the age of 30 years, as I believe was the case with the Auditor General, and who are possessed of some special qualification, to add something to the number of their years of service, and section 8 says:

"Retirement shall be compulsory on every person to whom the superannuation allowance hereinbefore mentioned is offered, and such offer shall not be considered as implying any censure upon the person to whom it is made; nor shall any person be considered as having any absolute right to such allowance, but it shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the time upon which it is calculated."

If that is really the effect of this clause, I should think the Government cannot desire that it should be so, and would provide in some other way for a suitable provision being made in case of the Auditor General's retirement.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think it is understood that the Auditor General should be independent of the Government, and be removable in the same way as a judge; but it seems to me that this clause placing him under the Superannuation Act will have the effect which

my hon. friend has just pointed out. The sub-section of section 8 of the Act further provides :

"Nothing herein contained shall be understood as impairing or affecting the right of the Governor in Council to dismiss or remove any person from the Civil Service."

To put the Auditor General under the Superannuation Act might give the Government right to dismiss him.

Mr. CASEY. If the Government merely wish to provide a retiring allowance to the Auditor General, I think they can do it in the same way as is done in the case of judges, who are only removable, like the Auditor General, by an address of both Houses of Parliament. The very usefulness of an Auditor General at all depends on his being utterly independent of the Government ; and I do not remember, although I was in the House at the time, that any of the hon. gentlemen opposite raised the slightest objection to the appointment of the Auditor General under these conditions ; and the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance this evening has been such as to lead us to believe that he approves of the Act under which the Auditor General was appointed, and does not wish to make him any less independent of the Government than he is now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say "hear, hear," and after that declaration he will doubtless say that it is more fitting to provide for the retiring allowance of the Auditor General in some other manner, and not to bring him under the control of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the last thing that the Government had in view in this Bill was to do anything that should enable us to interfere in the slightest degree with the position Parliament has given to the Auditor General. I quite concur in the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite that the value of this officer to a very great extent depends on the position he holds as an officer of Parliament, and the sole object we had in view in giving the benefit of the Superannuation Act, was to give a deserving officer the privileges which that Act would confer. But I do see a point in what has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this involves the contingency of the power of removal of the officer by the action of the Government, which certainly was not the intention. I will leave the clause over for such amendment as well enable us entirely to avoid any such thing.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have much pleasure in congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government on this act of justice to a most able officer. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that I urged this increase of salary upon him one or two years ago. Although I have always differed politically from Mr. Macdougall, our excellent Auditor General, I have always observed that he is one of the most efficient officers we have in the public service, and I again thank the Government for this somewhat tardy act of recognition of his services.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution :

That the salary of the Auditor General of Canada shall be four thousand dollars per annum, and that he shall be subject to the provisions of the "Civil Service Superannuation Act."

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It probably would meet the case if we were to move that section 8 of the Superannuation Act should not apply. That gives the benefit of the Act, to the officer, and takes away the power of compulsory retirement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act, providing for retiring allowances for the judges, he might make a similar provision in this case. Let him make no allusion to the Superannuation Act, and there will be no difficulty or misunderstanding.

Mr. BOWELL. If you adopt that plan, you relieve the Auditor General from the monthly payment of the superannuation fund, and place him in the same position as a judge. I understand a judge does not pay anything out of his salary towards the fund out of which he gets superannuation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The object we have in giving him the benefit of the Superannuation Act, is to confer its advantages upon him, and I meet the objection hon. gentlemen opposite have raised by the provision that this portion of the Superannuation Act shall not apply.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The proper course would be to give the Auditor General the same position as a judge, and let him, on retiring, get fifteen years. No doubt he would be free from paying to the Superannuation fund.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that will not do. There is a special law for judges. After fifteen years, they may ask to be pensioned off, and their pension amounts to two-thirds of their salary ; but in the Civil Service, after thirty-five years, the officers are entitled to 70 per cent. of their salary. It would not do to place the Auditor General in a different position in this respect from the other officers of the service. The hon. the Minister of Finance has admitted that it is not the intention of the Government to interfere with the Act of Parliament, which made the Auditor General a special officer under the control of both Houses, and I think therefore that the clause may be well amended by putting this officer under the Civil Service Act as regards the superannuation. He should contribute to the fund the same as any other civil officer.

Mr. LAURIER. There are two objects to be attained with regard to this officer : First, he must be kept independent of the Government. We all agree upon that point, and then we also agree on the second point that he should be provided a retiring allowance. He will stand in a perfectly unique position. There will not be a parallel in the service to his case, and therefore there is no reason why we should not make a special law to enact that he will contribute to the Civil Service fund in the same way as other officers, and still not be under the control of the Government with regard to superannuation. A special law should be devised. It is just as much against the spirit of the Act respecting the Auditor General that the Government of the day should be entitled to reward him as that they should be enabled to punish him. Section 8, which the hon. the Finance Minister suggests might be left out, provides that under certain circumstances, the Government could compel the Auditor General to retire. Section 4 of the Act places it within the power of the Governor in Council to reward civil servants.

"The Governor in Council may, in the case of any person who entered the Civil Service after the age of thirty years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office to which he has appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, and to the actual number of years' service of such person, such further number of years not exceeding ten, as is considered equitable for reasons stated in the Order in Council made in the case."

It is not right that the Auditor General should be dependent on the Governor in Council to add years to his time of service. Section 5 provides the superannuation of every officer shall be preceded by an enquiry by the Treasury Board. Who will report as to whether it should take place or not ? That is not a desirable position in which to place the Audi-

tor General. Some further consideration should be given by the Government, and a special clause prepared.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the other hand, who is to decide when that officer is to be superannuated?

Mr. MITCHELL. Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Then the matter must be brought to Parliament by somebody. It should be brought by the Government. Supposing this officer is perfectly independent, as we are of opinion he should be, of the government, and you say he must contribute to the superannuation fund the same as any other officer, and is to be superannuated after so many years, when he becomes disabled, he should obtain his superannuation on the same scale as that fixed for any other officer of the Government. Well, the Auditor General will, most likely, when he finds he is failing in health, claim superannuation. He must write to some one, and he will write to the Government, which is the executive of the country. If you say that officer cannot be superannuated without the Government first coming to Parliament to obtain consent, he would not be different from any other officer. Because, if I am not mistaken, the Superannuation Act says that the names of the officers who are superannuated during the year must be reported to Parliament within so many days after the beginning of the Session. Therefore, this officer would be in the same position, and would be reported as such, but, suppose that officer becomes unfit for his work and is unable to claim his superannuation, is the Government to wait for six or eight months till Parliament meets before it can have an officer to discharge those duties?

Mr. LAURIER. Suppose he is unfit for his work to-day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Suppose he is unfit for his work at any time. The case never arose before, but it is well to discuss it now. Suppose that officer is unfit for his work. He does not ask for his superannuation, or perhaps he is unable to ask for his superannuation. What is to be done? Are we to remain five or six or eight months without an Auditor? I think not. I think, if the Auditor is unfit for his work, the Government should have the responsibility of replacing that officer during the year until Parliament meets, and should then report to Parliament and let Parliament deal with the matter. The Government would report the circumstances and would say: We had to put some one in there to fulfil those duties; we could not leave the accounts without audit during all those months. But if the officer applies for superannuation, the Government should have the power to grant it if he is unfit for his work. But, if he asks for superannuation and he is still fit for his work, the Government should not grant it, and the Government would have to report to Parliament that the officer had asked for superannuation, but that the Government did not think he was unfit for his work, and therefore did not think he should be superannuated. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke said the Auditor General should be altogether independent of the Government, that we should not be in a position to increase his salary or to give him any preferment. That is hardly the thing. We are doing the very contrary now.

An hon. MEMBER. Parliament is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The initiative comes from the executive, and I must say, continuing what the Minister of Finance said just now, that the Auditor General, who was, when he was in Parliament, opposed to us, and voted conscientiously against us, as we voted against his party and against himself, though he has an arduous duty to perform, a very difficult and a very unpopular duty, has performed his duties well. The Auditor General has never been a popular officer, and he never will be a popular officer, because his duties must make him unpopular. He is in the

Mr. LAURIER.

way of everyone. He is in the way of the ordinary officers, he is in the way of the Deputy Ministers, and, no doubt, very often he is in the way of the Ministers as well; and that is the reason why the office was created, and that is why we have supported him, because we think that, when Parliament in its wisdom created that officer, it did so for the purpose in accordance with which he is now acting. I think we agree on both sides as to what is to be done with this officer, and probably the best way would be to pass the resolution, report it, and go into Committee of the Whole on another day and amend it in the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit this point for the consideration of the Minister. To-day, as the law stands, the office of Auditor General can be vacated by death, resignation or by removal on a resolution of the House. It is not intended that, as far as that provision of the law is concerned, there should be any amendment. The only thing contemplated is that, if the Auditor was stricken by disease, he should not be left penniless, but should have the same provision as other public servants have. I would suggest that some such clause as this would meet the case:

"The Auditor shall have the privilege of contributing to the Superannuation Fund, and, if he resigns or is removed, he will be entitled to the same superannuation pension as if he belonged to the Civil Service."

I think that clause would meet the case.

Mr. THOMPSON. My own view is that we had better adopt the clause as amended, and, as the Bill has to go before the Committee of the Whole, I will consider the matter subsequently. I think it might be better to adopt the terms now proposed, or to make the whole of the clauses of the Superannuation Act apply to the Auditor Act. I think nearly every provision of that Act should apply to him except section 8, which makes the retirement compulsory. It has been suggested that this would put him too much in the hands of the Government, that the Government would have to reward him by adding to his years of service, and that the Treasury Board in that way would have the power to influence him. Look at the position now. The Auditor is entitled to no superannuation allowance. Parliament can provide for him, but it can only provide for him by an Act, so that practically he is now in the hands of the Government in that way, and the only control which we would have would be that, if that officer applied for superannuation to-morrow, the Treasury Board would have to ascertain his term of service and report whether, being a zealous officer, we should add to his term of service. It seems to me that, in any case, it would be absolutely necessary that the Treasury Board should have the right to investigate whether the officer has arrived at the time of life or is suffering from such an infirmity as would entitle him to superannuation.

Mr. CASEY. It is clear that this officer, being an able officer, and there being no provision for his superannuation, he must be put under some regulations, either under a special set of regulations involving perhaps nearly the whole of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or under a set of regulations which are already applicable to another class of officials, and I urge that he should be placed under the set of regulations which apply to that class of officials—I refer to the judges.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will observe that in that case, in the first place, he would not have to contribute to the superannuation fund, in the second place he would be entitled to two-thirds of his salary if he became infirm the day after he was appointed, and he would be entitled to retire on an allowance for fifteen years service.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt he would have certain privileges under those circumstances which he would not have under the proposed provision. He would not have to contribute

to any superannuation fund, and he would be entitled to a two-thirds allowance after a certain period. The hon. the Minister of Justice knows better than I do after what term of years he would be entitled to that. If judges are entitled to these privileges, why should not the Auditor General be, who is practically a judge, whom position is more important and more responsible than that of any judge in Canada, not excepting the chief justice of the Supreme Court? In his relations to the people of the country, he has more to do with the rights and wrongs of the people, and has more control over the executive, than any judge in Canada. I contend that the Auditor General should not have to contribute to the superannuation fund. There is no more reason why he should not contribute than a judge, there is no reason why he should not have the same privilege of retirement as a judge. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has raised a great many objections, and has taken the ground that the Government should have power of summary dismissal while Parliament is not sitting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, the hon. Minister raised this point. He said: Suppose the Auditor General became unfit for his duties; say, for instance, that he became insane during the recess of Parliament. He said: Are we to go on—I understood him to say so—seven or eight months with an Auditor General not fit to perform his duties, and have to wait until Parliament meets before we can have another Auditor General? Well, Sir, apply the same argument in the case of judges. When a judge becomes insane—if such a thing should happen; I do not know that I ever heard of a judge becoming insane—but if, for instance, the chief justice of the Supreme Court became insane, what are you going to do with him until Parliament meets? You cannot turn out the chief justice, or the judge of any court in Canada, until Parliament meets again; and we have never had any practical difficulty from that provision of the law. If there is no difficulty in the case of judges, who are so numerous, is it likely that difficulties will arise in the case of this one officer? All the arguments that the Minister of Public Works used to show that the Government should have the right to remove between sessions of the House, an Auditor General who may be, we will say, insane, or unfit for his duty in any way, would apply to the case of Government removing a judge who had become unfit for his duty in any way between sessions of Parliament. Of course, a judge who is insane, I suppose, could be put in a lunatic asylum like anybody else, and there would be a vacancy in that case, and *ipso facto* the same in the case of an Auditor General. If he became unfit for his duty by insanity, he would go to a lunatic asylum. If it was urged that he was unfit for any other reason, then the Minister of Public Works says the Government should have the right to decide whether he is unfit or not, but the existing Act says no decision shall be passed on that point until Parliament meets again, and I think it is proper that no decision should be passed upon his fitness or his unfitness, or in any other respect than insanity, or absolute incapacity of that kind, until Parliament shall meet again. Both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice have argued at length as to how his superannuation could be accomplished in any case, there would have to be an application to the Government and so on. How is it accomplished in the case of judges? A judge, when he chooses to retire at a stated period, resigns and applies for his superannuation allowance. Why not do the same thing in the case of the Auditor General? If you are going to create an analogy between the Auditor General and any other class of officials whatever, if you are going to place him under the regulations which govern any other class of officials, why not put him, in accordance with common sense, under the same conditions as those which

regulate the retirement of that class of officials whose position is analogous to his own? Put him under regulations applying to judges. If you want to put him under any Act, put him under the Judiciary Act, instead of the Civil Service Act. It must be kept clearly and distinctly in mind that there is no analogy whatever between the position of Auditor General and a civil servant of the highest grade—no matter how highly he is paid or what his duties are. The Auditor General is an officer of this House, put there as a check upon expenditure, and there must be no analogy created between him and any member of the Civil Service whatever.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me, otherwise he would not have made the statement he did just now. I did not say that because an Auditor General might become unfit for his work, the Government should immediately interfere. But I supposed the case of an Auditor General who, after Parliament has been prorogued, becomes insane. Are we to understand that for the remainder of the year, until Parliament meets again, the Government shall have no Auditor General, that the public accounts shall not be audited?

Mr. CASEY. What do you do with a judge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will speak of the judge afterwards. Suppose the Auditor General becomes insane. The accounts still have to be audited and we must have another. The hon. gentleman asks, if a judge becomes insane, do we have to replace him? Of course not; but all the judges will not become insane at the same time, and if they became all insane at the same time, probably a strong remedy would have to be applied. But the hon. gentleman said the Auditor General must be put in the same position as a judge, and as a judge applies for his superannuation after 15 years, so the Auditor General should be allowed his superannuation after 15 years. But the hon. gentleman forgets that although a judge may apply for his superannuation, the Government is not bound to give it. The Government examine whether that judge deserves to be superannuated, whether he may not be fit to continue to serve his country, and if they find that he has no claim to superannuation, they say to him: No, we cannot give you superannuation, because you are fit to continue your labor. The hon. gentleman says that we should put the Auditor General out of the reach of the Executive. But the hon. gentleman would put him entirely into the hands of the Government, because he would authorise us to refuse or to grant superannuation, to reward him for his good services, for dereliction of his duty in being too lenient towards other officials or towards the Government. I think the hon. gentleman has established no comparison between the position of a judge and that of an Auditor General. But there is no doubt that if you want the Auditor General to be as we always wish him to be, independent of the Government for the time being, he should be made subject to the Superannuation Act, and he must contribute as any other officer. Why not?

Mr. CASEY. Why does not a judge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is not a judge, he is an officer. He has never been called a judge, except this evening by the hon. gentleman. He is an officer of the Government, like any other officer, with this exception, that Parliament has declared that he shall not be removed by the Government, but only by Parliament. Very well, but that does not prevent his being put under the Superannuation Act, provided that clause put him under the control of the executive. But why should he not contribute as well as any other officer? There is no reason why he should not. The highest officers, men receiving the highest salaries, are made to contribute as well as those receiving lower salaries. Let him be put on the same footing as the others.

Why, after 15 years, should that officer be entitled to two-thirds of his salary, without contributing to the fund? The Deputy Heads, after fifteen years, would have only 30 per cent. of their salaries. It is not fair, it is not just to the other officers, and, therefore, if he is to be superannuated at any time when he becomes unfit for his work, he should contribute to the fund as well as the others.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree with the hon. Minister that he is in any sense an officer of the Government. In fact he is distinctly by law not an officer of the Government. He is not in any degree analogous to any other servant. He is a statutory officer like a judge, and he is completely analogous, in his duties, in his appointment, and in the method of his removal to a judge. The Minister says: Why should he not contribute to the superannuation fund? Why? The burden of proof rests on the Government to show why he should contribute, and the analogies go to show that he should not contribute to the superannuation fund. His office and duties are analogous to that of a judge and not to a civil servant. He is in no sense an officer of the Government; he is not removable by the whole Government combined or by the Governor General except by an address from both Houses of Parliament. He should, therefore, be placed in the same position as a judge. The Minister of Finance says that even a judge is subject in regard to superannuation to the decision of the Government. I do not grumble about that; but if it gives the Auditor General the same position as a judge, he will be as independent as a judge—and we know they are independent. As to the insanity question, I believe that if the Auditor General became insane and was placed in an asylum under the certificate of two medical men, his position would become vacant. I do not know whether an insane man could hold office or not; that is a question for lawyers. The main point is that there is no analogy between this officer's position and that of the deputy head of a department, with which the Minister of Public Works compared him; the analogy is with a judge and he should be placed in the same position.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is unnecessary at this stage to enter into the whole question as it is simply desired to carry a resolution respecting increase of salary and his right to superannuation under the Superannuation Act.

Mr. WELDON. There is no dispute as to the independent position which this officer should hold. I suggest that a special provision should be framed to meet this case so far as superannuation is concerned, as it will not properly come under the Superannuation Act. I would suggest that the true analogy in regard to the Auditor General is with the judge of the new Court of Exchequer, who is a single judge, and there should be a provision by which a temporary deputy to the Auditor-General might be appointed. If the principle is conceded that the Auditor General should be independent of the Government, that he should be an officer of the Parliament and only amenable to that body, we should take care that the provisions in regard to his superannuation should be a special provision, which would place him in a proper position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must get on with the measure or throw it over to the next Session. One portion of the resolution is to increase the salary paid to the Auditor General, which must commence by resolution. Another portion of the proposition is to provide for his superannuation, and that also must commence by resolution. When the Bill is introduced and is before the House, any portion of the Superannuation Act, which would not apply to this officer, could be especially referred to in the Bill. All we wish now to do is to adopt these two propositions: first, that the Auditor General shall have an increase in salary; and second, that he shall come under the Super-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

annuation Act, so as to have the right to claim a retiring allowance.

Mr. MILLS. I think the right hon. gentleman was not in his place when the discussion commenced. I believe he has the Act before him, and if he will look at its provisions he will observe that the whole drift of the Act is incompatible with the position of an Auditor. An Auditor is not an officer of the Government; but the Act deals solely with officers of the Government and no other class of officials. You cannot apply that Act to this case. You will be obliged to reconstruct the whole provisions of the law relating to the Auditor General from the beginning to the end in order to protect the independence of that officer as now constituted. I understood the Minister of Finance not to favor any interference with the independence of the Auditor General and not to seek to place him under the Administration. That being settled, you cannot apply the provisions of the Superannuation Act to him. If, as the First Minister says, and says rightly, we must commence by resolution with respect to providing for the superannuation of the officer, we need not state that the superannuation shall be under the provisions of the Superannuation Act. Leave out these words in the resolution. If we are obliged to fight this matter we do not intend to concede the principle which the Minister of Public Works has enunciated. The whole drift of his observations was that the officer ought to be under the control of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the hon. gentleman knows better than that. I have already given my negative to that, and surely the hon. gentleman should not repeat the statement, when I have already said it was not my belief, it was not my intention, it was not what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I only infer the hon. gentleman's meaning from what he said. I spoke of the difficulties that might arise if this officer were to become disabled or mentally disqualified and the observations the hon. gentleman made if they had any point at all were made on this line, that in order that the country might be perfectly secure, the office ought to be under the control of the Government. I enter my protest against that. The hon. gentleman says that was not what he meant in respect to his statement and I accept his explanation. I am pointing out that in this resolution relating to superannuation it is proposed it should be made under the provisions of the Superannuation Act. I am sure the First Minister and the Minister of Justice could have provided for the superannuation of this officer without referring to the Superannuation Act at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to remove the difficulty we can strike out the superannuation clause and let the motion remain, that the Auditor General gets an increase of salary merely. We shall leave the superannuation clause for another Session, and I do not think the Auditor General will be thankful to the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think that in a matter of this importance we should be driven from our position upon a mere technicality. The right hon. gentleman was not here when this discussion arose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have heard enough of it to know what it is.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps so, and the hon. gentleman sees that we believe the intention of the Government was very praiseworthy and on proper lines. We contend that this motion was not aptly expressed, because as it is expressed in the resolution and in the Bill it would place the officer in the power of the Government, and the Government repudiate this idea and say they do not want that. Therefore they must devise something else in order to keep the independence of the officer and provide an allowance

for him. The hon. gentleman now says, in a fit of temper, perhaps, that he should strike out this provision for the present. I do not propose that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You do.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it should be removed in its present form. We simply say that the officer shall not be subject to the Superannuation Act, but that he shall be allowed a superannuation allowance. Perhaps the idea of the Minister of Justice is a good one, that we might apply the whole of the Act except one or two clauses, but perhaps the suggestion which came from this side of the House would be the best one, that we should frame a special law for this officer as he is a special officer. If we carry the resolution as proposed to be amended it will, I have no doubt, meet the views of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. There are two sections in the Act, one saying his salary shall be \$4,000 and the other that he shall be subject to the provisions of the Superannuation Act. I do not see why we should pass more than the first resolution to-night as to his salary. The hon. the Finance Minister who is in charge of the Bill—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was until hon. gentlemen opposite took it out of my hands.

Mr. CASEY. That may be very smart. The hon. gentleman is in charge of the Bill and responsible for it, and before the Premier came into the House he agreed to let the matter of superannuation stand over and merely pass the first clause of the resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot do that, because it requires a special clause for superannuation.

Mr. CASEY. You can pass the resolution about his salary to-night and you can pass the resolution about superannuation later on when you have agreed to the terms of that arrangement. I quite understood before the Minister of Public Works spoke that form of the superannuation question was to be the subject of mature deliberation by the Government in the meantime.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that the hon. gentlemen opposite after expressing their views would allow this resolution to pass and it will be incorporated in the Bill. Before that Bill passes there can be such amendments made as will preserve the complete independence of the Auditor General. In the meantime by passing this resolution we get the assent of the House to give him a superannuation allowance.

Mr. LAURIER. For my part I see no objection to carry the resolution, but I shall endeavor to amend it before it is incorporated in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to an allowance for this officer as well as any other officer in the service.

Committee rose and reported the resolution.

ACT RESPECTING FERRIES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 39) to amend the Act respecting Ferries, chapter 97 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to. House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. This is a very important change in the law. It provides that we shall strike out the provisions that there shall be public competition for the licenses of ferries in

certain cases. I do not think we should do that without some very good reason. The original clause is:

"Every license for a ferry shall be under the Great Seal and shall be issued by the Governor in Council after public competition as hereinafter provided."

This amendment is to strike out those words "after public competition." I know the effect of this is limited by the other amendments to put it in force between Canada and the other countries and I know that according to the other amendments in this Bill public competition is still left in cases of other ferries. I would like an explanation from the Minister of Inland Revenue as to why public competition under this clause should be abolished.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The change has been correctly stated by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. The reason for repealing that portion of section 2 providing for public competition is to make it more convenient to establish such ferries. When I say establish, I use the word in a very limited sense, because all of these licensed ferries are now established, although it is quite possible that some few may be established hereafter. A new application might be made for an international ferry at some point where one does not now exist. The Act of 1872 provided that the Governor in Council could give leases for ferries all over the country, international as well as Canadian ferries; and in most cases they were given to the corporations of towns in the immediate vicinity of which those ferries were established. Government leases were given in some cases to the extent of 50 years without competition, and some of these leases are still running. We have not full control of these international ferries. The only right we can sell by public competition is the right connected with our own side of the river; we can give no rights to land on the opposite shore, and in many cases the arrangement will have to be made between the two parties. There is no power taken by the Governor in Council to interfere with existing leases, many of which have several years to run; but in many cases a large amount of capital has been invested in the maintenance of these ferries under a lease for a certain number of years, and it is thought wise to give the Governor in Council power to extend that time, for not more than ten years (although twenty years was asked), on being satisfied that the parties had performed their service satisfactorily to the public and had invested, perhaps \$100,000 in boats and other plant. That does not apply to Canadian ferries now under lease. On the first establishment of a ferry, tenders would be called for, and there would be competition as at present; but even in the case of Canadian ferries, that have performed their service satisfactorily to the public, and in which large amounts of capital have been invested, there is no reason why they should be taken from the people who have them and put up at public competition. When a lease expires, if tenders were called for, there might be dozens of tenders put in at a price that the existing licenses could not afford to pay, and these might be used as levers for the purpose of extorting money or imposing unfair conditions upon him. Therefore we think it would be safer to leave the extension of the time in the hands of the Government in Council. Of course, the Act as it stands, gives the Government in Council power to make regulations as to the toll that may be charged (which differs according to the localities), as to the time of crossing and the capacity of the boats. In most cases these ferries are not sources of revenue. The ferries generally established in the Provinces, or between one Province and another, are for the convenience of the public and not for revenue, and I am sure that in many cases the parties carrying them on derive little or no profit from them. I have been asked about arrearages. We have to take steps to collect in some cases, but I do not think the House would justify us in taking

arbitrary means to collect the license fees from those people who, in many cases, make little or no profit out of the money they have invested, especially in view of the fact that these fees are not imposed so much for revenue purposes as for the public convenience. So far as the present leases are concerned they will expire at the times fixed in the leases.

Mr. EDGAR. In answer to the enquiry I made about the reason for abolishing competition for the licenses of ferries between Canada and a foreign country, the hon. gentleman has gone into the whole subject of the amendments. As he has referred to these clauses of the Bill, I will refer to them also to show the extraordinary nature of the amendments. In the first place, he proposes that competition should not be required at all for licenses for ferries between Canada and foreign countries. That is one safeguard of the public that is proposed to be removed. Then, in the 3rd section, he provides that instead of ferry licenses being renewable for only five years, they may be granted or renewed by the Governor in Council for ten years without competition. That is a strong provision, and not at all in the public interest that I can see. Then, there is another attack upon the system of competition where, in cases of ferries between two Provinces, it is provided that without seeking for tenders, the Government may authorise the extension of a license for an additional period of five years. Now, that is entirely new, as is the provision for a license for ten years in a case between a Province and the foreign country. That is entirely new. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the difficulty is collecting fees from ferries and the unprofitable character of many of the ferries. But there is nothing in that to explain the reason why he asked Parliament to authorise these changes. He has not told us of any particular case in which it was not in the public interest to call for competition. It requires a very strong argument to convince any man that advertisements calling for applications for licenses for public institutions, like ferries, is not in the public interest. I cannot see any justice for any one of these changes. They put more power in the hands of the Government in connection with a matter in reference to which has heretofore taken the power out of their hands, to the extent of requiring tenders to be called for in the public interest.

The committee rose and reported.

Bill read the third time and passed.

[CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY COMPANY.]

The House resolved itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorised, be the 1st July, 1890, instead of the 1st July, 1889; also that the company may be accorded a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the first above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to seven per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The committee is so well acquainted with the subject, which has been before the House on a number of former occasions, as to make it unnecessary that I should take up the time of the committee explaining it now. It will be remembered that when the question of constructing and enlarging the canals was brought under the notice of the Government, a very able

Mr. COSTIGAN,

commission was organised, comprising the most able commercial as well as engineering talent in the country, and they reported that among the first canals which ought to be constructed in the interests of the Dominion was one to connect the waters of the Bay of Fundy with the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. A survey was made of that work and an estimate formed, that it would cost about \$5,000,000. Parliament adopted that estimate, and both the Government of the right hon. gentleman and the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, at a subsequent period, placed a million dollars in the Estimates for the purpose of proceeding with that work. In the meantime, Mr. Page revised the estimates, rock was discovered, and he increased the estimated cost from \$5,000,000 to \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000. In this case, hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that while they felt the work would warrant an expenditure of \$5,000,000, it would not warrant such a large expenditure as \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000, and its construction was abandoned. Subsequently the proposition was brought forward to accomplish the same object by the transport of the vessels from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of St. Lawrence by means of a ship railway, and Mr. Ketchum, an engineer of considerable ability, who gave a good deal of attention to that subject, took the work in hand. He brought forward a proposition to the Government, and he was told the only terms upon which we would submit it to the consideration of Parliament was that the entire risk should be borne by the capitalists who undertook the construction of the work. And subject to that it was provided that a sum of \$150,000 a year should be granted for twenty five years for the purpose of securing the construction of this ship railway, which was a work to take the place of the canal which was originally contemplated and for which Parliament had agreed to provide an expenditure of \$5,000,000, a work which would not only connect the waters of the St. Lawrence with the Bay of Fundy, but would bring the ports of Quebec and St. John 500 miles nearer together than they are now. But the commissioners, the very able engineers who first reported on the canal and took a large amount of testimony as to the traffic which would be promoted by the construction of that canal, led one to suppose that the trade and commerce of the country would be greatly facilitated by the construction of this work. The result was that Mr. Ketchum endeavored to float his scheme in the great money market of the world, but he was met by the difficulty that a ship railway of that extent was a novelty. In the London Docks, the means of lifting ships fully loaded by hydraulic pressure was exemplified every day. Every slip showed the feasibility of drawing up a large ship on rails. But the scheme which Mr. Ketchum submitted was a novel one. The question of the engineering difficulties was laid before the ablest engineers, and Mr. Fowler, who is an engineer second to none in London, gave the project his enthusiastic support.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was that engineer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Fowler, a man of the highest engineering talent in London. There were many engineers who had the same opinion, but I referred to Mr. Fowler especially because I had it from himself. He is a man of world-wide reputation, and he assured me that, having gone thoroughly with Mr. Ketchum into all the details of this scheme, he was prepared to pledge his professional reputation on its success, provided the capitalists were prepared to embark their money in a scheme which was altogether unprecedented. While I was absent from this Parliament, the terms were revised, and, instead of giving the company \$150,000 a year for twenty-five years, the amount was increased so as to give them the same sum, according to actuarial calculation, in twenty years. Mr. Ketchum, who has spent a large amount of money and of time in regard to this matter, who has expended his own private means in endeavoring to bring this work to a com-

pletion, and has met with difficulties of a financial character in connection with it, owing to the novel character of the work, has reason to believe that he has now found capitalists who are prepared to carry the work to a successful completion, but they ask that this change shall be made in the terms. They ask that there shall be an extension of time of one year for a completion of the work, and that there shall be a further time of twenty-four months allowed, subject to the payment of a penalty of \$5,000 a month for every month during which the work is uncompleted after July, 1890. It appears that twenty-four months is a large extension of time, but practically it is only an extension of twelve months, because there are only six months in the year available for the work, and if you gave an extension of twelve months it would really be only an extension of six months, which is the working period for the operation of the contract. Under the terms of the engagement made by Parliament with this company, all the responsibility rests upon the capitalists and upon the company. They are not only obliged, before they receive a dollar of public money, to complete the contract to the satisfaction of the Government, but they then receive the subsidy per annum only during the successful operation of the work. The extension of time amounts simply to this, that, if any untoward circumstances arose in regard to the completion of the contract, if they were prevented from completing it, if they were a month behind the time, they would have to abandon the entire contract after incurring the expenditure of this large amount of money. The extension of time is, therefore, practically only for twelve working months, and that is made in order to meet any unforeseen contingencies. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more at present than that Mr. Ketchum is very sanguine that, if this extension of time is granted, he will be able to raise the necessary capital and to proceed with the work vigorously.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to discuss the question to-night, or to offer any strenuous opposition to the enlarged time which is proposed to be given, but I must say that I regret that the Government continue to give their countenance to this scheme. Of course, I accept the statement that eminent engineers have given their adhesion to this scheme, but at the same time I have never been able to meet any practical man in the Maritime Provinces who believes that the scheme will be of any real utility. Two or three years ago, it was proposed to give an additional subsidy to this company, I think by the Minister of Agriculture at that time, the Hon. Mr. Pope.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No additional subsidy was proposed.

Mr. DAVIES. It was proposed to change the terms very much in favor of the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was simply making it 20 years instead of 25 years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At that time the scheme was characterised by such practical gentlemen as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and others, as a chimerical scheme, and it was stated that, even if it were accomplished, at an immense expense to the people of this country, it would be of very little advantage to the people of the Maritime Provinces. I have failed to meet, either in Prince Edward Island or in Nova Scotia, anyone who has any opinion that this could lead to much benefit to the people of the Maritime Provinces. It is no doubt possible to build a marine railway, and to carry a vessel over it, but I have questioned captains and shipowners in regard to it, and those who are interested in the export of produce, and I have not met anyone who did not laugh at the scheme. Perhaps, when the Bill is brought in, we may discuss it further, but the hon. gentleman has omitted to discuss the most important part of this resolution. The first section of

the Act provides that the term during which a subsidy may be granted from the consolidated revenue fund of Canada to this Chignecto Marine Railway Company, under provisions of the Act 47 Victoria, shall be for 20 instead of 25 years, and the amount shall be \$170,602, instead of \$150,000. That is one of the changes to which I referred increasing the subsidy, as provided for by the Act passed in 1886. I see the hon. gentleman proposes to make that \$5,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a clerical error. The substitution of \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000 is a clerical error, and it is to make the Act conform with the contract.

Mr. DAVIES. As it is printed here it is for \$5,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In my resolution for \$5,000,000, I proposed to provide the limited subsidy, so as to make up the net earnings to 7 per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000. I say that is simply to correct a clerical error, and does not alter the agreement with the Government at all.

Mr. DAVIES. It certainly alters the liability under the Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is no liability at all. The liability is precisely limited to the amount per annum to be paid for the 20 years, but this, instead of being a liability, is the very reverse; it is a provision by which, when the profits reach a certain figure, the Government shall be relieved, it is a relief from liability. It is a provision that when the profits reach 7 per cent. on a certain amount, the Government shall share equally the profit, and shall only be called upon for the balance between that and the amount we originally proposed to give.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will find that in one part of the Act it is correctly stated.

Resolution reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce a Bill founded on the said resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill introduced and read the first time.

THE REVISED STATUTES RESPECTING CUSTOMS.

Mr. BOWELL moved that Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes respecting the Customs, be read the second time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I think if the House will allow the Bill to be read a second time now, it will be much more convenient, as it contains a large number of clauses with a good many amendments, to discuss the particulars of each amendment in Committee. It will take some little time for me to explain the changes. I propose to take the second reading to-night, and refer it to committee to-morrow, and then move the resolution which has been placed upon the paper, and refer it to a committee, and we can enter into a full discussion in committee of each clause. If the House desires at that time, before going into committee, that I should make any lengthy explanation of the Bill, I shall be prepared to do so.

Mr. JONES. I think there will be no objection to that, but I would repeat the suggestion that it would be advisable to print this Bill with the exceptions in brackets. It is not easy to follow the discussion when so many sections are repealed and substituted by other sections. It appears to me that we could discuss this much more intelligently if the hon. gentleman will have this Bill printed with the sections he proposes to omit, and substituting the new sections.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I can meet the hon. gentleman's proposition. I have an explanation of every clause before

me, and the reason for the change, and as he has made the suggestion, I will have these printed before going into Committee so that each hon. member may get a copy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 527 of the *Debates*) respecting the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. We desire, in the first place, to explain what the word "value" means. In different sections of the Act at present the word "value" of goods occurred, sometimes the dutiable "value," and the object of this amendment is to provide that wherever the word "value" occurs it shall mean the duty-paid value of the goods in this market. This occurs now in some portions of the Act and in other portions it does not, leaving it open to discussion, particularly with lawyers, as to the particular meaning to be given to the word in particular cases in which it occurs. The second proposition is to change the penalty which is imposed for undervaluation. If a merchant imports an article, and enters it at 20 per cent. undervalue, he will be liable to a penalty of 50 per cent. of the duty. In other words, if an article is imported and entered at an undervaluation of 20 per cent., if the article is dutiable at 25 per cent. it pays 37½ per cent. I propose to change that so that when the value of the article is entered commencing at 10 per cent. under its real value in the market where it was purchased, the penalty, instead of being 50 per cent., will be only 10 per cent. of the duty, and so on in proportion as the value is increased. Under this proposition an article will have to be entered at 50 per cent. below its marketable value in the country where it is purchased before the penalty now imposed is enforced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You are relaxing the regulations.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. If the amount runs over 50 per cent. then it would be higher. I see the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) smiles; he does not think this can be possible. The hon. gentleman draws a distinction between making a law and administering it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was about to ask whether it was in the direction of relaxation or stringency.

Mr. BOWELL. In the direction of relaxation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad of it.

Mr. BOWELL. The next proposition in this resolution is one which affects the revenue. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) will direct his attention to clause twelve of the Act he will see that this proposal provides that the damage done to any article shall be based upon a valuation. That cannot apply equitably to damage which is done to sugar that pays duty upon its strength as proved by the polariscope. There is a certain reduction given when sugar is tested in the laboratory if it has salt water in it. Under the present system as the law reads a doubt has arisen as to whether the merchant is not entitled in addition to the allowance which is made when the strength of the sugar is tested by the polariscope, for whatever might be given by way of appraisement. I might give an illustration, a case that occurred in Montreal some time ago. There was certain damaged or supposed to be damaged sugar, and the valuers and underwriters who had insured it paid the importers 3½ per cent. as damage. They made a like demand on the customs for a reduction. Upon testing the sugar by the polariscope, and after making a thorough investigation as to what was supposed to be the damage done to the sugar, we found that no damage had actually been done at all, and the consequence was that we saved to the revenue by that investigation a very large sum, amounting into the thousands. I desire to put that matter at rest in future by changing the law in this particular.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). With respect to changes applicable to sugar—does the hon. gentleman propose to make any change in the polariscope test of sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. No, we do not propose to make any change as to the mode of levying the duty. This change is in order to prevent importers from being paid more than they should be paid in case of any damage being done to sugar by salt water or otherwise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this extra power taken to determine the value? Does it do away with the clause providing for appraisement?

Mr. BOWELL. No. It is to meet a case of this kind. A gentleman goes to a foreign country and buys an article, for which he pays say \$600. I give the hon. gentleman an actual case. Then he pays to the inventor \$200 a year for the use of it for ten years, and at the end of that time the article is not his property. Now, what is the value of the article for duty? That is only one among thousands of cases that arise all the time. The last provision provides for the abolition of giving bonds for the ex-warehousing of goods from one warehouse to another and transferred from one port to another. Under the present system every merchant, if he transfers any bonded goods from one warehouse to another at another port, has to supply bonds. When I tell the House that in Montreal, in one year, over 10,000 bonds are given, hon. gentlemen will readily understand the amount of work and expense attending the giving of those bonds. I propose to add to the Customs Act a provision which makes the owner of the goods liable in the penalties the moment he makes an ex-warehouse entry of the goods. It will relieve the trade of an immense amount of trouble, annoyance and expense, and at the same time will protect the revenue just as well as is done at the present time.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The original importers?

Mr. BOWELL. Any one who ever owned the goods, the original importer or a trader to whom the goods were transferred. If goods were transferred from Halifax to Brantford the merchant would have to give a bond. Under the proposition now before the House he would not have to give a bond, but the fact of his making an ex-warehouse entry would make him as liable.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I certainly think the Minister cannot be found fault with in this regard. It has been charged by traders and merchants that the hon. gentleman is a little severe at times, but the last provision is certainly in the interests of trade no less than the custom house officers. If the revenue is secured there is no reason why this cannot be done, and any one in trade can understand what the relief will be. He deserves the smiles of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) on this ground. The only danger I see is whether the Minister being given power to place value for duties, which he seems to think is necessary in some cases, there was danger of the exercise of arbitrary measures in some cases.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

Mr. BOWELL moved that said resolution be now read a second time, concurred in and referred to the committee with this Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 18, 1888.

No. 37.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) to enable the Central Ontario Railway Company to alter the location of their line of railway and to mortgage their road to a greater amount than \$20,000 per mile.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 103) to provide for the examination and licensing of persons employed as engineers elsewhere than on steamboats.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 105) to prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock."—(Mr. Boyle)

THE TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON (for Mr. WHITE, Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) further to amend chapter 51, Revised Statutes, "The Territories Real Property Act." He said: One of the purposes of this Act is to authorise the appointment of an inspector of registration offices in the North-West Territories, in order to secure uniformity of practice in regard to the registration of deeds. The other provisions of the Bill are principally intended to reduce in several particulars the expenditure connected with the registration and the practice of procuring certificates of titles.

Bill read the first time.

INONDATIONS DU SAINT-LAURENT.

M. BERNIER (pour M. PRÉFONTAINE) demande: Est-ce l'intention du gouvernement de mettre à exécution prochainement les moyens suggérés par diverses personnes, et entre autres par le capitaine Léger, en construisant des piliers sur le lac Saint-Louis, pour diminuer les dangers et les dommages de l'inondation du Saint-Laurent sur la rive sud dans les comtés de Laprairie, Chambly et Verchères? Si oui, un montant suffisant sera-t-il mis dans les estimés pour faire ces travaux dans le cours de la prochaine saison?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: En réponse à l'honorable député, je dois dire que le gouvernement a dû employer des experts relativement à cette question, et que nous ne sommes pas maintenant en position de dire quelle sera la décision du gouvernement à cet égard.

37-1888-1

KINGSTON DEPUTY POSTMASTER.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, 1. Whether the deputy postmaster of Kingston, William Shannon, was detected by the deputy inspector, or by any other officer, in the act of opening certain letters? 2. Why said deputy postmaster was not forthwith arrested? 3. Why the said deputy postmaster was allowed to depart to Cape Vincent, the succeeding day, without any interference? 4. Why no attempt was made by the Post Office authorities to arrest the said deputy postmaster, on his return to Kingston, some days since?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been reported to me that the deputy postmaster was detected in treating letters improperly; and when that report was made to me, it was also reported he had left the country. As soon as I saw this notice intimating that he had returned, I gave orders that he be proceeded against.

ONTARIO COUNTY JUDGES' SALARIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any addition to the salaries of the County Judges of the Province of Ontario?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not their intention.

DUTY ON BOOKS FOR MECHANICS' INSTITUTES.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to remove the duties on books imported for use by Mechanics' Institutes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

RICHARD MONCK, OF CHATHAM.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. LISTER) asked, When did Mr. Richard Monck, of Chatham, cease to be in the employ of the Government, and what is the total sum paid to him during the past year for services and disbursements?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I would say that Mr. Monck ceased to be in the employ of the Government in 1886; the exact date I have not got. There has been no money paid to him for services during the past year.

W. F. O'DONOGHUE.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, 1. When was Mr. W. F. O'Donoghue engaged as extra clerk in the Department of Agriculture? 2. When did he obtain leave to engage as Tory canvasser in the County of Russell? 3. Is his salary as extra clerk assured to him during his absence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. O'Donoghue was engaged as extra clerk in the Department of Agriculture in November last, and he is still receiving salary as such. He did not obtain any leave to engage as Tory canvasser in the County of Russell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then he went of his own accord.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And drew his pay.

SAUVAGES DE CAUGHNAWAGA.

M. DOYON demande—

Copie de toutes lettres, télégrammes et requêtes adressés par des Sauvages de la réserve de Caughnawaga au ministre de l'Intérieur, demandant une élection de chefs suivant les dispositions de l'Acte des Sauvages, et de toutes correspondances échangées à ce sujet entre les dits Sauvages, le ministre de l'Intérieur et l'agent de la réserve.

M. l'Orateur, je désire faire quelques observations au sujet de cette motion, et je le ferai aussi brièvement que possible. Au mois de décembre 1887, j'ai reçu une requête des sauvages de la réserve de Caughnawaga, portant cinquante-quatre signatures. J'ai présenté cette requête à l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur (M. White), accompagnée d'une lettre la recommandant à sa sérieuse attention. Comme cette requête énonçait en entier les griefs des sauvages, je m'en vais en donner communication à cette honorable Chambre. Elle est rédigée en anglais, et je la lirai de même.

"To the Honorable
The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa.

"SIR,—At a general meeting held this day, fourteenth of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven,

"We the undersigned members, braves of the Caughnawaga Reserve, solicit to be granted us to represent to you most respectfully:

"That from time immemorial, and since the establishment of our settlement here, in all occasions where our common interests are involved, and that the want is felt to be redressed, it is customary with us to implore your interposition as father and protector of our community, who is always willing to comply with our desires, being, as one should say, the representative of our noble mother, 'Queen Victoria,' for whom we have the profoundest veneration, and the Crown of whom our ancestors have so oftentimes defended;

"That in this instance the motive of our urgent prayer is of the most eminent character, which is the alteration in the Council of Chiefs; that is to say, a general election of a suitable number of chiefs, if not for the term of three years, as provided by law hereinafter mentioned, at least temporarily. The actual council is defective on account of its quorum being insufficient;

"That we deem it unnecessary to state in detail the extent of our grievances towards our chiefs; in a word, be it given us the humble expectation that the benefit of 'section 74 of the Indian Act of 1880' be applied to us;

"And your petitioners will ever pray.

"(Signed)

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| "Chas Kanatase, | Moses Niwennitaa, |
| "Martin Theahiashe, | John Thawennate, |
| "J. B. Anonsawenrate, | Francis Sakohentetha, |
| "J. B. Absentonni, | Joseph Thantakete, |
| "Peter Shoketowane, | Joseph Ariwaken, |
| "Thomas Ahiewate, | Jean Tehonwatase, |
| "Ignace Thahokathe, | Peter Katsitsakeron, |
| "Louis Tharonhatie, | Lazar Tharonhiorens, |
| "Louis Karonhontie, | Peter Shakorewatha, |
| "Chas Tekanbiatarekwen, | Joseph Thanonsokotha, |
| "Matias Shatekarenhes, | Peter Thawennoken, |
| "Louis Tekahonwake, | Peter Takatsitsaneken, |
| "James Karenhoton, | Joseph Shorakowane, |
| "Thomas Tekarenhontie, | Joseph Onetotako, |
| "Thomas Kahiaha, | Moses Mailloux, |
| "Ignace Tehonnatamhen, | Felix Thonitatie, |
| "John Shakowihe, | Joseph Karontasa, |
| "Toussaint Tionkwaronni, | Matias Tsatakentha, |
| "Francis Kaneratiich, | Wm. Shaonwentsowane, |
| "Louis Shoniatarowane, | Peter Niioherasa, |
| "Louis Wisekowa, | Francis Anonehitha, |
| "Louis Thairi, | René Shatekaronhies, |
| "Joseph Thiaaweron, | Francis Shawentanen, |
| "Louis Tekentashen, | Louis Thawennaienton, |
| "Ignace Aronhiakens, | Ignace Kanento, |
| "Peter Warenhiaki, | Ignace Thaseraren, |
| "Francis Thanonsokotha, | Louis Aronhiensere." |

Comme on le voit, ces Sauvages de Caughnawaga demandent, par leur requête au ministre de l'Intérieur, qu'il leur soit permis de faire l'élection de chefs pour leur tribu. Ils allèguent que depuis sept ans, ils n'ont pas eu telle élection; que plusieurs des chefs, qui dirigeaient les affaires de la tribu, sont morts ou inhabiles à agir comme

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

tels, et que, par conséquent, il ne leur reste plus que deux chefs, actuellement, à Caughnawaga. Voilà ce sur quoi ils se basent pour demander au gouvernement la permission, ainsi qu'il appert par la requête ci-dessus relatée, faire l'élection des chefs.

Je citerai encore l'art. 75, de l'Acte des Sauvages qui se lit comme suit :

Lorsque le gouverneur en conseil jugera à propos, pour le bon gouvernement d'une bande, d'introduire le système de l'élection des chefs, il pourra prescrire que les chefs d'une bande seront élus, comme il est ci-après prévu, aux temps et lieu que le surintendant général fixera; et ils seront, en ce cas, élus pour trois ans, mais pourront être déposés par le Gouverneur en Conseil pour cause de malhonnêteté, d'intempérance, d'immoralité ou d'incapacité; et ils pourront être dans la proportion d'un premier chef et de deux seconds chefs ou conseillers par chaque deux cents Sauvages.

Les détails n'y font rien. Aussi par leur requête, ils ne demandent pas une loi spéciale; mais ils demandent que la loi qui a été passée, en 1880, pour leur bénéfice, soit appliquée.

Au mois de janvier 1888, ils ont présenté une autre requête, signée par cent soixante Sauvages de Caughnawaga, tous gens habiles à voter. Cette requête se lit comme suit :

"To the Honorable THOS. WHITE,
Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

"We the undersigned, members of this tribe, humbly request the Indian Department to be allowed an election of chiefs while pending the decision of the government to grant us the Indian Advancement Act.

"Signed,
KANADA KE, Jan. 21st 1888.

"I se ne onkde on de se ra kde kon se iats te ris ta Ottawa ts sa te ri on te

"Kda ne ken ni as kda ri on ta ia kden ni tio kda ken ni a on sa ia ki ia ta ra ko (chiefs) ra ti ko da neus a hon ten tia te na o ten io ri da ien ne ken to.

"Tsi ni io re ias kda ri on na ia ki ia ta ra ko ne (Councillors)

"Da a kda tats hen na ren ne ia kda non des.

"RoBi ThaBeiakenra, Tier Katsitsiakera, Sose Anenarotunk8as, Tosen x Athienk8anonni, Sose x Anontsakare, Tier Sakore8atha, Sose Tiorakh8isen, Sa8atis x Soronia, Ennias Shaetati, RoBi renuierio, Sakarie Kanentoton, Ennias x Karoniaratie, Marten Thiashe, RoBi x Tha8ennainton, Rasar x Iekaratemsele, Sose x Thauonsoneotha, Arenne x Satekaronies, Ennias x Kament. Sa8athies Oheroskon, Tiev Karoniare, Ennias Otsinek8ar, Sak Karakontie, Tisian Ari8a-kenha, Sose Anetotake, Sishe x Kavoniore, Aton8a Taronko8a, Sente8on8a x Tase, Sishe x Taioroniote, RoBi x Thaironiote, Tier Karatohon, Aton8a x Nikana8aa, RoBi x Nonrakete, Sishe x A8enra-thon, William Shaonontsiotane, Tier x Onakharakete Ennias x Kentokake, Marten x Kaneratoare, Aton8a x Te8ennintashen, Sa8atis x Nonsa8enrate, Ennias x Te8ateron8aronkotha, Marten x Rak8atiion, Sa8atis x Atsitsiaks, Sose x Orite, Ennias Arhotonk8as, RoBi Tekanavataneken, Savo x Tekanbiatarek8en, Ennias x Aroniakens, RoBi Thiaientaneken, Tiev x Kanatoave, 8athias x Thatokenthia, Vo8i x Shoniatavo8ane, 8athias Satekavenes, Suk x Kanatsiakiaion, Tiev x Kentiokhon, Saksavie x Saennatie. Sose x Nikavontasa, Tien x AKhidirabe8, Sadati8 x OondateKen, WiShe Non8anoven, Sak-Savie x KatSiv8Kevon, Vodi x Dis8Koda, Sadati8 x SaKodie, SaKSavie x Sadantenan, Tien x Kanatiio, Tien x Aienta8, Dishe x AvidaKauha, Ennias x Nikavonta8a, Dishe x Taden8akati, Ennias x OSKenontona, Ie8-ent x Tekavataneken, Dishe x KanetaKon, SaK-Savie x Tio8u Kden, SoSe x TatovaKavon, SoSe Teniatie, Ennias Saatie, Tiev x Thiveta, Ennias x Tekanadati Kden, Sadati8 Saatie, Tisian x Vais, SoSe x Saiodi8aKevon, SaKSavie x SaKokennionKda8, Vodi x Darlrave, Sadati8 x Kaua8ati-vhon, Ennias x Kontitie, KaSar x Thavoniovon8, Sadati8 x Vaienton-ri8, Vodi x Thavondatie, Ennias x AtadaKhon, Atonda Avata8, SaK-Savie, x AtKdivoton, SaKSavie x Sontavon8Khon, Sadati8 x Adennacienta8, Sadati8 x Odi8ateKen, Ennias x Anont8iaKervo, Vodi x Anu-lea, SaK x Tekanon8oKen, Dishe x KavoniaKevon, SaKSavie Te8ona-venion, SavoKanen x VaKe, SoSe x ThaotaKenva, SaK x Kavhnoton, Sadati8 x OnasaK-nva. Atonda x Tekavenonta, Atonda x Kachias, SaK x Anatovena, AveK x Anenavoton, Dishe x Kadeniio, SaKSavie x Thiaidentonte, Ennias x Atevhiton, SaKSavie x Niade8ace, Atonda x Avoniot8, Vodi SaKodenmenadi, SoSe x AKhienentonko, Atonda x IaKevitontie, Sadati8, Thaenvate, Soce x TaentaKenva, Sadatis x IovaKdenton, SoSe x Thiaidevon, Vodi x T. Kentavashen, Dishe x Sothienton, SaKSavie x Kanevatitio, Sadati8 x Adennaniion, SaK x Ska-8eKov8aKen, Vodi x Kent8ioKoda, SoSe x Anenvi8eve, Ennias x SKennetati, Atonda x Athiatavonne, Tiev x Kanata8e, Entden x Tio-nataKdente, Dishe x Tha8ennontie, Sadatis x Atedennavikhon, Dishe x Tedata8haviaKe, Ennias x TeKeniavutov8Ken, Vodi x Sholstrenodane, Marten x Ovoniakete, Dishe x Tekanadatek-den, Aveksent x Teon8akanere, Ennias x T8iseveken, Savo x Sakahese, Tiev x Tekatsitsaneken, Vodi x Onuonkoton, Savo x T8ioniti, Marten x Sakovaiatakda, Saksavie x Anonsiatha, Saksavie x Thavoniakethon, Ennias x Thasevaren, Tiev x Katinontie, Dishe x Kanentakevon,

Sose x Kavoniakevon, Vodi x Avirhon, Mavten x Tekatsitsenseve, Atonda x Taawavishoa, Dominik x Tioakiente, Sose x Sovakodane, Sose x Thontakete, Saksavie x Non Sakenthéake, Aton8a x Anenvente, Tiev x Daveniliaki, Sose x Katavativon, Tiev x Soket8ane.
Caughnawaga, Jan 21st 1883, P. Q.

Ils ont attendu pendant deux semaines la réponse de l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, mais en vain. Croyant, ou supposant qu'on avait oublié leur humble requête, ils lui ont télégraphié, et vo ci ce qu'ils demandaient à l'honorable ministre :

"CAUGHNAWAGA, Feb., 10th, 1883.

"To Hon. THOS. WHITE,
"Ottawa.

"Is petition received demanding election of chiefs.

"(Signed) JOSEPH FOSTER.

Voici la réponse qui a été faite par le département :

"OTTAWA, Feb. 10th, 1883.

"JOSEPH FOSTER.

"CAUGHNAWAGA, Quebec.

"Petition received, and agent will be written to.

"(Signed) R. SINCLAIR.

Le 11 février, ils ont envoyé un nouveau télégramme à l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, ainsi conçu :

"CAUGHNAWAGA, Feb 11th 1883.

"To Hon. THOS. WHITE,
"Ottawa.

"Whenshall we expect a definite answer to our petition.

"(Signed) JOS. FOSTER."

Voici la réponse :

"OTTAWA, Feb. 11th, 1883.

"JOS. FOSTER,

"Caughnawaga, Que ,

"Will write Agent on Monday about proposed election.

"(Signed) L. VANKOUGHNET."

Plus tard, le 1er mars, un autre télégramme fût adressé à l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, se lisant comme suit :

"CAUGHNAWAGA, March 1st, 1883.

"Hon. THOS. WHITE, &c.,
"Ottawa.

"Anxious for an answer to our petition.

"(Signed) JOS. FOSTER."

Voyons la réponse :

"OTTAWA, March 1st, 1883.

"To Jos. FOSTER.

"Telegram received. Department taking no action.

"(Signed) THOS. WHITE."

Ainsi, après avoir adressé deux requêtes, dont une en décembre dernier, et l'autre en janvier, donnant les raisons à l'appui de leur humble demande, les Sauvages de Caughnawaga étaient dans l'anxiété ; et après deux semaines d'attente, n'ayant reçu aucune réponse, ils télégraphièrent à l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur. La première réponse qu'ils reçurent du département, comportait qu'on allait entrer en correspondance avec l'agent des Sauvages à Caughnawaga. C'est-à-dire qu'on allait s'entendre avec l'agent et voir ce qu'il y aurait à faire. Et plus tard, le 1er de mars, après un nouvel échange de télégrammes, on répond finalement : "Department taking no action..." C'est-à-dire ne s'en occupe pas.

Eh bien ! M. l'Orateur, je comprends que, d'après la section 75 de l'Acte des Sauvages, que j'ai citée, ces derniers n'ont pas le droit absolu d'élire leurs chefs, il faut qu'ils s'adressent au département pour en obtenir la permission ; mais je suis surpris de voir dans le statut, un acte passé en 1880, disant que lorsque le gouverneur en Conseil jugera les Sauvages assez avancés, ou assez éclairés, il leur permettra de faire les élections de leurs chefs.

J'ai eu à ce sujet certaine entrevue avec l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, et la réponse qu'il m'a donnée a été si peu satisfaisante que j'ai cru de mon devoir, ou plutôt, que je croirais manquer à mon devoir si je ne m'adressais pas à cette Chambre afin de savoir si ce qui a été consigné dans

les statuts révisés est une farce, ou si on l'a fait sérieusement. Ce qui me paraît étrange, ce sont les réponses mêmes du département, dans lesquelles on dit qu'on va se mettre en rapport avec l'agent ; et plus tard, l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur—avec qui j'ai eu plusieurs conversations à ce sujet—m'a dit : Je veux prendre des renseignements auprès de l'agent des Sauvages de Caughnawaga pour savoir s'ils sont assez avancés pour leur appliquer la loi municipale telle qu'elle existe dans les autres parties de la province ou du pays ; c'est-à-dire de leur permettre d'élire des conseillers ; et s'ils ne sont pas assez avancés, on leur permettra d'élire des chefs.

Je dois faire remarquer qu'il y a trois ans, on donnait à entendre la même chose à ces bons citoyens de Caughnawaga. Ce que je trouve de plus étrange, c'est la réponse que m'a donnée l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, qu'il allait consulter l'agent pour savoir si ces Sauvages étaient assez avancés pour leur appliquer le système de lois municipales.

Quand, en 1885, le gouvernement passait le bill des franchises, octroyant le droit de vote à un grand nombre de tribus sauvages de la Puissance, j'espère bien qu'il avait consulté les agents de ces tribus ; mais ce n'est pas sur la foi des réponses qu'il a reçues de ces agents, qui étaient ses employés, qu'il a octroyé le droit de vote aux différentes tribus sauvages du Dominion. Et je trouve fort étrange, si ce n'est pas une farce sinistre que l'on veut faire, que l'on dise : "avant de permettre à ces citoyens de Caughnawaga, ou d'ailleurs, d'élire des chefs et des conseillers, l'on va consulter notre agent pour savoir s'ils sont assez avancés." Comment le gouvernement qui a fait ces tribus sauvages les égaux des autres habitants de la Puissance peut-il dire sérieusement qu'il n'est pas assez renseigné pour savoir s'ils sont capables de faire leur cuisine tout seuls.

Je ne blâme pas le gouvernement d'avoir donné le droit de vote aux Sauvages, d'avoir conféré tous les droits des citoyens aux tribus sauvages de la Puissance. Je ne parle pas de toutes les tribus de la Puissance, je m'abstiendrai à parler en particulier de la tribu de Caughnawaga, que j'ai l'honneur de représenter et que je connais plus particulièrement. Je dis que le gouvernement a fait, en leur accordant le droit de vote, non-seulement un acte de générosité, mais un acte de justice ; et il ferait de même en leur permettant d'élire des chefs et des conseillers quand le besoin s'en fait sentir. Ce n'est pas une faveur que ces bons citoyens demandent, c'est un acte de justice. Et quand je dis que je parle plus particulièrement au sujet des Indiens de la réserve de Caughnawaga, c'est parce que je les connais plus intimement ; parce que je les ai vus en relations journalières depuis nombre d'années avec les bons habitants des comtés de Laprairie et de Châteauguay, et de la ville de Lachine. Je suis convaincu par l'expérience qu'ils ont hérité de leurs mœurs et de leurs coutumes, et par conséquent, il devrait leur être permis de jouir du bénéfice des lois qui régissent les autres citoyens du Dominion.

Pour toutes ces raisons, M. l'Orateur, je pense que le gouvernement se fera non-seulement un devoir de déposer sur le bureau de la Chambre les documents qui sont mentionnés dans ma motion, mais qu'il répondra d'une manière satisfaisante à ces différentes requêtes, et qu'il prendra en considération les observations que je viens de faire. Je fais cette demande non pas comme représentant les Indiens de Caughnawaga, mais au nom de la justice, du droit et de l'équité.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: M. l'Orateur, en l'absence de mon collègue, le ministre de l'Intérieur qui, je regrette de le dire, est sérieusement indisposé, je dirai quelques mots en réponse aux représentations que vient de faire l'honorable député.

Il n'y a pas d'objection à accorder sa demande, c'est-à-dire, à déposer sur le bureau de la Chambre les documents mentionnés dans sa motion. Je ne suis pas au fait de la

question qui concerne l'élection des chefs ou des conseillers par les tribus sauvages. L'honorable député paraît en connaître presque aussi long que moi sur cette question, et même un peu plus, parce qu'il a déjà en mains tous les papiers qu'il demande. Cependant, je crois qu'il n'a pas eu tort de les demander, parce qu'il pourra ainsi faire participer les autres membres de la Chambre à la connaissance qu'il possède.

Je suis convaincu que si l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur était ici, il aurait de bonnes raisons à donner à l'honorable député pourquoi il n'y a pas encore eu de décision sur ce sujet. Le fait qu'à deux reprises le département des Sauvages a déclaré en réponse aux questions posées par télégrammes, que le département allait consulter l'agent, et la dernière réponse que le gouvernement n'agirait pas dans le moment, me portent à croire que la question a été référée à l'agent pour renseigner le département. Il est impossible que le ministre de l'Intérieur puisse savoir dans quelle condition sont les Sauvages de Caughnawaga ou d'une autre tribu sans consulter les agents. On peut bien savoir généralement qu'il y a des sauvages qui sont très avancés, très intelligents, et nombre d'entre eux, très instruits. J'en connais même que l'on ne prendrait pas pour des Sauvages, qui sont aussi blancs que des blancs et qui, par leur intelligence, pourraient certainement lutter avec n'importe quel blanc. Mais cela ne veut pas dire que toutes les tribus devraient être affranchies et autorisées à élire des chefs et des conseillers. L'honorable député ayant attiré l'attention du département sur cette question, je suis convaincu que le ministre de l'Intérieur la prendra en considération aussitôt qu'il lui sera possible de le faire.

M. LAURIER: M. l'Orateur, si mon honorable ami a réussi à stimuler ce que j'appellerais l'indolence du gouvernement sur cette matière, il sera justement arrivé au point où il voulait en venir. Il est évident que mon honorable ami avait en vue, non seulement d'obtenir les papiers qui sont mentionnés dans sa motion—parce que je crois qu'il a déjà ces documents en main—mais il voulait savoir pourquoi une requête qui paraît aussi naturelle que celle-là, une requête par laquelle les Sauvages demandent d'élire des conseillers ou des chefs aux termes de la loi, n'a pas encore été accordée.

Il y a une singulière anomalie dans la loi au sujet des Sauvages. On leur donne droit de vote sans consulter l'agent, par un acte du parlement, comme l'a fait remarquer mon honorable ami; on leur donne droit, par conséquent, de se prononcer sur toutes les questions qui peuvent affecter le pays en général; et cependant, comme l'a dit mon honorable ami dans un langage assez pittoresque, quand il s'agit simplement d'administrer leur propre cuisine; quand il s'agit d'élire des chefs et des conseillers, le gouvernement ne peut pas se décider à leur accorder ce droit de lui-même; il est obligé de consulter l'agent. Je soupçonne qu'il y a peut-être au fond de cette affaire-là de la mauvaise volonté de la part de l'agent, et l'obstacle vient peut-être plus de la part de l'agent que de la part du gouvernement. Il est un fait bien connu que s'il y a des Sauvages qui sont arrivés à un certain diapason de civilisation dans le pays, ce sont certainement les Sauvages de Caughnawaga, et je ne crois pas que l'on trouve, dans Ontario ou dans Québec, des Sauvages qui sont plus avancés qu'eux sous aucun rapport. Mon honorable ami a fait cette demande parce que les requêtes de ces Sauvages ne reçoivent pas de réponse. Ils pétitionnent et on leur dit qu'il faut consulter l'agent; ils pétitionnent de nouveau, et on leur fait la même réponse. L'objet de mon ami est de connaître les faits, parce qu'il y a raison de croire qu'il y a de la mauvaise volonté de la part de cet officier-là.

Motion accordée.

Mr. DORON.

NOEL FORTIN.

M. Fiset demande—

Copie de la correspondance entre J. C. Pottinger, écrivain, surintendant du chemin de fer Intercolonial, et M. Noël Fortin, de la paroisse de St-Fabien, concernant l'accident et les dommages causés à ce dernier par suite du mauvais état des passages à niveau du chemin de fer.

M. l'Orateur, je dirai quelques mots seulement au sujet de cette motion, et je crois que cela sera suffisant pour attirer l'attention du gouvernement, afin d'éviter le retour de pareils accidents.

Le pétitionnaire, M. Fortin, se plaint des traverses du chemin de fer de l'Intercolonial. En effet, presque chaque printemps, dans le comté de Rimouski, où il y a beaucoup de neige, des accidents arrivent. Je crois que les concessionnaires n'entretiennent pas assez bien les passages publics, ils se contentent d'ouvrir la ligne sans ôter la neige sur la voie de chaque côté. L'accident dont se plaint M. Noël Fortin est arrivé l'année dernière. Cette année plusieurs accidents sont encore arrivés, notamment à Cyrilas Dastous, Auguste Berger, Philippe Coulombe, et à d'autres dont les noms m'échappent.

Il me semble que le seul fait d'attirer l'attention du gouvernement sur ce point sera suffisant pour l'engager à remédier à cet état de choses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: M. l'Orateur, je ferai observer à l'honorable député que sa motion devrait s'arrêter à ces mots: "concernant l'accident et les dommages causés à ce dernier." Car il nous fait dire que c'est en conséquence de l'état défectueux des traverses du chemin de fer, que l'accident est arrivé. Nous ne savons pas cela. Mais la première partie de sa motion, c'est-à-dire la correspondance qui a été échangée au sujet de cet accident,—et je présume que c'est tout ce que l'honorable député veut avoir,—il ne peut pas y avoir d'objection à la produire.

M. Fiset: Je ferai remarquer à l'honorable ministre qu'il me semble que ma motion est bien rédigée: "Concernant l'accident et les dommages causés à ce dernier par suite du mauvais état des passages à niveau du chemin de fer."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: L'honorable député ne m'a pas compris. La première partie de sa motion qui se termine aux mots: "accidents et les dommages causés à ce dernier,"..... jusque là est correcte. Ensuite il nous fait dire la cause de l'accident, et c'est à cette dernière partie que je m'oppose, parce que ce serait nous faire admettre une chose qui, peut-être, ne sera pas justifiée par les documents du département. Par conséquent, je lui demanderais de retrancher les mots: "par suite du mauvais état des passages à niveau du chemin de fer"..... De cette façon il atteindra le même but, et il ne nous mettra pas dans la position d'admettre une chose que nous ne connaissons pas.

M. LAURIER: Je crois que l'honorable ministre des travaux publics a raison. Mon savant ami est probablement d'opinion que l'accident dont il a parlé a été causé par le passage à niveau en question; peut-être que le gouvernement est d'une opinion contraire. Dans tous les cas, ce que veut mon honorable ami, c'est d'avoir ces papiers, et il les obtiendra pareillement en supprimant ces mots. Si plus tard il juge à propos de faire une autre motion au sujet de ce passage à niveau, il pourra le faire.

La motion est adoptée telle qu'amendée.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRK moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any member thereof, and the municipal councils of the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysboro', N.S., and any other persons; together with copies of resolutions passed by the said municipal councils rela-

tive to the repayment by the Government of moneys paid by the said municipal counties for the right of way for the Eastern Extension Railway, now owned and in possession of the Government.

He said: This is a question in which, as the resolution indicates, these three counties, embracing four municipalities, are interested. The law in Nova Scotia provides that, wherever a company or the Government build a railway, the municipality, or the inhabitants of the municipality through which the railway is built, must supply the right of way, and they do that as well as making grants to the companies. That is a law which existed, I believe, long previous to Confederation, and, as far as I am aware, it is still on the Statute-book. The Cape Breton and Halifax Railway Company, under a contract with the Local Government, built a line of railway from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave, on the Strait of Canso, being a distance of about eighty miles. The company afterwards transferred that to the Local Government. The company, however, had built the road on the condition of receiving a subsidy in money from the Local Government and the transfer from this Government of the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway. Before the Pictou and Truro Branch was transferred, the company transferred its right in the road to the Local Government, and the Local Government, in consequence of some difficulty between themselves and this Government in reference to the transfer of the Pictou and Truro Branch, compromised the matter and sold their right to this Government at Ottawa, which thus became the owners of the whole line to the Strait of Canso, which is now operated as a part of the Intercolonial. The terms of the compromise with this Government do not secure for the municipalities the amount of money which was paid by the people for the right of way. The people feel a deep interest in the matter, and the municipalities in the different counties have moved in the matter, and I believe have had some communication with the Government in regard to it. I notice that the municipality of Pictou passed the following resolution:

"Whereas this county has been for some years paying, and there is still a large amount due, for the right of way for the Eastern Extension Railway, which latter amount, although the proprietors have been paid, is still a liability of the county, as county debentures have been issued for the same; and whereas the Dominion Government have become the proprietors of this railway and it is part of the I. O. R.; and whereas in all other cases of Government railways in the Dominion it is the policy of the Dominion Government to pay the cost of the right of way; therefore resolved, that the members of the county in the Dominion Parliament be requested to represent our case to the Dominion Government and request that Government to refund to this county such amounts as we have paid for that purpose and also assume the balance that this county is responsible for."

I believe this resolution was passed unanimously by the municipal council, of which I believe the senior member for Pictou is a member. I have no doubt that the hon. gentlemen who so worthily represent the county of Pictou have been pressing upon the Government to refund this money in accordance with the resolution which I have read. I understand that the municipal councils of the other municipalities have passed resolutions somewhat similar in purport. I have not seen them, and this came to me by accident, as someone happened to send me the minutes and proceedings of the Pictou Council. I believe the other municipal councils have been pressing upon this Government the necessity of their refunding the money which has been paid for the right of way, inasmuch as it is and has been the policy of this Government wherever it has built branch railways, to buy the right of way, and not to require the municipalities through which the railway passes to pay anything for it. I feel that it is only necessary to bring this matter before the Government, as not only are the hon. gentlemen who represent Pictou interested in this matter, but the Minister of Justice him-

self represents one of the counties which has been taxed very fully for the right of way.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH JAMAICA.

Gen. LAURIE moved for:

Copies of correspondence and proposals connected with the visit of the delegates from the Island of Jamaica to Ottawa, in 1885, and of proposed delegations from other West India Islands, whether for the purpose of considering closer political relations or solely with a view to closer commercial relations. Also correspondence from the Imperial authorities on the same subject.

He said: In reference to this motion I would say that whilst all parties in this country are desirous of obtaining a market for the products of our manufactures, I think we hardly give sufficient attention to a proposal that appears to have been made for closer commercial relations with us, if not actual political relations, by a very important portion of Her Majesty's dominions, at least important to us, because we already trade largely with them—I refer to the West Indies. I hold in my hand the proceedings of the Legislative Council of Jamaica for 1884, in which I find that the question was submitted for more intimate and closer commercial and political relations between Canada and the West Indies. That subject was discussed, but it did not receive the approval of the Legislative Council to any great extent. But the matter was also discussed by a very influential body of property holders in Jamaica, the Jamaica Planters' Association in London, and they highly approved of the scheme for the entrance of Jamaica as a province into the Canadian Confederation. They desired that it might be brought before the Dominion Legislature, but I am not aware that any further steps were taken. But the following year it was again brought up in the Legislative Council of Jamaica in another shape, expressive of a desire for closer commercial relations with the Dominion of Canada. Then the scheme met with hearty approval, and I find that in discussing the sending of a delegation to Canada, strong expressions were made in its favor. One of the members of the Legislative Council said that he was satisfied the day would come when they would burn bonfires at the prospect of having closer commercial relations with us than they have now. Every member expressed the same view, practically, and the resolution passed unanimously. In 1885, accordingly, a delegation visited Canada, but from various causes the matter appears not to have met with much encouragement in Canada. I conceive, Sir, that at the present time when we are desirous of developing our trade relations, we might reasonably consider this proposition. It is well, at any rate, that we should ascertain the position in which we stand, and the proposal that Jamaica has made to us. Now, Sir, I find that although a delegation from Jamaica only visited Canada, a delegation from the Leeward Islands were also prepared to come here, but the intimation was given, I understand, from the Colonial Office, that Her Majesty's Government would not view with approval any proposition for the admission of a portion only of the West Indies into the Canadian Confederation, or into closer commercial relations with Canada, but that if any proposal was made, it should include the West Indies as a whole. Now, to show that the Home Government do not disapprove of the idea, I may say that Lord Derby, then Colonial Secretary, stated that:

"It was difficult to conceive of any arrangement between Canada and the West Indies to which the British Government could raise an objection."

Other than, of course, that the West Indies should make separate and isolated arrangements. Now, Sir, without taking the House through all the details of the trade of the whole of the West Indies, I may refer more particularly to

the Island of Jamaica, and we may enquire whether its trade offers any prospect that would render it desirable for us to encourage them in their proposal for closer trade relations. The population of the Island of Jamaica is about 580,000; of the Leeward Island, 120,000.

Mr. DAVIES. How many whites in that 580,000?

Gen. LAURIE. I can ascertain by the census, but I have it not before me. I am at present discussing the trade question; I am not discussing Confederation with the West Indies. I suppose a black man's money is as good as a white man's.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman said that the population was 580,000. I merely desired to know how many of those are whites, and he has not answered me.

Gen. LAURIE. No, because I do not think it bears particularly on the point I am discussing. But at the same time, if the hon. member desires it, and if the House will not object to my detaining them, I shall be happy to furnish the information. But, at the present moment, I am only discussing the trade relations, and I am dealing more particularly with the imports and exports of Jamaica. I suppose it is immaterial to us, when we are seeking in all quarters markets for our goods, what color the people are with whom we trade, I do not think that we enquired, in a former discussion in this House, whether the population was white or black among the 60,000,000 that have been talked about. Now, I take Jamaican trade as an illustration of the trade of the West Indies. The imports of Jamaica are \$6,500,000. The imports from the British Possessions are \$871,000, and from the United States, \$2,301,000. Now, Sir, analysing this trade to ascertain what articles we could supply, I will give you a few items. I find that the total amount of breadstuffs imported into Jamaica is \$2,695,000; of this amount they import from the British Possessions only \$800,000, and from the United States \$1,599,000. Of liquors—as long as we manufacture them, and until prohibition comes into force, we may discuss that item—they import \$235,000; of these the British Provinces furnish only \$873, and the United States \$5,515. Of tobacco they import \$55,000, of which the United States furnish \$48,000, and we furnish none. Of furniture they import \$105,000, of which the British Possessions, who certainly manufacture furniture in abundance, only furnish \$40, while the United States furnish \$28,610. Of clothing Jamaica imports \$1,755,000, of which the British Possessions furnish \$6,000, and the United States \$57,235. Of hardware they import \$340,000, of which the British Possessions furnish only \$2,560, and the United States \$71,635. Of building materials they import \$240,000, of which we furnish only \$34,000, and the United States \$172,000. Machinery and tools, \$195,000, of which only \$7,555 worth came from British Possessions, as compared with \$58,000 from the United States. Coals and coke, \$190,000. Of this sum only \$825 worth came from British Possessions, and \$3,075 from the United States. Books, \$48,000; British Possessions, \$1,700, United States, \$6,000. The next item is miscellaneous, a portion of which we might not be able to furnish; but I claim that all the preceding items we could furnish. The value of miscellaneous goods was \$750,000, of which the British Possessions sent only \$20,000 and the United States \$250,000. I have thus shown that out of total imports of \$6,500,000 we send in far less than \$1,000,000 worth, while the United States sends in nearly \$2,500,000. I will not detain the House by giving comparative statements, and entering more fully into details, but I may mention that of cotton goods—and the West Indies form a desirable market for them—we send in only \$10,000 worth, while the United States send in \$930,000 worth. In dealing with this question it will be asked, What are we to take in return? Every article we desire to take, I

Gen. LAURIE.

maintain. They produce what we want just as we produce what they want. It is commonly believed, too commonly, that the business of Jamaica is mainly sugar and that sugar is the main export. But the sugar export of Jamaica is really only one-sixth of the total export, there remaining five-sixths being largely made up of logwood and other articles of commerce, so that Jamaica would not alone overload our market with its sugar. Our consumption of sugar is 100,000 tons a year, while their production is only about 25,000 tons; so we have to go outside Jamaica to obtain the sugar we require. The total exports, of course, from the whole West Indies aggregate much more than our present consumption; but if we entered into commercial relations with them the duty on sugar would be taken off and our sugar consumption would be very largely increased. This would no doubt be the case if sugar was as cheap as it is in England, where the consumption is nearly double what it is in Canada under our present system by which a large revenue is collected from sugar, and as a luxury it is considered an article from which it is considered reasonable to collect a revenue. But the consumption is increasing very largely,—but this has only taken place within the last year, the increase having been no less than 20,000 tons. This shows that with our increasing population and with our increased prosperity, should such commercial relations be entered into as is proposed in the resolution, the consumption of sugar would be very largely increased. I do not say we could take the whole production of the West Indies for some time to come, but we could approach it, and they would retain the facilities for marketing their product in those markets we possess now, so that the objection raised that we could not consume the whole sugar of the West Indies I conceive fails to the ground. There is a serious question involved, and that is the question of the duty on sugar, this being such an important part of our revenue, and the further question as to how that amount should be made up. I do not hesitate to recognise the fact, and face the difficulty that is involved in this question. I believe, however, that is practically the principal difficulty in connection with the entering into commercial relations with the West Indies. Difficulties there may be in connection with having closer political relations, difficulties that have been pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), but I believe we have statesmanship in this country, as in the country to the south of us, to deal with that difficulty. I believe we might most reasonably enter into closer commercial relations with those islands. I hold that as a large amount of money has been spent to develop the country to the west of the Provinces which first formed the Dominion, which expenditure has given great impetus to the trade of the western Provinces, it is highly desirable that we in the east should have an impetus given to our trade, and I conceive nothing would give it greater impetus than bringing the West Indies into closer commercial relations with ourselves. I believe it would stimulate our commerce and stir our heart blood, it would stir up commercial enterprise, and I believe far greater life would pervade the eastern Provinces than we now find there. There is plenty of room for it, and we desire this result to be brought about, and, therefore, I have not hesitated to bring this matter before the House, especially because I know that the products in which we are chiefly interested are the products that the West Indies largely consume. But while I believe that is of great material, of momentous importance to the Maritime Provinces, I conceive it is also a matter of very great importance to the upper Provinces. I believe, moreover, that one of the great causes of success to the country to the south is that they possess within themselves the products of the temperate and practically of the tropical zone, and if we could bring the West Indies into closer commercial relations with ourselves, which they themselves have proposed—for remember we are not going

after them, but they have come to us and made this proposition—it would materially advance the interests and prosperity of the Dominion as a whole.

Mr. BROWN. I think both the House and the country are under a debt of gratitude to the hon. gentleman for bringing this important subject before the House. I do not intend at this time to enter into any discussion of the subject, but as one engaged in commerce I think we cannot over-estimate the importance of the question which the hon. gentleman has presented. I know it is surrounded with many difficulties and would require to be closely investigated; at the same time the requirements of the West Indies are to so very large an extent for articles the product of Canada, that I feel satisfied arrangements might be made of the character indicated in the resolution.

Mr. SKINNER. As seconder of the resolution I hope the result of the statements placed before the House and the country by the hon. gentleman, and the resolution moved by him, will be that the Government will turn their attention towards that portion of the British Dominion, with a view to opening free commercial relations between them and us. Whilst I favor free unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I cannot forget that trade should be opened up with the British West Indies and British Possessions in America, and that this would be of paramount importance to the interests of the whole Dominion; and, as has been intimated, we on the seaboard feel that if we could have a fair share of that trade, which we certainly could have if we had free commercial relations with them, it would not only benefit us on the seaboard, but it would place us in a position to have more advantageous trade with the western portion of Canada as well. At the present time Ontario and Quebec have to be paid for the products they send to us largely, by money rather than by interchange of goods, though, of course, we send a good deal from the Maritime Provinces to western Ontario; but if trade with the West Indies was opened up their purchasing power would materially increase, and the increase of that power would enure to the benefit of Canada. Therefore, it is not an isolated nor a local question, but it is one of the greatest importance to the interests of the whole Dominion. I am very much gratified that this question has been brought up, and I have pleasure in seconding the resolution. I hope the Government will pay attention to what has been said with reference to it, and that we may look forward to speedy action on their part, having in view the opening up of commercial relations in the reciprocal sense with the West Indies particularly, and with the whole of the British Possessions in America.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to express my own gratification at the action taken by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the country. I regard a motion of this kind with regard to more intimate trade relations between the West Indies, or even any outside country, and Canada as the natural outcome of the efforts of the Conservative party in this country in the direction of the National Policy. It was my pleasure to visit a portion of Central America last fall, and in British Honduras and Guatamela, where the climatic conditions are somewhat similar to those of the West India Islands, I found that the Americans were making large advances in promoting their commercial interests in that direction. It did occur to me while there that something might be done by the Government of this country in seeking and acquiring more intimate trade relations with that portion of the world. I believe that of all the outside countries that purchase the surplus products of this country, the West India Islands rank fourth. That being the case the subject cannot be overestimated as to the importance of encouraging trade with these countries which are

so anxious apparently to trade with us. Another thing in my opinion is this, that in those countries it must not be supposed that because a small percentage of the population is white, that therefore the rest of the population are useless so far as being producers and useful members of community is concerned. On the contrary, Sir, a large proportion of the colored population of those countries are energetic, hard-working, intelligent business men, and that fact being taken into consideration, as is shown indeed by the trade statistics quoted by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), I repeat again that the importance of this subject is one which cannot be overestimated. I regard it as the natural outcome of our support of the National Policy in this country, that it is our duty to extend our outside market as much as possible, and I think if we do extend our outside market as much as possible, that possibly we will find that the manufacturers of this country will not manifest any desire for a further extended trade, although it is possible, if we do not take some steps in that direction, some manufacturers themselves may desire to see that outside market extended. I wish to express my own views individually upon the Government that this matter is of very great importance. I took occasion to write to the Government, on my return from Central America last fall, as to the importance of this subject, and I was glad to receive in reply a letter which told me that already steps had been taken and that Mr. Jones, a gentleman well fitted for that purpose, had been sent from St. John to the Argentine Republic. I may say, furthermore, that I think the manufacturers of this country and those largely engaged in commerce might of their own accord show a little more enterprise than they have yet displayed in encouraging our trade with that portion of the country. Those countries produce many things that we require, and in all articles of woodenware particularly I do not see, with the facilities which we have in the way of shipping, why we cannot, at all events, compete with our neighbors to the south.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The subject brought to the attention of the House by the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is of a very interesting character but one that involves very heavy responsibilities on our fiscal policy, which the Government of the country would have to take charge of and be responsible for. This subject of trade with the British West Indies is not a new one. It has been discussed in this House on previous occasions and it was discussed in 1884 when delegates were sent from the Island of Jamaica to confer with the Government of this Dominion. On that occasion I had the opportunity of meeting those gentlemen, with all of whom I am well acquainted, and they returned to Jamaica with the feeling that they had not received from the Government of the Dominion that courtesy which they thought they had a right to expect. It appeared from their representations that the Government of Jamaica had received communications from the Government of this country intimating that this Government would be prepared to discuss with the delegates, any question relating to an exchange of products, or the larger question of trade generally between the two countries. When those delegates arrived at Ottawa they were put off from day to day by the Government and had to return to Jamaica without ever having elicited from the Government of this country any opinion as to the course they were prepared to adopt on the subject. It was a regrettable affair, because I know those gentlemen returned to Jamaica very much disappointed, and they did not hesitate to express, at public meetings in various places where they addressed the merchants, their great disappointment in that matter. It must not be forgotten in this connection that the Government had a rather difficult question before them. On that occasion I took the ground that the Government had to consider the matter very seriously, because

any action looking to a free exchange of products with the West India Islands involved a very large loss of revenue as would be the case if the Government admitted sugar into this country duty free. Of course the delegates from the West Indies would only open negotiations on that basis and nothing but the free admission of their products into this country would be of any service to them. Therefore, they were naturally anxious to know at once whether the Government were disposed to entertain a proposition on that basis. One can very easily see that the Government would hesitate a long time before they would adopt a policy under which they were going to lose a large amount of revenue and sugar. The product of the Island of Jamaica taken alone is about 40,000 tons a year, and if such arrangements were adopted that would only supply one-half the consumption of the Dominion. Therefore, under those circumstances, the planters of Jamaica would have a benefit of the duty which we now levy on sugar, because we have to be driven outside to make up the balance, and the Government I presume naturally looked at it in that light and made up their minds that they could not under those circumstances afford to lose the revenue. I do not blame them for it because they were responsible for the management of the affairs of this country, and they had to look at the question in all its aspects. But the people of Jamaica were not so very anxious for union with Canada as they were for a union with the United States. They in fact voted down a resolution proposed by Mr. Solomon, the leader of that view in their Legislature, for a union with the Dominion, and by a very large majority they voted a resolution in favor of opening up negotiations with the United States. They go on to show in a report of some length, which I need not detain the House by reading, but which is signed by Mr. Farquharson, Mr. Walker and Mr. Bennet, three members of the Legislative Council, that in the event of the United States agreeing to their proposal and admitting their products duty free, they would have to admit the products of the United States free to the same extent, and they proceed to show how the loss of revenue could be made up. The imports of Jamaica are about \$6,600,000, and the exports \$7,750,000; the total revenues amount to \$3,000,000, the expenditure to \$2,845,000, and the debt to \$15,750,000. Its imports from the Dominion of Canada amount to about 11 per cent., from the United States 27 per cent., from England 58 per cent., and from other countries 3 per cent. The people of Jamaica considered this question, and they were quite willing that a proposal of that kind should be made, provided their products were admitted free into the country with which they should negotiate. With reference to the observations of the hon. gentleman who spoke last, looking to the shipment of our manufactured articles not only to Jamaica but to all of the West Indies, under our present fiscal policy it is utterly impossible for the manufacturers of this country to attempt to compete in Jamaica with the English manufacturers. If it requires from 25 to 50 per cent. of duty to keep English goods out of the Canadian market, hon. gentlemen, I think, will see, without much explanation, under what disadvantages our manufacturers would have to compete with goods manufactured under the free trade policy of Great Britain. Therefore, however desirable it may be—and I do not deny that it is desirable—that we should increase the exports of our manufacturers, it is utterly impossible that they can compete with the manufacturers of Great Britain in those markets when we have to put on such a high tariff to keep them out of our own. With regard to exports in natural products, there are no doubt many articles which might find a market in the West Indies at certain times of the year; but our chief product along the coast, which is fish, now finds a market there to as large an extent as the needs of those countries require; and when the hon. gentleman

Mr. JONES, (Halifax.)

who introduced this resolution said that it was a matter of vital importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces, he was perhaps hardly aware that that trade was developed at present to its fullest extent. If the consumption increased, we should find merchants with sufficient enterprise and knowledge of trade to take advantage of it, and they were only sorry that those markets do not take our products to a larger extent than they do. I should like to see our trade increased with the West Indies if it could be done in any legitimate way; but any trade that is forced, must necessarily be forced at the expense of the community, and I do not think that is a fiscal policy in accordance with the spirit of the age. In relation to the admission of sugar from the West Indies, the Government sent a delegate to the West Indies the year before last, and his report was submitted to this House last year, but it has never elicited any public notice, and has not been referred to by any of the gentlemen who have spoken on that subject in the House. I say nothing about the suitability of the gentleman who made that report for the undertaking, but he was not able to show that there was any field there for the development of our trade beyond the gradual development that was already going forward, because everything that we were producing applicable to the wants of those people was being supplied to them in a regular, expeditious and economical manner, and meeting all the wants of the people. Therefore, no further action was taken in regard to that. A great deal is said nowadays about fostering this trade, and no one would like to see it increased more than I; but the wants of a people are the test of the extent to which trade can be developed; and if the country cannot receive more than it now receives in a regular way, any money expended for such a purpose would only be a waste of the public revenues of the country. I presume the Government will have to consider any proposition of this kind with very great care, because if it is carried out it will entail the loss of a very large amount of revenue. At the same time, judging from the reports which I hold in my hand, and the proceedings in the Legislature of Jamaica, the people there appear to be looking to the United States rather than to us, because the United States furnishes a market which will take all their products, while we can take only a portion of them. All their fruits, spices, logwood, lignum vitae and rum would find a market in the United States, while we could only take their fruits to a small extent. Therefore, if they could get their sugar free into the United States, it would be of much greater advantage for them to send the whole of their products there, and that is the direction in which they are looking at the present time.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite sure that the House, and, I think, the country, will thank the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution for the course he has taken here to-day. I am sure we all admired the practical and able manner in which he laid his views before the House with reference to a subject the importance of which to the people of this country I think can scarcely be exaggerated. I confess that I was surprised when I found that the consensus of approval which seemed to exist in the House, as to what the hon. gentleman had said, was broken by the observations which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I am very sorry indeed to find an hon. gentleman on that side of the House set about deliberately to throw cold water on a movement in this direction. I think a movement which has for its object the drawing closer of the bonds which unite the various parts of this Empire together ought to be one which would commend itself to the approval of the members of this House. The hon. gentleman seemed very much oppressed with the difficulties that would arise in connection with the loss of revenue which might accrue from the adoption of

the policy suggested by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. I perceived that he was not so tremulous about the loss of revenue a few days ago when a very much greater loss of revenue was imperilled by the proposition he then supported. I very much regret to find that so soon as a proposal of this kind is brought before us, there should be a party in this House who are prepared to belittle it and stunt it and prevent its development. When I say a party, I do not refer to the Reform party; but there are individuals connected with that party who seem to take a special pride and pleasure in doing all they can to prevent that unity which we desire to see maintained and strengthened in the Empire to which we are proud to belong. My hon. friend who moved the resolution pointed out that there was a great deal of trade which might be fostered between Canada and the West Indies. He pointed out that this trade had fallen into the hands of our natural commercial rivals, and the hon. gentleman in reply spoke of the competition of Great Britain. My hon. friend did not refer to the competition of Great Britain; he referred to the competition of the United States, and he pointed out the requirements of the people of Jamaica which were being filled by the United States, and which we ourselves could supply. I am glad to find that, at all events, there was one gentleman on that side prepared to support the resolution. He said it would benefit the people of the Maritime Provinces, and that he believed it would also benefit the people of western Canada. I am quite sure that anything which would benefit the people of the Maritime Provinces would be hailed with pleasure and approbation by the people of the west. We are one people and one Dominion as we are one Empire, and I am satisfied that the policy my hon. friend has suggested is a policy which will be approved of by the people of this country. I sincerely hope that the Government will do all that they can to promote that policy, and thus develop the natural trade which ought to exist between Canada and our near neighbors and fellow-countrymen in the West Indies.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has referred to the cold water thrown on this movement, but in doing so he laid the blame on the wrong quarter. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the cold water was thrown by the Government he follows. I was a member of the Board of Trade of St. John when these delegates came to St. John, fresh and warm from Ottawa, and it is impossible to give any idea of the indignation they felt at their reception by the Government. Whether the Government was right or wrong, I do not say, but I say that such was the feeling these gentlemen had when they came to St. John.

Mr. McNEILL. The more necessary then the hon. gentleman should move his resolution.

Mr. ELLIS. Precisely; but I do not think my hon. friend ought to be so very unfair as he is with regard to a matter of this kind, and should have informed himself of the exact facts before making the statement he did.

Mr. KENNY. I regret exceedingly I was not in the House when this discussion began with reference to the trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and the West Indies. This is a matter, the importance of which has been frequently recognised in this Legislature. I have simply this opinion to express upon it, that, in endeavoring to secure this important outlet for our products, we must be in a position to compete on equally favorable terms with our neighbors of the United States. Formerly that business was done exclusively by sailing vessels, and it is still conducted in that manner in the Province of Nova Scotia. Now, I hold strongly to the opinion which I expressed last Session that it is impossible for us to compete on advantageous terms for that valuable trade unless we

employ steamers. Last year, in my place in Parliament, I urged the Government, to the best of my ability, to subsidise a line of steamers to open and develop trade with the West Indies. I was told then that no line of steamers then plying between the United States and the West Indies was subsidised. I do not know that to-day even any such line is subsidised. But I do know that when the Atlas line of steamers first began to ply between Jamaica and New York, it was subsidised by the Island of Jamaica to the extent of £5,000 a year, which was afterwards reduced to £2,000, and which finally, when the trade increased and developed to such an extent as to become self-supporting, was withdrawn. I contend that a subsidy would be advantageous; I contend that a line of steamers plying between the Province of Nova Scotia and the West Indies would be very largely advantageous to our fishermen. I think we recognise to-day that all business must be conducted with regularity, and that we cannot hope to secure regular traffic without employing steam. To-day business is very largely done by cable with the West Indies. When a cargo is shipped or prepared to be shipped to the West Indies, the merchant who sells the goods there knows of it, and it is that knowledge which regulates the price of fish in the West India market. The price is regulated, in order words, by supply and demand. We had at one time steamers plying between Halifax and Jamaica; but, unfortunately for Halifax and for the trade of the Dominion at large, they were withdrawn in 1886. They only commenced running in 1880 and they ceased to run in 1886, so that steam communication between the West Indies and the Dominion has not had a very fair trial. In discussing this matter, I labor under the very great disadvantage of not having heard what hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me said on this question. I simply rise to say that in my opinion, at least, if we are to conduct this business advantageously for the Dominion and for ourselves, we must conduct it by steam. Already a large portion of the fish exports from Halifax which formerly went by sailing vessels or by the steamers to which I have referred, find their way to the markets of the West Indies through the port of New York. I find that between the 1st January, 1887, and the 31st December, 1887:

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Casks, dry fish..... | 6,225 or 24,900 quintals. |
| Boxes " "..... | 13,662 or 13,000 " |
| Drums " "..... | 61,343 or 61,343 " |
| Total..... | 99,243 " |

were exported from Halifax to Boston and New York, and that we also sent 40,850 barrels of mackerel and 21,055 barrels herring to those cities, a large proportion of which ultimately found a market in the West Indies. I notice that before the Labor Commission, in a recent sitting at Halifax, some evidence with reference to this important trade was taken, and that a gentleman, who is conversant with the business, testified that a large amount of this fish trade went by way of New York. Not knowing that this discussion was going on this afternoon, I have not the papers referred to, but in the course of his evidence, this gentleman mentioned that the rate per barrel from New York was something under 15 cents while from Halifax it was over 50 cents. We all know that it is exceedingly difficult to get goods shipped from Halifax to the West Indies. The merchants who are engaged in that trade use vessels of small tonnage for their own particular business, and they want all the space for their particular trade, and are not prepared to accept cargoes from outsiders, or from those who are engaged in other branches of business. Consequently, not only has fish had to be sent to these West India markets through New York, but many articles of manufacture have had to be sent the same way. It may be said that this very low rate of freight per barrel which exists between New York and the West Indies would be difficult for us to compete

with, and that must be admitted; but are the merchants of Montreal prepared to say that, because freight between Liverpool and New York may be lower than it is between Liverpool and Montreal, they do not want steamers to come to Montreal, but are prepared to do their business in sailing vessels? We have this advantage in competing with American ports, that we are nearer the fishing grounds, and can secure our fish on better terms and at cheaper rates than they do, and therefore we can afford to pay a trifle more for freight. During the discussion which took place on that very important reciprocity resolution, great stress was laid, especially by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, on the great advantages which would ensue for Canada by giving us a larger market for our exports. That is exactly what we want, and there is a market in the West Indies which requires the very articles we produce. I do not know whether this afternoon any reference has been made to the large amount of flour which is shipped from the United States to the West Indies. I forget the exact figures, but I know that to Brazil and South America generally, there are nearly three quarters of a million barrels of flour shipped from the United States, besides a very large amount to the West India Islands. I contend that we could do a share of that business from western Canada, and it would be in the interests of the whole Dominion that we should seek to find an outlet there for all our products. Our whole energy should be turned to improve our markets and increase the facilities for transporting our exports. In reference to this matter, an article appeared in a recent number of a Halifax paper, which deals with this West Indies question, and it reads as follows:—

"The serious blunder made by some of our merchants in petitioning the Imperial authorities to withdraw the subsidy of the Cunard line of West India steamships, is daily more apparent. Instead of benefiting the trade of our vessels, the fish now largely finds its way to the West Indies by United States steamers *via* Boston and New York. Enquiries in the Dominion Senate have elicited the facts that fish to the value of \$1,250,000 annually were exported from the Maritime Provinces to South America through the medium of American middlemen, 'who make huge profits thereby.' Mr. Abbott said: 'The Government recognized the importance of direct steamship communication with the West Indies and South America, and had now under consideration, &c.' A few of our merchants by their insane action deprived us of the benefits of a direct steamship line to the West Indies, which was subsidized by the Imperial Government, and now the Dominion authorities will have to rectify the mistake at the expense of our own exchequer. The stoppage of the Cunard line entailed heavy loss on the part of Halifax, and the movers in the petition are deserving of severe censure."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What paper is that?

Mr. KENNY. The *Critic*. This is a matter which concerns us very much in the lower Provinces. The last occasion on which I had to address the House was on the subject of the Fishery Treaty. I thought that was a matter in which we in the Maritime Provinces were specially concerned, and in which the constituency which I represent had very much at stake. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), addressed the House on that matter, and it is true that I followed him. It happens—it may be unfortunately for the House—that Halifax is represented by one gentleman on the opposite side of the House and by one gentleman on this side. The hon. gentleman on the other side of the House is a man of long parliamentary experience and of recognised debating power, while the gentleman on this side, unfortunately, has none of those qualifications; but, such as they may be, I consider it my duty, when my hon. colleague expresses views in opposition to those which I entertain and which I believe the majority of those whom I represent entertain, to give expression, no matter how imperfectly or how feebly I may do so, to my views. I was rather surprised, at the close of that day's proceedings, to hear the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) intimate that in doing so I had been guilty of some transgression—I do not know whether it was of parliamentary etiquette or that I had done some-

Mr. KENNY.

thing unusual. I think I was within the strict line of my duty. It was a question, like the present one, in which we in the lower Provinces are especially interested. It vitally concerns us. And I have no apology to offer to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or any one else for following any hon. gentleman with whom I may differ in the views he places before Parliament.

Mr. EISENHAEUER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has addressed the House in favor of the resolution, but I think it is quite evident that in many points he does not understand what he has been talking about, and that he would probably be a better authority on dry goods than on fish. He has endeavored to lead the House to believe that the large quantity of fish exported to the United States by steam has found its way to the West Indies.

Mr. KENNY. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not desire to misrepresent me. What I said was that a large proportion of the dried fish, I believed—I would be sorry to say all—found its way to the West Indies, and that a portion of the pickled fish did so also, but I did not say all.

Mr. EISENHAEUER. I think it is easy to show that a very small portion either of dried or pickled fish finds its way to the West Indies by that route. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the great loss that Halifax and the Maritime Provinces have sustained by the withdrawal of that steamer, but he has failed to tell us why the steamer was withdrawn. As soon as the subsidy was withdrawn, the steamer was withdrawn, because she could not get freight enough outwards and homewards to pay. Very often a steamer on the outward voyage takes but half a cargo, also on the home voyage the cargo is sometimes almost nothing. Does not that go to show that it is a waste of public money to subsidise a steamer to the West Indies? Now, I cannot see why these manufacturers and other people cannot do as I am obliged to do. I am obliged to build my own vessels and sail them, and ship my fish and other articles that I send to the West Indies. The road is open for every person who feels inclined to trade with the West Indies, to put on their steamers if they choose; but they prefer to wait until the Government will grant them a large amount of money for the purpose of giving them an undue advantage over other people who are obliged to sail their own craft without assistance. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the rate of freight. Now, he is entirely mistaken with regard to the rate of freight from Halifax and New York—I think he said it was 15 cents a barrel. I have shipped a little in that way, and I think the rate is about 75 cents from New York to Cuba, or nearly that. This question was very fully discussed last year, and I think the hon. gentleman told us about the same thing last year that he did to-night. I am inclined to think that some of his friends down in Halifax propose to ask a subsidy from the Government this year. I will just say to the Government, as I said last year, that it will be a complete waste of money, in my opinion.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) spoke strongly in favor of steamers and in favor of a subsidy. I object to the idea *in toto*. I say that we have got other risks to look after besides steamboat interests. In Nova Scotia we have employed a large fleet of sailing vessels to carry on trade with the West Indies. I have been engaged in that business for the last thirty years, and have a number of ships running between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces; but I have no subsidy. Do hon. gentlemen want to destroy the marine interests of this country? I say if it will pay men to put on steamers, let them put them on. Let us have a free course, don't let us handicap sailing ships. If you give steamers a subsidy you must give sailing vessels a subsidy. The hon. gentleman has also spoken about withdrawing the subsidy from

the Cunard line that was subsidised by the British Government, as I understand. They ran for a number of years, and what good did the subsidy do them? Did any one ever see a steamer of that line take full cargo out of Halifax and bring a full cargo back to Halifax? Will the hon. member for Halifax tell us that? I object, on principle, to Government subsidies to any steamer, or to any service, except for carrying passengers and mails in connection with the traffic with Government railways; but as for mercantile competition, I say, leave the road open, and if steamers can drive sailing vessels out the route, let them do it; if sailing vessels can drive steamers out the route, let them do it. My hon. friend must know that Halifax has been the centre of West Indies trade for the last fifty years. They have got a large fleet of ships, and can carry anything they want from Halifax to the West Indies in fifteen days, or twenty, at the furthest. I shall, in all cases, oppose any subsidy for any steamboat service for commercial purposes. I want to see steamers and sailing vessels try and compete with each other on a free trade basis. I do not want to subsidise one man and leave another out. Now, the hon. member spoke of the freight rate between New York and England. It is very low, and you can get grain carried for one cent a bushel. Sometimes a ship is very anxious to get ballast to take back home, and they will carry grain as ballast at one cent a bushel. Of course, if shippers had to depend upon that alone they would lose money, but these large steamers make their money by carrying the mails and passengers, and they only take the grain for ballast. There is a great deal of competition in that line, which makes the freight rates low. The law of supply and demand rules in that case, and there is no lack of steamers every year to do the passenger trade. There is a large fleet of steamers running between the United States and the West Indies without any Government subsidy. I think the only steamers that get any subsidy doing West Indies trade are the mail steamers; they do get a subsidy for carrying the mails, and I do not object to that. But I certainly will set my face against mercantile companies coming here and asking the Government to tax the people to pay them subsidies to enable them to compete with the marine interests of the Dominion.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). As representing a maritime constituency, I desire to say that I fear a great many members of Parliament do not realise how important the measure is that is now before the House. The hon. member who has spoken last seems to contemplate, as a necessity, an antagonism between the sailing vessel and the steamer; he speaks as if we were asking the tax-payers to subsidise steamers at the expense of sailing vessels. That is a harsh and unfair way of stating the question. Our real object, by subsidies for these steamers, is to procure and hold for our own people, the trade that is now largely enjoyed by middlemen in the United States. I think it will be found to be a matter of very great importance, and not prejudicial to the owners of sailing vessels; it will be of great importance to St. John and our other maritime cities, that we should have enlarged and new facilities for the West Indies such as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says the Americans have. I desire in the strongest way, as representing a county largely interested in this matter, to urge the importance of this traffic upon the Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The inference to be drawn by the hon. gentleman's statement is, that the line of steamers which carry on the traffic between the West Indies and the United States are subsidised in some way by the Government. Such is not the fact. The line of steamers between the United States and the West Indies run on purely commercial principles, and are owned by private citizens, and receive no bonus or subsidy from the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were started by subsidies, were they not?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think not. I shall read to the hon. gentleman a statement which practically supports the opinion I have given.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think I was right in my statement, that these companies were first aided by Government subsidies from the United States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman is wrong. I was reading, a short time ago, Mr. Froude's book upon the West Indies; I only speak from memory, but I think, from his statement, that the hon. gentleman is wrong. These steamers were put on for an increasing and ever growing trade. During the past few years the trade between the United States and the West Indies has been rapidly increasing, and the people of the West Indies, if Mr. Froude is to be taken as an authority, are yearly looking more and more, not only for closer commercial relations, but for political relations with the United States. The difficulty is that the United States do not want to receive them politically, although they are perfectly willing to deal commercially with them. The hon. and gallant gentleman who moved this resolution seems to think that I had some desire of impeding his speech by interpolating the question I did. I had no such desire. I listened with great interest to the hon. gentleman's speech, and was very glad to hear him give his views to the House. I have not the slightest desire to quarrel with him. He mentioned the population of Jamaica as being 580,000, and I supposed he mentioned it for the purpose of impressing upon his listeners the idea that it would be a desirable thing to traffic with half a million of people. Very well; I recollect that the white population of Jamaica is about 14,000. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that it does not matter very much whether a man is white or colored for the purpose of trade; still, he knows that a colored population, as a rule, do not consume such goods as we export to the same extent as a white population. So far as the position before the House is concerned, my hon. friend knows that the Government sent a commissioner about two years ago to visit the West Indies, and that gentleman made a report, and so far as one can ascertain from reading the report, about the only recommendation he had to make, as is generally the case I find in these attempts to force artificial trade, was that we should put our hands into the public exchequer and grant a subsidy to some line of steamships. There is always a call to be made upon the Government. I do not belong to that class of politicians who believe that trade could be obtained by granting subsidies. I believe that trade, as a rule, follows natural channels, and that the Government best promotes trade by removing any hindrance in the way of trade following its natural course. I believe there could be no better way of promoting trade with the West Indies than by removing some of the artificial barriers we have erected against it. Our trade with the West Indies is not very large. I believe it only amounts to three per cent. of our total imports and exports. But when a Government commissioner went to those Islands and laid before the people a scheme to promote trade with Canada, what answer did they give him? It was that they did not want to join in giving any subsidy. The Colonial Secretary of Barbadoes, Hon. C. C. Knollys, told Mr. Wyld:

"I was informed by Mr. Knollys that the finances of the Island were in such a state that they could give no encouragement whatever as regards the granting of the subsidy; the Government having to practise the utmost retrenchment in order to make ends meet."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is inability.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is only one of the quotations I wish to read; and I say that so far as the Island of Barbadoes is concerned the Colonial Secretary said they were unable to do anything owing to their financial position,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce did not confine itself simply to the statement that they were financially unable to grant any subsidy, but they went further and said they were opposed to granting such subsidies on principle. At all events that is the way I understand the answer they gave. I will read the answer, as showing the view that the commercial people of the West Indies take of this question. It is as follows:—

"Sir,—I am directed by the Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce to acknowledge the receipt of your statement respecting direct steam communication between Canada and the West Indies, and to inform you that at a meeting of the council held on the 24th inst., the following resolution was, after due consideration of the subject, unanimously adopted:—

"Resolved—That the Council, having duly considered the proposals made by Mr. Wyld, regret that it cannot recommend the Government to aid by a subsidy the promotion of steam communication between Canada and the West Indies. The council, however, is quite alive to the advantages which such a line as that proposed would confer and would give it its cordial support.

"I am further directed to call your attention to the fact that, at the present moment, there is no subsidised line of steamers running between this Island and the United States, all the lines at present in operation being purely private enterprises; it is the opinion of the council that the commercial community of this Island is adverse to the granting of subsidies, such as that suggested. The council, also, while fully alive to the great advantages to be derived both by the Dominion of Canada and by Jamaica, by the establishment of a direct steam service, considers that Canada would derive much greater benefit than Jamaica from such service. In illustration of this it is sufficient to refer to the eleventh paragraph of your statement, in which are named the various articles of export which Canada could furnish Jamaica, which articles are at the present time imported from the United States."

"The council desires me also to remind you that the two principal fruit exports of the Island are bananas and oranges, the former of which is the larger of the two. Bananas also are admitted free of duty to the United States. In the absence of any statistical information respecting the consumption of fruit in Canada, the council is unable to compute what the value of this trade is likely to be.

"There likewise seem to be to the council two great drawbacks to the increase of the fruit trade with Canada, should the proposed line of steamers take the route suggested in your statement:

"(1.) The passage from Jamaica to Halifax would occupy from ten to twelve days, much too long a time for perishable articles.

"(2.) If sugar and molasses are to be stowed in the same hold it will be found impossible to carry fruit with any prospect of profit to the shippers.

"The council directs me, in conclusion, to convey to you its sincere thanks for your able statement, and to assure you of its hearty co-operation in aiding the establishment of direct steam communication between Canada and Jamaica.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. B. ELLIS,

"Secretary.

"JOHN T. WYLD, Esq.,

"Commercial agent of the Government of Canada to the West Indies."

Talk about throwing cold water on the proposition, I think that the Council of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and Commerce threw as much cold water as they possibly could. They said the distance is so great, that the time occupied in the voyage from the West Indies to Halifax is so long that fruit will be spoiled, and that it could not be carried in the same hold with molasses and sugar. The fact is that anybody who reads Mr. Froude's late work on the West Indies, will find that he states that the great export from the West Indies for many years back, namely, sugar, is being grown less and less every year; that a feeling akin to despair has seized the planters and those heretofore engaged in the growing of sugar; and the only hope, in Mr. Froude's opinion—he seems to take rather a pessimistic view of the situation—for the West India Islands lies in their abandoning sugar growing and developing the cultivation of fruit. The best fruit in the world can be grown in those islands, and there is an abundant market in the United States. He further states in his book, rightly or wrongly, that all the business men of the West Indies look to the United States for their market; and

Mr DAVIES (P.E.I.)

no doubt the great distance we are from the West Indies, even supposing a treaty was entered into, would act greatly to our disadvantage in competing with the United States. Where people send products there they will buy. The United States seems to be their natural market, and if they sell their sugar or fruit there they will buy a return cargo of such articles as they require. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) has stated that it is possible to open up a market for our flour in the West Indies. I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the subject to be able to express an opinion, but I have heard from men of experience that our flour will not keep in that climate. I do not know sufficient about that point to be able to express a definite opinion.

Mr. KENNY. With the permission of the House I wish to make a correction. In my remarks I referred to the evidence given before the Labor Commission at Halifax as to the rate of freight that prevailed between New York and the West Indies. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), referring to my statement that it was 15 cents a barrel, said that instead of such being the case it was only 5 cents a barrel between those points. With the permission of the House I will quote from the evidence taken by Mr. Carney, of James Butler & Co. That gentleman said:

"There are now several large steamers running out of New York, belonging to lines established in later years, which carry fish very cheaply. He instanced the fact that it cost 53 cents to send a barrel of fish from here, while it only cost 12½ cents from New York by these steamers. The decrease in trade was due to no fault of the Government."

So, Sir, instead of it being 75 cents it is only 15, and I think I was nearer the mark than my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer).

Mr. EISENHAUER. I can say that they do not give us those rates. They may have rates for favorites in New York, but I have paid 75 cents for even less than a barrel.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bear a few words of testimony on this matter, as I consider it important to us in the Maritime Provinces. It is no new subject. In my constituency they have especially been anxious about this matter, and the people of Annapolis saw the necessity for some better communication with the West Indies and other portions of the world and they organised a steamship company. That steamship company to-day is only a company in name, inasmuch as they own no steamships, but it has been a company that has done a great deal for the people of that part of Nova Scotia in the way of increasing the trade. That company went so far as to charter a steamer to run to the West Indies and they went so far as to get the merchants of the West Indies to take shares in the company.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And they lost all their capital.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I beg your pardon, they did not lose all their capital.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I beg yours, I know it.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). And I beg yours again; I know it. I know what I am talking about, and I know perfectly well the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) does not know what he is talking about. I happen to be the secretary of that company at the present moment, and I am in a position to know what I am talking about. If, by reason of some past internal mismanagement of that company, there were losses incurred, that is no argument against the fact that there is a trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, and a very valuable trade to my constituents as well as to the other constituents in the Maritime Provinces. We have in the Maritime Provinces grand facilities for communication with the West Indies, and I see no reason why those facilities should not

be taken advantage of as well as the facilities have been availed of that obtained between the United States and the West Indies. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Davies) says that the trade between the West Indies and the United States is increasing. To be sure it is, and it is increasing because trade has been opened up between the two countries; and what are Governments for unless for the encouragement of, and the opening up of new avenues of trade? I contend that there will be sufficient trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies to warrant any government in giving a subsidy to a company to develop it. We entered into that trade in Annapolis without any subsidy whatever. The Government gave us some money to build a wharf and warehouse. We have that wharf and warehouse at the present time, and we have facilities for shipping all kinds of merchandise and all kinds of products from Annapolis to the West Indies. Those facilities should be utilised and they cannot be better utilised than by a line of steamers being put on from Annapolis or St. John or Halifax to the West Indies. I understand that parties are asking the Government for a subsidy for a line of steamers from St. John to the West Indies. I agree with that entirely, but I do not agree that it should entirely be confined to St. John. There are other places in the Maritime Provinces besides St. John and if they place their steamers to run from St. John let them take in Annapolis and Halifax as well. I see no reason why the Government cannot have a line of steamers and I see no reason why that line of steamers should not only pay the parties interested in it directly, but also the country and the Dominion at large.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said I made a misrepresentation with regard to the Annapolis Company. I wish to explain. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that they formed the company at Annapolis and I am also correct in saying that it was a company without money being paid up and merely a company on paper. One gentleman, a friend of my own, was induced to take five hundred pounds sterling in that company and he lost every cent of it and never got a cent to the present moment.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I am in a position to know that there is not one single gentleman who took stock in that company but who paid up every single dollar that he took stock for, and there is not a single gentleman who took stock in that company but who has received and will receive something for that stock. I am interested in that company myself to the small extent of \$1,000 and I paid it all up. I have received something on that stock—

Some hon. MEMBERS. How much?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I know perfectly well that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) himself has taken stock in other companies that have not paid nearly so well as that company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, with regard to this West India trade, I remember that in 1878 that it was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the want of a National Policy had caused the West India trade to decline. I believe the Finance Minister and the First Minister told the people throughout the country during the political canvass that if they got possession of the Treasury benches the West India trade would be revived, and that Halifax would be made the centre of that trade from North America as it had been at a previous period. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the West Indian trade has declined notwithstanding the promise of those hon. gentlemen, and that the effect they said they could produce by the alteration of the fiscal policy upon the trade between Canada and the West Indies, has not been produced and that trade is in a worse position to-day than it was ten years ago. Then, Sir, we were reminded by the member for North Bruce (Mr.

McNeill) that in this matter Canada could successfully compete with the United States if only facilities were furnished to carry on trade between the two countries. He is confident that we could drive the people of the United States out of the West Indian market. I thought the hon. gentleman not very long ago declared that we would not be able to hold our own market against the United States if we were to put upon the footing of equality.

Mr. McNEILL. Excuse me a moment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You can explain later on.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman have the fairness to allow me to put him right?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am right.

Mr. McNEILL. If he will not have the fairness to let me do so, all right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman can make that correction by-and-bye. He is confident of our ability to beat our neighbors in a market 2,000 miles away and he is not confident of our ability to compete with them in our own market. I do not take so hopeless a view of our capacity or our enterprise as the hon. gentleman did a little while ago. It would be an extraordinary way of carrying on trade with the West Indies if we were to adopt a sort of communistic principle, for that is what the hon. gentlemen are advocating, and undertake to subsidise, at the expense of the entire country, a trade that can only be of advantage to a very small number. In fact, Sir, it is not in the interests of the trade generally that it is proposed to grant those subsidies. It is simply in the interest of parties who have property in certain vessels. Those parties would be benefited while those who own ships who are sailing them and taking risks of all kinds of loss in the enterprise they are engaged in would be subject to an unfair competition with subsidised lines of steamers. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. He expects to build up here a great commercial community upon the principle of taxing the people generally for the benefit of these few. Sir, I do not think the people of this country will be disposed long to submit to that policy. I think the Finance Minister has done a very great deal within the past fortnight to destroy it, and I trust he will lend us his powerful assistance to further discountenance it, and to encourage the people of this country to depend on the habits of self-reliance, energy and enterprise to accomplish those advantages for the country which alone can be of a permanent character.

Gen. LAURIE. I should like to say a few words in reply to one or two observations that have been made. My hon. friend, the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), pointed out that a motion was brought up in the Jamaica Legislative Council and was there voted down, in favor of closer political relations with Canada. That is so, and so I stated when I moved for the address. But I wish to say, as I stated before—and I hold in my hand, not merely a newspaper report, but the official report of the proceedings in the *Royal Gazette*—that a motion was carried, with but one dissentient, asking that negotiations for closer commercial relations between Canada and Jamaica should be opened, and those who had opposed the motion for closer political relations, voted in favor of closer commercial relations.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The United States would not have them.

Gen. LAURIE. I am not discussing that, I am stating what the people of Jamaica desired. I also stated that the sugar product of Jamaica was 25,000 or 26,000 tons. The hon. member for Halifax stated that it was 40,000 tons; but here is the statement made in the Legislative Council of Jamaica that the product is 25,000 or 26,000 tons.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It varies.

Gen. LAURIE. Certainly. With reference to the broader question of a subsidy, and the larger effects upon our trade, which I did not introduce, it is asserted that certain products of our country went by a steamship line from the Dominion of Canada to the United States, and thence to the West Indies. That is disputed. Here are the Jamaica returns of the imports into Jamaica from the United States, which state that £25,000 sterling worth of fish went from the United States to Jamaica, while from Canada there went only £134,000 worth; but according to the United States returns, they did not send more than one-third of that value to Jamaica. Well, where did the other two-thirds come from? They came from Canada, but because they went by those steamers from the United States, they were credited to the United States. That opens the question, which I did not open, whether it would be desirable that we should have a direct communication with the West Indies. Now, we have heard very often that the United States is the only market we have for our potatoes. It is very extraordinary if that is the case, for I find that while Canada sent to the West Indies and British Guiana 153,000 bushels, the United States sent twice that quantity, 321,000 bushels. It is evident, then, that they buy our potatoes, for the purpose of selling them again. If they do, would it not be in the interest of our shippers that we should sell direct and get the benefit of the handling? I think it certainly would.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is carried, I should like to say one word or two. I recollect, as well as my hon. friend beside me, the very extravagant statements that were made by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance as to the great benefits and the great extension of trade with the West Indies that were going to come to the Maritime Provinces from the National Policy. Here in two words is what it has done: In 1878, our exports to the West Indies amounted to \$3,314,000, and in 1887 they amounted to \$2,075,000, or a loss of a million and a half under the beneficent operation of the National Policy and the wise Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that is the natural result, Sir, of making the production of our articles dearer. So long as you continue to impose these exorbitant taxes, so long as you continue to mass up your debt by hundreds of millions, so long as you continue to put our people at a disadvantage beside the people of the United States, so that to-day our debt is nearly treble the debt of the United States, and our necessary taxes 50 per cent. higher than the necessary taxes of the United States—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, every penny of that, and it will be more if we go on in the same foolish, reckless course that we are taking—so long as we do that it is the idlest folly to talk of opening up new markets. If you want new markets, reduce your taxes and arrest the increase of your debt, and you will not have this result, that at the expiration of ten years of your so-called National Policy, your trade with the West Indies is reduced nearly 50 per cent.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had taken the column opposite that to which he referred, he would have found that there is a very large increase in the exports to South American countries, of about \$800,000; and taking the West Indies along with these, he will find that there is an increase of about \$1,000,000, notwithstanding what has been shown in this debate, that a very large quantity of our exports go through the United States and are credited to the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And so they were before, and probably in a larger degree.

Gen. LAURIE.

Mr. GILLMOR. A large part of our exports to the West Indies necessarily go through the United States. The cargoes are made up of a great variety of articles, and it is quite impossible to get a vessel of the smallest capacity loaded sufficiently from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to constitute a cargo. In my own county we put up probably 1,750,000 boxes of smoked herrings which we ship to the West Indies through the United States. The small ports cannot furnish enough articles to make up a cargo; it is only the large ports that can do so. What is meant by these closer commercial relations of which we hear so much? Is it intended to bring the islands nearer to us? Have we not plenty of opportunities for commerce now? Has not the trade been going on for fifty years between Canada and the West Indies? If you want closer commercial relations, adopt the policy of Great Britain, and then you will have the closest commercial relations with all the world. The hon. member for Annapolis suggests that steamers said be subsidised. I grant you that if you will undertake to carry goods for nothing and make the public pay, you will increase the trade. But the hon. gentleman says you must not subsidise steamers to touch at St. Johns and Halifax alone; they must also touch at Annapolis. Well, I want them to touch at St. Ann's also. If they are to be paid out of the public treasury for doing the trade, is not my claim a just one? That shows the absurdity of these speeches calling for Government assistance to encourage trade. What we want is free trade. We want a low tariff, and we want to follow the example of that country to which we are all proud to belong and to which we are all so excessively loyal.

Motion agreed to.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

DETROIT RIVER WINTER BRIDGE.

The following Bill was considered in committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Winter Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland).

THE SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HALL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in Committee and reported.

On the third reading,

Mr. BERGIN. I move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months. I make this motion because I believe that the action of the committee yesterday was not one which ought to be approved by this House. It is, I think, in direct violation of the principle established by the Railway Committee last year, and it is interfering with the vested rights of the Montreal and Champlain Railway. It is now known to many members of this House, perhaps to all the members of this House, that the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company have invested a very large sum of money in the construction of that road, a road which has afforded the very best possible service to the people in that section of the country through which it passes. It was stated last year, and not contradicted at the time, that application was made by the people of the country through which the Montreal and Champlain Junction passes, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a line to Beauharnois and Valleyfield,

from some point at or near Caughnawaga. That proposition was refused by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and consequently another effort was made by the people of these counties to induce the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company to listen to their request. Finding that the people of that country were really desirous of a railway, that they were in good faith, and were willing to assist in promoting its construction, the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company undertook, with the assistance of the people, to build the line that they required. They came to Parliament and obtained a charter and proceeded with the construction of the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway, under the name of the South-Western Railway Company, came to Parliament last year and asked for a line which practically was parallel to the line of the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway. This the committee refused, and the principle adopted by the committee is one which, I think, ought to have been adopted with regard to this Bill. We affirmed the principle that unless there was a real necessity for a competing line of railway, it was not proper or wise to grant a second charter over the same territory. If it could be shown there was any possibility of a second line being made in that section of country, if it could be shown that there was really a necessity for it, then I confess that circumstances would be altered, and we might properly be asked to grant a second charter over the same line. But those who know that section of the country, know that it is not at all required there. They have ample railway service for that section of the country, and they do not require this. True, since last year, another reason has been discovered why this road should be constructed, a reason which, I venture to say, has no solid foundation. The reason now given, one which did not occur to these people last year who framed this Bill, is that it is required for the purpose of taking American trade over the Short Line to the Maritime Provinces. Now, Sir, I, for one, do not believe that there will be a ton of American freight attracted over that line to the Maritime Provinces. Let any one look at the map and see for themselves, and ask whether it is possible that American trade, for any place but Montreal or Quebec, will be attracted from northern New York in preference to their own seaports, which are so much nearer than the Maritime Provinces. I, for one, place no faith whatever in that proposition, and if I did, I do not think I would be warranted by the facts as they appear and looking at the map in supporting this Bill. For this reason, and for the further reason, that I believe it is a contest between a small railway company and a gigantic railway company, attempting to crush out the smaller one, I feel bound to move that this Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. SHANLY. As the time allowed us for discussing Private Bills is limited, I shall only follow my hon. friend from Cornwall in a few words. I entirely agree with the motion he has made, and I do not think this Bill should pass. And my reasons for so thinking are these: Last year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came before the Railway Committee of this House and asked for the passage of a similar Bill. It was very thoroughly canvassed in the committee, and it was rejected by a very strong and emphatic vote, and the Bill was not reported to this House. If the reasons given last year for refusing to pass the Bill were sound and good reasons, they are doubly and trebly so now. Last year when this Bill was before the Railway Committee the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company pledged themselves to proceed at once with the construction of a line over the same ground as that through which the South-Western Company desired to obtain a charter for a line. The Montreal and Champlain Company have honestly fulfilled their pledges, and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent since this time last

year in constructing that branch of railway, alongside of which it is now asked we should grant a charter to another company. For what purpose? To destroy the investment made in the Montreal and Champlain Junction Road. As I have said already, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended in this branch railway, and the capital put into the road is not our money, Canadian money or public money, but it is money that came from abroad, borrowed money. If before there has been time to test whether or not this road will pay as an investment, we grant a charter to another company to build a line alongside of this road, it evidently must prevent the company earning dividends, then I say we are doing great injury not only to those people who have invested their money in the enterprise, but we are doing a great deal to injure this country, because after money has been honestly invested as this has been on the face of what was done by Parliament last year, if the same Parliament this year destroys the security it then offered those people, and which Parliament practically did offer—put your money into this road and you are perfectly safe—I say if we now give a charter, which would destroy the security, that sort of legislation is wrong legislation, it is wicked legislation and it is legislation that must react injuriously on this country. I know that part of the country thoroughly well, I might say I know every one hundred acre lot and I say this second road is not required either for the purpose of local traffic or through traffic. The country is now splendidly served by the railways already constructed. I repeat that the effect of granting the charter proposed must be to destroy the road which was built upon the good faith of the charter we granted last year. I have no desire to discuss the matter at any great length, nor do I think after the very clear exposition of the case given by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) it is necessary I should speak very long. I speak as a Canadian jealous of the honor of his country, and I say if faith is broken by granting a charter to destroy the road Parliament authorised to be built last year, and in which capital was invested by people abroad on the good faith of this Parliament, we will do an act that will reflect most injuriously upon Canada. I trust, therefore, that the motion of my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) will be accepted by this House, and will be passed by a good majority.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I think this is not a question between the two great railway companies altogether, although it appears so now and would be made to appear so by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. It is a matter that is very important to the merchants and manufacturers of Montreal as well as to Canada. There are two views to be considered apart from the view of the railway companies, and I might be twitted with being a partisan of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I beg to state from my place in this House that I have no sympathy with them in this matter whatever, but that I speak in the interests of the people of my locality as well as in the interests of the people of Montreal, especially the merchants and manufacturers there. I can overlook the interests of the two railway companies and speak of the matter from the standpoint of the two interests I have named. We have had a great deal of dust thrown in our eyes in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway and the small Beauharnois Junction Railway Company, and they wish to unite the two interests in the one issue; but we must divide them. We are told that the Grand Trunk Railway or the Montreal and Champlain Junction Company have spent between \$300,000 and \$500,000 in this enterprise since the passing of that charter. Let me correct the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and let me remind the House that Parliament did not grant the charter under which the

company is now operating, and, let me also remind the House that if we grant a charter now we are not stultifying ourselves as regards any action of the House previously. In regard to the matter of expenditure, it should be stated to this House frankly and fairly, and if the hon. gentlemen who have spoken will not do it, someone else must do it, that this money was not spent and has not been spent under the charter referred to and granted last year by the Quebec Legislature for this same Beauharnois Railway Company, but the major portion of it, two-thirds, of the \$300,000 or \$500,000 has been spent on the old Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway to connect that system with Fort Covington and Messina Springs, and it has no reference whatever to the small line spur, or branch which comes in from St. Martine to the town of Beauharnois and then to Valleyfield. I can go over this line, because, as the hon. member who last spoke, said he knew every foot of the ground, so I may say that I know every foot of the ground. I am told that the line has been graded from the Montreal and Champlain Junction to Beauharnois, a distance of six miles, or I will say seven. This line is constructed through a perfectly flat and level country. To say that the road cost \$10,000 a mile is a fair calculation. I grant that seven miles at \$10,000 a mile is \$70,000. I know I am right in stating that the bridge at St. Martine cost the company a sum not exceeding \$50,000. These two items involve an expenditure of \$120,000 on the Beauharnois Junction Railway. If you add three miles of grading at \$2,000 a mile, you have a total expenditure since last year of \$126,000 upon that railway. Granting that this sum has been expended—I regret very much that I have to rise and speak against this company, but as I said I am not speaking against the Grand Trunk Railway and for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but for the interests of my locality and the interests of the city of Montreal—I hold that if this company expended that money, it has only itself to blame. Why? It has been stated in this House and in the committee that the committee had stultified themselves in view of their action last year. I hold that we have a right to change our opinion, especially when the truth dawns on us, as it has dawned on many hon. gentlemen since the question came before the House last year.

An hon. MEMBER. Passes.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). In connection with the question of expenses and the letter sent by the people of that locality to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company I may say, that the people went to that company when they first heard of the bridge spanning the St. Lawrence below Lachine. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refused to entertain the application of the people of that locality then, they did it in good faith and all earnestness. The people of that locality asked a railway for local purposes and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not see their way to build a local railway. You cannot blame them for that. If they see at this later day, as they do see, that they will be able to give those people a railway for local purposes and give themselves a line for far greater and more important purposes, hon. gentlemen cannot say under those circumstances that they have not treated the people in good faith, or that they were playing with them. The people of the locality have now a perfect right to come and say to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company: Gentlemen, we understand your position now. You want a through line, we want a better connection than the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway can ever give us and we will sustain you in running your line in this locality. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not only actuated by a desire to afford better Railway accommodation to the people of that locality but they are moved by the far greater consideration of having a line to the United States border. I would like every hon. gentleman in this House to know that the present line is

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

like going round a horseshoe instead of taking the two nearest points from Montreal to Valleyfield. In going to the village of St. Martine and across the Beauharnois Junction Railway the people have to travel a distance of 44½ miles from Montreal or at least 42 miles. Under the line which is proposed to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people of the town of Beauharnois can reach the city of Montreal by traversing 20½ miles or 21 miles at most. Why will hon. gentlemen compel them to travel double the distance that it can be done in? Have those people no rights? Why should we compel those people for all time to come, for it is not a matter of a year or two, to travel at least double the distance to get to the city of Montreal than they would have if this charter was granted and this railway built. I am sure that if this House considers the position of the people of that locality they will entertain the petition which they have sent in favor of this Bill and which is signed by a couple of thousand names from the lower part of Chateauguay County, from the County of Beauharnois and from portions of the County of Huntingdon. Is this House not to listen to the demand of those people, and are they not going to grant this railway, when, remember, it is not going to cost the Government one cent to construct it? They are not going to ask you for any subsidy for this company and why refuse them this grant? This branch railway and the little scheme that gave birth to this was like this: In 1886 the people came to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and asked them for the railway. The company refused it. Just at that time the Grand Trunk Railway Company saw the importance of the matter and they said: If we allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to build this railway they will have trade connection with New York city and the northern portions of the State of New York and we must checkmate them. It was a very simple matter to go to the Quebec Legislature previous to this House being called together, and to get a charter to run a separate railway to Beauharnois and from there to Valleyfield. That railway will never pay and it would not pay the shovelling of the snow in winter. The people are deceived because this Beauharnois Railway Company is an independent railway company and it will not run in connection with the Montreal and Champlain Railway, but they will have to get out of their cars at Chambly and take the Montreal and Champlain Railway to come to Montreal. Now the company comes before this House and claims the sympathy of the members on the ground that they should not grant a charter for two parallel lines. It is a fallacy to imagine that they are parallel lines. The point where this railway starts from the river at Caughnawaga is seven miles from the Montreal and Champlain Railway, and as it passes up the river it still remains seven miles apart. From Beauharnois to Valleyfield it will be parallel to that line. That is only a distance of fourteen miles, but the Beauharnois Junction Railway ends in the town of Valleyfield, 55 miles from the city of Montreal, whereas this company asks for a charter to run to the boundary line of the Province, which is 74 miles from Montreal. The argument of its being a parallel line must fall to the ground, because it only parallels a little junction railway for a distance of 14 miles. It does not parallel the Montreal and Champlain Railway. It only runs to the same point, and it would be as well to use the argument that the Grand Trunk parallels the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Toronto. They both start in Montreal and end in Toronto. Those two companies start in Montreal and end in Fort Covington or Dundee. But the greater question is this. Are we the merchants and manufacturers of the city of Montreal to be deprived of connection with the city of New York because the Grand Trunk Railway wants to hold the whole trade between those two cities? Is it not known by the hon. gentlemen that the Grand Trunk controls the

traffic over the Delaware and Hudson Railway? Is it not well known also that the same company controls the traffic over the Central Vermont Railway Company, and where is the other railway company that runs between New York and Montreal? Shall we have no competing lines between the cities of New York and Montreal? I say it would not only be a hardship on this locality but a hardship on the city of Montreal and upon the merchants and manufacturers of that city who import their raw material and their merchandise if we refuse to grant this charter asked for.

Mr. HALL. Whether or not the House will adopt the very unusual course of giving the six months' hoist to a Bill reported on by the Committee of Railways rests with the House to decide. As the member in charge of the Bill I must oppose any such action as strenuously as lies in my power. The remarks made in supporting the motion by the hon. members on the other side lead me to make a reference to the matter before the House which is somewhat of a repetition to the members who heard the discussion in another place. I will make those remarks as briefly as possible so as not to weary the House. They referred, in the first place, to a petition that was brought up last year; that is that the application of the present promoters of this road is not in earnest so far as an ultimate design of constructing the railway is concerned, but that it is rather for the purpose of obstructing a company that has already made an expenditure in that direction. To that the answer already made is correct and probably complete. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were approached two years ago to build a local railway for the purpose of reaching Beauharnois and Valleyfield. They declined then and I may say that so far as a local road at present is concerned they would again decline to build it. They have no motive to build a railway in that section of the country for local purposes simply. Since that application was declined by them their larger schemes have been completed or nearly completed; their construction in the west has been finished; their bridge across the St. Lawrence has been built; their short line to the Atlantic sea ports is nearly completed and they were approached by powerful railway companies in Northern New York to know if they would establish a through line which would enable the freight that comes from New York city and State to Montreal to reach that latter city under much more favorable circumstances than at present. The company looked upon that application as a very much more important one than the one previously made for local purposes, and therefore they applied to the House last year for the right to construct such a railway. They were opposed, and the objection I am sure which induced the committee to throw out that Bill was the impression that they were not serious in their application. As I have previously stated in another place, there could be no greater confirmation of their sincerity in their desire to build a through line of railway than their application again this year, after the Grand Trunk Railway have obtained their subsidies from the municipalities, and have actually constructed their road. It can no longer be said that they only desire to obstruct the Grand Trunk. Their desire is to construct a more direct line in the public interest, and they ask the House for the authority to do so. The only other point which has been raised is the question of existing right, and that point has been very ably dealt with by the hon. member who has preceded me. This Bill brings before this House a principle which is to me very much more important than any of the details which have been referred to, this is, the principle whether the right of this House, give competing railway facilities in different sections of the country is to be restricted in any way. On the North Shore of the St. Lawrence there are two important lines of railway which run so close together that a stone can be

thrown from one to the other. Is there any reason why the same thing should not exist on the south side of the St. Lawrence, especially when we consider that this line would shorten the distance fourteen miles, and that the people interested have petitioned in favor of the road? It seems to me it would be a retrograde step for the House to decide that because a railway already existed, no other should go through the country. I think we should desire to see in every settled portion of this country a healthy active railway competition, and I am sure this House will not adopt the principle that because a railway already exists, therefore they are going to refuse the application of another railway company, which is presenting its application in good faith, and proposes to carry out the work without asking for any Government assistance whatever.

Mr. WATSON. It may seem strange that one who is so much in favor of free trade in railways should oppose this Bill; but I do so as representing a class of people who are greatly in need of railway accommodation which has been promised them for years by the promoters of this Bill, and many of whom have to haul their grain a hundred miles or more for the want of it. Deputation after deputation has waited on the general manager of this company and asked that they should fulfil the pledges that they made years ago, and the reply has always been that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have no money with which to build those branch lines; and yet we are told that they want to parallel an existing road in the east. Therefore, on principle, and in the interests of those people to whom these promises were made, I oppose this Bill. I believe that a company that has received such large assistance from the Dominion of Canada for opening up the North-West, ought to fulfil the pledges they have made to construct branch lines in the North-West, before they take the money which has been granted by this Parliament to parallel lines of railway for opening up and developing, as has been said, the State of New York. Now, we are told by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) that the expenditure on the existing road has only been some \$126,000. The railway company was informed, and it is not disputed, that the Grand Trunk or this local company has spent something in the neighborhood of \$400,000 on that piece of railway; and I feel as others feel who have spoken, that if we granted this charter we should be breaking faith with men who have put their money into this enterprise. This House gave these people assurances a year ago that their investments would be protected. They claim that it is against the settled principle of this House to allow parallel lines of railway to be built. That principle has been carried out during the present Session. It is only a week or two since a charter was asked for a railway to traverse the same ground as a railway which was chartered some three years ago from Calgary in the North-West, and the committee refused to grant that charter on the ground that the people who controlled the other railway have certain rights that should be protected, although the only evidence given to the committee was that they had graded one mile of railway. There was no evidence that they had spent \$500. As one who opposed this Bill last year, I feel that I have equal reason for opposing it to-day.

M. PRÉFONTAINE: M. l'Orateur, en me levant pour appuyer la motion de l'honorable député de Stormont et Cornwall (M. Bergin), j'aimerais à donner les raisons de la position que je vais prendre sur cette question. Les raisons qui ont été données en langue anglaise par ceux qui m'ont précédé pour s'opposer à la passation de la mesure maintenant sous considération sont, à mon point de vue, tellement fortes que ceux qui supportent cette mesure n'y ont pas répondu. L'argument le plus fort c'est certainement celui basé sur le précédent de l'année dernière. Lorsque les deux

compagnies qui sont devant la Chambre à l'heure qu'il est, l'une s'opposant au bill actuel et l'autre demandant sa passation, sont venues devant le comité des chemins de fer l'année dernière, le bill que l'on demandait alors a été rejeté par la grande majorité du comité, et la raison qui a décidé le comité à rejeter ce bill existe encore aujourd'hui. Cette raison était que la compagnie du Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway était à faire des instances auprès de la législature locale pour obtenir la passation d'une loi l'autorisant à construire l'embranchement que cette compagnie a commencé à construire depuis. Et pour cette seule raison, le comité des chemins de fer, l'année dernière, a rejeté un bill semblable à celui qui est maintenant sous considération. Agissant de bonne foi, la Compagnie du Montreal and Champlain Railway a obtenu de la Législature de Québec les pouvoirs nécessaires; elle a commencé ses travaux, et elle a dépensé des sommes considérables pour construire cet embranchement qui était demandé par les localités spécialement intéressées à la construction de ce chemin de fer. Maintenant que cette compagnie a dépensé un montant considérable,—on ne s'entend pas sur le chiffre, les uns disent \$300,000, d'autres disent \$125,000, mais j'aime mieux prendre l'autorité de l'honorable député de Grenville (M. Shanly) qui est un homme expérimenté en construction de chemin de fer et qui nous dit que lorsque la compagnie du Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway prétend avoir dépensé \$300,000 il croit qu'elle a dépensé cette somme,—je le demande, serait-il juste, serait-il raisonnable de donner à une compagnie rivale les pouvoirs qui lui ont été refusés l'année dernière?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. The time for Private Bills is expired.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for Private Bills having expired, the House will pass to Public Bills.

DEFECTIVE LETTERS PATENT.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act respecting defective letters patent and the discharge of securities to the Crown, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. As the Bill interferes to some extent with the rights of the Crown, and has been considered by the Executive, I am authorised to state that it has received the assent of the Crown.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand, from reading the discussion that took place when this Bill was before the House on Thursday last, that the hon. the Minister of Finance proposed it should stand over until the Railway Bill in the hands of the Minister of Railways should be brought down and discussed. I do not object at all to that course, but I desire to have it understood that if this is the course which the House approves of, an opportunity will then be afforded of taking the opinion of the House on the provisions of this Bill. I do not desire that it should be left in the hands almost entirely of my hon. friend to say whether or not the Government will incorporate the provisions of this measure in the Government Railway Bill. I desire to press the Bill, or, at all events, some of its provisions, and I believe they ought to be passed, though perhaps not exactly in the form in which they are to be found in the Bill I have had the honor to introduce. This Bill deals with three matters. It deals with the packing of frogs, as it is called; and from the discussion that took place, I understand there is no serious objection on either side of the House against that provision.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

On the contrary, it was thought by one hon. member at all events, who I see spoke on that occasion, that in that regard the Bill did not go quite far enough, and I may say that I would be quite prepared to accept or to propose an amendment embodying the provision which that hon. member suggested as to the packing of the wing rails, as it is called, so, as far as possible, to give protection to the employés in whose interest this Bill is intended. There is another provision which I do not think ought to meet with very serious opposition. That is contained in the 5th clause, and is that the oil cups used for oiling the valves of the locomotive shall not be placed outside. It is possible that that may be the only method to attain the desired end. That may be amended by saying that this should be done by that means or by some other means which would be equally effective in order to obtain the end which it is desired to attain. I am not at all wedded to the exact provisions of the Bill. I have taken it, as hon. gentlemen must have observed, mainly from the statute of the Province of Ontario, where it has been in force for five or six years; but since that time there have been improvements, and other suggestions are now made, and I think the proper way to deal with the subject would be to say that the end we seek should be attained, but the means should be left to each and every Railway Company, that this Parliament should enact that the Company should so oil the machinery that it should not be necessary to oil it in motion, and that steps should be taken to prevent danger to the employés in the discharge of their duty. There is a provision of the Bill, however, in regard to which there is more difficulty, that is in regard to the running boards on the roof of the freight cars. While this Parliament is, of course, quite competent to enact that all the freight cars belonging to the railways of Canada shall have these running boards, we have no control over the freight cars, which I fancy are a majority of those which pass through the country, which pass over our roads in the carriage of freight and come from the United States, and we cannot say that they shall be built in any particular form or that they shall give any particular protection; but it is quite plain that some of the States on the other side are moving in this direction, and I think, on the whole, perhaps, the better plan would be to have this Bill sent to a small Select Committee to consider its various provisions, and I have here dozens of suggestions which have been made since the Bill was placed before the country. Then, these might be embodied in the report of the committee, and the House might afterwards put as many of them as they saw fit into the Bill of which the Government has charge. I quite agree with the view that whatever we do should be put into the Government Bill. We should have only one Railway Bill, which, if possible, should embrace all these provisions. If the Minister of Finance will agree to that suggestion, and the House approves of it, I will ask the House to read the Bill a second time and then refer it to a committee, and then, when it emerges from the committee, the House can amend it, as I have no doubt it may, in several particulars, and especially in making the enactments general instead of particular in regard to the forms which are to be used. I may say that we do not occupy, in Canada, a very enviable position if I am to judge from certain statistics which I have seen in regard to the management of our railways, both in regard to the carriage of our passengers, and the number of employés who are killed and wounded yearly. That number is very large indeed, and is much larger in Canada in proportion to the number of persons carried than it is in any of the neighboring States of the Union. I am not going to say that the railway companies are specially to blame for that, but I do not think they have been very active or diligent in adopting means for the protection of their employés. It was stated here by an hon. gentleman of great experience in railway matters that there

was a certain parliament dealing with this question which was more competent than this House could possibly be to deal with it, and we ought to await the result of the deliberations of that body. I do not quite agree with that proposition. I think perhaps we may speed that body, and we may speed the motions of the railway companies which have the power to deal with these matters if we take steps, not at once, and not at all in disregard of the interests of the railway companies, but in a reasonable time to call upon them to put as much of these improvements in force on their cars as may to a large extent limit the danger to which railway employes are necessarily exposed in their hazardous occupation. Let me point out some of the matters which are being dealt with in the neighboring States. There is, first, and I believe it is at this moment in use, what is known as a power brake on freight cars. I understand that at this moment that power brake is in use on the Pacific roads, on the Denver and Rio Grande, on the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati and St. Louis, on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and on the Topeka and Santa Fe. If it is in force on these railways now, it is not impossible that in time it might be put on our railways. At the same time the automatic couplers are gradually coming into use under the legislation of different States of the Union, and those are of the greatest importance. I know, of course, that we ought not to move too speedily in this direction. We ought not to insist upon cars which are in use being altered or changed, but we might say that within a limited time any cars which may be constructed or repaired should have these reasonable and necessary appliances. At present in the States of Connecticut, New York, Michigan and Massachusetts, these automatic couplers are required to be put on all cars under a penalty after a given date. We would be going somewhat in that direction, and would be insisting upon the carrying out of what we must all desire, if we were to enact similarly that the railway companies in this country which are subject to this Parliament should also apply these improvements within a certain time. I am very glad to hear from what an hon. gentleman said the other day that possibly the necessity which I think we must all feel of affording some protection to the brakemen—those unfortunate men who have at great danger and at all seasons of the year to run on the top of the freight cars—is likely to be done away with, and certainly it is not before it was necessary. Still, perhaps the greatest danger exists in the coupling of cars. I find that in this country, in 1885, 285 men were killed in coupling cars, and in 1886, 222.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that in Canada alone?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, in Canada alone. Then there were those who were killed by falling from engines or cars in 1885, 117; and I am glad to say that there is a great reduction in 1886, when the number was 67. I am deducting the number of passengers who were reported to have been killed in that way, the number of whom was reported in each year to be eight. I think, therefore, that the subject of this Bill is worthy of the consideration of the House, and that it cannot be said that we are moving too hastily, or are proposing to act in any unfair manner towards the companies. I perfectly recognise that we ought not to do anything of that kind, and that we might interfere very seriously with their traffic if we made an arbitrary provision that no car should run through Canada except under the enactments which we might make here; but I think it is worthy of the careful consideration of a committee to which I ask the House to refer this Bill, and afterwards the House could, under the direction of the Government, take such action as they pleased on that report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There can be no objection at all to the second reading of the Bill, but I would suggest

that, instead of sending it to a special committee, it should be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, and should be brought up at the time when the Bill which has already been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways comes under consideration. I will say to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat and who takes such a deep interest in this matter, and has so long taken such an interest in this important question, that every opportunity will be given for the discussion of the matter, and that, when the Government Bill comes to be considered, every provision of this Bill will be taken as a notice of motion, so that any of the provisions of this Bill can be introduced as an amendment. If they are not included in the Government Bill, they can be taken as a notice, and I hope that will be acceptable to the hon. gentleman, and I think it would be better than to send the Bill to a select committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be disposed to agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, and I think the hon. gentleman should accept it. I believe that a large number of members on both sides of the House are disposed to favor the Bill of the hon. gentleman, and I can see no reason for referring it to a special committee. If there were a large difference of opinion in regard to it, there might be some reason for referring it to a committee, but in view of the consensus of opinion, I might say the almost unanimous consensus of opinion, I think the suggestion of the Minister of Finance is a reasonable one.

Mr. McCARTHY. After what has fallen from the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the leader of the Opposition, I will not press what I thought was the best course to adopt. It was not because of any difference of opinion in the House that I proposed to refer this Bill to a special committee, but in order that it might give consideration to the various suggestions which have been made. I have a large bundle of them here, principally from the owners of patents, who desire to put forward their particular panaceas for these evils, and I thought that in a special committee we could perhaps deal with them more conveniently than we could in the Committee of the Whole. Of course the Bill has to come before the Committee of the Whole when it comes from the special committee, but if both my hon. friends think this is the better course to adopt I will not press my view further.

Bill read the second time.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Kirkpatrick for the second reading of Bill (No. 7), to permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters, resumed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government have very carefully considered this measure, and there is a great deal in it. The general principle and the general features of the measure entirely commend themselves to the Government as wise and desirable, but at the same time the Government feel that this is connected with a larger and a still more important question, which would probably be prejudiced by the adoption of this Bill. It is very well known that there is a great desire on the part of the Congress of the United States that a measure of this kind should be adopted. On the other hand, the policy of the Government of Canada has been, when gentlemen opposite were in power, as also under the present Government, to use every possible means of obtaining the common registration of vessels between the two countries, and the common enjoyment of reciprocity in the coasting trade of the two countries. Now, Sir, there is, perhaps, no immediate prospect of our being able to obtain the larger measure embracing the whole coasting trade

between the United States and Canada, but I think there is very good reason to believe that if we do not accept this measure at the present moment, which is greatly desired by the Congress of the United States, they will be prepared to go a step further, and, at all events, adopt the coasting trade as far as the inland waters of Canada are concerned. I think, under these circumstances, we may fairly ask the House to pause in the consideration of this measure, and allow us to ascertain if it is not possible to get the larger measure which would absorb this, and which would give all the advantages this measure proposes to give, and upon terms which would be more fair and equal between the two countries. I hope, under the present circumstances, this measure will not be pressed, and that we shall have an opportunity of seeing whether we cannot obtain the same principle of reciprocity in the coasting trade, or at all events, the inland waters of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. I would have been disposed, for my part, to urge the hon. member to go on with his Bill, but since, as the hon. Minister suggests, by pausing we may have before us the prospect of an enlarged measure of reciprocity, I think that is an adequate reason why we should pause. It is evident that reciprocity is in the air, it is moving all the time. We have been making progress this very Session, we have obtained reciprocity in seeds, in trees, in shrubs and fruit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have sown the seed.

Mr. LAURIER. And it will bear fruit by-and-bye. We may not get it all at once, but we will get it piecemeal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am very sorry to hear the decision of the Minister of Finance that he does not think this Bill should pass at the present time. I must say that I cannot agree with his reasoning. I do not think that if we want reciprocity in wrecking, we should decline to enjoy the advantages and privileges of that reciprocity, in order that we may try and get a larger measure of reciprocity in some other matters. I believe that if we pass this measure and meet the United States Government in a friendly spirit, showing them that where they held out the hand of fellowship, where they offered reciprocity in any one or more subjects, we are ready to meet them in the same spirit, I believe it would lead to reciprocity in coasting and to further reciprocal trading rights hereafter, more easily than if we say: We will not trade with you at all, we will not meet you half way, we will not meet you even in this little matter of wrecking. I think a very large number of people throughout the country are earnestly desirous of seeing this Bill pass. I do not think my hon. friend who comes from down by the sea, fully realises the extent of that interest, the number of ships that we have trading upon our inland lakes, the number of men that are there employed, the capital invested in it. All these men are deeply interested in this Bill; they are anxious to have greater facilities to render aid to vessels wrecked or in distress, greater privileges to assist in the saving of life and property. The hon. members of this House, I think, have had communication from every part of the Province of Ontario, the Province which is chiefly interested in this Bill, urging that it should become law. To night, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) came to me and said he was very sorry he had to go away by the train, but he desired me to say that he had received a letter from the mayor of Owen Sound, stating that he had been communicating with the shipping men and people interested in marine in that town and neighborhood, and that they all urged him to support the Bill, and hoped that it would pass. He gave me a telegram from Mr. Simpson, managing director of the Owen Sound Dry Dock and Ship Building Navigation Company, in which he says:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

"Am decidedly in favor of the Act. The want of such an Act, to my own knowledge, has been the cause of much inconvenience and delay to vessel owners, and of times of loss of life and property. The only advantage has been to a few tug owners who will be fully compensated, in my opinion, if equal rights are accorded to them in American waters as to our vessels in Canadian waters. It is not so much, however, a matter of sentiment and advantage as of humanity."

Sir, another ground upon which this Bill has been opposed is that taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who opposes it because it will interfere with the wreckers. Who are these wreckers? One or two companies that own some inferior wrecking appliances, men who are unable to render the assistance which wreckers ought to be able to give. But it is injurious to our men, because our own people do not come forward and invest money in better plant because they have such a limited field for their operations. But if this Bill was to pass and reciprocity in this matter was granted, I know, as a fact, that considerable capital would be invested in wrecking apparatus, that money would be invested by Canadians in wrecking, not only in our Canadian waters, but also in American waters. Sir, I state as a fact that the largest number of wrecks, by far the largest number, have been in American waters, and also the greatest value of wrecks has been in American waters. If that is the case, it is very important to our own wreckers that they should get American waters to operate in. My hon. friend from North Norfolk made a long speech the other night during which he read from papers that had been brought down to this House to show that when application had been made for permission to use American tugs and American vessels in Canadian waters on our side, it had been granted by our Minister of Customs, and he defended the Minister of Customs for granting this permission for allowing these wreckers to come in. He stated that in no case when application had been made to the Minister of Customs, had it been denied. Sir, if that is the case, and if the Americans can come into our waters, why not pass this Bill and get the reciprocal right to go into their waters? The hon. member said that when application was made by our shipowners to Washington to have the right of going into American waters with our tugs, the answer came: "No;" and he instanced the case of the *Algoma*, wrecked near Thunder Bay, where they had to get a tug and wrecking apparatus from 600 miles away to render assistance to that vessel, although the Canadian owners had vessels of their own to do it, but they were refused the privilege. That is what I contend, that in every case when we have a wreck in their waters and we apply to them for permission to use our Canadian tugs or wrecking apparatus, they refuse it; but if application is made to our humane, courteous and affable Minister of Customs, he immediately says: "Yes," or if he does not say so, he ought to. He ought to allow the first wrecking vessel that offers to render assistance, and he does so, I believe. Sir, I say that we do not want to ask, as a matter of favor, permission to go into American waters, but as a matter of right. We ought to have a law upon our Statute-book, such as has been placed upon the Statute-book of the United States, that there should be reciprocal rights in this matter. The cause of humanity demands it, the interests of our shipowners and of insurance men demand it. I hope this Government will allow this Bill to pass, and show that the opinion of this House and this country is that we are ready to meet the United States Government, so far as necessary, in all such reciprocal matters. We have shown it by our readiness in putting seeds, trees and shrubs on the free list. Why should we not meet them in this matter also? Why do the Government withhold reciprocity of wrecking in order to try and draw something greater with it? If that is the policy of the Government, I would ask why they did not withhold reciprocity in trees, and seeds, and shrubs, in order to try and get reciprocity in all natural products? Why did they grant the one until they had the larger mea-

sure granted too? I do not think the reason for the refusal is correct, and I hope the House will pass the Bill through its second reading.

Mr. EDGAR. I was very much surprised to hear the Finance Minister put the veto of the Government on this Bill, because I thought if there was one question the House might be allowed to deal with without being influenced by party considerations or considerations effecting the Government or the Opposition this was the question. I thought too this was a question, and I have looked at it rather carefully, respecting which I do not blame the executive of the country. I frankly say I do not blame the Government of the day, or the former Government, for their conduct in this matter, and I think this Parliament is to blame, if any one is to blame. Every hon. member who had a right to introduce a Bill to meet the American Act of 1878 in the spirit in which this Bill meets it, is to blame, and not any member of the Government in particular. I find that in 1878, when a circular was issued by the former Government drawing the attention of the officers of the department to the law on the subject of wrecking, the American law had not been passed then, and I find that when the American Act of 1878 offering reciprocal privileges was passed, the present Government took an early opportunity to inform their officers that they desired that no harsh measures be enforced under the law. On 12th June, 1879, a report was made by the Minister of Customs to the Privy Council on this subject, which was adopted, in which it stated:

"With respect to the circular of March, 1878, that no Canadian officer ever interpreted the circular or the law, as justifying interference with the efforts of vessels of any nationality to succor vessels in distress and save human life or property, while there was a possibility of preventing their loss, nor has any such case of interference ever occurred."

I accept that as the opinion of the Government, and I ask, when they stated this to be their view, why Parliament should not pass an Act placing it on the Statute-book. I can see no reason why this should not be done. They go on further, and in a circular issued in September, 1879, a departmental circular of the Minister of Customs, they instructed their officers as follows:

"It is not to be understood that the circular of March, 1878, has any application to cases wherein life may be in danger or where property may be jeopardised by delay, such, for instance, as the grounding of a vessel in circumstances in which immediate assistance would prevent a wreck; nor is there any possible case in which vessels of any nationality should be prevented from going to the rescue of persons in peril of their lives, or of vessels in danger of being lost."

I say again when the Government went so far as that in September, 1879, what objection can there be to passing this Bill, which proposes merely to place upon the Statute-book the interpretation which the Government themselves very properly chose to put upon the customs law? Then again on 15th November, 1880, commenting on some complaint by the Americans as to the refusal of our authorities to permit their wreckers to go to the assistance of vessels in distress, the present Minister of Customs says:

"The above statement of facts the Minister admits clearly establishes the fact that there was not, at any time, the least obstruction placed in the way of Mr. Evans, nor of his tug to perform such part of the work as it was fitted for, but, on the contrary, the evidence shows that his interests were carefully considered, and every facility offered by the Collector Barrett, of Port Dover, Ontario, to protect his property."

Why did not the Government bring in a Bill asking Parliament to accept the American terms? What is the only reason put forward by the Government against accepting this Bill? It is that by refusing it we may perhaps obtain coasting privileges which would be very valuable. Did not the Government have some experience in trying to force reciprocity upon the Americans; did they not try during a great many years to force it on them; did they not especially try in 1880 to force the Americans to make concessions to us in the direction of admitting our fish free by making reprisals on their vessels, and surely hon.

gentlemen opposite know full well that those efforts will have no effect on our neighbors, and that our resisting this law will not make them more likely to grant us additional concessions. Another reason was urged by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening against this House adopting the Bill. The hon. gentleman used these words:

"I say that the advantage which we enjoy in the matter of wrecking is very great."

I wonder who enjoy this advantage? Surely they are not the owners of the commercial marine of Canada, surely not the owners of the cargoes, and surely not Canadian underwriters who enjoy any advantage from the present condition of the law. They can only be the owners of wrecking craft on the lakes, and surely the interests of a small class like that cannot be considered to be the interests of the whole people. I have no doubt that the wrecking business is a very honest and proper calling and a very necessary one, but surely the country cannot be called upon to feed them with wrecks in order to enable them to make a living. If this matter were left to the simple, honest, open, untrammelled vote of this House to-night no doubt this Bill would be carried by a large majority. This is not an executive matter in which the Government has announced any policy on any former occasion or taken any ground except in this very direction, and this is a case where the House should be left to exercise its legislative functions without the interference of the Executive. If there ever was a case in which the House should be allowed to be free surely this is a case, and I add my appeal to that of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) to the Minister of Finance representing the Government on this occasion, and I ask him to let the House have a free vote on the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Before the question is put to the House I desire to offer a few remarks. I do not know particularly what the leader of the Opposition meant when he said he could smell reciprocity in the air. It was quite evident, at least to my mind, that he was unaware of the fact that on this question of reciprocity in wrecking and coasting there has been a law on the Statute-book since 1867 offering the United States the freest possible intercourse in those matters. More than that. If the hon. gentleman who has just spoken had taken the trouble to read a little further on in the despatch to which he referred, he would there have ascertained that in the despatch sent from our Government, emanating from the Customs Department, that we pointed out, as long ago as 1879, that this Government was prepared to enter into wider commercial relations, in so far as the coasting trade and wrecking were concerned. He might also have informed the House that an order was issued even by the Government of which he was a supporter, and by my predecessor until repeated refusals had been made by the American Government to allow a Canadian vessel or tug to enter its waters and render assistance to any Canadian wreck. It was for these reasons that the late Government issued their order to prevent American tugs and wreckers from coming into Canadian waters in order to save their property. Under that regulation which was issued by the late Government many persons in Canada invested their means in wrecking and tug plant for saving not only life, but all property of wrecks of our own country and of others that take place on the north side of the great lakes or on our rivers. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant, nor to whom he referred, nor do I propose to enquire, when he insinuated that wrecks had to be supplied in order to keep alive certain parties in this country who own wrecking plant. This I do know from my experience in the department, that until the law was enforced by the late Government and followed up by the present Government in this respect that we had no wrecking plant of any conse-

quence in Canada. Now that we have wrecking plant that is quite prepared to do all work in our waters, we find that the American Government, as they do upon all occasions where their own interests are at stake, pass a law giving reciprocity in this particular subject alone. But they studiously refuse to extend it any further where it would by any possibility interfere with any interest of their own. It is a question for this House to say whether we should upon all occasions, whenever any particular subject or act of theirs will give to them the advantage over those which are possessed by Canadians, that we should at once accept it, whether it is to our own interest or not. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says it is in our own interest. It may be in the particular locality in which he lives. It is not so in the west. If this is passed now without our asking for further concessions to our marine, we shall destroy a large amount of interest which our people have in this industry, and in which they were induced to invest their money only after the refusal on the part of the Government of Canada to allow American vessels to come into our waters. So late ago as 1878 when this question first came under the notice of the Government, and when complaints were made at the Canadian Government enforcing the provisions of this order, which was issued by my predecessor, I find it was scarcely a month after we had assumed office, when we reply to a despatch from Washington:

"The undersigned has carefully considered the suggestion of Mr. Everts in his despatch of the 13th June, in which he suggests a modification of the instructions given in the circular of the 5th March, 1878, relating to wrecking in Canadian waters, and finds that said orders were not issued until after repeated refusals on the part of United States officials to allow Canadian tugs to assist or interfere with British vessels wrecked in United States waters and not until instructions were sent from Washington preventing said aid being rendered by British tugs of which the following is a copy:—

"WASHINGTON, 14th June, 1877.

"Vessels ashore in American waters pass into hands of United States customs authorities, cannot be taken possession of by alien wreckers."

"H. F. FRENCH,

"Assistant Secretary."

These orders having been continually enforced the Canadian Government deemed it in the interests of their own property holders and of that particular trade in this country to enforce the law as it stood on the Statute-book. The present Government have upon all occasions extended the fullest privilege to American tugs and American wreckers available. Even where those tugs may have been available and when there was danger of immediate loss of property and of life—in no cases have those privileges been denied, and it is only where vessels have gone on the shore and remained there for a short time, or a long time without any danger of destruction that a refusal has been extended to the Americans. Such liberality has not been extended by the American Government to Canadian tug owners or to Canadian wreckers, and I see good reason for adopting the suggestion made by the Finance Minister that we should not give this privilege without some return, particularly in a case of this kind where it is in our interest, as I believe it to be in the interest of the American shipowners as well, that we should have the freest possible intercourse in coasting trade in inland waters at least, and if it is possible on the sea coast. It was only last January, if I may refer to it, that in sending a despatch to the department of Washington on this very subject, on the charges which are imposed upon vessels in making entries inward and outward that the Government called the attention of the American Government to the existence of the provision in our present law. The law was quoted, and they were asked to extend to us the rights and privileges which we were prepared to extend to them in the coasting and wrecking trade. Now, if we adopt the reciprocity as suggested by the Bill before the House, they will have attained all that they want and all that they ask; together with the destruction of our wrecking industry, and, most certainly,

Mr. BOWELL.

refusal will follow in respect to reciprocity in the coasting trade of the country. I am rather sorry that my friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has taken up this subject so warmly and thinks it so absolutely necessary in the interests of the country, and more particularly the interests of the neighborhood of the outlet of Lake Ontario that we should accept the proposition which has been made. I believe it to be in the interests of the wrecking industry, in the interests of the country and in the interests of the coasting trade that we should hold the position we are in at present. I may refer to three or four instances, within these last six or seven years, in which the Americans legislated directly against the carrying trade of this country, and when we adopted the same policy, if they found it affected their immediate interests, they at once passed Bills repealing the clause in their Acts which prevented certain trade with this country, and asked us at once to accede to their request to do likewise. If we did that in one or two cases to which I might call the attention of the House, the result would be the destruction of certain industries in this country. I find no fault with the action of the American Government in this matter. They have acted as I believe every Government should act; for whenever they found it to their interest that to repeal a law or a portion of law would give greater trade to their own people, and would assist in the development of their trade, they at once repealed that law. But I do not believe, neither does it follow, that we should adopt a similar policy when we know that the adoption of that policy would injure our own trade and certain interests which we have built up under this and other systems.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Why do you injure the seeds and small fruits?

Mr. BOWELL. We should not have done it. If the law had not been on the Statute-book, I do not suppose it would have been done.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex.) It seems to me that the wise and statesmanlike policy, enunciated by the hon. Minister of Finance, is one that should commend itself to the good sense of this House. We who are not taken into the inner confidence of the Executive are not in a position to dabble in legislation of this kind wisely. While the generous and disinterested speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), may command our sympathy, I do not think it commands our reason. He is proceeding entirely on false premises. Somebody has led him to believe that this a question in which humanity is involved, and that these wrecking regulations affect the lives and properties of those engaged in our inland marine. It has been pointed out again and again to-night very ably by the hon. Minister of Customs, and also by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that that is a fallacious idea; and I trust that no member of this House will vote on this Bill should it come to a vote, under the impression that there is any question of humanity involved. The late Mackenzie Administration were compelled, under the pressure of circumstances, brought about by the action of the American Government, to pass certain Orders in Council which now govern our wrecking system. Before these Orders in Council were enforced, the wrecking business in Canadian waters was almost exclusively in the hands of American tugmen; but after they were passed, our tugmen at various points in our inland waters, invested their money in wrecking tugs, hydraulic pumps and other wrecking appliances, and trained a class of men who have become skilled in that work, and who will be useful citizens to the Dominion in other directions should their services be required; and having established this system, we are now asked, for an empty sentiment which has no foundation in fact, to repeal our own policy, and throw these men out of

employment and give the business in which they are engaged to our American cousins. If we are to adopt this policy, I believe in going the whole length. I do not believe in giving our neighbors one little item of privilege which they desire, and thereby entirely place ourselves in their hands. If we have anything to exchange, let us give them something which will be worthy of their acceptance so that it may bring about the reciprocity which I believe we all desire. I think if we had that reciprocity which the hon. Minister of Finance has spoken of in our inland waters at least, all those engaged in the wrecking business in our Canadian trade would be well able to hold their own with their American competitors; but while our neighbors offer us reciprocity in wrecking they at the same time withhold from us the small privilege of the coasting business—the one small item of being permitted to tow into an American port a wreck which has been saved by a Canadian tug. I would ask my hon. friend who has distinguished himself in the cause of humanity not to quarrel with his best friends, but to submit to their superior wisdom; but if the Bill is to be pressed to a second reading, I propose to move a rider to the first clause to this effect: As soon as the Government of the United States shall accept the statutory offer respecting the coasting trade, contained in chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada so far as the same may apply to the inland waters of Canada contiguous to the United States." If the Bill with this provision is allowed to pass, we shall then see whether the American Government and shipowners are sincere in their desire to meet us in this matter, or whether they are throwing dust into the eyes of Canadians in pretending to give us something which is valueless to us in order that they may get something from us which is valuable to them. I live in a part of the country where there is a great deal of wrecking done and where there are several wrecking companies, and I have never known a case of the Minister of Customs of Canada refusing the privilege to an American tug to wreck in Canadian waters, not merely where life and property were in imminent danger, but where there were not, on its being proven that a Canadian tug was not at hand and immediately available. I myself have applied a dozen times within the last ten years on behalf of American wrecking tugs and obtained for them permission to wreck in Canadian waters where life and property were not in imminent danger, because at the time Canadian tugs were engaged at a distance, either in Lake Huron or the Georgian Bay. The policy of the Canadian Government in this matter has been humane, liberal and generous, while that of our American neighbors has been inhumane, illiberal and ungenerous. Their conduct to us in these matters has been of a character to rouse the indignation of those who live on the borders, and who see the petty way in which Canadians are harassed, not merely in this matter, but in every matter in which United States officials can harass Canadian citizens. I do not say that this is done by the United States Government. I think many of these things are done without the knowledge of the United States Government, to affect local interests; but it is in my personal knowledge, and almost in my daily experience that the Canadian Government and Canadian officials, in all their dealings with Americans, set an example for courtesy and kindness that would be well worthy of their imitation; and to talk to-night of this being a generous offer on the part of the Americans is only an assertion made by one who has not studied the subject with his head, but has only given to it the warm impulses of his heart. It was only yesterday that I received a letter from a gentleman who has lived many years on the Detroit River, and who is familiar with the wrecking business, in which letter he says:—

"When I wrote you some time ago regarding the wrecking business and stated that a much larger number of disasters occurred in Canadian

waters than in American waters, I meant in the waters of this vicinity.

"I have spoken to all parties interested in navigation in this part of the country and they all agree that it would be much better to let the wrecking laws remain as they are, for the very sound reason that the Americans will benefit much more than the Canadians by the change.

"The talk of inhumanity regarding the present wrecking laws is all nonsense. In my twenty years' experience in this business I have never known the customs authorities to refuse a permit to American steamers to render assistance when life and property were in imminent danger.

"The only occasions that permits were refused were when Americans wanted to do the work themselves instead of employing Canadians. I hope Mr. Kirkpatrick will withdraw his Bill for you may be sure that the Americans would not be so willing to give reciprocity in wrecking if they were not sure that it would be more to their advantage than to the Canadians. Do you not think that it is pretty cheeky on the part of the Americans to include in their Bill, the Welland Canal? I presume they would also take in Georgian Bay and all Canadian inland waters. I see that quite a number of petitions favoring this measure, but I am very strong in my opinion that it would be better for Canada to let the wrecking laws remain as they are."

I trust my hon. friend having achieved his object in bringing his Bill before the House and the country, will allow it to stand and mature for future legislation, when the seeds which he has planted, and which have been referred to more than once to-night, will bear fruit; later on he will recognise the wisdom of this action, and will find that when the Government advise him to take a certain course, there is more in it than meets his ear and appears on the surface, and next year the hon. gentleman will be glad he took the advice of the Minister of Finance and thus gained on a larger scale the objects which he desired and retained for himself the confidence and respect of his colleagues.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire to say but a very few words on this subject. The hon. gentleman who spoke last told us that it is merely a question of sentiment or humanity which is involved in this matter. I may say that I have received from persons in whom I have very great confidence letters urging me to support the Bill and to do my utmost to make it become the law of the land, and they pointed out to me that there was a great deal more than mere sentimental interest at stake. In fact, they said that persons who have large interests in this country are very much in favor of the passing of such a law as that proposed by my hon. friend from Frontenac. However much these people may be interested in a pecuniary sense, I know that each and every one of them is a patriotic Canadian citizen, and that although their own interests may suffer for the time being, the reasons of public policy given by the members of the Administration who have spoken to-night will cause them to approve of the vote I am about to give. I am satisfied that they will take into consideration the fact that the motives which induce the Government to call upon their friends to withdraw their support from the Bill, are motives worthy of the consideration of every patriotic Canadian, and for that reason, and for that reason alone, I will have to vote against the proposition of my hon. friend.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire, Sir, to add a few words—

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. gentleman has spoken on the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to make a personal explanation.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I object to the hon. gentleman making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to make a personal explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will leave you, Sir, to decide whether it is strictly a personal explanation or not.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I object to another speech from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

The House divided on motion of Mr. Kirkpatrick.

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Amyot, | Fiset, | Mitchell, |
| Armstrong, | Fisher, | Paterson (Brant), |
| Bain (Wentworth), | Gauthier, | Perry, |
| Béchar, | Gillmor, | Platt, |
| Bell, | Girouard, | Préfontaine, |
| Bergeron, | Godbout, | Rinfret, |
| Bergin, | Guay, | Robertson, |
| Bernier, | Hale, | Rowand, |
| Borden, | Holton, | Ste. Marie, |
| Bourassa, | Kirk, | Scriven, |
| Bowman, | Kirkpatrick, | Semple, |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich.), | Labelle, | Shanly, |
| Casgrain, | Lang, | Smith, (Sir Donald) |
| Choquette, | Laurier, | Somerville, |
| Cook, | Lovitt, | Sutherland, |
| Coulombe, | Macdonald (Huron), | Thérien, |
| Desaulniers, | McIntyre, | Trow, |
| Dessaint, | McMillan (Huron), | Turcot, |
| Doyon, | McMullen, | Watson, |
| Edgar, | Meigs, | Wilson (Elgin).—61. |
| Ellis, | | |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bain (Soulanges), | Foster, | Moncreiff, |
| Baird, | Freeman, | Montague, |
| Baker, | Gigault, | O'Brien, |
| Bowell, | Gordon, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Boyle, | Grandbois, | Porter, |
| Brown, | Guillet, | Robillard, |
| Bryson, | Henderson, | Roome, |
| Cameron, | Hesson, | Rykert, |
| Cargill, | Hickey, | Skinner, |
| Carling, | Hudspeth, | Small, |
| Carpenter, | Ives, | Smith (Ontario), |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe) | Jamieson, | Sproule, |
| Chapleau, | Kenny, | Stevenson, |
| Charlton, | Langevin (Sir Hector) | Taylor, |
| Cimon, | Laurie, | Thompson, |
| Cockburn, | McGilla, | Tisdale, |
| Colby, | McDonald (Victoria), | Tupper (Sir Charles), |
| Coughlin, | McDougald (Pictou), | Tupper (Pictou), |
| Couture, | McDougall (C. Breton), | Tyrwhitt, |
| Curran, | McKay, | Vanasse, |
| Davin, | McKeen, | Wallace, |
| Davis, | McLellan, | Ward, |
| Dawson, | McMillan (Vaudreuil), | Weldon (Albert), |
| Denison, | McNeill, | Wilmot, |
| Dickinson, | Madill, | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Dupont, | Marshall, | Wilson (Lennox), |
| Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.), | Mills (Annapolis), | Wood (Brockville), |
| Ferguson (Renfrew), | Moffat, | Wright.—84. |

Motion negatived.

M. Fiset : L'honorable député de Verchères (M. Geoffrion) n'a pas voté.

M. GEOFFRION : M. l'Orateur, j'ai pairé avec l'honorable député de Bonaventure (M. Riopel) de sorte que je n'ai pas le droit de voter sur cette question.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, statements, petitions and other documents received by the Government, or any department thereof, with reference to the assumption by the Government of the cost of deepening the channel of the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, and with reference to the return of moneys expended in respect thereof, from out of the revenues of the port of Montreal, to a corresponding provision for the improvement of that port.—(Sir Donald A. Smith.)

Correspondence and petitions regarding a grant of public money to aid in the construction of a bridge over the Bay of Quinté at Belleville.—(Mr. Platt.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do the Government propose to take up to-morrow?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We propose to take up the business on the Paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do they propose to go into Supply?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not likely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to mention to the Government that to-morrow, in the way of a motion, either a motion with respect to a matter of privilege or a motion of adjournment, I proposed to call the attention of the House to certain facts affecting the conduct of the returning officer for the county of Haldimand.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would very much prefer if we could dispose of the next Order on the list of Private Bills to-night. We reached the other day the same stage as to-night, and it was then suggested to me by a member of the Government that it would be better to allow it to stand until to-night. I do not wish that this matter should stand over any longer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I would meet the wishes of the large majority of the members of this House by moving the adjournment of the House. It is nearly eleven o'clock, and we may expect that to-morrow and the next day, being Government days, we will have to sit late. I have no doubt my hon. friend will have more than two or three opportunities to have his Bill considered by the House. He need not be uneasy about that, for we will see that the opportunity is given him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to put a question to the hon. the Minister of Finance, though I am not quite sure if he will give me an explicit answer or not. Several enquiries have been made to me, which, not being in the confidence of the Government, I could not answer, as to whether or not the Government intend to continue the lavish expenditure made for railway purposes during the current season.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to wait for the Estimates for that answer.

Mr. FISHER. I think in view of the fact that this is the second time the next Order on the Paper has been reached and the Government have taken upon themselves to prevent discussion on it, they should promise some definite day on which that Order may be reached and thoroughly discussed. It has been frequently asserted that the temperance people have not brought this question up sufficiently early in the Session to have it thoroughly discussed and passed by this House; and if the House adjourns at this early hour to-night, just as this Order is reached, I cannot refrain from throwing upon the Government the responsibility of thus blocking amendments to the Scott Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am certain the hon. gentleman did not hear the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in which he stated to my hon. friend behind me that he proposed to adjourn because the House was greatly fatigued by late sessions, but that he would take care a full opportunity would be given to bring this question before the House.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the promise of the Government, it is quite sufficient, but I would like to know when it is likely we will have that opportunity. The Government should fix a day.

Motion was agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Printed by McLEA, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 19, 1888.

No. 38.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE INDIAN ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON (for Mr. White, Cardwell) moved first reading of Bill (No. 106) to amend "The Indian Act," chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: The object of the Bill is to make some stringent provisions as to the commission of half-breeds to treaty privileges, and the retirement of half-breeds from treaty privileges; also to make Indian lands in the different Provinces amenable to assessments for municipal taxes, and to enable them to be sold and conveyed by tax deeds; likewise to make more stringent provisions with reference to the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, and to make provision in British Columbia for authority for the Governor in Council to appropriate to the Provincial authorities the proceeds of fines for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER, CO. HALDIMAND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to invite the attention of the House to a matter of which I gave notice last night; and I may say that I propose to close my remarks with a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. What motion does the hon. gentleman propose to make?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A motion for adjournment. I dare say the House will recollect that a few days ago I addressed a question to the Government in these words:

"Whether Government are aware that one Charles Young, one of the deputy returning officers at the two elections held in the county of Haldimand, in February and November, 1887, and one of the parties at whose polls certain irregularities are alleged to have occurred, has served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant, prior to being appointed deputy returning officer as aforesaid?"

To which the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Thompson) gave the following reply:—

"The Government are not aware that Charles Young served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant prior to being appointed deputy returning officer. They are informed that he has not. Mr. Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government; but we are informed that he

is a respectable man, who has held several offices of trust and honor in the county of Haldimand, and that he was recommended for this office by several persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician. The only charge with regard to irregularities at his polling place was investigated and dismissed."

I will call the attention of the House to some remarkable features of that reply before I get through. In the meantime I would like to submit a few statements bearing on the question. The first of these is the sheriff's, dated from the sheriff's office, county of Brant:—

"BRANTFORD, April 4th, 1888.

"This is to certify that from the regular gaol books kept for the county of Brant, it appears that one Charles Young, of the county of Haldimand, farmer, was sentenced by Her Majesty's regular court of Assize, on the 2nd of May, A.D. 1879, for the offence of stealing wheat, to six months imprisonment in the common gaol of the county of Brant, and duly served his term of imprisonment in accordance with the said sentence, and at and during the said period he was sentenced by the county judge's criminal court to a similar period of imprisonment on another charge, both sentences being concurrent.

"H. J. SCARFE, Sheriff of the county of Brant.

"ALFRED KITCHEN, Gaoler."

It will be observed this merely establishes that a certain Mr. Charles Young has served a certain term of imprisonment in the county gaol. I have here also the statutory declaration from the Dominion of Canada, county of Haldimand, as follows:—

"I, Charles, Wesley Colter, of the town of Cayuga, county of Haldimand, Barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare that, in or about the month of March, A. D. 1887, I had a conversation with John A. Langrill, Esq., M. D., who was returning officer for the electoral district of Haldimand at the Dominion elections, held severally on the 22nd day of February, A. D. 1887, and on the 12th day of November, A. D. 1887, at the office of James Mitchell, Esq., and in the presence of James Mitchell aforesaid, in the court house, in the village of Cayuga, in the county of Haldimand aforesaid, and during such conversation, I censured said John A. Langrill for appointing improper and unfit men to act as deputy returning officers at said elections.

"The said John A. Langrill asked me to name any improper appointments made by him, and I then and there named Charles Young, who I then informed him had been convicted of stealing wheat, and had served a term of imprisonment therefor.

"The said John A. Langrill professed to be surprised at my information, and pretended he had no knowledge of this, but subsequently he appointed said Charles Young as deputy returning officer in November last.

"And I make this solemn declaration believing the same to be true, &c.

"C. W. COLTER."

It will be noticed that affidavit No. 2 pretty well establishes the identity of Charles Young; but, for fear of any possible accidents, I have here a third affidavit made by a certain Timothy McMonagle, of the township of Oneida, in the county of Haldimand, who says:

"I well know Charles Young who was imprisoned in the Brantford gaol for the larceny of wheat in or about the month of May, A. D. 1879. In conversation with the said Charles Young on the 14th day of April, 1888, as to his imprisonment in the Brantford gaol for the larceny of wheat, aforesaid, the said Charles Young informed me that he had been imprisoned in the gaol at Brantford for the larceny of wheat for a term of six months. That the said Charles Young so imprisoned in the gaol at Brantford as aforesaid is the same Charles Young who acted as deputy returning officer at No. 4 polling sub-division in the township of Oneida, at the Dominion election held on the 15th day of November, A. D. 1887. I have lived in the township of Oneida, a near neighbor of the said Charles Young ever since the said Charles Young resided in the said township of Oneida, and I know of no other Charles Young. The said Charles Young never held any office of trust or responsibility in the said township of Oneida since he was imprisoned as aforesaid in the Brantford gaol.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act for the suppression of extra-judicial oaths.'"

"TIMOTHY McMONAGLE."

Now, I have one or two things to say with respect to the answer I have received. It appears to me that there is no loophole of escape from these affidavits, and that it is clear and certain as anything well can be that Mr. Charles Young had served a term of imprisonment in the Brantford gaol for theft, prior to his being appointed as returning officer, first of all in February, and secondly in November.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman state the time of his imprisonment?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have already stated it three times. It was in May or June, 1879. I think, when evidence of this sort is placed before the Minister of Justice, he might take the trouble to enquire or to communicate with the keeper of the gaol or the sheriff, or any other parties he sees fit, in order to find out the state of affairs, and if the hon. gentleman had done so, he would not be in the position he now occupies when he states that due enquiry has been made, because no other deduction can be taken from his answer, and that this Charles Young had not served a term of imprisonment for theft. Moreover, I take issue in the strongest possible manner with the Minister of Justice in regard to this point. He states that Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government. I say that is altogether an unworthy equivocation. The Government of this country, for their own purposes, for purposes which I am not going to characterise now but which the House can imagine, took the power of appointing the returning officers into their own hands. They took those offices away from men who had discharged the duties fairly and well, men who were known to the people and were responsible to the people; and are we to be told that the Government can appoint returning officers at their own will and pleasure, and can repudiate any responsibility for the action of the deputy returning officers who are appointed by those returning officers? *Quod facit per alium facit per se* applies here, at all events, whatever its application else where may be. The Government are responsible in the highest degree for the conduct of the returning officers and the deputy returning officers whom they may appoint. That is a doctrine which must commend itself to the common sense of every one in this House, and it is a doctrine upon which they must be judged. The affidavit of Mr. Colter, the affidavit of the sheriff and the affidavit of a neighbor of Charles Young contradict the statements of the hon. gentleman in every particular except one. They do not contradict his statement as to the fact that Mr. Young was recommended by persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician, I should like to see, and I think the House would like to see, and I know the electors of Haldimand would like to know, who was the prominent Grit politician who recommended an ex-convict as a deputy returning officer in that county. Perhaps he was a practical humorist, and wanted to play a practical joke on the returning officer and those who appointed the returning officer for the county of Haldimand. Perhaps he was a cynical party, and, having seen the previous practice in the county of Haldimand, he thought that an ex-convict would necessarily be a good deputy returning officer for that county. But, as I do not know who he is, perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us his name, and then there may be other affidavits in store for us. I shall not pursue that part of the subject any further. We called the attention of the Government to the facts which have been disclosed as to the conduct of the returning officer. We have Mr. Colter's sworn affidavit that he went to the returning officer and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

remonstrated with him on his appointing a person of this class to a semi-judicial office. We find that the returning officer, according to Mr. Colter's affidavit, pleaded ignorance, and intimated that he would not do it again, and we find that, when November came, Mr. Charles Young was there as large as life discharging the duties of deputy returning officer. It appears to me that a returning officer who has so little regard for the decencies affecting his position, ought to be held to task by this House and by the Government who appointed him, and I think there will be a failure in the plain duty of the Government and especially in the duty of their judicial officer, the Minister of Justice, unless steps are taken to teach this returning officer that this House does not entirely endorse his action in appointing a man with the antecedents of Mr. Young to the responsible position to which he was appointed. I understand further that Dr. Langrill has also been an applicant for office, that he applied for the position of Superintendent of an Indian reserve which has been vacated by the death of Mr. McKinnon. Why has there been this delay in rewarding a gentleman who has been such a faithful servant of the Government? Is it possible that it is because there is danger of a third election taking place in the county of Haldimand, and that Mr. Langrill and Mr. Charles Young are too important in their offices to be so soon dispensed with? I suggest to the Minister of Justice, as I understand he has some amendment to the Election Act under consideration, to introduce a new clause providing that where two parties are applying for a position of deputy returning officer, both being equally competent on other grounds, the preference should be given hereafter to ex-convicts, or, at all events, that ex-convicts should be allowed to rank next to secretaries of Conservative associations of the pattern of Mr. Dunn. Perhaps, Sir, it may be their intention to institute some new decoration, some badge or other, to distinguish these worthy persons. I recollect my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) suggesting, when Mr. Dunn's case was before us, that they might receive, with some propriety, a coat of arms, equal parts tar and feathers, in recognition of their services. Now, I would be sorry to have it supposed that I think Mr. Charles Young very much worse than his employers; for all I know to the contrary, Mr. Young may be a true penitent, and he is quite as likely to be a true penitent as many other persons much more highly placed. Sir, Government are now seized of the facts, Government now know, if they did not know before,—and I am surprised that they were so very ill-informed—they now know—I think there is hardly any escape to be had from these affidavits which I have read to the House—Government now know that a gentleman who, whatever his present state of penitence may be, had at one period of his existence so far forgot himself as to serve six months in a common jail, and this man was appointed twice over deputy returning officer for the county of Haldimand, in a very closely contested election, where it was known that the manipulation of a single vote might change the whole contest. And Sir, this was done by the returning officer, Dr. Langrill, who, be it remembered, as I am informed, is an applicant for office under this Government; it was done by him under formal remonstrance. If we were very charitable, we might suppose that it may have occurred once in ignorance, but it is clear from these facts to which I have called attention, that it was done after formal and repeated warning—warning in the presence of witnesses. Now, Sir, it is in the power of the Government—they have ample power, they lead this House, they have a large majority in this House—it is in their power to purge themselves from all accusation of complicity with their returning officer, if they so saw fit. If they chose, on this statement of facts, to inflict some proper punishment on the returning officer, such as I think he deserves for appointing such persons, why, Sir, no more

need be said; if they fail to do that, Sir, we will know the reason why, and the country will know the reason why. For myself I await the explanations, such as they may be, of the Minister of Justice. I reserve my right of further action, and I will now bring my remarks to a close by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON. The statement which the hon. gentleman has read in the *Hansard* of the 9th April, is a correct statement of what I said on that occasion with the exception of a single word; I am not correctly reported in the expression that this gentleman was recommended by a prominent Grit politician; the expression I used was "a prominent Liberal politician." Now, Sir, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in the criticism which he made upon the Government generally, with respect to these returning officers. I presume he expects from me a statement of how far the facts which he has laid before the House this afternoon—I rather hesitate to call them facts at present—the allegations which he has laid before the House this afternoon, were within my knowledge on April 9th, when I made the reply which seems to have given the hon. gentleman umbrage. I may say, in the first place, as the hon. gentleman has been told before, that with reference to his general attack upon the returning officers in this country, with respect to his insinuations that convicts will be proper returning officers under the system that prevails to-day with regard to elections in this country, the statement is a somewhat extraordinary one, in view of the fact that although unusual numbers of petitions in controverted elections which took place a year ago, have been filed in the courts of this country, and have been investigated, out of the very few, if any, charges that have been made against returning officers, not one, so far as my memory serves me, has been sustained. That, of course, does not deprive the hon. gentleman of the right which he exercises here; and on every opportunity, of attacking the Government, and insisting that they appoint unworthy persons to that position, and that they appoint partisans to that position, and that the persons whom they appoint exercise their powers unscrupulously on behalf of the Government of Canada; but it will convince the country that unless hon. gentlemen opposite are able to show in some case which has been adjudicated on, in which they have had the courage to make a charge, and they have had the proof to sustain it—it will convince the country that these charges are not quite worthy of the hon. gentleman from whom they come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As in the case of Mr. Dunn.

Mr. THOMPSON. As in the case of Mr. Dunn, whom the hon. gentleman and his friends had at the bar of this House, and against whom, after they had attacked him week after week, they had not the courage to offer a resolution of condemnation. Now, I may be entirely mistaken as to the duties and responsibilities to be attached to the Government with respect to deputy returning officers in this country, but it does seem to me that neither under any principle of the constitution, nor under any enactment on our Statute-book, has the Government any control with respect to the appointment of these officers, or any responsibility with regard to them. The Government, it is true, have the choice of returning officers, but when the returning officers have been appointed, the choice of something like eight or ten thousand deputy returning officers, not one hundredth part of whose names ever reach the Government, and over whom the Government have not the slightest control—the responsibility with regard to these officers, I claim, rests entirely upon the returning officer who has appointed them, and not the Government that has appointed him. The remedy that is given, either to the candidate aggrieved or to any elector that is aggrieved, is simple and

plain. Any public officer, returning officer, or deputy, is liable to indictment if he violates the statute or violates his duty, and every charge that can be made against him is to be investigated under a petition in which the accused shall have the advantage, that the hon. gentleman has taken good care this officer should not have this afternoon, the advantage of answering himself all charges that are formulated and prepared for him to answer. Now, Sir, while I claim with respect to these eight or ten thousand officers that we have no responsibility, we can have none as to their fitness or the reasons for their choice. I disclaim responsibility likewise for the information which may be given to any gentleman in this House who asks information as to their antecedents. When an hon. gentleman puts a question which the Government require me to answer, I am bound to give him the best information in my power. I gave on April 9th the full information which I had with regard to this returning officer. I did not state that I had made an elaborate enquiry, I did not feel bound to do so. If no information had reached me with regard to this officer, I would have told the hon. gentleman that we had no information on the subject; as the information reached me, so I communicated it to the House. I gave the hon. gentleman all the information that I had, conceiving at the same time that it was as much out of place for the hon. gentleman—I say it, of course, with deference to his superior parliamentary knowledge and experience—as much out of place for the hon. gentleman to ask the Government if they knew that one James Young had served a term of imprisonment for theft, as if he had asked that question about any other private citizen of the country who was not an officer of the Government at all and for whom we had no responsibility. Now, I do not propose to say anything this afternoon with regard to the affidavits which the hon. gentleman has read. His own sound sense and his sense of fair play will surely indicate to him that in so far as they are imputations against the returning officer, who was an officer of the Government, that officer ought to have an opportunity to reply to them, and I shall be very much surprised, after the information I have received and after the information that has been laid before the House this afternoon, if the returning officer will not be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer that will make him feel he has been a little unjust in the statement he has made to the House this afternoon both as regards that officer and as regards the general attack which has been made on the Government. As regards the question which I answered on April 9th, the hon. gentleman has not this afternoon called the attention of the House, if my memory serves me, to any ground at all for the imputation conveyed in that question. The House will remember that this person was a deputy returning officer, as the hon. gentleman has stated, in the elections in February and November of last year. The ground, and the only ground surely, upon which the hon. gentleman could fairly put a question upon the paper reviving a charge of theft against this person, ten years old and for which he served the full penalty that was put upon him, the only ground surely actuating any person of ordinary humanity and with any ordinary sense of justice was this, that the deputy returning officer had committed some wrong in the conduct of the election which justified the reproach of his former misfortune being called up against him and the conduct imputed to the Government even for its indirect connection with his appointment as returning officer. But I failed to hear this afternoon, although the imputation was conveyed in the hon. gentleman's question the other day—because he intimated in the question that at this officer's poll certain irregularities had occurred—vigorously as the returning officer was attacked and the deputy returning officer, I failed to hear the slightest justification for the hon. gentleman's attack upon the character of either of

those men or upon the Government that appointed the returning officer, arising from any alleged irregularities in the course of the conduct of those elections. I need not remind the House that if any irregularity occurs the amplest opportunity exists for redress, and I suppose I need hardly remind the House that the hon. gentleman has made this impetuous attack and this unscrupulous insinuation at the very time when he gives us to understand these matters are *sub judice* and the conduct of these persons is being investigated in the courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will answer the last remark made by the hon. gentleman. I am informed that irregularities occurred; I am informed that ballots were improperly rejected at that poll; I am informed that the county judge, on the recount, restored to Mr. Coulter the votes of which Charles Young had deprived him.

Mr. LAURIER. The Government cannot get rid of the responsibility which properly belongs to them and which is charged against them to-day by my hon. friend. The fact, the shameful fact we have to-day that an ex-convict has been appointed the representative of the majesty of law and justice in an important election, is altogether in keeping with the system that has been adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite of selecting returning officers at their own sweet will and selecting irresponsible persons for the position. Common sense and common justice alike would require that those returning officers, those who by the nature of their office are to hold the scales of justice between contending parties, who are to give their *fiat* at the election, should be permanent officers of the law, sheriff's registrars, or such like persons who have characters to maintain and positions to uphold. But the Government have acted otherwise. Such, indeed, was the practice at one time; but in 1880 it was a feature of the Gerrymander Act that the Government should repeal that system and take to themselves the power to select their own men, their own creatures and their own favorites as the persons to stand fire between the contending parties. We have had that system in operation, and now have the result in the occurrences that have taken place. If we had permanent responsible officers of the law as returning officers, then the answer given by the Minister of Justice would apply; then he would say: The responsibility does not rest with the Government, but it rests upon the officers of the law who filled the position. But if the Government insists upon choosing their own creatures as returning officers they must be held responsible for the appointments made and for the result of those appointments. This is the true doctrine which my hon. friend has laid down to-day, and the Government stand convicted of having had as one of their officers a man who at one time was an ex-convict, and he it was who was selected to stand fire between contending parties in a hotly contended election. If we desire to have a proper system prevail, we must revert to the system that prevailed at one time, and have permanent officers of the law as returning officers. What was the reason the old practice was abandoned? We had an explanation given at the time when the law was amended, we had an explanation given during the present Session. The reason given on both occasions has been that Conservative candidates would fail to receive justice at the hands of registrars and sheriffs, because they would be appointed by the Provincial Government, who might be men not favorable to the Dominion Government. The First Minister stated the reason several times. He said that if returning officers were to be registrars and sheriffs appointed by the Grits of Ontario, Conservative candidates would have a scanty measure of justice. We can see what measure of justice is to be obtained by Liberals when returning officers are appointed—by whom? Not by the Dominion Government, but actually by ministerial candi-

Mr. THOMPSON.

dates. We had this proved to be the case last year; Mr. Dunn was appointed returning officer at the instance of the ministerial candidate for Queen's, N.B. Mr. Dunn applied to the ministerial candidate for the office, the candidate applied to the Government, and Mr. Dunn was appointed, and we saw the result. We have heard the statement of the Minister of Justice, that, had Mr. Dunn been here, we would not have dared to attack him. Even if we did not dare to attack him, it did not follow that he was not guilty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. So guilty was he that the man who sat in this House by virtue of his warrant did not dare to come to Parliament a second time on that warrant, but went to his constituents again. Under such circumstances, so long as we have the present system prevailing, and so long as the Government will insist on appointing their returning officers, we are bound, we are justified in holding them responsible for whatever appointments are made under those circumstances. Since the Minister of Justice did not care to justify the acts of the returning officer, the Government stand responsible for the charges made against those officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government accept the full responsibility for the alteration of the law and for that provision of the law by which returning officers are selected by the Government of the day, on their responsibility and subject to their responsibility to Parliament for the appointments being proper appointments. That charge was forced upon us by our experience. We found that the Conservative party had no fair play in the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Government found in the selection of the returning officers, at all events in the Province of Ontario, that the screws were put by the Provincial Government on their officers, and that in the choice of a deputy returning officer they were compelled to select the sheriff or registrar with very few exceptions, and this, in their view, justified an alteration of the law. Those officers were chosen for the purpose and with the object of their political antecedents and political proclivities. The deputy returning officers were selected as if for the purpose of defeating the Conservative candidate. We had this experience of 1878 and 1882, and we were obliged, in self-defence, to alter the law. We are responsible to the people of Canada, we are responsible to this House for making improper appointments, and as my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, has stated, the proof that we have not made improper appointments is shown by the fact that although every kind of charge has been brought against the Conservative members and against other gentlemen interested in elections, for corrupt practices, and that though they tried to make out irregularities of every possible kind, yet in those petitions no charge has been brought against the returning officers who were selected by the Government. Can there be a more conclusive proof of the correctness and the propriety of the selection of the returning officers than that fact? Surely amidst all those improper appointments as hon. gentlemen opposite allege; surely if the returning officers were selected for the purpose of favoring the Conservative candidate, one returning officer might have been found who had committed wrong. Surely the hon. gentlemen opposite who have raked up those who they say were opposed to their candidates, some would have found some returning officer in whose conduct there was a fault and against whom there could be brought a charge. Sir, consider for one moment, forsooth, that the Dominion Government are to have no choice in the returning officer and that the returning officers are to be instead the appointees of the Provincial Government. Now, there

was a good ground for appointing registrars under the old system in Ontario and Upper Canada, when the registrar held office during good behavior, but that does not apply to the present case. The registrars are not appointed during good behaviour now. They are the mere tools of the Government, or they may be made mere tools of a Government of strange political feelings who are resolved to exercise those feelings against those opposed to them. The sheriffs and registrars of Ontario are at the present time mere officers at the pleasure of the Provincial Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a check in Provincial elections against the impropriety of the conduct of those men in their capacity as returning officers, for the Provincial members, if there is any impropriety, can complain, and the Government of the day are responsible to the Provincial Legislature. But the Provincial Government are perfectly irresponsible in any action that may be taken or any instructions that may be given to any returning officer, be he sheriff or registrar. They are not responsible to this House. We can arraign a returning officer, but we cannot arraign at the bar of this House the Government of a Province, if they use their power over those officers while holding office during pleasure by saying: You must appoint Reform deputy returning officers, you must do this and you must do that. They cannot be held up to the bar of public opinion; they can be held up to a responsibility before this House. As servants of the Local Legislature, they are not responsible to us; and I say there are gentlemen behind me who have felt in their own constituency the injustice they have suffered by this fact of the returning officers being politically opposed to them and as being under a Government and holding office at the will of a Provincial Government also opposed to them. I say we are perfectly justified in self-defence in making that provision, and until it is shown that the choice of the Government has been improperly used; that the returning officers have acted illegally; that they have acted unfairly; that they are liable to any one of the charges that can be brought against them; if they have acted unfairly, until that is shown our justification is complete. I state here in my place that the Government are aware, from the reports received from constituencies in previous elections, that the screw was put on by the Provincial Government and by members of the Provincial Government upon their own officers, as to the appointment of deputy returning officers, and that it was merely in self-defence that the Government have acted as they have done in applying to Parliament. They have got the sanction of Parliament—of a previous Parliament to this—and if the Government have acted improperly I have no doubt that this Parliament representing the people will repeal that law. Until that is done and so long as the law remains as it is now the Government are perfectly justified. They must do it, they must make the selection of a returning officer, and as long as they make that selection with so little objection as to the *personnel* of the returning officers and the conduct of the returning officers, I do not think the representatives of the people in the Dominion Parliament will hand over that power to the Provincial Government who are quite irresponsible as respects their action towards returning officers if appointed from Provincial nominees.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The right hon. gentleman, like an old parliamentarian, in making his rather impassionate address to the House, has been exceedingly astute and careful to avoid the special matter before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I answered the speech made by your leader.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) He has not referred even indirectly to the charge made by the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and he has not

attempted to justify the Government for having sanctioned the appointment of this convict as deputy returning officer by Dr. Langrill. What has the hon. gentleman said? In his answer he has said that no charges were prosecuted in the courts against the returning officers, and therefore the system would be supposed to be a good one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say anything about courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That in none of the petitions filed by members relating to the elections have any charges been brought against returning officers, and the hon. gentleman asked us to conclude from that that the system which prevails at the present time is an excellent one. The hon. gentleman knows that he did not change the old system whereby the officers of the Legislature were appointed as returning officers, because of any charges filed in the courts against those officers. No charges were filed in the courts against those officers under the old system.

An hon. MEMBER. In 1878.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) None were successful. The hon. gentleman cannot point out one where it was proven where there was any wrongdoing on the part of the returning officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman turns round and he justifies the change he made in those appointments because he did not believe they were fair. How does he know?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in the case of the election of Mr. Laframme, the returning officer was complained of.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That was not a returning officer. If you allow me, the hon. gentleman will see that it was not a returning officer at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

An hon. MEMBER. He was a deputy returning officer.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) He was a deputy returning officer, and the hon. gentleman will see that he was appointed to his official position as deputy returning officer by a Government favorable to himself.

Mr. GIROUARD. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes.

Mr. GIROUARD. The returning officer in that case was not the one designated by law, but he was the one selected by the ministerial candidate.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Which shows conclusively, if it proves anything positively, that the system of allowing members to nominate returning officers is a bad system. I accept the explanation given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as the most convincing condemnation of the present system. But, Sir, the hon. First Minister sought to bolster up his rather weak argument by a statement which I regretted to hear him make. He tried to lead his followers to believe that he had to change the whole system of appointment of returning officers because he could not bring them to the bar of this House and punish them if they had done wrong. The hon. gentleman knows well that if a sheriff or other officer is appointed as returning officer, he is under our law and is amenable to the jurisdiction of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. What I said was that we could not bring the Government of Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Of course I am bound to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman, but I wish to tell him

that he was universally understood on this side of the House—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I could not be so understood.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On this side of the House he was universally understood, and my ears entirely deceived me if he did not expressly say that one of the reasons why he had to change the law was that under the old system the returning officer could not be brought to the bar of the House and punished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; *Hansard* will prove it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman says—and in that he follows the line of argument taken by the hon. Minister of Justice—that we ought to be satisfied with the present system because as a matter of fact, in the petitions which have been filed, no charges have been made against the returning officers; but the hon. gentleman knows right well that the partisanship which a returning officer can exercise and the injustice which he can inflict on one of the candidates, can be very great and very reprehensible and still may not be such as to bring him within the provisions of the criminal law. The hon. gentleman knows right well that returning officers were censurable and censured, one after another, for improperly returning or withholding returns for partisan purposes. The hon. gentleman knows that days and days were taken up by hon. gentlemen of this House complaining of the injustice with which they were treated. The deputy returning officer is not a semi-judicial officer, but he is a judicial officer, and is very often much more important than the returning officer, because he decides what votes shall be accepted and what rejected, and his decisions cannot be appealed from except to the county judge. But this is to some extent a departure from the main question before the House. I think there was one universal feeling of regret when the hon. Minister of Justice resumed his seat because he refused to condemn the appointment of this returning officer or to express regret that such a man had been appointed. It is surely desirable, in the interest of good government and common decency and justice, that those who have been punished as common rogues should not be appointed to positions of honor and credit; and when such a deplorable thing takes place, and no language that can be construed into condemnation and censure falls from ministerial lips, what will the public believe, and what will that man himself believe? He will believe, as Dunn believes, that his conduct is such as meets with the approval of the Government. The hon. First Minister asked us, when Dunn was brought before the bar of this House, why did you not move a motion of censure upon him? Because the hon. Minister of Justice told us beforehand what would be the fate of any resolution that we should move. He told us that the case was *sub judice*, and when we challenged the correctness of his decision, our motion was voted down. There has been no public scandal or disgrace in the history of Canada for twenty-five years which has sunk so deep as that scandal of that man Dunn, who, in defiance of all law and decency, returned a man to this House who was 75 votes below the other candidate; and the conduct of that returning officer, if it was not openly justified, was palliated and excused when he was brought before the bar of this House. What would have been the use of our moving a vote of censure? He was condemned by every man who wants to see fair play and justice. The newspapers everywhere have condemned him; and it remained for the hon. Minister of Justice alone to palliate and excuse such conduct in this House. There has been no answer, or attempt at an answer, to the charges brought by my hon. friend. The only apology the hon. gentleman made to the House was that the reporter had reported him as having stated that

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

this man was recommended by a "Grit politician," while he had used the expression, "Liberal politician." The hon. gentleman was challenged to name him, and he has not named him yet; although having made the statement he did, I think he was bound to give the name to the House, in order that the party with which we have the honor to be connected may know whether this man was recommended as the hon. gentleman says, or whether the hon. gentleman was misled in his statement, and is misleading the House in making it.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend has said that it was left to the hon. Minister of Justice alone to defend the conduct of returning officer Dunn who was at the bar of this House. I think it was not left to the hon. Minister of Justice alone, but it was left to the people of the constituency who have defended him in the verdict they have since rendered. My hon. friend said further that hon. gentlemen opposite had bitterly complained of the conduct of returning officers for not sending in the returns of candidates, and because on that account the returns were not registered as they ought to have been. Why, Sir, we heard hon. gentlemen opposite get up one after another and denounce the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery because he withheld the returns which they alleged the returning officers had sent in. It is very difficult to know what would be satisfactory to these hon. gentlemen. I happen to know that in the case of my own election contest, the Government went out of the constituency and selected the sheriff of the county as the returning officer. One would suppose from what hon. gentlemen have said that would have been eminently satisfactory to the Reform party; but what did we find? We found the members of the Reform party in my constituency solemnly meeting in convention and passing a resolution denouncing the partiality of the sheriff. So that it is absolutely impossible to imagine what is to be done to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. The appointment of the sheriff, which they say ought to be done, is not satisfactory to them. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will now rise in his place and tell us exactly what the Government ought to do.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I should like the friends of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec to hear the fiery denunciations in this House of anything that is not strictly correct, for we see in the bye-elections that are now going on that the Local Government, although bound to appoint returning officers according to the law, are going behind the returning officers, and forcing them by threats to change every one of their deputy returning officers who are not of the stamp they need to carry the elections. I could cite precisely what has happened yesterday. A very respectable man in Sault au Recollet had been appointed deputy returning officer, but was notified by the returning officer that he could not continue him in office because the Liberals were not satisfied with his political creed.

Mr. LAURIER. Who was the returning officer?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Mr. Philatreault, and the deputy returning officer who was forced out was Mr. Cyprien Corbier.

Mr. LAURIER. What is Mr. Philatreault?

Mr. DESJARDINS. He is the registrar of the county, and he was forced by the Liberals to appoint their own tools. This is the way hon. gentlemen opposite act, who are so ready to denounce the Government.

Mr. CARGILL. I regret very much that the names of these people should be brought up here when no proof is brought that they are guilty of wrongdoing. They do things differently in Ontario. Let hon. gentlemen opposite examine the record of the Government of Ontario, and he will find that they not only appoint returning officers who

have been convicts, but also justices of the peace who have been inmates of the penitentiary. It is all very well for a man to have the power to take money out of your pocket, but these men, occupying a quasi-judicial position, have the power of depriving a man of his personal liberty. No men should be selected to administer the law who are not men of honor and capability. In addressing a meeting in my county, I made the statement that the Government of Ontario had not only appointed as justices of the peace men who could not write their own names, but they appointed men who had been inmates of the prison and the penitentiary. Well, I was interrupted by a man at the meeting who complained to the chairman that I had no right to expose him, because he was a justice of the peace and had been an inmate of the penitentiary. He said that happened years ago and that I should not have exposed him. His case was one of those that confirmed the statement I made. Hon. gentlemen opposite are supporting this motion for the purpose of exposing a man who may have at one time in his life been unfortunate and yet be a good man to-day—and I believe the men the Government appointed to these positions were not the worst appointments the Government made in that matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one point to which I desire to call attention in connection with this matter. I do not wish to follow in the wide range that has been taken, but simply to call the attention of the House to this fact. It is evident that in the matter now under discussion, the House and the country were, at a previous date, misled by the answer the hon. the Minister of Justice gave to the question then put. I thought to-day that the hon. gentleman would have stated he had been misinformed, as he practically, I think, accepted the statement set forth in the affidavit. I thought he would have regretted having led the House and the country to believe, from the information he had received, something which was not strictly in accord with the facts; but I regret to find he took the line of rather seeming to justify his answer. I think the House is entitled to know from whom the hon. gentleman received his information. Of course, it was open to him at the time to have taken the ground that the question was not a proper one to be asked, and have declined to answer; but he answered it, and answered in such a way as to lead the country to believe that the hon. member for South Oxford, who put the question, had been misinformed. Now we find that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford is supported by affidavits, the correctness of which the hon. the Minister of Justice does not pretend to deny, but expresses his willingness for the time being to accept. We are therefore entitled to know on what information he based his answer. Was it the returning officer for Haldimand who gave it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will answer the hon. gentleman when he sits down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The answer which the hon. gentleman gave leads me to believe that there must be some misapprehension in the whole matter. When he told us that he was informed Charles Young had not served any term of imprisonment, and that he was further informed he had held several offices of trust and honor and was recommended for that office of deputy returning officer by several partisans of the Grits, he must have received his information from some one. That person should have been careful to give the correct information, and we cannot but regret that he did not do so. The hon. gentleman will have to be more careful the next time as to whom he addresses for information. I do not wish to enter into the charges made with reference to the action of the Ontario Government with regard to appointments of magistrates or with reference to other questions that came up. I do not think the hon. the Minister of Justice will take that line. We

are dealing with a certain question that ought to be decided on its merits; and if wrong has been done in any other case, that does not make this right. The hon. the Minister of Justice will hardly venture frankly to say what the answer he gave would imply; he would hardly attempt to justify the conduct of the returning officer for the county of Queen's. I do not believe there is a respectable gentleman in this House who will justify, in his heart of hearts, the conduct of that returning officer. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) tells us we changed our base. He tells us we first complained that the returning officers did not do their duty, and then that the returning officers did do their duty but that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not. Well, both charges were made. We claim that the writs were delayed by the returning officers in many cases, and then we charged the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with delaying the publication of these writs. The hon. gentleman then says that we are never satisfied, and that there is no way of pleasing us, and would lead the House to believe that we were finding fault when there was none to be found. He asked what would please these hon. gentlemen. Well, Sir, nothing less will please us than that justice and fair play should be done. That is what they ask, and if they are enabled to secure that by reason of a majority on the other side, they are prepared to vote down what is right and just and fair, they can at any rate maintain their rights as members of Parliament and rise in their place and protest against the unfairness which is manifested, against the injustice which is done to them severally and collectively, as has been done by this Government. The Government, as we have it here, in view of the numbers supporting them, ought to be able to do right, they ought to be able to discharge their duties in a proper way; and, if it is correct that this returning officer was notified prior to the appointment of this individual, before the last general election, and, as it appears, agreed that, if the charges which were made against him were true, he was not a fit person to be appointed, the Government must see that they appointed a gentleman whose appointment it is admitted was not in the public interest. I do not desire to say anything more on this question. I did not know that my hon. friend had any affidavits in reference to this matter, but, in common with other members, I have heard the testimony which has been adduced, I have heard the answer of the Minister of Justice, and I think, in the light of the affidavits which have been produced, it would be right for the Minister of Justice to say that he accepts them or that he does not accept them, and if he does accept them, that he should express his regret that he was misinformed, and that he consequently misled the House in regard to this matter, if the facts which have been recited are correct.

Mr. FREEMAN. I would not have risen to say one word on this subject but for the accusation which these gentlemen have thrown out to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman says that a majority on this side of the House are prepared to vote against justice and right. I am one of that majority. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I am prepared to vote and that I do vote for justice and right just as often as he does, and that these accusations are not only ungentlemanly but are unwise, and should not be thrown across to this side of the House, that we should not be told that we are prepared to vote against justice and right. Let us examine the record, and it will be found that we uphold justice and right as much as they do on the other side. Last Session I listened with some amazement to the accusations which were thrown against us, and against the Government especially, as to their conduct in the election of February, 1887. I presumed, as a matter of course, that those hon. gentlemen had

some grounds for those accusations, and I thought that, when they got the opportunity, they would substantiate those accusations. They declared that all they wanted was the opportunity. They said: Give us the opportunity, and we will show you how you have behaved, we will show you that the constituencies have been deceived and that they are now waiting for the opportunity to return members to support the Opposition in place of the members now supporting the Government. They got the opportunity in many cases, and how many more have they now than they had last Session? Have they one more? On the contrary they have less. Did they get any more voters in the constituencies in which they returned the same members as they had before? Were any more votes recorded in favor of the Opposition than there were in favor of the Government? No, Sir, it was on the contrary. Wherever an opportunity was offered to the people, there was a larger number of voters who recorded their votes for those sitting on this side of the House, and I may say also that in every case those hon. gentlemen have failed to substantiate their charges or their contentions. Does that show that they have justice and right on their side? It is just the opposite. When they brought up this returning officer from Queen's, N. B., they made a spectacle of themselves when they had that man before the House. With all the legal power and legal knowledge and legal wisdom which they had arrayed against that man, they showed themselves to be perfectly imbecile in regard to that charge. I contend that, with all these facts before them, it is unwise and it is improper and it is insulting for them to throw their charges against us, and to say that we vote for what we know to be wrong and unjust. What is the charge which is brought against this deputy returning officer? It is that at one time of his life he did wrong, and he was punished for it. Perhaps if every hon. member on that side of the House had been dealt with according to his deserts, many might have been punished. At any rate, if this man was guilty, he paid the penalty, he paid it to the public and to the law, and there has been no charge that he did not do right since that, there is no charge that he did not discharge his duties properly as a deputy returning officer. What do the hon. gentlemen assert that the Government should do? The last speaker said that he wished the Minister of Justice to say, I have done wrong, and I am sorry. Did he suppose that the Minister of Justice would take that course? For several years I was returning officer, and I made my own appointments, and I never asked the Government whom they were pleased or displeased with as regards deputy returning officers. All I studied was to see that I had deputy returning officers who would do my work well. That is what I looked after. I never asked what the man had done before, but was he prepared at that time to do my work well, so that the Government would bring no charge against me, and the candidates would bring no charge against me, and the public would bring no charge against me. That was the object I had in view, and I venture to say that this returning officer who has been referred to in this case had the same object in view, and, if this man who was appointed as a deputy returning officer did his work well, the returning officer was justified in appointing him, and these hon. gentlemen have nothing to complain of. If the deputy returning officer has done wrong, let him be brought to the proper tribunal, and no man would be more desirous than myself to see that he was punished if he did not carry out his duty. These deputy returning officers should always do their duty, and should be punished if they do not. I think this discussion is a thorough waste of the time of the House. If this man, at some time or other, stole anything or committed any other crime for which he was punished, he paid the penalty; but, if he has done any wrong in this particular case, bring him before the proper tribunal and

Mr. FREEMAN.

punish him. The cause of my rising to-day, however, was the continual throwing out from that side of the House of statements that we are frauds on this side, that we support injustice in place of justice. Dare hon. gentlemen tell me that outside of this House? They dare not do it, and what they dare not do outside of the House, as gentlemen they ought not to do inside of this House.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman opposite has asked me a question. He has said in effect that he expected me to state to the House that I had been misled in the statement which I made and that I had accepted the statement which was put before the House this afternoon. If he had followed my remarks, he would have observed that I expressly reserved myself from accepting the statements which were put before the House this afternoon, and which was sprung upon the House by the hon. gentleman, because I think the persons who are referred to ought to have an opportunity of answering those statements. I do not want to be misrepresented as to anything I may have said, and I may therefore state that I gave the best information to the House which was in my possession at the time. I do not think the question which the hon. gentleman put is one that should have been asked. I think it is not a question in regard to which the Government has any responsibility, but, notwithstanding that, I should be very sorry to have misled the House, but if the statements which have been put before the House now are correct, I was misled myself. Still, I think that these people should have an opportunity of replying to them before we come to any conclusion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the permission of the House I will lay on the Table these three affidavits so that hon. gentlemen may inspect them.

Mr. RYKERT. You had better keep them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I leave them for the information of the Minister of Justice, who desires, as I understood him, to investigate the matter.

Mr. RYKERT. They don't amount to much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They simply amount to this, in my opinion, that they are the clearest possible proof that a man whom it was a disgrace to place in a position of justice, has been placed there. With regard to some remarks that have been made on the other side, particularly by the last speaker or two, I will just simply say, that they are tantamount to a declaration within the minds of those hon. gentlemen that ex-convicts are fit and proper returning officers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, they do not think ex-convicts are fit and proper persons for returning officers; then let the Government deal with this returning officer who has appointed such. The First Minister, however, asked a question of this House to which I will venture to offer a suggestion. The First Minister declared that Provincial Governments were not fit persons to be intrusted with the selection of men to act as returning officers, that they put pressure on returning officers to appoint proper deputies—that, I think, was his contention;—that therefore, in self-defence, he had taken it into his own hands, which is the same as saying that he had assigned to the ministerial candidates the task of selecting the returning officers who were to sit in judgment on them, and that was his preference. He asked the House, what is the alternative? Well, I say there are several alternatives. It would be possible, I think, although, I do not desire to mix up our judges too much with these things—it would be possible to allow officers of the judiciary to select the returning officers; it would be possible to allow such a court as this: a court composed of the warden, representing the people

of the county; a judge, representing the Dominion Government; and the sheriff of the county, or the registrar of the county, an appointee of the local Government, to select a returning officer; with either of such reasonable impartiality would be obtained. That impartiality will be obtained under the present system, no human being believes.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to make a personal explanation. I wish to say with regard to the remark of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), that I never heard until to-day, neither did any hon. members sitting near me hear until to-day, the charge against returning officers that they had withheld returns. On the contrary, we understood that the chief charge against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had been that the returns had not been sent in, and that he had withheld them.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice has risen twice in his place and addressed the House, since the charge was made by the hon. member for South Oxford, and he has not, so far as I have heard, nor has any member of the Government expressed the slightest regret, that a returning officer of the Government, after he had been formally notified of the character of this deputy returning officer, should have appointed him again. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to say that we must wait till the other side is heard. But surely when an hon. gentleman of the position and standing of the hon. member for South Oxford in this House, makes a statement of that kind, in his place—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And he knows it.

Mr. EDGAR. And when, more than that, he brings affidavits and shows a *prima facie* case, surely the Minister of Justice who holds that high position in which he has great responsibility before the people of the country, surely he ought at least to be able to say. Well, if that be true, I exceedingly regret it. But we have not had one word of that kind from the hon. gentleman or from any of his followers in this House. The First Minister has seemed to justify the whole thing from beginning to end, his followers have done the same. The hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia, who made such a warlike speech a moment ago, states that he would not find fault with any returning officer, and he could not be found fault with, so long as he did his work well. Of course, this man in Haldimand did his work well, therefore he should not be found fault with. But the debate took a little wider range, and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Madill) told us about some appointments to office made by the Ontario Government in his county. Well, Sir, perhaps hon. members may have observed that in the Province of Ontario, when the Treasurer was making his budget speech the other day, he announced that certain defalcations had been discovered in the Treasury, and he was pressed urgently by the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Meredith, in that House, to say what he had done upon discovering the defalcation, and when he was pressed he said, without giving names—I do not know the names myself—that an officer had been dismissed from the service on account of that defalcation, and he had since been taken into the service of the Dominion Government.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). My hon. friend has referred to the remark of the First Minister. He forgets that my hon. friend from Oxford made a certain charge, which was in reply to the Minister of Justice. They both confined themselves to a specific case. Then the leader of the Opposition got up; he did not touch on that case, but he went into generalities, enlarging on that subject, and the First Minister, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, confined himself to that reply. Now, I do not know about the other Provinces, but I challenge any member of the Opposition from the Province of Ontario to stand up in his place and name the appointment of a returning officer at the last general election that he considers objectionable. I

would like him to get up and enumerate a case where the present Government did not select officers who were worthy to be selected. I recollect, in the debate in 1882, when the law was changed, that the First Minister stated then that it was not his intention to exclude the sheriffs and the registrars, except in cases where these men, appointees of the Local Government, had proved themselves unworthy partisans. And they have not been excluded. In my part of the country they are invariably chosen, and I shall not sit here and allow to go to the country these general statements, without getting up and contradicting them. As an illustration, there are two by-elections pending to-day in the Province of Ontario, and I ask, Who is the returning officer in the riding of Kent? Who is the returning officer for Russell? In Kent, it is the sheriff of the county, and in Russell, it is the registrar, and these men are appointed, not because they are Ontario officials, but because their moral character and standing in the community justify this Government in selecting them for the position. That is the true ground upon which the Government are acting, and I believe they are thoroughly justified.

Motion to adjourn the House withdrawn.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting the salary of the Auditor General, be now received.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the said resolution be now read the second time and concurred in. He said: As I stated to the House, the Government held very strongly, indeed, the necessity of the Auditor General occupying an entirely independent position. He was a parliamentary officer, and did not occupy the position that other officers occupied, and the moment my attention was drawn to the fact, that, in bringing him under the operation of the Superannuation Act, it appeared to have the effect of placing a certain amount of governmental control over that officer, I felt that it was a matter that required further consideration. It was suggested, subsequently, that in the meantime we should ascertain what measures were necessary in order to remove entirely any such objection, and I suggested that the object would entirely be accomplished by placing the officer under the operation of the Superannuation Act, except as regards two clauses which appear to give a certain amount of governmental control. But I was greatly surprised to find, on referring to the discussion that had taken place in this House, that hon. gentlemen opposite and not this Government were entirely responsible for having placed the Auditor General under the operation of the Superannuation Act. I hold in my hand the original Act passed in regard to the Auditor General. The Act is to be found in the Acts of 1878, page 47:

"The Acts 33 Vic., c. 4, and 36 Vic., c. 32, and 38 Vic., c. 9, providing for the superannuation of officers employed in the public service of the Dominion, shall apply to the Auditor General and officers, clerks and other persons employed in his office."

So there was no necessity, so far as the present Auditor General was concerned, for any Bill. He had the benefit of the Superannuation Act, and under the authority of the Act placed on the Statute-book by hon. gentlemen opposite when he was appointed, he has been paying regularly his amount; but it was in relation to his successor, as this Act had been dropped out of the Revised Statutes, that it became necessary to re-enact it. I now propose to meet the difficulty by providing in this Bill that the Superannuation Act shall apply to the Auditor General, except to two clauses which seem to give the Government a certain amount of control over officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is decidedly desirable. Of course it is very desirable that the Auditor General should have the benefit of the Superannuation Act, but care should be taken to provide that occasion could not be seized by any Government to deprive that officer of his position; it is very important, I am bound to say, that this care should be exercised.

Mr. EDGAR. I am sure the Finance Minister must admit that when explanations were made with respect to the provisions of this Bill neither he nor any of his colleagues were able to give the explanation he has just made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so; our attention had not been drawn to it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I confess that I was not aware that the Auditor General was entitled to superannuation under the Act of 1878, under which he was appointed. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that it is sufficiently difficult to bear in mind the statute laws, without being able to recall Acts repealed. The Act was repealed in the revision of the statutes, the view of the revisers being that the Auditor General was under the Civil Service Act, and therefore the Superannuation Act applied. But that was a mistaken view, because he is not a member of the civil service and is not covered by the Superannuation Act without being especially mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing, as it is possible, that the Auditor General became too infirm or too old to properly discharge his onerous duties, how would you act in that case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think in that emergency the Government would be compelled to take action and assume the responsibility of appointing some officer to discharge the duties of the office until Parliament could be consulted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You would call upon Parliament finally by formal Act to dispose of him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so, no doubt of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because it is important that the Auditor General should be strictly an officer of Parliament and only be removable as judges are removable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Exactly so.

Motion agreed to.

THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 89) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chap. 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How exactly is that Treasury Board now composed? Are there not some considerable alterations in it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It consists of the Minister of Finance, who is *ex-officio* chairman of the Board, the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And one to be appointed by the Government, who at present is the Minister of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is in fact a committee of the Privy Council composed of four members
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and one holding office on what I shall term "good behaviour."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At least one removable officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause there is a large and important omission I think. Some words are omitted from the old thirty-fifth clause. There is an alteration in the month, and the date is changed from the 31st of October to the 30th of September. I suppose that is a matter of convenience. Several words are left out after "June preceding." The words left out are: "For the interest and management of the public funded and unfunded debt, for the civil list, and all other issues in the financial year."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only alteration is to provide for sending to the Auditor all accounts before the 30th of September instead of the 31st October.

Mr. EDGAR. There is evidently a clerical mistake because some very important words are left out of the old section after the words "June preceding." I suppose that one of the greatest advantages of having the Auditor General's report was that he should comply with the section as it stood?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall consider that matter and we will postpone that clause in the meantime.

On section 7,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is referring to public accounts to be laid before Parliament, and it is amended by striking out the words, "Such accounts to be countersigned by the Auditor General." That is according to the present practice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason or the object of the countersigning?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It never has been done, as the Auditor General considers it unnecessary, and it has not been done because it has not been found of any advantage.

On section 8,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The department prepares the appropriation account on the 30th September instead of the 31st of October.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This makes the report a month earlier. Is that the only change?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. It omits by what department such accounts should be prepared and rendered to the Auditor. There is no reason for that, as each department is bound to prepare its own accounts.

Mr. EDGAR. In the amended section 40 there is an omission of the words, "provided always that the Auditor General may, if he thinks fit, require the said department to transmit to him, in lieu of said balance sheet, a certified statement showing the actual disposition of the balances."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amended section omits the special statement, and requires that outstanding balances shall be accounted for not later than the next financial year. It is more clear and positive than the old section. The amended section 43 enacts by what officer the appropriation account of each department shall be signed. The old section merely stated that it should be signed by the proper officer. The old section 44 provides that the accounts shall be examined to see whether the payments

are supported by vouchers or proofs of payments. The amended section is more explicit. Under it payments are to be supported by vouchers required by this Act, and by proofs of payment.

On section 10,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This section amends section 48 of the Act. With regard to the matters to which the Auditor General shall call the attention of Parliament, the old Act states that he shall report cases in which it appears to him that a grant has been exceeded. The words, "it appears to him," are omitted in the amended section, so as to require him to report all cases. It leaves no option to him.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chap. 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Costigan.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first change is made on the recommendation of the chief analyst, so as to provide that such articles as baking powder shall be included in the term "food." According to the ruling of some of the judges that term does not include such articles, and therefore, we could not reach baking powder that might be found to be of a dangerous character. The second change makes the term "analyst" include any member of the examining board and any assistant analyst to the chief analyst at Ottawa. It is considered that the members of the board ought to be as well qualified to give evidence in the courts as the analysts to whose qualifications they certify. The reason for taking the power under clause 5 is that the vote given by Parliament from the administration of this Act is a limited vote for the services to be performed. It is necessary to obtain these samples all over the country, and have them sent either to the local analyst or to the chief analyst at Ottawa. Instead of appointing a new class of officers outside of the service, to whom salaries would have to be paid, it is proposed to take the power of designating some officer already in the service whose salary might be supplemented by a small appropriation from this vote.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me you take larger powers under the Bill. Under the Act, as it exists, you are limited to employing only inspectors and deputy inspectors of weights and measures. By this Bill you take power to appoint special officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Sure that power is there; cases do occur where it is necessary to exercise that power, and we find it very inconvenient not to have it. I am quite willing, however, that this should be struck out. Where you could not get a suitable man in some localities, it would be well to have the power of appointing one, but I do not insist upon this.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know whether the amendment is called for or not, but the amendment does not seem to be consistent with the explanation given by the hon. Minister.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This Bill would give the power to add these additional duties to the duties of any of the officers, and this power is not given in the Act. The Act does not give the power of doing what it is the intention of the Government to do; that is, to take a portion of the amount appropriated by Parliament for the administration of the Act to pay for this additional service. Clause 51 of the

Civil Service Act provides that no additional sum can be paid to any member of the Civil Service.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It would be better if the hon. gentleman would explain each section by itself.

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman not got the power under the Act to add any article that he wants by Order in Council. I would like a definition of the word food. For instance, the hon. gentleman speaks of baking powder. Does that come under the term food?

Mr. THOMPSON. A decision was given that the article of food could only be defined to be something that could be consumed in its then condition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Every article that can be consumed in its then condition would come under this definition?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

On section 2,

Mr. EDGAR. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this amendment was introduced in order to enable the Government to appoint existing officers to do this work, rather than appoint new officers. The amendment, however, does not agree with that explanation, but gives the power to the Government to appoint any person for that purpose. That would be giving the Government rather a dangerous power. Is it desirable to take up people all over the country and appoint them for this purpose, giving them compulsory powers of inspection? The Government is asking for power to give to anyone at all, without discrimination, these complete powers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman objects to that part of the clause which proposes that the Government shall have the power of appointing others besides those named. When the leader of the Opposition called my attention to that, I said that I did not consider that feature of the Bill important and I would strike it out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will strike out the whole clause.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to add something to the clause. I was explaining the whole matter when I was asked to take this section by section. I am quite prepared to strike out these words:

And any person specially appointed by the Minister of Inland Revenue.

But I stated before that we have the power to give these additional duties to the officers named in this Act, but, on account of section 51 of the Civil Service Act, unless we make some provision here, we have no right to take any money to pay them out of the money which is voted in regard to the adulteration of food, and other things. I propose to add this:

The prohibition contained in the first paragraph of section 51 of the Act concerning the Civil Service of Canada shall not extend to officers rendering service under this section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister propose to give these officers any extra pay?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You propose to give extra pay to your own officers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When I add these additional duties to those already performed by those officers, by using them I save the necessity of creating a staff of new officers, and the

duties can be performed much cheaper than they could by appointing new men. It is the same principal which I have adopted in regard to the inspectors of gas. I do not think I have appointed an additional inspector of gas, or if any, very few, as the duties have been performed by the officers already appointed. Whenever the position of a gas inspector was open, I appointed an officer of my department, if there was one in the locality, and paid him \$100 or \$150 or \$200 to discharge the duties of gas inspector in that district. Under the Act gas inspectors might be appointed at salaries ranging from \$800 to \$1,200 or \$1,400 a year. I have not disturbed those officers who were already appointed, but, instead of creating new appointments, I have added these new duties to the local officer, with some advantage to him and with a saving to the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But this is only, as I understand, for the procuring of samples. That is all which this covers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many samples are procured in any one year in any special division? Take the Paris Division of Inland Revenue, how many samples were procured there during the last year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I might say a few words more in order to obviate the necessity of all the objections which may be raised. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he is under the impression that such an officer is to be appointed in every Inland Revenue division throughout the country. That would involve a considerable expense, and the quantity of samples obtained would not justify the extra remuneration; but it is not intended to apply that principle all over the country, even in the employment of our own officers. The appointment will perhaps be confined to one man for a Province. There may be one for Ontario, who will do the whole of that work for the additional amount paid to him; and there may be one for Quebec and one for the Maritime Provinces. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot see anything objectionable in that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But I understand that the Minister has struck this provision for a special officer out. We are now discussing the payment of the officers of Inland Revenue. Surely it is not the intention to allow one officer to go all over the country and procure samples.

Mr. COSTIGAN. An officer will go where it is necessary for him to go.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose the case of Hamilton, the Minister would not ask an officer to go from Ottawa to Hamilton, for instance, but he would tell the officer in Hamilton to get the samples. That officer would not require any additional salary for doing that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If I require samples in the city of Hamilton, I certainly want to have the power to send an officer from the city of Ottawa; and if I require samples in Montreal, I want to have the right to send an officer from Toronto to Montreal to get the samples. An officer in Montreal might do the work, but there may be cases where the officer from Toronto would get the samples much better than the officer in Montreal, and *vice versa* an officer going from Montreal to Toronto, who was not known to the merchants there, would get the samples better than one who was known in Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that the Minister is willing to strike out the provision in this Bill to which reference has been made. He was proposing to do one thing, but now he wishes to take power to use an officer in Ottawa or anywhere else for this extra work. It seems to me that the Minister cannot carry this out without additional expense by instructing the officers in the different

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Inland Revenue divisions to do the work, and, if he has officers whom he cannot trust in the public interest to assist in carrying out the Adulteration Act, they should be changed. It should not be necessary to send an officer from Ottawa to other parts of the Dominion. We ought to be able to trust our officers, and they ought to be able to do this work, and should be willing to do it, and, if the officer does the work in his own division, there is no reason for him to require extra remuneration. If it should be desired to send an officer from Ottawa to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, it might be a nice trip for the officer, but how will the ends of justice or the efficiency of the carrying out of the statute be promoted by that? It is clear that this is supposing that the officers in the different divisions are not fit to be trusted in carrying out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman wants to criticise and find fault, I cannot help it. Have I said a single word to justify the statement that I have not confidence in my officers?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; when the hon. gentleman says that he might have to send an officer from Ottawa to Hamilton, it must be because he has no confidence in his officer there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No. The hon. gentleman jumps to a conclusion which is not warranted. I said it might be better to send an officer from Ottawa to Toronto, or from any one division to another, to obtain the samples, because a stranger can get the samples much better than those who are known in the place itself to be officers of the department. Then the hon. gentleman states that I was quite willing to strike out that clause which gives me power to appoint anyone outside of my own staff to do this work. I say at once that I do not want to take that power, that is to strike out. The Government is limited now to imposing these duties on the officers named here, officers in regular standing, and belonging to the department in one branch or another. I still hold that in imposing on these officers additional duties, we have a right to ask the power to pay them a small remuneration in consideration of these additional duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What words does the hon. gentleman propose to add for that purpose? That is the point.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I said before to the hon. gentleman, when my attention was called to it by him, I consulted the Minister of Justice on this point and on all the points in the Bill. The words to be added are:

The prohibition contained in the first paragraph of section 51 of the Act concerning the Civil Service of Canada shall not extend to officers rendering service under this section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The effect of that is that you may pay your officers an extra amount for doing this work.

Mr. COSTIGAN. An additional amount for their services.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what I object to.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Parliament laid down this principle before. The Civil Service Act does provide that, if you come to Parliament in any one case, notwithstanding that 51st section, or even in that 51st section, and state that A, B or C, civil servants, have two or three thousand a year salary, and if you place a sum in the Estimates to pay them a thousand additional for some additional duty, Parliament votes the sum to those officers. The same reason we give now. I take these men with small salaries, and I want to pay them out of the fund voted by Parliament for the administration of that branch for which the services of these men will be utilised, I ask power to pay a small proportion of that vote to supplement their salaries, instead of being obliged to ask for their whole salary for that particular purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The practice hitherto pursued of adding to the salaries of civil servants in that way, has just been taken exception to by the hon. member for Brant, and I think myself it is a very undesirable practice, and the sooner we put a stop to it the better. But it appears in this case that the hon. gentleman is asking the sanction of this House to appropriate money voted for that purpose to increase the salaries of the officers of his own department. Now, I do think, with all due deference to the Minister, that the officers of his department should do the work allotted to them within their hours of duty—and I do not suppose that they are very frequently worked beyond that time—without any additional remuneration from any other branch. This practice that is growing up of asking the House for an increased vote for such and such a person in the civil service, for services done, or supposed to be done, and very often only supposed to be done, so far as we consider the question, is a practice that should be condemned most emphatically by every member of this House.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman has clearly understood me. The salaries of our excise officers are voted by Parliament. The Estimates provide for a certain amount for the administration of that particular branch of my department, coming under the Act for the Prevention of the Adulteration of Foods and Drugs. Now, I am not asking Parliament for any more money. Parliament has voted the money for the administration of that Act. I have power to appoint collectors of these samples all over the country, and give such a salary as by Order in Council may be approved of, and that will be paid. I do not want to incur such an enormous expense as that would be, simply because the clause in the Civil Service Act provides that these accumulated salaries shall not be paid. I want to take the House into my confidence and say that, instead of taking money—not new money—I do not want any more money, because Parliament has voted the money already to enable me to administer that Act. I want Parliament to understand that instead of appointing a new man, as I may do, and which the Civil Service Act does not prevent me from doing—instead of appointing a man at \$1,000 to go and collect these samples, the vote you have given me already enables me to administer the law. Therefore, I want Parliament to understand that I am going to impose this duty upon our present officers, already in our department, and I am going to take a small amount of the money that you voted for that purpose, and pay a portion of their salary out of the vote. I do not ask you to give me a new sum of money to increase the salary of these men; I only want authority to use the money you have placed in my hands for the administration of the law in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has explained the point very clearly, and possibly in some cases the principle may be defensible. I think I understand him, but it amounts to this, and it is a belief which has permeated very deeply the official mind, that no man who holds an office to which a salary can be attached, can be asked to cross a T or dot an I, or do anything that is not in the bond, without being paid extra. Now, the objection which my hon. friend to my left submitted was this, that the hon. gentlemen will ask an official having certain defined duties, with a fixed salary, to do a little work which is not strictly within his department, and then ask us to pay him for it. For every additional act they ask us to pay an extra sum of money. It may be right that should be done, but my impression is, and it is the impression of many members of the House, that many of the officials in the hon. gentleman's department, serving in the outlying parts of the Dominion, so far from being over-worked, are very much underworked. I may be wrong in

that, but my impression is that they have not got half enough to do, in some cases. It may be unfortunate that it is so, the hon. gentleman may have to pay a large salary, a man may be necessary in a certain place, and the duties of the office may not be sufficient to occupy all his time, but you have to pay him a salary. The hon. gentleman is carrying out the principle that if you ask any one of these men, who have very few duties attached to their office, to do one single thing that is not in the scope of the appointment he must pay them extra for it. I do not think that is a desirable thing to do. I do not think their duties are very onerous, and they might be fairly asked to do that without additional pay.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose. The Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chap. 107 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. (Mr. Costigan).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Inland Revenue has explained that the amendment he proposes would enable him to pay officers in his department, who are already in receipt of salaries, an additional sum for work in which he might employ them in connection with the Inspection Act, and he proposed to do this without placing a sum in the Estimates. The opinion is entertained very largely on this side of the House that members of the Civil Service should be paid enough to secure their time, and not be continually asked to do other work for which extra pay must be granted. The hon. gentleman says the country will not lose anything by adopting his proposition, because payment will be made out of special sums appropriated by Parliament for carrying out the Adulteration Act. Surely if he pays them in that way, he is appropriating their time which should be given to another service, and they should not be paid for both services. There will be no saving, directly or indirectly, effected by paying the men out of one fund more than another. The principle is objectionable as well as the practice.

On section 3.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same reason applies to this change in the law that I gave in connection with the first clause. It has been decided by the courts that if an article to be submitted to analysis be sent out of the district where it was taken, it is questionable whether that will stand. The chief analyst takes the ground that it would be better that people should be free to submit samples to any of the analysts. One analyst might be a better authority on a particular article than another, and for that reason as well as for the reason that it is important that any analysis should be legal, this section has been framed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Any appropriation of public money looking to the development of the natural channels of trade, is, of course, a defensible measure; but it appears to me, looking at this undertaking on its merits, that it is an utter waste of public money. I have never yet seen or heard any man in the Maritime Provinces, familiar with the trade of that part of the country, who entertains the

opinion that any good will result from the expenditure of money to build the railway contemplated under this Bill. The hon. Minister of Finance last night mentioned that an eminent engineering authority in England, a Mr. Fowler, had expressed an opinion as to the feasibility of this work. I have no doubt whatever that that was the case, because there can be no doubt that the work can be completed if you are disposed to spend sufficient money. We know very well that in a great enterprise of this kind where there is a large subsidy concerned, that when people go to England where money is cheap they will go to an engineer of the eminent character that I have no doubt this gentleman is and submit a project to him and he will say it is quite feasible. He did not go so far as to pronounce the same hopeful opinion as to the working of that railway, nor did he give us any information regarding the opinion of any eminent or prominent authority with respect to its usefulness in the future. It is in that aspect of the case that I think it is unfortunate the Government are committed to this expense. I suppose they are bound to go on and I do not intend to delay the House by offering further opposition to it than merely to say I regard it as an unnecessary expense and I cannot allow it to pass without recording my opinion against it.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the words that have fallen from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I think it is a work that is unnecessary, and that is my private opinion. I know the place well. I know Baie Verte and I know there is a rocky strand where you have to go for five miles from shore before you get twenty feet of water. I would like to know how you will build this railway. If you build it on the principle of a marine slip you will find great difficulty. Any person in this House conversant with the shipping interests knows that there are very few marine slips so perfect that they can take a ship out of water and take her on the rocks on to the slip without doing her an injury. I say that in taking a ship out of water, say a ship of 1,000 tons, loaded or unloaded, and conveying her overland, the chances are that the ship will be badly injured. If this Bill passes I hope there will be a clause inserted that the company will be liable for any damage or injury done to a ship during transport. I notice that this company applied for a charter seven years ago and that they got what they asked for. I find that a few years after they applied for an amendment to that Act. They obtained the amendment seven years after the passing of that Act granting them all they asked for, and without their putting a spade in the ground or having a shilling paid out they asked this House for further amendments. I think that is pressing the matter rather close. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated the other evening that everything comes to those who wait, and I think those gentlemen who applied for an amendment to the charter are acting upon that principle. I think it is a bad principle, where a company after seven years comes a third time applying to this House for further concessions or for further grants in some way or other, that we should grant it until they do something. In looking over the list of promoters of this scheme I do not find many shipowners among them. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that some ten or twelve or thirteen years ago there was an agitation for a Baie Verte Canal, and this was agitated for a number of years. Finally the Government of the country appointed a commission to take evidence as to the feasibility and chance of success for that canal. I think that the result of that commission was that the canal was not warranted, that it was not feasible and that it would be of no service. I myself remember being in court when the evidence was taken. I remember the evidence of an old man, Captain Salmon, I think his name was, who had been engaged in the Bay of Fundy trade for several years and who had

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

served in the Imperial Navy. He was asked his reasons for objecting to the canal, and he said he would sooner go the long route than he would attempt it if there was a navigable river across this isthmus. It was a large tidal basin, that there was a great rise and fall of tide, and it was full of rocks and shoals—more dangerous for navigation than any part of the world, I suppose. He was asked what was his reason. He said: A fog; and when they asked him what was the fog, he said: I have been there and I mean it. Sir (somebody) Young, I think it was, asked him how thick the fog was? and he said: I have seen the fog so thick that I could make a looking glass of my hand. I think that is true. If this Bill passes I would like to have a clause in it to the effect that the company should be liable to any damage or injury sustained by any ship transferred by that railway. I know well and any person acquainted with shipping knows, that if you build a ship the foreman must look after her to keep her in proper position when she is building, so liable is she to strain from undue weight on any one section. If a ship is so difficult to keep in position when she is not moving, how difficult is it to get her out of water on to a marine slip and how much more difficult it is to take a ship out of water and take her 20 miles over land and drop her into the Bay of Fundy. I really believe that it will be more than the third time the House will be troubled with this kind of thing, for I do not imagine that any capitalists will invest money in it. I should like another clause in the Act, and that is, that the company shall not commence operations until they have a subscribed capital of a million of money. I remember, some years ago, that a company got a concession to build a railway from the same part of Nova Scotia. They commenced operations, employed a large number of men, levelled a lot of the road, and all of a sudden the gentleman who got the charter was not to be seen; he was *non est*. The poor people he employed were done out of their money for their supplies and labor, and the man had gone away. What was the consequence? The consequence was that the Government had to undertake this work and pay the people. Suppose this gentleman who comes here three times asking for concessions commences work, employs men and incurs liability, and the people get nothing, will the Government have to pay it? I suggest to the Minister of Finance that the company be not allowed to commence operations until a million of capital is paid up, so as to secure liabilities, and to prove this a *bond fide* enterprise. I believe if it was a *bond fide* enterprise they would not, after being granted the concessions they asked in this House, after seven years come this time for the third concession, and without having invested, as I believe, one dollar. All this work is costing the country money, and I think there is a disposition on the part of the Minister of Finance to keep our expenses within bounds, and to check it. It is my will that this policy should be carried out, and that the expenditure of public money should be lessened, and the expenditure of public money for useless purposes should be put an end to.

Mr. ELLIS. This is undoubtedly a purely experimental work; I think there is no railroad or marine slip of this character in the world; and it is certainly quite an undertaking for this country to make such an experiment. The navigation there is open only five or six months in the year, and that is all the time this marine railway can be used. However, the Government appear to be committed to it, and all I desire to say in the matter is that I think it should be distinctly understood on both sides of the House that this undertaking cannot be regarded by Maritime Province men as in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. It may turn out so; but I think there are many things that we are agreed on are necessary for the Maritime Provinces, and should be proceeded with before this work. Therefore, I desire as one representative of the Maritime Provinces to

disclaim the idea that this can be absolutely and purely for Maritime Provinces purposes, and it ought not to be charged to us as undertaken solely for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. EDGAR. So far as Ontario is concerned, I think that Province can stand a little further delay and investigation of the matter, and therefore it should not be shouldered on us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can hardly allow the measure to be carried, after what has been said, without making a statement to the House. I would remind the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh) that they are six years too late in the speeches they have addressed to the House to-night. This Parliament deliberately six years ago adopted the policy of giving a certain amount of aid for securing the construction of this work, after the matter was put fairly and distinctly before the House; and from that hour down to the present, although certain modifications and extensions of time have been asked, not one dollar additional has been asked by the promoters of this enterprise over and above what Parliament deliberately sanctioned six years ago. So much for that part of the question. Now, Sir, why did the House sanction this work? I can understand the position of the hon. member for Halifax perfectly well. The hon. gentleman wants to prevent the construction of this work in the interests of his own constituents. He wants every vessel sailing from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to be compelled to pass by the port of Halifax, to make a friendly call at that port, and leave a little money there on its way to New York, Boston, or Portland. But I consider it the height of ingratitude on the part of the hon. member for Queen's to stand up here and oppose a measure which, if it is going to benefit one part of this Dominion more than another, will benefit the island on which he lives. Why, Sir, it will give to the great article of export of that island, potatoes, a value almost equal to the amount of the duty that now meets them in the United States. It will enable the large fleets with which Captain Welsh is identified—if he will allow me to use his name—to make two or three voyages between Charlottetown and Boston and New York, for every one that it can make as matters stand to-day.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why, Sir, I am not attempting to offer to the House, on a question of this kind, my opinion in opposition to that of a gentleman who is perfectly familiar with navigation on the water; but that hon. gentleman has had no experience in navigating his ship on land.

Mr. WELSH. No, and I do not want to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He is no authority on the question of taking his ship over land for twenty miles. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) objects to this work. The fact is, I have cannon in front of me, cannon to the right of me, cannon to the left of me, and cannon in all directions—Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Ontario, all bound to crush this enterprise. Now, Sir, what is the fact? This policy of having the means of sending ships from the Gulf of St. Lawrence into the Bay of Fundy is not a policy of mine. I did not propound it to this House. It was propounded to this House by gentlemen who had more interests in ships and more interest in the traffic of the country, than any of the gentlemen who have addressed the House, great as their interests are.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you name them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will. I will name Sir Hugh Allan, the chairman of the commission which recom-

mended this work, and I will give the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) a name that will command respect in the Province of New Brunswick for many years to come, as it has for many years in the past. I will give you the names of the foremost men of every section of this country—of Ontario, of Quebec, New Brunswick—all charged with the important duty of reporting for the consideration of the Government, and for the information of Parliament the value of having the means of transferring vessels from the Gulf of St. Lawrence into the Bay of Fundy. That commission, Sir, was composed of Sir Hugh Allan, its chairman; of Col. Gzowski, a distinguished engineer, and a man whose knowledge of trade and business is widely known and respected in this country; Mr. Calvin, a gentleman who had a great interest in all questions connected with inter-provincial trade, and who understood this question about as thoroughly as any gentlemen here; Mr. George Laidlaw, a man of high attainments and great ability; Mr. Garneau, from Quebec, a merchant of high standing, whose opinion would command respect everywhere; Mr. Stairs, of Halifax, a gentleman whose name only requires to be mentioned where he is known to command great and unqualified respect; and Mr. Jardine, of the Province of New Brunswick. Now, Sir, what did these gentlemen say? That there was no object in shortening the distance from Quebec to the Bay of Fundy? Let me read to the House what they did say:

"Inseparably connected with the growth of intercolonial trade is the construction of the Baie Verte Canal."

Mr. MITCHELL. Canal, not railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will keep quiet, I will come to the reason for the substitution of the ship railway for the canal. The first point is the question of traffic—is there business sufficient to warrant the work? Ontario, Quebec, and all the Provinces are interested in shortening this communication. I establish that by an authority that I consider as great and undoubted as any authority that could be offered on a commercial and engineering question to this House. They said:

"The advantages that must accrue, not merely to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the Maritime Provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the boards of trade of all the leading cities of Canada, and by men interested in the development of our commercial cities—not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants at Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec—that it is superfluous for the commissioners more than briefly to refer to a few salient features of the scheme."

"A steamer laden with flour for St. John, N.B., now goes down the Gulf as far as Shediac, where the cargo is transported by rail to its destination. The total distance by water from Shediac through the Gut of Canso and round the coast of Nova Scotia to the Bay of Fundy, as far as the commercial capital of New Brunswick, is about 600 miles, and the consequence is that there is little or no direct communication between the Bay of Fundy ports and those of the River St. Lawrence. That is to say, that the construction of the canal at that

point or of any other means that will accomplish the same object as the canal, will shorten the distance between Shediac and the port of St. John by no less than 600 miles.

"By a canal through the isthmus, from Shediac, the distance to St. John will not be more than 100 miles. This fact will show the insuperable obstacle that now exists to anything like extensive commerce between Montreal and the Bay of Fundy ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the great impulse that must necessarily be given to the trade by the opening out of a route which will shorten distance so considerably, furnish an inland navigation from the lakes to Boston, and consequently lessen freights between those points at least twenty-five per cent."

Now it is quite true that my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., will lose that 25 per cent. on the voyage; but he must not forget that although he will get 25 per cent. less for the cargo he carries over this ship railway, he will make it up in another way. He will send four vessels through in this way for every one he can send to Boston or New York, with that very valuable commodity of which

Prince Edward Island is so prolific. It has been shown that there is a tonnage on the Bay of Fundy from the gulf ports of something like 2,687,550 tons entering and leaving these ports per annum, which would receive the advantage of this work. Then there is the fishing fleet of not less, I believe, than 600 vessels per annum, which would avail themselves of this ship railway and would be a source of incalculable wealth and profit to the great commercial city of St. John. I am astounded, Sir, at the remarks of the hon. member for St. John; but I was glad from one point of view, to hear that hon. gentleman make the speech he made to night, because I believe he could not have made any speech that would be of greater strength to the Government or more likely to relieve this House of his presence than the speech he made with reference to this enterprise. Knowing, as the hon. member for St. Johns does, that the press and people of St. John have been for years urging the Government to adopt this scheme, I was astounded to hear the hon. gentleman endeavor to kill this enterprise from which the city of St. John will receive greater benefit than any other portion of the Dominion. If I looked upon the hon. gentleman as an exponent, which I do not, of the views and sentiments of his constituents on this question, I would just as soon see the Bill thrown out as not, because I should feel that if a city which must inevitably derive the advantage that the city of St. John will from this measure is disposed to endeavor to thwart and obstruct the efforts the Government are making to give that city these great advantages and benefits, it would be hardly worth our while to endeavor to force these blessings, not only on an ungrateful, but on an unwilling community. The hon. gentleman talks about this country not being able to make the experiment. The country is not making it. Let the hon. gentleman read the Bill, and he will find that the Government of this country are not imperilling a single sixpence of the country's money. No money has been expended on the enterprise by the Government. A large sum of money has been expended in connection with the enterprise, but it has been expended by one of the hon. gentleman's own friends in New Brunswick. It has been expended by a gentleman of high character and standing as an engineer who has satisfied himself of the entire practicability of this work. It has been expended by a gentleman who was so confident of the practicability of the work that without the aid of one dollar from the Government or the Parliament of Canada, he spent six years of his own time—six years of the time of a man whose services command a very large remuneration—and spent his own money in endeavoring to bring this work to a completion. It is not an experiment the Government is making, nor is the Government imperilling a single sixpence, because under this scheme the work must be accomplished and must be continued to be performed if the country is to pay any money. What are the terms? They are, that the Government is not to be bound, directly or indirectly, to furnish one sixpence until that work is completed, and until the ships are transported from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Bay of Fundy and *vice versa* for a year. Vessels five times as large as those which will cross this railway are lifted by hydraulic pressure at the East India docks at London out of the water every day a distance of fifty feet, with the same ease, facility, and celerity almost as I lift up my hand. So that, so far as regards the difficulty, that question has been disposed of. Is there found to be any difficulty, any question of damages in taking these large vessels out of the water and lifting them to this great height? Not the least. That can be seen every day in the week by any one who will visit the East India dock in London. Then, as far as moving the ships on a marine slip is concerned, we have seen marine slips in which, by steam power, ships are drawn, not along a level

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

as they would be in this case, but up a steep incline, and that is done without any harm or injury to the vessel whatever. But I say that this question involves no risk on the part of the Government, because the company not only have to complete the work, but they have to successfully operate it for a year before they get the first year's subsidy; and if the second year, the third year, or the tenth year, the works fail and the company are unable to carry on this work successfully, that moment the subsidy stops; so that we only pay so long as the work is completely and successfully done. I have shown not only did these gentlemen, the high authority I have referred to, show that we would be warranted in spending \$5,000,000 in the construction of a canal there, and that it would be a profitable investment for the people of this country, but that Parliament only abandoned the construction of this canal when Mr. Page, by his estimates, declared that the work, instead of being accomplished for \$5,000,000, would cost from \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000. That, it was thought, would be more than under the circumstances the Government would be justified in spending. What does this scheme involve? It involves less, all told, than \$3,000,000. The hon. gentleman may be interested in knowing that our neighbors in the United States take so deep an interest in providing the means of transport of vessels from the Bay of Fundy into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, that at this moment there is a Bill before Congress, placed there by a distinguished Senator, by which it is proposed that the Government of the United States should contribute half the money and ask the Canadian Government to contribute the other half to build this canal at joint expense. So that instead of its being supposed by these gentlemen, who know the currents of trade and are acquainted with what is likely to be profitable, that there is no business to be done, the evidence of this Commission shows that great facilities would be given and a great advancement would be made in the trade and commerce of the country. If, instead of circumnavigating Nova Scotia in order to oblige the hon. member for Halifax, by making vessels come in there like a lame duck, they can take the short cut, you will have Montreal, that great centre of commerce, and the great lakes with their shipping, and all those places in connection with them, by saving 600 miles of circuitous navigation, brought into direct connection with the Bay of Fundy, and thus with Portland, Boston and New York. We are not asked to pay any money on this. It is to be a success or we are not to pay any money at all, and an engineer of the highest standing has so satisfied himself as to the practicability of the scheme that he has given six years of the best period of his life to it, and has at this moment behind him the highest engineering talent in the world. There is no higher engineering authority in the world than Sir John Fowler, and he told me himself that, having examined this question from beginning to end, from top to bottom, he had satisfied himself not only of its entire practicability, but of the ease and success with which this navigation overland could be accomplished. Therefore, I have a right to say to the House, having taken the best information which I could get, that the plan is feasible. There is an eminent engineer in this House, and, though I have not discussed the matter with him, I should be greatly surprised to hear him say that there is any difficulty in raising ships from the water, carrying them over a road 17 miles in length on a dead level, and placing them on the other side without any damage to ship or cargo. Sir John Fowler told me that a ship carried in that way from Baie Verte to the Bay of Fundy is not exposed to one tithe of the strain to which a ship is exposed in a severe storm; that vessels that go through a storm with ease and facility, through storms which they encounter every day, is exposed to ten times

the danger and difficulty that it would be in being transported by the means proposed. Parliament has over and over again voted money for this purpose, and I say that it is certain that the ship railway is infinitely superior to the canal. The hon. gentleman says that it can only be used for six months in the year. That must apply to the canal, because the ship railway can be used much longer, and so has an advantage over the canal. The cost of carriage will be extremely light, and much less than would be involved in the tolls which would be required to pay the interest on the \$5,000,000 necessary for the construction of the canal. I do not think I need detain the House longer than to say that my hon. friend's fear of damages should be removed by the fact that the most eminent engineers in the world are prepared to show him that there is no risk of damage whatever. But, even if there should be damage, does not the hon. gentleman know that, when a vessel is brought through Government canals, and is wrecked through the fault of the Government of Canada, or through any neglect on the part of the Minister of Railways and Canals, we have to pay the money, and we have done so over and over again? So, in regard to this enterprise, as the owners of a canal are bound to pay any damage caused by a failure on their part, the same thing must necessarily result. My hon. friend is very anxious that this company should not be allowed to undertake the work until they can find \$1,000,000. The work would have been undertaken long ago but that these gentlemen would not engage in it until they had raised, not \$1,000,000 simply, but every dollar required to complete the work, or until that was secured by the sale of the bonds and securities. I am asking the House for nothing which it did not grant six years ago, nothing that has not been submitted to the highest authority in this country and admitted to be of the greatest advantage to the business of this Dominion, or at all events to the business of the eastern portion of this Dominion, and I think we might extend it further. The Government is not asked to pay any money, but simply to enable English capitalists to furnish all the money required and to give us this work at half the cost we could obtain it in any other way. I think the House must see the great advantages to the trade and commerce of Canada that will follow the construction of this work.

Mr. MITCHELL. This House knows very well the great admiration I have for the abilities of the Minister of Finance, and I must say that, in all my experience of him, I have never admired him more than I have in the argument which he has made in favor of this Bay of Fundy ship canal. I have heard of a great many queer schemes in my life, but, of all the queer schemes that I ever heard of, to take money out of the pockets of the people of this country, and in addition to fleece the British public, I have never heard of anything to equal this Chignecto ship railway. The hon. gentleman has made two or three propositions. He has referred to the appointment of a commission by the Government some years ago in reference to canals. It is fashionable with the Government of which the First Minister is the head to appoint commissions when that hon. gentleman gets into a tight place, and I remember very well when that commission was appointed, but it was not in regard to this particular canal, but as to whether canals in general should be constructed or subsidised by the Government, as against railways, and it was upon that commission that Sir Hugh Allan and Colonel Gzowski and other distinguished gentlemen to whom the Minister has referred were appointed. They went over a great number of the canals of this country. If I recollect aright, they commenced in the far west with the Sault Canal. Then they had the Trent Valley Canal, the Ottawa Valley Canal, the whole system of the St. Lawrence canals, and last of all they tacked on their report the

ship canal between the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean that that commission recommended either the Trent Valley Canal or the Ottawa Valley Canal?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am simply stating the facts. I do not think I interrupted the hon. gentleman when he was speaking except to smile in a credulous manner. They made a general report, and if my memory serves me right, I think they were rather down on canals generally. The hon. gentleman has striven to show the mechanical possibility of building a railway that will take ships out of the waters of the Bay of Fundy and will land them in the waters of the St. Lawrence. No one doubts the possibility of that. No one doubts that money will do anything. The hon. gentleman referred to a distinguished engineer in this House, who, I presume, is my hon. friend whom I have in my eye, and he called upon him to verify the fact that such a thing is possible. No one doubts that it is possible; no one doubts that money will do anything, and that it is possible to build a railway which will do what the hon. gentleman proposes. That is one proposition which my hon. friend started. That proposition I concede to him at once. My hon. friend says that seven years ago this House sanctioned the idea of building a ship railway. If my memory serves me aright, the proposition seven years ago was to build a canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Six years ago. I said it was in 1882 this Bill was passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, six years ago, and seven years ago application was made, if I recollect aright. He states that a young gentleman who has devoted six years of his life to the prosecution of this enterprise, invested a large amount of money in it. Now, Sir, that gentleman to whom he refers may have invested a great deal of money in it, but so far as I can learn there is no work done. Where the money has been invested I do not know. That is the second proposition the hon. gentleman has made. The third proposition is the great advantage it would be to the trade and commerce of Montreal and Quebec and the Gulf ports, connected with the trade of St. John. Now, Sir, I ask: What would be the trade suppose you had a canal built tomorrow over that route—much less a ship canal? Does my hon. friend pretend to tell me that he has submitted to this House any statistics upon which he could base the continuation of the insane act? because I say it is nothing more than a piece of folly, first, to have subsidised such a thing as that Chignecto Ship Railway, and next to continue it from year to year upon the Statute-book, encouraging the belief—not that such a thing is not possible, because it is possible—but that such a railway, if built, would inure to the benefit of the country, or in any way benefit the trade and navigation of Canada. Sir, my hon. friend speaks of the shortening of the distance of 600 miles between Montreal and the port of St. John. What trade is there between the two? By the railway which we have subsidised from Montreal down to the harbor of St. John, you can carry, in less than twenty hours, freight and passengers. Does any man believe that in face of the low railway carriage at this day, people will ship goods down the St. Lawrence, ship them an eight or ten days' voyage down to the point where a vessel will take them on, and then take them over a railway down into the waters of the Bay of Fundy, and thence down the St. Lawrence? Why, Sir, there is no business between the two ports to start with, and my hon. friend has not submitted any statistics to show that there is any business to warrant such an expenditure as this. In the next place it is apparent to every one conversant with the current of trade in this country, that rail-

ways are taking away trade from the ships, that shipments by railway are taking the place of shipments by water in large quantities by vessels. My hon. friend speaks of 600 vessels visiting the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. Whose were they? Were they vessels of Canada? No, Sir. If 600 vessels last year, or the year before, visited the Gulf of St. Lawrence, they were the vessels of the United States, they were the fishing vessels for which we have sacrificed so much by the Bill we have already passed in this House, they were the vessels of a foreign nation from whom we are seeking justice, but have not got it as yet, they are the vessels of a country from which we are excluded from reciprocity in the natural productions of Canada. Are we going to expend \$170,000 a year for that purpose? And if we did so, would any of these 600 vessels go over that railway? Why, Sir, there is not a particle of evidence submitted by the hon. gentleman to show that if the railway were built to-morrow, these fishing vessels—and they are the only ones that go there, comparatively speaking—there is not a tittle of evidence to show that they would go over that railway, even if it were built. Now, Sir, is there any traffic in common between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the harbor of St. John, the only port to which my hon. friend has referred, from which traffic would result by passing over that railway? Sir, I know of none, I think I know as much of the business of that country as my hon. friend; I have been engaged in the trade of that country in shipping, and in business, for many years, and my hon. friend has not; and I may tell him now that if that railway were built to-morrow, it would not pay the grease to oil the wheels that run over it, and it is an expenditure of public money which this country is not warranted in making. Sir, my hon. friend has brought forward another argument to induce this House to adopt this scheme, he says it is to be built with British money. Is it possible that my hon. friend, occupying the prominent position he does as the representative of this country in England, speaking with the authority which that gives him, is going to give currency to an idea that if English money is going to be invested in this enterprise it can be invested profitably and with satisfaction to the men who furnish the money? Sir, does my hon. friend himself believe that this railway will ever pay a dollar? He has not told this House that he does. I tell this House that I would regret to see any investments secured under false pretences, brought into Canada to discredit Canada by putting them into a scheme which must be an utter failure, and an utter ruin to the men who furnish the money. The hon. gentleman says this country was pledged to this scheme six years ago. What are the facts? Seven years ago a scheme was propounded for building a canal. Subsequently this scheme comes up for building a ship canal, and a charter is granted. He says the House is pledged to it. Who pledged the House to it? The influence of my hon. friend pledged the House to that scheme.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was carried unanimously.

Mr. MITCHELL. The influence of my hon. friend pledged the House to that scheme, as he has managed, through his abilities, his eloquence and his persuasive powers, and his control over the Administration of which he is a member, to pledge this House to many a scheme which has not been very profitable to this country. That is the way this House is pledged to a scheme to which it never should have given its sanction, and which, now that it has an opportunity of terminating it ought to do by refusing to extend the time. This House, if it has any regard for the credit of Canada, should put its foot down and stamp out a scheme which is nothing but a fraud upon the British public, where we desire to maintain our credit and our reputation. That is the way I view the scheme of my hon. friend. Now, I am not going to follow my hon. friend

Mr. MITCHELL.

through every point that he has raised. I want to lay down a few propositions. First, that if the railway was built, comparatively speaking, no ships will go over it. I talked of that ship railway to-day with the largest ship owner in the port of St. John. He said, "It is a fraud, there is nothing in it. I know more of ships than any man out the port of St. John, and I would not send one of my ships over it. In the first place, I believe it will be detrimental to shipping, because it will strain them to be carried over the long track over which they will have to travel." The hon. gentleman says a distinguished engineer tells him that one storm at sea would strain a ship more than carrying it over that road. Sir, a practical man who has his money invested in ships, tells me that he would not trust one of his ships over that railway, even if she was carried free. In the next place, what trade is there between the two sections which this railway connects? Why, Sir, there is no trade, comparatively speaking, between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and St. John. Any trade that exists between Montreal and Boston and Portland and New York, has railway facilities for carrying it cheaper and quicker than it could be possibly carried by water, certainly in one-fourth of the time, and certainly at less expense. Then we come to another point, the claims which the persons who have promoted this railway, have upon this country. What claims have they upon the country? Is it because a scheme is propounded of this character that nobody but the hon. gentleman ever believed in? Why, Sir, I looked at him, listening to his dulcet tones, listening to the persuasive arguments which he used, looking at his countenance as he spoke, and I almost believe the hon. gentleman was sincere, and I believe it now. He is always sincere when Nova Scotia is concerned. Just suggest that one million dollars be spent in Nova Scotia and he is the man for it, no matter what the results and consequences may be. You may take the railways, whether the Cape Breton road or the Short railway, in regard to which the country had to step in and pay the workmen, or any other railway, and if the scheme is one that will advance the interests of Nova Scotia and will cause the expenditure of money, especially British money, the hon. gentleman will support it and let the consequences take care of themselves. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman with his knowledge that this scheme has been before the British public for years, has been quoted in the financial papers of England to the disadvantages of Canada, has been cordially denounced by men whose opinions are worth something,—with these facts before him I am surprised the hon. gentleman should come to this House and ask this House again to renew the offer, which is nothing more than deceiving the British public who are to be fleeced if they put one dollar of money into it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I entirely concur in the views expressed by my hon. friend who has preceded me. I fail to see what benefit would result from this project if carried out. In regard to the practicability of constructing the work from an engineering point of view, that is only a question of expense; but so far as Mr. Fowler knowing the resources of this country I would prefer not to take his opinion but the opinion of practical men. I have never heard anyone, with the exception of the originator and the Minister of Finance—and I have spoken to a good many persons on the subject—speak favorably of it; but the opinion of practical men is that the work would be practically useless. Although the company was incorporated in 1882, I do not find in the list of incorporators a single man who is interested in shipping; some are engineers or merchants who have interest in vessels, but there is not a single name interested in the shipping business. This scheme has been before the country during the last seven years. The Minister of Finance says a large

amount of money has been expended. I believe the gentleman who originated the scheme spent some money in soundings, and if my memory serves me he discovered that Baie Verte, which he supposed was sand, was, after a short distance had been passed, wholly rock. I admit that I am utterly incompetent to give an opinion as to the practicability of the scheme from an engineering point of view, but with respect to its value in a commercial sense, that is a matter on which I think it is incumbent for the Government to show clearly by statistics the benefit that will be derived. As regards large ships, they would not venture to go over it. Not only the gentleman to whom my hon. friend alluded, who is the largest shipowner in St. John, but others have told me that they would not trust their vessels over that route. As regards timber vessels going from the Gulf to New York, they would continue to go through the Gut of Canso. The small vessels which might possibly use the route would be prevented on the ground of cost, for a man would rather beat about a week in the Gut than pay the expense. Of course statistics can be brought forward to show that all the potatoes and produce of Prince Edward Island would go over that route. They would, however, continue to be shipped by railway to a large extent, while the balance would be sent by schooner as at present. The Finance Minister has explained that a large sum has been expended. What work has been done? It is true that the gentleman at the head of the scheme, who is a perfect enthusiast, has made several trips to England. Has a company ever been incorporated? It is true that a contract has been entered into with the Government, but I do not know there is in existence such a company; the promoters are simply endeavoring to obtain a subsidy in order to get British capital invested in what I can truly call a wild-cat scheme. We have had some experience, and I am afraid we are going to have some more sad experience in the direction of getting British capital invested in this country, and while it is put forward that the credit of Canada is pledged to this scheme I hold that the credit of Canada would be better maintained in the mother country if Parliament would not lend itself to a scheme for the purpose of inducing capitalists to put money in a scheme, when, if the promoters went through the different towns of Canada they could not get one single man to invest a dollar in it. We are always being told as to the amounts of public money expended in the Lower Provinces; we are reminded of the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway, and I am bound to say that we do not want \$5,000,000 of public money invested in this scheme. If the money has to be expended, I would rather have it invested in a subway between the Island and the mainland, which, if not so practicable, would be more useful and beneficial than ever this railway will be to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know nothing about the engineering merits or demerits of this scheme, but no sort of evidence has been submitted to us to-night or at any other time to show that this will be a commercially profitable transaction. As I understand, the Finance Minister was not correct in stating that this would cost us nothing. This is to cost us \$170,000, if my memory is correct, for a period of either fifteen or twenty years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Twenty years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is but equivalent to a present payment of \$2,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that, looking at the enormous proportions our debt has attained, looking at the enormous proportions of the taxation of this country, looking, as I have had occasion to point out again and again, at the enormous disadvantages which every million

of added debt and every additional tax means to us in our commercial contest with the nation beside us, this is the last time in the world when we should be called upon to add, if we can possibly avoid it, to the expenditure or liability of the country. This contract will expire on the 1st July, 1889, and we will be free of the whole concern. The Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company was bound to complete the work, I see by this Bill, on 1st July next year, and it is quite clear that cannot be done, and therefore we are honorably free from all liability. They have not been able to live up to their agreements, and they have had the chance during five or six years, and I can see no reason whatever why, under these circumstances, we should practically throw away, or at all events risk, to take the mildest possible view of it, a couple of millions on an enterprise, the profits of which are of a most dubious description. I hope, Sir, that this scheme will not be proceeded with and that we will not add to our existing debt or liabilities as this would do on the evidence of hon. gentlemen who know more about the matter than I do, and who are very much interested if this were a practical scheme in putting it forward. It appears by their evidence that it is extremely doubtful as a commercial undertaking.

House divided on motion for second reading.

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Amoyot, | Dawson, | Marshall, |
| Bain (Soulanges), | Denison, | Moncreiff, |
| Baird, | Desaulniers, | Montague, |
| Bell, | Desjardins, | O'Brien, |
| Bergeron, | Dickinson, | Perley (Assiniboia), |
| Bergin, | Dupont, | Porter, |
| Borden, | Ferguson (Welland), | Riopel, |
| Bowell, | Freeman, | Roome, |
| Boyle, | Guilbault, | Rykert, |
| Brown, | Godbout, | Shanly, |
| Bryson, | Gordon, | Skinner, |
| Cameron, | Grandbois, | Small, |
| Cargill, | Guillet, | Smith (Ontario), |
| Carling, | Hale, | Stevenson, |
| Carpenter, | Hall, | Taylor, |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe), | Henderson, | Temple, |
| Chisholm, | Hickey, | Thompson, |
| Chouinard, | Jamieson, | Tisdale, |
| Cimon, | Joncas, | Tupper (Sir Charles), |
| Cochrane, | Kenny, | Tyrwhitt, |
| Colby, | Labelle, | Vanasse, |
| Costigan, | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Wallace, |
| Coughlin, | Laurie, | Weldon (Albert), |
| Coulombe, | Macdowall, | Wilmot, |
| Couture, | McKeen, | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Curran, | McLellan, | Wilson (Lennox), |
| Davin, | McMillan (Vaudreuil), | Wood (Brockville), |
| Davis, | McNeill, | Wright.—84. |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Armstrong, | Flynn, | Paterson (Brant), |
| Bain (Wentworth), | Gauthier, | Perry, |
| Barron, | Gillmor, | Platt, |
| Béchar, | Guay, | Parcell, |
| Bernier, | Holton, | Rinfret, |
| Bowman, | Innes, | Robertson, |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich.), | Jones (Halifax), | Rowand, |
| Casey, | Kirk, | Ste. Marie, |
| Casgrain, | Lang, | Scriven, |
| Charlton, | Laurier, | Somerville, |
| Cook, | Lovitt, | Trow, |
| De St. Georges, | Macdonald (Huron), | Turcot, |
| Dessaint, | McIntyre, | Watson, |
| Doyon, | McMillan (Huron), | Weldon (St. John), |
| Edgar, | McMullen, | Welsh, |
| Eisenhauer, | Meigs, | Wilson (Elgin), |
| Ellis, | Mitchell, | Yeo.—52. |
| Fiset, | | |

Motion for second reading carried.

Mr. TROW. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Labelle) was not in the Chamber when the motion was read and voted on.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Richelieu will please state if he was in the House when the question was put?

Mr. LABELLE. I was in the entrance of the House when you read the motion and I came in as they were taking the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. You were not in your seat?

Mr. LABELLE. I was very near it then.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question to which the hon. member must answer is if he was in the precincts of the House when the question was put either in English or French—that is in the Chamber.

Mr. LABELLE. I was within the precincts of the House. Plusieurs honorable DEPUTÉS: En français, en français.

M. L'ORATEUR: Est-ce que l'honorable député de Richelieu (M. Labelle) dit qu'il était dans la Chambre lorsque la question a été posée?

M. LABELLE: J'étais assez près pour entendre lire la motion, seulement j'étais à parler. Mais si mon vote embarrasse trop ces messieurs, je suis prêt à le retirer.

M. Fiset: M. l'Orateur, l'honorable député de Verchères (M. Geoffrion) est à peu près dans la même position; il était dans le portique, lui.

M. l'ORATEUR: Est-ce que l'honorable député de Richelieu (M. Labelle) dit qu'il était dans le portique de manière à pouvoir entendre lire la question, ou bien s'il était dans le corridor?

M. LABELLE: Puisque l'opposition ne tient pas à mon vote, je n'ai pas d'objection à ce qu'il soit retranché.

M. l'ORATEUR: Il vaut mieux que le point soit décidé suivant les règles de la Chambre. Est-ce que l'honorable député était dans le portique ou s'il était dans le corridor?

M. LABELLE: J'étais dans le portique lorsque la motion a été lue.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member's vote will be allowed to stand.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has not voted.

M. CHOQUETTE: M. l'Orateur j'ai pairé avec l'honorable député de Restigouche (M. Moffat).

M. AMYOT: L'honorable député de Bruce-Sud (M. Landerkin) n'a pas voté, M. l'Orateur.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was very near the House, Mr. Speaker.

House in Committee on Bill.

Bill considered in Committee, read a third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 41) respecting the application of certain laws therein mentioned to the Province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 24) to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, Chapter 8, Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. Trow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object?

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained this when I introduced it the other day. It contains most of the provisions which were in the Bill before the House last Session, for increasing the safeguards as to secrecy of voting and it contains some further provisions also with regard to corrupt practices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has that Bill been distributed? I do not find it amongst my papers.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, it has been distributed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was it distributed?

Mr. THOMPSON. Some time ago.

Mr. EDGAR. I understood that the hon. Minister of Justice promised the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who has a Bill on the subject of the Dominion Controverted Elections before the House, that it might be considered at the same time as this Government Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I only proposed that it should be read a second time to-night, and when we go into committee on the Bill to-morrow, he will have an opportunity.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

PUNISHMENTS AND PARDONS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 181, respecting Punishments, Pardons and the Commutation of Sentences.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object of that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained in introducing the Bill that the defect was a technical one. There is no clear provision to enable a sentence with hard labor to be imposed in the North-West Territories, and this Bill is to remove that defect.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third and passed.

FRAUDULENT MARKS ON MERCHANDISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill to amend the law relating to fraudulent marks on merchandise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman explained this Bill when he introduced it, I was unfortunate enough not to be present, and I would call the attention of the House to the fact that it is a Bill of considerable length which is to be substituted for the Act upon the Statute-book, and it would be convenient if the hon. gentleman would state the changes made.

Mr. THOMPSON. I explained when I asked leave to introduce the Bill that its object was to carry out the Convention of Paris which was entered into a few years ago by the principal powers of Europe and assented to by the United States as well. The convention was followed by a subsequent one in Rome, in which other details were agreed upon. Our law on the Statute-book is practically the same as the English law, and the principle embodied in the amendment. I can best state in a few words which contain the synopsis of the English enactment. The most noteworthy features of the new Act are as follows:

"First, the protection by criminal process which it affords to trade marks is confined to registered trade marks, a provision which will be recognised as just, now that the register has been opened to the public for upwards of twelve years. Second, it throws the burden of proving the absence of fraud largely upon the defendant. Third, all offences under it may be subject to summary conviction. Fourth, it enlarges the law as to false trade descriptions. Fifth, it provides as to search warrants. Sixth, it provides for the seizure by the Customs authorities of goods bearing false indications of general or other marks, rendering them liable to forfeiture under this Act."

I may say that the Bill which was framed to carry out the convention was adopted in Great Britain last year, and Her Majesty's colonies have all been urged by circular to adopt it. The present Bill is an adaptation of the English Act to our condition.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 93) further to amend the Speedy Trials Act, chapter 175 of the Revised Statutes. He said; The object is to amend the Speedy Trials Act in such a way as to make it applicable to the new districts in the Province of Ontario. I shall ask the committee to allow me to add one or two clauses to remedy one or two technical defects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CABLES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 98) respecting the international convention for the preservation of submarine telegraph cables (from the Senate). He said: The object of the Bill is to carry into effect the provisions of the convention by imposing penalties on those who break cables, either in disentangling anchors or in any other way.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill No. 48, further to amend the law respecting procedure in criminal cases.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the bearing of this Bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Act which this is to amend is an Act of last Session. Hon. members will remember that I proposed last Session to take away the appeal to the

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The words used were the words which have been read by the hon. gentleman, that no appeal should lie to any court created by the Parliament of Great Britain. One would suppose that this would cover the case of the Privy Council, but, at the time of drafting the Bill, a decision of the House of Lords was overlooked, in which these words were defined in regard to an Act of Australia, and were considered to mean not the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, although that is organised under an Act of the Imperial Parliament; but it was considered that the Legislature must have contemplated the establishment of a Court of Appeal under the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain and was not applicable to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House went into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to add another clause to the Bill. I ask the attention of the Committee to section 267 of chapter 174 of the Revised Statutes, the chapter which this Bill is to amend. There is a verbal error in the second line. The word "or" has been used instead of the word "on." I propose to amend the section by striking out in lines 2 and 3 the words "or any indictment, information, presentment or inquisition," and I think that will meet the case.

Mr. EDGAR. I observe that there is another change in the Bill as introduced by which the word "authority" is inserted. What does that mean?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to that. It is a misprint. The word should be inserted in another place. It should be that no appeal can take place from any judgment, &c., to any Court of Appeal or authority.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Printed by Maclean, Roger & Co., Parliamentary Printers,
Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Friday, April 20, 1888.

No. 39.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 101) to make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was in hope that my hon. friend—if he will allow me to call him so, after the sharp discussion we had last night—would not have made this motion. I hope I am not trespassing too much in calling him my hon. friend, because, with all the assurance with which he submitted this to the House again, my confidence in him has been a little weakened. I think he has worked himself up to a belief that the Bill is everything he has portrayed it to be, but still I was in hopes that, after some reflection, the hon. gentleman, knowing that this will be of no benefit to the country at all, would have seen the propriety of dropping the Bill. In my opinion, it is a Bill which ought not to be pressed, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see the propriety of dropping it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

House again went into Committee on Bill (No. 87) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that there was a clause of this Bill which was left over when the House was in committee yesterday for further consideration, in consequence of an enquiry made, I think, by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I have had an opportunity of conferring with the Auditor General as to the exact meaning of this clause, which was prepared in connection with my department during the time I was not able to attend to business, and I find that the alteration in this clause is simply for the purpose of avoiding surplusage; that it is held that the instructions to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to cause an account to be prepared and transmitted to the Auditor General on or before the 30th

September in each year, cover everything, and therefore it was unnecessary to provide more in this Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I have taken some trouble to look over the Act since the Bill was last in committee, and I quite agree with the Minister of Finance that that is the effect of it, though the whole thing is rather complicated and it was not very clear at the time.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

FRAUDULENT TRADE MARKS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 91) to amend the law concerning Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I stated last night, in answer to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), what the particular changes are that the Bill proposes. I may state to him, however, as a supplement to my answer of last evening, what the principal causes were for the failure of the existing legislation. They are stated to have been principally threefold. In the first place, offences against the Trade Marks Act had to be prosecuted by indictment, and inasmuch as that is a very difficult and cumbrous mode of procedure, the mercantile community practically abandoned any prosecution under the Act. In the second place, there was a difficulty about the burden of proof. The original legislation contained words like these, that it was an offence against the Act to use a forged trade mark with intent thereby to deceive, and in all cases in which prosecutions were attempted, it was found practically impossible to prove intent in relation to goods which so easily and so quickly change hands, as trade-marked goods generally do. Furthermore, it was found absolutely necessary that a provision should be inserted for search warrants in cases which are provided for in this Bill. The question was asked me by a member of the House, as to the representation of this country in the convention at Paris and the convention at Rome. There was no representation, even of Great Britain, in either of those conventions; but subsequently Great Britain became a party to them, and it is intended that countries which adopted the convention this year or last, shall send representatives to a convention next year. One of the features connected with that convention is to be a representation of the colonies of countries which have been parties to the convention. Great Britain, however, as I said, has become a party to the convention, and has urged upon her colonies to take part, and the advantage of that will be the protection of registered trade marks in all countries which form part of the convention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the Minister to a communication I have had in respect to this, which seems to me to deserve some attention. It is from an eminent merchant in Toronto, and he advises me that in consequence of the fact, as the Minister knows, that importers usually place their orders for foreign goods a long time ahead, he hopes the Government will see their way

to delay bringing this Act into operation for a reasonable period—he suggests six months, after the Act passes. I am not sufficiently conversant with all the details to know whether that is an unreasonable time, but it seems to me there might be some hardship in applying this at once. I wish the Minister would be good enough to take that into his consideration, and after he has considered it, to see whether he can accede to the proposition.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall be very glad to consider it, and examine the ground upon which it is based. But as regards the prohibitions which are contained in this Bill, there are none that are not contained in the present law. It is merely a prohibition against the importation and the use of fraudulent trade marks. They are as much prohibited at present as they will be under the new Bill. The only difference is that there will be provisions for prosecuting offences in a different way. But if the hon. gentleman ascertains that there is any practical difficulty, I will see what can be done to meet it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will just send him the letter confidentially. I do not care to give the gentleman's name in public, but I will just hand the letter to the Minister and let him take note of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the Bill was before the House on a previous occasion it was urged that something should be inserted in it which would more effectually protect manufacturers. This Bill does give a large amount of protection to manufacturers, inasmuch as it is made an offence against this Act to use a bottle which bears a trademark of one manufacturer and contains the product of another manufacturer. But the persons who were asking for that legislation request that the following section be inserted as clause 7 of the Bill, to which I have no objection:

"Every person other than the lawful owner of the bottle and proprietor of the trade mark who sells, disposes or offers for sale bottles marked with the trade mark of the owner and without the assent of such owner, is guilty of an offence against this Act."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The name must be registered?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. With regard to the special case the hon. gentleman asked me about, I might inform him of the origin of it: "This section presupposes marks indicative of origin on the case and no marks of origin on the movements; if by common repute the marks on the case are considered indicative of the origin of the movement, and if they are false as regards the movement, an offence will be committed. The marks usual on cases made to contain foreign movements are either an English hall mark or some such words as 'sterling silver' or 'fine silver.' The evidence given to the Select Committee was very strong as to the public being misled by the English hall mark; whether they are misled by the above or any English words without a hall mark, will be a question for the jury."

On section 17,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This seventeenth section levies the whole penalty on the vendor.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will leave that stand, if you please. I am not quite sure about our right to do that.

On section 21,

The CHAIRMAN. What shall the blank in the clause be filled by as to the amount of penalty?

Mr. THOMPSON. \$500.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am not quite sure whether this twenty-first section does not conflict with the seventeenth. Does not this twenty-first section make the purchaser equally liable?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, yes; but the seventeenth section relates only to the civil contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not understand legal phrases very well. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if this \$500 is the minimum?

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be a fixed sum.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you think it should be so large as that?

Mr. THOMPSON. Make it not less than \$200 and not exceeding \$500.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUBMARINE CABLES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 98) respecting the International Convention for the preservation of Submarine Telegraph Cables (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice will tell us how he proposes to shorten the time for electoral proceedings in British Columbia and other outside constituencies, as is proposed by this section.

Mr. THOMPSON. The facilities for communication have been so much increased during the last few years, since the Election Act was adopted making those exceptions, that I think we can now make the dates for holding the elections uniform all over the country, except perhaps in one section of British Columbia, as to which representations have been made to me very lately, and I shall not, therefore, ask the adoption of this clause at present. That is, however, the effect of this measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he proposes to amend this clause so as to provide, in the case of bye-elections, that the writ shall issue within a certain period of time? Certain great abuses grow out of the practice of delaying the issue of the writ, after the Speaker's warrant has been issued, and it ought to be provided that it shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue the writ to some specified officer, unless the Government names some person, within a certain number of days after the Speaker's warrant is issued.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no provision of that kind in the Bill, and it is not the intention to alter the law in that respect.

Mr. BARRON. I had drafted an amendment following the idea of the hon. member for Bothwell, and I think it is very important that something of the kind should be introduced. We have had some experience already of the danger of allowing a prolonged period to elapse between the receipt of the Speaker's warrant by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the fixing of the date of the election. I propose that there should be an amendment of this kind:

And in the case of a vacancy happening in any electoral district by death or otherwise, the day so fixed by the Governor General for the nomination of candidates shall, so far as relates to the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, to the electoral district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and to those of Gaspé, Chicoutimi and Saguenay, in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after

the Speaker's warrant shall have been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and so far as relates to the other electoral districts of Canada, within twenty days after the Speaker's warrant shall have been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery aforesaid.

That will apply to all cases, I think, arising in the bye-elections. Of course, it would not apply to the cases where a judge who tried the election case reported that there were corrupt practices existing in the election, because in that case the fixing of the nomination day and the ordering of a new election would have to be disposed of by order of the House. In all other cases, however, the Speaker would have to render his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and then the Governor in Council, as provided by the statute, fixes the nomination day, and the returning officer will hold the election in a certain fixed time after that. I propose to add at the end of the fifth clause of the Dominion Election Act the following words:—

The day so fixed by the Governor General shall be named in the writs of elections for the several bye-elections to which this Act applies.

I think that amendment will meet all the cases and do justice between all the parties. It is to the effect that in all the cases of bye-elections—of course it does not apply to general elections—the nomination day shall be fixed within a certain time positively, and it shall not remain with the Governor in Council to prolong the fixing of the nomination day as long as he chooses.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to move this as an amendment to the first section?

Mr. BARRON. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I stated the object of the first section. I propose to let that section stand for the present, because there may have to be one or two exceptions added to it. As to the section the hon. gentleman has just read, I would ask him to give me a copy of the clause, as it is one that must be carefully considered.

On section 2,

Mr. DAWSON. I would call attention to this fact that if this becomes law it will strike out Algoma from representation. It would be absolutely impossible in the time allowed in ordinary districts to send proclamations over the district of Algoma; and after the proclamation had issued and the nomination had taken place, it would be impossible to convey information to the remoter parts of the district within three weeks. Twenty days is the shortest time in which it has been found possible to convey information over the district. With every exertion, even in summer when the travelling is good, it takes a fortnight, and in winter when hundreds of miles have to be travelled on snowshoes, it is impossible to distribute a proclamation within the time occupied in ordinary districts.

Mr. THOMPSON. Sections 2 and 3 will stand for the same reasons.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. This makes a great change in the law by striking out the use of all the oaths for the voter at the election, except one. We have no oath now at all for farmers' sons, and, therefore, they have not to swear that they have been resident with their parents and have not been absent from such residence more than six months since they were placed on the list of voters. As I understand it, the effect of this change will be to make the list, as revised, absolute in regard to farmers' sons and owners' sons.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is only fair that I should allow this section to stand, because the substance of that legislation will have to be an amendment to the Franchise Act.

Therefore we will let this stand until that is passed upon by the House.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the Minister of Justice think that this requires an amendment to the Franchise Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think so. There is an oath required that, subsequently to the making of the list, he has lived with his parents.

Mr. EDGAR. These oaths are not in the Franchise Act but in the Elections Act. The Franchise Act only refers to what is required in order to put the name on the list, and it does not say anything about the subsequent oath; so I think the Minister will see that this does not require an amendment to the Franchise Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps so, but we will let the section stand for the present.

On section 8,

Mr. EDGAR. I give my cordial assent to this, because it is my Bill of last Session.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that I stated last Session that, if he would allow his Bill to stand, it would receive fair consideration, and he will understand now that that statement was not made captiously.

On section 9,

Mr. EDGAR. Will the hon. gentleman explain the effect of this addition to section 63?

Mr. THOMPSON. The section provides for the loss of the ballot box, but it contains no provision in case of the loss of the lists. It says that if ballot box is lost the list should be used, but there is no provision where not only the ballot box but the list also is lost.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a very important provision. I nearly lost my election, two years ago, in consequence of that.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would have been an irreparable misfortune.

Mr. MILLS. The Act provides for giving copies of the certificates to the representatives of the parties at the polling places, and this provides that the returning officer shall retain a copy as well as put one in the ballot box. I suppose it will be the duty of the returning officer to make up his return from such certificates of the result of the polling, where the original is not found in the ballot box. It would not be the duty of any returning officer to open the envelopes and undertake to count the ballots?

Mr. THOMPSON. Only in the case of no returns being available.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that quite clear? Might not the returning officer prefer to count the ballots instead of taking the result from the certificates or the copies of the certificates? I think he ought to take the result from the certificates or the copies of certificates, and should only take the recounting as a last resort.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is quite clear that if the list is not found in the box, and cannot be had in the shape of a copy, then only can he recount the ballots.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It reads that:

"The returning officer may proceed, in the manner hereinbefore directed, to ascertain, by the ballots or by such evidence as he is able to obtain, the total number of votes given to each candidate," and so on. I do not think that is clear as to the order in which he is to take these means.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

On section 10,

Mr. PLATT. I would draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that section 62 of the Act should be amended by making provision that the returning officer may adjourn the proceedings if any of the contents of the ballot box are missing. At present, the Act only allows him to adjourn if the ballot box is missing, but there is no provision for adjournment where the lists are missing.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite likely. I will look into that point.

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice was going to allow another clause to stand with reference to the qualifications of farmers' sons. This relates to the same matter and should stand also. The Minister suggested that it might involve a change in the Franchise Act, and this refers to the same point.

Mr. THOMPSON. That clause will stand.

Mr. LAURIER. I think you are giving great power to justices of the peace:

"Every person who acts in contravention of the provisions of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, before two judges of the peace."

I would suggest the ordinary courts.

Mr. THOMPSON. That involves an indictment.

Mr. LAURIER. You can employ a stipendiary magistrate, or some such like officer. It is giving justices of the peace large powers, and there are some of them which would be utterly unable to try such cases.

Mr. MILLS. Would it not be well that the offender should be tried by any judge having jurisdiction in such cases where punishment for misdemeanor to this extent may be awarded?

Mr. THOMPSON. Such jurisdiction is now possessed by two justices, or one stipendiary or police magistrate.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a great difference between the ordinary magistrates and a police magistrate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to let that sub-section stand.

On section 14,

Mr. EDGAR. The two sub-sections of this clause seem to be very desirable, and create offences of corrupt practices. But the third clause provides that the "Candidate shall not be liable, nor shall his election be avoided for any corrupt practice under this section committed by his agents, other than his agent appointed under the provisions of the Act." Now, I think that would be quite reasonable as regards the second sub-section, which provides that any person who, during an election, "knowingly publishes a false statement of the withdrawal of a candidate, shall be guilty of a corrupt practice." I think it would be rather hard to disqualify a candidate for a report of that kind being started by any agent except his special agent. But as to the provision in the first part of section 14, that "every person who votes, or induces, or procures, any person to vote at any election, knowing that he or such person is not entitled to vote thereat, is guilty of corrupt practice," I certainly think that the candidate should be responsible for his ordinary agents who choose to commit a corrupt practice of that kind. I do not see why the candidate should be exempt from responsibility for such a serious corrupt practice as that one is. I would suggest that it would be much more reasonable to make a provision in sub-section 3, only limiting it to the second sub-section.

Mr. THOMPSON. The whole section is taken from the late English Act regulating corrupt practices. I think that Mr. THOMPSON.

law is exceedingly stringent, and that if we go as far as they have gone in that direction, we should be going far enough. The adoptions of agency are going so far that it is almost impossible for a candidate to avoid constituting agents, if he runs an election in the way they must be run, to solicit votes and solicit aid.

On section 15,

Mr. BARRON. Before the Bill is passed in its present stage, I think there should be an amendment. Section 66 of the Elections Act provides:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of a member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette* of the name of the candidate so elected."

That should be amended by adding the following:—

"And the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall give notice in the ordinary issue of the *Gazette*, the next after such return shall have been received by him, or, in the case of several returns being received by him at the same time, he shall then give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Canada Gazette*, of the names of the candidates so elected in the order in which the said returns are opened and read by him."

That proposal, I think, would meet the case that came up last Session, regarding which there was a good deal of discussion.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will leave that when the committee sits again, I suppose.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CUSTOMS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs,—(Mr. Bowell.)

On section 3,

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Are the Board of Customs to have additional powers?

Mr. BOWELL. No additional powers. Now they have a status only by Order in Council, and it is proposed to give them a status by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of the word "Commissioner of Customs?" The old Act says: "Commissioner of Customs, who shall be deputy of the Minister of Customs." In the proposed legislation there will be a board to consist of the Commissioner of Customs, Assistant Commissioner, and so forth. Is the Commissioner of Customs the Commissioner under the statute we passed last year, or under the Customs Act?

Mr. BOWELL. It is Commissioner of Customs under the customs law. The Act to which the hon. gentleman now refers is not in force and has no reference to this. As soon as this Act comes into force the Commissioner of Customs will cease, and I am advised that law will have no effect. That point was fully discussed.

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are you taking extra powers under this clause?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any necessity for doing so?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It is proposed to give a lien on the goods with the additional duty; this section is to make the law more plain than it is at present.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The department could come upon innocent purchasers and take goods at any time.

Mr. BOWELL. Just in the same way as if a man steals a horse and sells it to another, it belongs to the original owner; and the Crown, I take it, always has a lien on goods for customs duty.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You have found some necessity for obtaining the power ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this not a totally new power ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The goods might pass through half a dozen hands and be finally seized in the hands of a man who was utterly and completely innocent of any intention to defraud the revenue. That would be a hard case, I think.

Mr. BOWELL. It does appear to be a hard case. The Customs Act is different from almost any other Act on the Statute-book, and experience has taught all countries that this is necessary in order to protect the revenue, and that we require power to enable us to follow the goods. There may be hard cases, if I may use the expression, such as those referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but we have found cases of this kind: Horses have been smuggled; they have been seized in the hands of an innocent party, but unless there was some power to follow, it would be questionable whether the department would be able to collect the duty. You may sue the person who smuggled, but the probabilities are he is not to be found, or if he is to be found, he may not be worth the duty. I may say that the practice of the department has been that in cases of that kind, upon the payment of the duty, the innocent party has been allowed to retain the goods. We simply ask the power to continue that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that this is a very exceptional power. The hon. gentleman gives us an illustration from the criminal law, but the law that he has given us is not good. The sale of any property sold by a thief becomes the property of the innocent purchaser; and why should the hon. gentleman undertake to lay down a different rule? Here the Government, from want of vigilance or some other cause, fails to collect the duty on the goods. Those goods pass into the hands of the innocent purchaser, and the hon. gentleman proposes that the innocent purchaser shall pay the duty when he would not have purchased the goods if he had not obtained them at a particular price. Why should the Government seek to exercise this exceptional power and practically rob the purchaser of moneys that he is not morally bound to pay? Certainly the Government may take power to punish a man criminally who undertakes to defraud it in this way. It may undertake to take from him property which he may possess in lieu of the money which he ought to have paid; but why punish the innocent purchaser? If a man steals a horse and that horse is brought into the market and sold to an innocent purchaser, you do not allow the purchaser to be punished in that way. You do not compel him to pay the value of the horse to the man who has lost it, but you provide for the punishment of the thief if you can catch him, and you allow the party who lost the horse to take the value of the property from him if he possesses it. I think the Government should rest upon that general principle for the protection of its right, but the idea of following up an innocent party in this way is perfectly monstrous.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that what my friend the Minister of Customs has said is quite applicable to the arguments of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). All the remedies given by the Customs Act are just as severe as that which he now proposes, and necessarily so for the protection of the revenue. The owner of a valuable ship loses his ship if one of his seamen smuggle goods in her, entirely without his knowledge, and in the existing law with regard to the duty on goods, the unpaid duty attaches as a lien upon the goods if the goods have been smuggled into Can-

ada. They may be seized even in the hands of an innocent purchaser for the amount of the duty, and now it is proposed simply to extend the right of lien in respect to the increased amount of duty to which the goods are liable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Justice gives the case of the responsibility of a shipowner for wrongdoing by the party who was using the ship. There is an attempt to force the owner to diligence as a matter of public policy. If it were established absolutely that he was innocent, and had taken every possible precaution, and the Government should undertake to forfeit the ship, the law would very soon disappear from the Statute-book. You merely undertake, in that case, to secure the diligence of the owner, and his act of co-operation along with the Government, in order to prevent the ship being so used. You do that as a matter of public policy, but it does not apply in this case.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, precisely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the purchaser of goods going to see whether duty is paid on those goods or not. Take a man living in Chatham or London or some other town, and he goes to Montreal for the purpose of purchasing goods. He buys them, and takes them home as retail dealer; and after he has them for twelve months, under the provisions of the hon. gentleman's law as he proposes to make it, the hon. gentleman may send his customs officer and seize those goods because the original importer has not paid the duty upon them. Such a rule is perfectly monstrous, and there is no analogy between the rule he proposes to adopt, and any other principle in law.

Mr. THOMPSON. The rule which the hon. gentleman says is monstrous is precisely the rule with regard to a vessel. A seaman smuggles goods in a vessel even without the knowledge of the master or owner; the vessel changes hands and may go through a dozen hands in foreign ports, and when she comes back to Canada she is seized, as has been done time and again.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). An outrageous thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perfectly outrageous.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps so. It is the law, and the hon. gentleman says that if it is used with severity the law would disappear from the Statute-book. I say that in this case precisely the same means of relief exists here as exists in relation to a vessel. That is to say that while a lien is declared by law to attach to the goods in all cases, even in the case of duty, and that the man originally guilty could not be punished, still the same discretion to relieve rests in the Minister and the Crown in cases where goods have passed into the hands of innocent parties. We can do nothing more than lay down a general rule as regards custom laws. They are severe rules, but they are always considered with the modification which takes place where the rights of innocent parties intervene.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). There is another principle which perhaps does not occur to the Minister. He is aware that a large amount of business is done by taxes on property. By this law he would strike at the credit and create a great deal of uncertainty in the business transactions of the banks and other financial concerns of the country. A man has certain articles which are dutiable, and he goes to a banking institution or private individual and asks for an advance on them or he may sell them. In many cases he asks for the advance and they give him the advance in good faith. He is in possession of the property. He is not required by the law to prove that property has been duty paid, because if it is in his possession the assumption is that the duty has been satisfied. Therefore when he goes to a monied institution and gives a warehouse receipt for that property the bank of financial concern would readily advance him the money upon it, but if this law passes the bank may advance

the money and months afterwards the Government may come down and say: "Oh, it is quite true the duty was not paid on that, and we will take it out of your possession or you must pay the duty." I think that is a most arbitrary Act. I think it is very unnecessary and I think it is more power than the Government should ask. I do not think, from the explanations given by the Minister of Customs, that he has sufficient grounds for asking this House to confer such a power upon the Government. If the hon. gentleman could satisfy this House that it was necessary and give us some sound reason for it, I have no doubt the House would go a long way to meet his views, but up to the present moment I fail to see any just reason for asking for such extraordinary exercise of power to be placed in the hands of the Government, and which may be destructive of commercial confidence. I think the hon. Minister will see it when he looks at it in that light.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that a few clear moments' reflection will teach the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that if his ideas were carried out there would be no protection against smuggling in many cases. The advance which may be made upon a ship cannot by any possibility protect it from seizure, if the captain or one of the proprietors or any one of those on board it had been smuggling. Take the case, for instance, where a man advances a mortgage upon a ship, and certainly he is not responsible for the smuggling which the owner may carry on.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The fines are really a small matter in comparison with the value of the ship.

Mr. BOWELL. I admit that, but the principle is precisely the same. The principle of punishing shipowners who allow or use their vessel for smuggling takes place whether the penalty is \$50 or \$400 or confiscation of the vessel as the case may be. Any vessel which is caught smuggling is subject under law to confiscation, though an innocent party may have advanced money on mortgage upon that vessel, just the same as a bank advances money to a merchant who purchases his goods; but surely no one would argue that that would protect a merchant against the confiscation of goods he had purchased in a foreign country and smuggled into this country. Take a case which is now under consideration. In one of the western towns a party carrying on a woollen factory or something of that kind, obtained a large quantity of machinery which had been purchased in the United States and brought to Canada. Before it was discovered that a fraud had been perpetrated in the entry of this machinery, the importer had sold it to another party. Now, if the theory laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) be correct, that the party who now owns the property is to be exempt from the duty, then all a rogue would have to do would be to buy machinery from a business man, and, if not caught in the act, transfer it to an innocent party. All you could do would be to punish the individual who had committed the fraud in the importation, and you would have to prove that the party who purchased was a party to the fraud, or you could not touch him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems fair.

Mr. BOWELL. Although the hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet, he had not to do with all the intricate cases that come before the Minister of Customs; if he had, he would have come to this conclusion, that many an honest man might perhaps suffer, but that still the moment that door was opened, many persons would become parties to fraud for the purpose of escaping the duty. Under the present law you can follow smuggled goods wherever you can find them. The only object of this provision is to set the matter at rest, so that people will know that there is a lien on the goods. I am not particular whether this becomes law or not; but, for the protection of the revenue

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

and the honest importer, you cannot make the law too rigid in cases of this kind.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I do not think there is an analogy between the case of vessels and this case. The case of vessels is a peculiar one. The law is no doubt harsh, but as a rule the parties are treated very lightly unless they are actually guilty. In this case the Government have a lien on the goods for the duty, even after they pass out of the possession of the importer. I do not see why the Government should stand in any other position than any other person who has a lien, and allows the goods to pass out of his possession. The person purchasing the goods has a right to assume that the duty was paid. In the cases of fraud the hon. Minister has mentioned, he is going beyond the common law of the land. If a party obtains goods by fraud and sells them to an innocent party, the purchaser has a title to the goods; but no matter how innocent a person might be, he could not get a title against the Crown. If a person has had goods passed through the custom house improperly, either through carelessness or negligence of the officers or by fraud, let him be punished by the proper tribunals; but it would be hard to put the penalty on the innocent purchaser.

Mr. BOWELL. If hon. gentlemen have no objection, after what has been said, I will allow this clause to stand for further consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that in such a case as the one he has cited, the party would be obliged to pay only the difference between the duty which had been originally collected and that which ought to have been collected, or is there any fine besides?

Mr. BOWELL. There is no fine at all. The practice has been this, that if an article has been smuggled in, and is in the hands of an innocent party, all we ask him to pay is the extra duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it limited as to time?

Mr. BOWELL. Three years, under the present law.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the law is always carried out in the way in which the hon. the Minister has stated. I know of a case which occurred last fall, in which two grain cleaners were imported from the United States into Manitoba. The price paid for them was \$450, and that was the amount on which the duty of 30 per cent was paid. They were released by the customs officers and placed in an elevator; and after they had been in actual operation for two months, the contractor was notified that the machines were entered at an undervaluation, the customs authorities claiming that they should have been entered at \$600. There appeared to be no resource but to pay the duty on \$600. The extra duty was paid, and in addition, a fine was imposed of 50 per cent on the original duty under section 8 of the Customs Act; but the fine was afterwards returned. Now, I think the innocent purchaser should not suffer. Thirty per cent was paid on the full price which had been paid for the goods in the United States, and as it was the actual duty paid, instead of being 30 per cent. was exactly 40 per cent. I think the Act should provide that if no fraud was committed, no fine should be imposed, and the duty should be paid on the actual price of the goods.

Mr. BOWELL. The case mentioned has no reference to the question now under discussion. The hon. gentleman is discussing the clause that provides for an additional duty being imposed on an article which was undervalued. I suppose he states from his knowledge that the machines were only worth \$450. I am not going to dispute that, because I know nothing of the case. The hon. gentleman knows that if it were purchased in the United States at

\$400, and that was \$100 less than it was sold at for home consumption in the United States, it would be just \$100 under valuation if so entered. That is, the law provides—which I propose to modify when I reach it—that in all cases where the undervaluation amounts to or exceeds 20 per cent. of the value of the article as sold for home consumption in the country where it is purchased, 50 per cent of the duty follows as a matter of course; and that is just as much a part of the law as the imposition of 20 or 25 per cent. is.

Mr. WATSON. What I said was in answer to the illustration given by the Minister of Customs with regard to the woollen machinery. Here is an innocent party, the owner of an elevator, who paid the contract price for building the elevator, and is then liable to a fine as well as the extra duty.

Mr. BOWELL. His recourse would be against the person from whom he purchased, just as if I sell you goods which I have no right to sell. The custom laws make every article imported absolutely forfeited the moment the crime is committed. From the moment smuggling takes place, the goods are really not the property of anyone but the Crown, and if you purchase, and are an innocent person, you ought to treat the seller the same way as if you purchased from him any other article that was not his.

Mr. WATSON. The contractor in this case was an innocent person.

Mr. BOWELL. Very likely.

Mr. WATSON. What I say, is that the custom collectors at those outports should be instructed as to what goods they are in a position to release. That collector ought to have been in the position to know that these machines were valued at \$600, and that a duty of 30 per cent. should have been paid on \$600, no matter what price was paid for the goods. Had the collector been informed at what prices these articles should have been entered, the proprietors of the elevator would not have been in a position to be imposed on by the customs authorities.

Mr. BOWELL. The giving of instructions such as that indicated by the hon. gentleman could not by any possibility be done. An article to-day might be worth \$100 and to-morrow \$200 or \$50. The value of the duty is the value the article had at the time they were purchased and exported.

On section 5,

Mr. BOWELL. On looking at the old Act, you will find that where the undervaluation exceeds 20 per cent. a sum equal to one-half the duty shall be levied in addition to the regular duty. It also provides that 50 per cent. of the duty shall apply to goods which bear a specific as well as an *ad valorem* duty. I propose to change that so as to relieve from the penalty the goods upon which a specific duty is imposed, and have it apply only to those which bears an *ad valorem* duty. And I propose to reduce the undervaluation from 20 to 10 per cent., so that in case the goods are entered at 10 per cent. under value, then the penalty will not be 50 per cent., as at present, but 10 per cent. of the duty, and so on in proportion to the amount of undervaluation. Under this clause an article would have to be entered at an undervaluation of 50 per cent. before the penalty now imposed by the Act could be collected. For instance, if you import a horse for which you paid \$100 and entered it at \$20, that would be 20 per cent. under the price you paid. Under the present law, that would carry a penalty of 50 per cent. besides the whole duty, which would be \$10; under the present law, it would be simply 10 per cent. of the duty itself; that is \$2 instead of \$10.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How would that apply to cargoes of sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. Just the same, if there was an *ad valorem* duty. It would not apply to cargoes of sugar for refining purposes, because they pay the duty on their strength, as tested by the polariscope. If it were entered at an undervaluation,—that for general grocery purposes and not for refining—then the penalty would be imposed upon the *ad valorem* value of the sugar. Sugar now bears a duty of 1 cent per lb. specific and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. If it were undervalued, the undervaluation would apply only to the duty *ad valorem* and not to the specific value as it does at present.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I asked that question because it applies to other articles as well as to sugar. Take cargoes of molasses.

Mr. BOWELL. Just the same.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is perhaps aware that difficulties have at all times arisen in the customs in valuing cargoes of molasses, where part has been purchased at a lower rate than other portions of the cargo, and I have known frequently cargoes coming from the West Indies which have been entered at the *bond fide* prices at which they were paid. Yet the prices have been increased by the appraisers, very improperly, I think. It would be hard enough under those circumstances if they were called upon to pay an increased duty at all, but, if they are to pay upon an increased valuation as well, it would make it so much the worse, and would be very unfair. There is no intention, as a rule, on the part of importers to evade the customs law in that way, but this arises sometimes from the fact that a part of a cargo may be purchased at a lower rate than the balance. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that sometimes his officers have raised the value of the whole cargo to the highest amount specified in the invoice. It seems to me that that would work unfairly to the original importer.

Mr. BOWELL. If that were so, it would be much worse under the old law than under this, because, if the officer raised the price of the whole invoice before, if it exceeded 20 per cent., the 50 per cent. penalty would follow, but now it would not. Under the present law, if the cargo was undervalued 20 per cent., as the hon. gentleman says—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not say it is undervalued, but that the customs suppose it to be undervalued.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course the customs must suppose it, or the officer would not take that course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course the customs are right.

Mr. BOWELL. Sometimes they are not right, or I would not have so much trouble. The basis of this measure, however, is to relieve, as much as possible, parties who have not intentionally undervalued their goods.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). My hon. friend does not quite catch the point which I desired to lay before him. Under the present practice the customs would increase the value of the portion they suppose to be undervalued, and the 15 per cent. duty would be placed on the increased value; but, under this Bill, they would not only make that increase, but would add 10 per cent. to the duties.

Mr. BOWELL. No, not at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is so unusual for the Minister of Customs to relax the rigor of the law that one must feel persuaded that he has found that the old clause worked very harshly, and that being the case, I would like to ask him now, when he sees that it is fair and right to relax the rules, whether any relief will be given to innocent parties, parties acting in good faith, who have been fined when there has been a dispute between them and the customs officers in cases such as that instanced by my hon. friend

where a *bond fide* purchase was made and the importer had to submit, as we all have to submit, to the ruling of the department, and had to pay the amount, but did so under protest. I desire to know whether the Minister will look back at all. If not, the passing of this law is an admission that parties have been fined in the past who should not have been fined, and have been harshly dealt with. We practically admit by this that the penalty for innocent undervaluation heretofore inflicted was unjust. Very many people throughout the country feel that, but they have had to pay the penalty and did it under protest. I suppose that where it has not been paid under protest, the Minister would not take any notice of it, but I suggest whether justice does not require that he should take power to deal with cases of that kind where the amount has been paid under protest.

Mr. BOWELL. There is full power now under the law. If there are any cases where injustice has been done to an importer, if he will show where the money has been improperly collected, the money will be refunded. The hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) mentioned a case of that kind, where the officer made a mistake, and the \$90 was refunded. If the hon. gentleman can show any case where an injustice has been done, the matter will be considered, and if the Minister of Customs cannot deal with it, he will take it to the Treasury Board, and the money will be refunded. The hon. gentleman knows that, when once money goes into the hands of the Receiver General it is only by action on the part of the Treasury Board and the Council that the money can be refunded. The present Bill does not affect that at all. The only result is to impose a smaller penalty than under the old Act.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend from Marquette has stated a case in which he paid \$150 for an article. The Government made the amount \$680, and \$90 was the double penalty, or the fine imposed. What would we have to pay under the new arrangement?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old law, assuming that the imposition of the extra duty was correct, he should have paid \$180 duty. Then, \$90 would be 50 per cent. on that, but under this provision he would have to pay \$60 instead of \$90.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I asked a question as to the case of a person who paid a larger amount under protest than we are now deciding by this Bill he should have paid. Would not the Minister have power to deal with this by way of refund?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not any more than if the duty on an article was 20 per cent. to-day and was reduced to 10 per cent. to-morrow, the Minister of Customs could be asked to refund the difference. The question of paying under protest has never been considered by me. If a man has paid the duty, and afterwards shows that he has paid it improperly, that the value of the goods has been improperly raised, and that the market value in the United States was that at which they were entered by him, and the officers exacted more from him than they should, I have always recommended the refund, but the matter of paying under protest or not has never made any difference.

On section 6,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There the Minister is enacting the first part of the section in the old law, and is removing the alternative provision which was in the old Act which permitted the production of the original invoice of the goods or a certificate.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read it closely, he will see the latter portion of the clause contradicts the first. It says:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

"Whenever duties are charged according to the weight, toll, gauge, or other rate, such allowances shall be made for tares and draft to the packages as are prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council."

There it gives the Governor in Council power to declare what tare, gauge, etc., shall be allowed. That has been acted upon. Now, if you read the other portion:

"But when the original invoice of any goods is produced, and a declaration of the correctness shall be made as hereinafter provided—"

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What are you reading from?

Mr. BOWELL. I am reading the old Act, because the proposition is to leave out a portion of that Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not see the contradiction.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, you have not let me finish. I say the first portion of the clause gives power to the Governor in Council to make such regulations as they may deem necessary, allowing tare, etc. Then the other clause goes on to say:

"When the original invoice of any goods is produced, and a declaration of the correctness thereof is made as hereinafter provided, the tare according to such invoice shall be deducted from the gross weight of the goods, instead of the allowance aforesaid, subject to such further regulations as may be made from time to time by the Governor in Council."

So that although it gives power to the importer to declare by affidavit the correctness of certain weights, it then goes on to say that they must be subject to any further regulations which may be made from time to time by the Governor in Council. Now, we very often find cases of this kind, that an importer, many of them, or an exporter, as the case may be, will add to the tare of their goods a great deal more than ought to be added, or they will as they have done in the past, add to the value of the packages more than should be added. One merchant will deduct as high as 20 or 30 shillings upon certain goods that constitute a portion of the tare, while another from the same port will deduct nine or ten. So, you see at once the difficulty that presents itself in the administration of this law. It simply provides that the Governor in Council shall have power to declare by Order in Council what the tare, etc., shall be, and then it removes any ambiguity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that; but still I do not see why the production of the original invoice, giving the tare, and supported by affidavit, should not be good proof as to the correctness of the tare. Now, I can understand that the Minister should make a regulation as to the tare of a certain article; but it is quite possible that the goods, or the packages in which they are contained, may vary, the tare may vary, and to make a new rule might work a hardship or injustice upon some importer. It seems to me that when an original invoice is produced, and an affidavit made to the correctness of it, that should be made *prima facie* evidence of its correctness. The Minister has mentioned one or two cases. I should suppose that any fraud that would be perpetrated would be in the original shipper altering his tare in order to avoid the customs duty; but he would have to make a fraudulent invoice all through in order to do it, and the Minister would have the original invoice, and could detect the fraud. Suppose there was a collusion between the parties, and that the importer should say to the exporter in a foreign country: Now, you make the tare 10 or 15 per cent. more than it is—especially if the duties were levied on the *ad valorem* basis; he would have to increase the price at which it was entered, and would reveal the difference in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. I ask the hon. gentleman what good reason, or any reason, is there why you should have a clause upon the Statute-book that is ambiguous in its wording and that would lead to complications between the administrator of the law and the importer? As I understand it now, the Order in Council which has been issued making the declara-

tion of the tare upon certain articles, sufficient proof, has been accepted by all the merchants; it was done after a great deal of consideration and consultation with the largest importers of the country; and when they accepted that as fair, and it is working harmoniously, there is no reason why we should allow a clause to remain upon the Statute-book which gives any importer who likes to be cantankerous or troublesome, the opportunity of saying: Well, this is a correct invoice, these tares are correct, and I am prepared to swear to them,—and even if he does, then the last two lines of the clause give power to the Governor in Council to change that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, I do not so understand the meaning of these last words, I do not think that is a fair interpretation of them. I interpret them this way; that you make your rule and it does not apply in the case of a certain importer, and he says: Your rule is not doing me justice, and in proof of that I produce my original invoice, giving the original tare, which I support with affidavit. The section in the old law, as I understand it, permits the Minister to accept that as proof, but it has added: "subject to such further regulations as are made from time to time by the Governor in Council," but I interpret that part in this way, that the Governor in Council might require more proof than the original invoice, more proof than the declaration of the owner, for instance, if the Order in Council should require that he should have a declaration from the exporter from whom he bought the goods—that is how I understand the meaning of the words, and I think they were put in the Act for that purpose.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It appears to me that it is absolutely necessary that the Governor in Council should have power to deal with it in that way, though I presume the Government would not very frequently interfere with the established tares in the various countries from which the goods were received. But, at the same time, I think it is absolutely necessary that the Government should have power to deal with that, in the event of an invoice leading them to suppose there was something irregular in the tares which the importer declared to have on his invoice. I cannot see any objection to it, although I think the Government would not interfere very often, or at all events, change the established tares of the country from which the goods were imported.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand from the Minister of Customs that that subject has been for a long time under consideration, that they have modified their rules from time to time, as experience shows to be necessary, and at the present time the rules on that subject are uniform and complete. Now, of course, the only object in giving the Governor in Council power to deal by Order in Council with a subject of this sort, is that Parliament has not the necessary data upon which to base specific and minute legislation; but if the Minister of Customs thinks that they have now, by Orders in Council, or by their experience, arrived at a condition of things when these Orders in Council no longer require to be modified or changed, then that ought to be embraced in this section as part of the legislation; the experience which the hon. gentleman has acquired, and which is set forth in these Orders in Council, should be embraced in the statute itself. At all events, if that is not the case, there ought to be made an appendix to the statute where they would be accessible and known to the mercantile community.

Mr. BOWELL. As to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell, it could be carried out the moment that trade ceases to fluctuate, and administrators become perfect. I do not anticipate that day will arrive until perhaps the hon. gentleman reaches this side

of the House. The trade is continually changing, and there is no member on that side of the House who knows it better than the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). It may be necessary to change these regulations affecting tare and draft and deductions allowed upon packages containing goods which are exempt from duty. That may occur to-morrow or a month hence. We know that a package containing molasses may be worth 9 shillings one day and 12 shillings a month hence. If the hon. gentleman's suggestion were adopted we would have no power to make a change. These regulations, however, have to be varied as changes take place in the trade of the country. It would be utterly impossible to carry out the suggestion, which would either impose a wrong on the importers or on the revenue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would only apply to cases where there were specific duties on particular packages. If the duty was on the value of the packages, then there would be no difficulty. Besides, if the value fluctuates in the way the hon. gentleman has described the Order in Council always comes too late. The trouble is that the hon. gentleman's rule is always made after the fact, whereas ordinary legislation is made before the fact.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to enquire the reason why the latter portion of the clause in the old Act has been omitted in framing the new clause?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old Act the importer appears to be given the absolute right to insist on his statement being accepted. That might be correct in dealing with an honest man, but such was not the case in dealing with a dishonest trader. I did not see the necessity of retaining that portion of the clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That portion of the clause must have been inserted when the old Act was passed to give the alternative to the honest importer. At the same time the Governor in Council was given power to require something more from the importer than the mere production of the invoice, or that the Governor in Council might make regulations requiring something more.

Mr. BOWELL. Then it simply means this, that the Minister of Customs, or whoever administers the law, must throw doubt upon the statement of the importer who has sworn to the invoice. Taking the interpretation of the law, as given by the hon. gentleman, and perhaps it is correct, then the old clause gave power to the Minister of Customs or party administering the law, to say: You are not telling the truth, I will not accept your invoice, but I require further evidence. No doubt the words referred to were inserted for a good purpose; but, like many other clauses in the Act, they might be applicable at the time, but the changes of trade have been such and the way of doing business has changed to such an extent that we find it impracticable to carry out some of the clauses without coming into collision with the trade, which we desire to avoid.

On section 9,

Mr. BOWELL. The change made is one already existing by Order in Council, and many importers plead ignorance and say, because it is not in the law they do not know it. I propose to add that which is the law by Order in Council to the statute.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). A consignee of course can only make a declaration to the best of his knowledge or belief.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, that is all.

On section 10,

Mr. BOWELL. I explained this fully the other night. It simply refers to the payment of damage on sugar which goes into a refinery. It would not refer to sugar which was

imported for household purposes, for that would be entitled to the same claim as under the fourth section. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones) knows that sugar used for refining purposes is tested by the polariscope, and we allow for the salt in the testing.

On section 11,

Mr. BOWELL. This section simply changes the words: "Whenever any vessel is entered," to "whenever any vessel is reported." The only change is substituting the word "reported" for "entered." In former times the word "entered" was used whether referring to the reporting of a vessel or the entering of goods. Under the present Act the terms are distinct, and our desire is that there should be no conflict hereafter as to what is the meaning of entering or reporting.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). "Reporting" is the proper word.

Mr. BOWELL. I think so.

On section 12,

Mr. BOWELL. The House will see that in making those changes where only a word or two had to be changed I have reconstructed the whole clause, as I thought it better it should be done. The only change made in this clause is by inserting "assistant appraiser" and making it in conformity with the Civil Service Act, which recognises assistant appraisers.

On section 13,

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old Act in reading it, there is a doubt existing as to whether it applies to parts of machines that are imported or to the whole machinery which is imported. The words added are, "when parts of any manufactured articles are imported into Canada, each such part shall be dutiable." The object of the clause is to make the matter so plain that we cannot misunderstand it.

On section 14,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this clause is to make clear the power to impose a duty upon an article which has been sent from one country to the other upon which a bounty has been paid or a drawback given. For instance you purchase sugar in New York upon which two cents per pound has been paid to the purchaser as a drawback, and that article is sent to Liverpool and there purchased in the market and brought to Canada. The question then arises: does the law empower the Customs to impose a duty upon that two cents in addition to the price paid for the article. If the article was purchased in New York and exported directly to Canada, then there is no question but that the two cents would be added to the value of the sugar for duty, but an attempt has been made to evade that law by sending it to some other country and ostensibly selling it in the market and returning it back to Canada. The law is not clear upon that point, and this position is to make it beyond a doubt.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Even with the law obscure as it is, I should think "they could not come it over you" in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. No, sir; I want to put it beyond the power of anyone importing goods in that way to taking an action against us.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman only refers to one article.

Mr. BOWELL. I merely give that as an illustration.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Practically it refers to only one branch, such as refined sugar. Under the operation of this clause I presume, duty will be demanded on sugar coming from Germany, including the bounty as well. There is a bounty or drawback on sugar coming from Germany which

Mr. BOWELL.

interferes very much with our trade relations with the West Indies, in which hon. gentlemen lately have shown much interest, and under the operation of this Act, that sugar heretofore has come in a different way. Of course, I know that the polariscope test makes the principle of levying a duty somewhat difficult, and that perhaps may be my answer. I think the hon. gentleman, while he is dealing with the subject, should take power to place an *ad valorem* duty on German beet root sugar to cover the drawback so as to place it on the same footing as the refined sugar which comes from the United States. The principle I think should be applied in both cases, and if so it would very materially assist our trade with the West Indies by keeping out the German sugar. It now averages 60 or 70 per cent. of the refined sugar of the Dominion, and there is only about 25 per cent. of West Indian sugar. The German sugar is allowed to come in and compete with it under the operation of this Act, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will deal with the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause carefully he will see that the object he has in view is provided for. It applies to every article on which it can be established a drawback has been allowed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's explanation is perfectly satisfactory, if he only carries that provision into effect. That has been the practice. The subject having been brought to the notice of the Government some years ago, an order was passed that the duty should be collected on the increased amount; but that order was subsequently rescinded, and beet root sugar has recently been permitted to enter the Dominion on its actual value, less the amount of the drawback. I wish to know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to place an *ad valorem* duty on German sugar, because, under the present arrangement of a polariscopic test, German sugar is hardly included.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to suggest that, as this is a subject in which a great many gentlemen are interested, and as a number wish to go away to-night, perhaps it would be as well not to resume this discussion this evening.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman had better let me go through with the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will be here.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what other business can be gone on with just now. If it is desired that any clause should stand over, I shall have great pleasure in letting it stand, but I would like to get through with the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very important Bill. It has excited a great deal of attention in the mercantile centres of this country; several gentlemen have written to me about it; and I know that a number of members are going away to-night after half past eight o'clock, and I think it would be only fair to allow this Bill to stand over until the next Government day, because there are some sections of this Bill which I take particular exception to. I trust, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will not press the Bill to-night. If he does, he will force a number of us to stay, and I do not think it will help public business.

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. We would like to meet the wish of the hon. gentleman, but he must see that the Session is so far advanced that if we postpone measure after measure because some members go away or take exception to a clause, we shall never get away; we shall be here until June, and later than June, and I have no doubt that the wish of the hon. member and of the House is to get through the work as fast as we can. This is a measure that we thought we would take up this afternoon, and resume it after 8 o'clock.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not aware that any other Bill has been asked to be postponed, certainly not at my request. I do think this is not an unreasonable request. This Bill is one that affects the interests of the commercial community of this Dominion, and we have a right to a fair and reasonable opportunity of discussing it. There has been no Opposition shown to the Bill, but we desire to criticise it clause by clause, as they come up, and we request that it may be left over until the next Government day, in order that those who wish to go home to-night may do so. If it is necessary for me to stay, I will stay, but I do not think it would promote public business. I tell hon. gentlemen that frankly.

It being six o'clock, the committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Mr. TISDALE moved that the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada (Mr. Scarth) be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following clause:—

The directors of the company may make and issue as paid up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock in payment for right of way, plant, rolling stock, or materials of any kind, and also for the services of directors and engineers. Such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for call, and the paid up stock heretofore issued and allotted in accordance with the provisions of this section is hereby legalised and affirmed.

He said: I may say that, excepting the last words with regard to the legalising of any allotment, this is precisely the clause that is in the model Bill. I am moving this in the absence of Mr. Scarth. The promoters of this Bill had supposed, until it went through the Railway Committee, that they had the ordinary powers this clause contained. The addition I ask is, therefore, simply to have the model Bill clause put in and to legalise whatever the directors have done in accordance with that clause. I presume no hon. gentleman will object to this legislation. This railway is one that has built over two hundred miles of road, and has expended over \$1,000,000, so that I am asking for no new thing, but simply that the charter shall contain the ordinary clause, and that what has been done in the belief that the charter did contain that clause shall be legalised.

Mr. EDGAR. The amendment conforms, I see, except in the last sentence, exactly with the model Bill, and that only makes the model Bill retroactive. I do not think there can be any objection to it.

Motion agreed to.

The House resolved itself into committee. The committee reported. Bill read the third time, and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Winter Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order:—

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Hall for the third reading of Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company, and the motion of Mr. Bergin in amendment thereto: "That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time, this day six months."

House divided on the amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Armstrong, | Desjardins, | McMillan (Vaudreuil), |
| Bain (Soulanges), | Dessaint, | McMullen, |
| Barron, | Doyon, | Meigs, |
| Bergin, | Edgar, | Mills (Bothwell), |
| Bernier, | Eisenhauer, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Bourassa, | Ferguson (Welland), | Perry, |
| Bowell, | Geoffrion, | Platt, |
| Brien, | Girouard, | Préfontaine, |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe), | Godbout, | Rinfret, |
| Casgrain, | Guay, | Rykert, |
| Chapleau, | Hickey, | Ste. Marie, |
| Choquette, | Labelle, | Shanly, |
| Chouinard, | Labrosse, | Thompson, |
| Cockburn, | Landerkin, | Tisdale, |
| Cook, | Landry, | Turoot, |
| Costigan, | Laurier, | Vanasse, |
| Couture, | Lister, | Wallace, |
| Curran, | Lovitt, | Watson, |
| De St. Georges, | McLellan, | Wilson (Lennox).—57. |

NAYS:

Messieurs

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bain (Wentworth), | Guilbault, | Porter, |
| Baker, | Guillet, | Prior, |
| Bergeron, | Haggart, | Reid, |
| Bowman, | Hale, | Robillard, |
| Boyle, | Hall, | Roome, |
| Brown, | Henderson, | Ross, |
| Burns, | Hesson, | Rowand, |
| Cameron, | Holtou, | Royal, |
| Cargill, | Hudspeth, | Scriver, |
| Carling, | Innes, | Skinner, |
| Chisholm, | Jamieson, | Small, |
| Cimon, | Joncas, | Smith (Ontario), |
| Oochrane, | Kirk, | Somerville, |
| Coughlin, | Lang, | Sproule, |
| Daoust, | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Sutherland, |
| Davin, | Laurie, | Temple, |
| Davis, | Macdonald (Sir John), | Thérien, |
| Dawson, | Macdowall, | Trow, |
| Desautniers, | McCulla, | Tupper (Sir Charles), |
| Dupont, | McDougald (Pictou), | Tyrwhitt, |
| Ellis, | McDougald (Cape Bret'n), | Ward, |
| Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), | Madill, | Weldon (St. John), |
| Ferguson (Renfrew), | Mara, | White (Renfrew), |
| Fiset, | Marshall, | Wilmot, |
| Flynn, | Mills (Annapolis), | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Gauthier, | Mitchell, | Wood (Westmoreland), |
| Gigault, | Moffat, | Wright, |
| Gordon, | Montplaisir, | Yeo.—86. |
| Grandbois, | Perley (Assinibofa), | |

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Perth has not voted.

Mr. HESSON. I paired with the hon. member for Kent, (Mr. Landry).

Mr. LANDRY. I did not vote either. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. I paired with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Vote.

Mr. HESSON. I vote against the six months' hoist.

Mr. LANDRY. Then I vote the other way.

Mr. TROW. I notice that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKeen) has not voted, and I see that he is in the House—at least he is in the gallery.

Mr. ROYAL. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is too late. I have declared the amendment lost.

Mr. CURRAN moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, to have the following clause inserted therein:—

This Act shall not go into force until the first day of May, 1890.

He said: I shall make very few observations in connection with this motion, as the time for private Bills is nearly up; but this Parliament having last year refused to pass the

Bill which is now about to be granted, it is of the highest importance, owing to the fact that some \$300,000 have been spent, not only on the branch line, but in perfecting the connection with the American system, that the present company which are now constructing the road should be permitted to complete their works which are now commenced and are nearing a termination, and that they should have an opportunity of floating their bonds, and in fact of carrying out the large construction they have now on hand and of bringing commerce to this work, which will be destroyed altogether, and will prove almost ruinous to the company if this Bill should go into force immediately. This is not the first occasion upon which similar legislation has been enacted. In 1882, the Great Eastern Railway Company was incorporated by this House, and it was provided in the Act of incorporation:

"That so much of this section as authorises the construction of any part or parts of said railway, from and lying east of any point on the frontier, at or near the village of Dundee, and which passes through the counties of Huntingdon, Chateaugay, Beauharnois, Napierville and Laprairie, shall not come into force until the first day of May, 1884."

Thus giving two years' limit before the Act should come into force. As this House, through its Committee on Railways last year, threw out a Bill similar to this one, and thereby it was considered by the promoters of the other road that Parliament was pledged that this Bill should not be granted, and went to work and expended this large amount of money, I think the House will consider it only fair that the company should have that brief time allotted to them, and then, if there is a prospect of business, if the gentlemen who are promoting this Bill see that there is enough business for them to operate their present charter, they can do so, and the people of the country will be glad to see them do so; but, in the meantime, there is no justice in crushing out an enterprise which has begun in good faith, and upon which a large amount of money has been expended.

Mr. BAKER. I ask if that amendment is in order. Clause 67 of the Rules of this House says that no important amendment can be moved, either in committee or on the third reading, without one day's notice having been given. Has that notice been given?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to declare that this motion is not in order.

Mr. BERGIN. I object to the Bill being read the third time to-night. It must go over until Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. On what ground does the hon. gentleman object?

Mr. BERGIN. You cannot take that stage to-night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order for to-night is for the third reading.

Mr. BERGIN. The order to-night is for the consideration of the amendment I proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot entertain the objection. The third reading must take place if the House so wills it.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper.)

Mr. CURRAN.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I enquired of the Minister of Customs before Recess in reference to his interpretation of a previous clause which I did not understand to be passed. That was with reference to the value of goods on which there was a drawback. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he proposed to deal with the beet root sugar in the same way as the sugar from New York?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The proposition is to deal with all articles whether it be sugar or anything else. I might state, however, what I did not state before in reply to my hon. friend in reference to beet root sugar. There was a doubt existing in the minds of some eminent lawyers whose opinions we had, that we had no right to impose that duty upon sugar which was manufactured in England from sugar imported from Germany upon which the drawback had been paid. However, I might state frankly that we differed in the department from that opinion which was given to us by some Montreal gentleman who belongs to the legal profession on behalf of the sugar refiners. But, under the peculiar circumstances which the hon. gentleman remembers I explained at the time, we did not think it advisable to put our construction of the law into force. It is changed now so as to place it beyond a doubt and it makes it more defined in the future under this clause to impose duty upon sugar of that kind if purchased in England or any other country when a drawback is paid.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is, beet root sugar coming Germany?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How will you apply that to the others on which duty is levied by the polariscopic test? Do you propose changing the law so as to have an *ad valorem*?

Mr. BOWELL. Quite right; we cannot do that under the polariscopic test for refining purposes. That is the point that arose in dispute in relation to the sugar manufactured in England from the German sugar. It was the refined sugar purchased in England for grocery purposes, or the "low yellows," as they were called. Those do not go to the refinery and, consequently, they will bear an *ad valorem* duty, and this clause can be applied.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps I did not make myself understood. I understand that a complaint made by the refiners led to a change in the duty a few years ago, and that beet root sugars were admitted, less the bounty, for a time, because it was said that the English refiners having the advantage of using the beet root sugars, if the raw material was not admitted into the Dominion on the same terms as other sugars, that our refiners could not compete with them. Since the change has been made under which the duty on refined sugar from Great Britain has been increased to meet the views of the refiners, what I desire to know is whether the Government propose taking any action to levy the duty on the raw beet root sugar from Germany on the same principle that they apply it on the refined

sugars from New York. That is to say, on the value of the sugar without deducting the large bounty or drawback which is allowed the purchaser off the raw material in that country.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no proposition of that kind. The proposition before the House is simply to apply to sugar or any other articles upon which an *ad valorem* duty is imposed. Under the system that prevails now—the charging of duty in accordance with the strength of the sugar—that question cannot arise, nor has it arisen in the past, and unless an *ad valorem* duty was imposed in addition to the duty which was imposed upon the different degrees of strength now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BOWELL. We do not propose to change that. The hon. gentleman will remember that one of the principal reasons why we changed the mode of collecting the sugar duty was to encourage the West Indian trade with Canada. It was contended by those who were engaged in the trade that, when sugars were purchased in China, or the Sandwich Islands, and such places, it could be purchased at a very much lower rate than in the West Indies, or Cuba, and the result of that was that the freights being so much lower in the long route it would, in a measure, have acted against the West Indian trade. Then it was changed to the polariscopic system, by which it mattered not from what part of the world it came, and it mattered not under what circumstances it was published, the duty would be collected on the actual strength of the sugar, so that if it were purchased in China and brought to Canada, and contained the same strength as sugar purchased in the nearest islands to Halifax or Canada, it would pay precisely the same duty as that brought the short distance. It is not proposed to change this mode of collecting duty on sugar.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The point I was trying to get the hon. gentleman to notice was this, he stated the object was to encourage the West Indian trade.

Mr. BOWELL. That was the object of the change.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, I understand that was all right so far as it went, but the hon. gentleman will see he is not carrying out his own policy; that is to say, he was only carrying it out with a particular object, and in so far as it is beneficial to the refiners. He is placing duty on the refined sugar coming from the States at its market value without allowing for that drawback. An *ad valorem* duty is assessed at the same rate as the article sells for in the wholesale market in New York. I wish to know whether the hon. gentleman does not see that under that principle the beet root sugar should be assessed in the same way. I admit you do not reach it by the polariscopic test system. The question is whether you should not apply an *ad valorem* duty in that way to meet that difficulty. The hon. gentleman knows, and no one knows better, that under the present arrangement the beet root sugar is driving the West Indian sugar almost entirely out of the market. I have not the figures in my hand at the moment, but I think, if the hon. gentleman refers to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that less than 40 per cent. of the sugar manufactured in this country is what is called Barbadoes and that the large proportion is the beet root sugars coming from Germany. If the import of that article goes on under the present system in the same ratio it has for the past few years, instead of encouraging the West India trade which seems to be the object the hon. gentleman and the Government have in view, it will completely kill that trade. Therefore it is useless for them to talk about building up a trade with the West Indies, while at the same time the effect of their tariff regulations is to encourage the importation of beet root sugar, and is driving the West India sugar out of the market. If the Government desire to help the

West India trade, they should take some means by which the duty will be imposed on the raw sugar at its value in Germany, without allowing any deduction for the bounty or drawback, just as they do on sugar from New York, to benefit the refiner.

Mr. BOWELL. I fully recognise the logic of the hon. gentleman on this question, but to adopt the system he proposes now would disarrange the whole system of the collection of sugar duties. The probabilities are from present appearances that the discrimination which he has pointed out may not exist for any length of time, for I understand that the effect of the international congress which has been discussing this question, is that Germany, Belgium, France, and nearly every country which has been paying heavy bounties on the production of beet root sugar, have agreed to their abandonment. I am not sure of any that have not joined in the conference except the United States, and it was only about a week ago that it was announced in England that the colonies had given in their adhesion to that decision.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the meantime the West India trade shall suffer.

On section 16,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not see any difference between this and the old law, with this exception, that under the amended clause the collector appoints one appraiser, the individual who feels aggrieved nominates another, and an officer of the Customs Department is the third; virtually leaving the Government or their officers to appoint two, whose decision is final.

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old law, in case of a dispute between the importer and the customs authorities as to values, the collector is empowered to appoint two merchant appraisers who are supposed to know the value of the goods. They take the evidence, and report to Ottawa, and the decision of the Commissioner of Customs is final. The importers have contended that that arrangement is too one-sided, and that they ought to have something to say. Therefore we have changed the law so as to give the importer a voice on the board. The Government, instead of having the power to appoint the whole of them, have only power to appoint another, who is outside of the customs, and the appraiser, who is supposed to have a better knowledge of the value of the goods than any one, is the third; and their decision is final. This relieves the Government of any responsibility in the matter, and this is a concession which has never been given before either in this country or in the United States. In the United States they have had two or three systems of appraisement, but they have abolished them all, and at the present the law there is that the Government appoint a board of appraisers from their own officers, whose decision is final. It was thought under the circumstances that it would be better to make our law a little more moderate by giving the importers a say in the matter.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I understand that, but really I cannot see that it is such a concession on the part of the Government as the hon. Minister would lead us to believe. Virtually the Government control the whole valuation. Before, the party feeling aggrieved had no voice in the matter. Now, he may have a voice, but the voice does not amount to anything, because the two Government appraisers decide as to the value of the article and the duty to be paid, and their decision is final.

Mr. BOWELL. That argument is very good, based on the assumption that the only object the Government have is to take all the duty they can get out of everybody. I take it for granted that the Government do not want any more than they are entitled to, and this provision is only

to protect the honest importer who enters his goods at a fair valuation. The Government have no power to take one cent of duty out of the importer if it is shown, after these appraisers meet, that the original appraisal by the department was too high. All they have to enquire is whether the article imported has been entered at a value less than that article is sold at in the market for home consumption. Under the circumstances, my hon. friend will see that this is a very equitable provision, unless I am to infer that he desires when a difficulty arises that the merchant who imports shall have the selection of the board to decide the question. Then, I suppose the argument is fair on the other side, that the Government would have nothing to do with the valuation, and might as well surrender at once, because the importer would select such friends as would do away with the valuation at which the goods were entered.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think my hon. friend will see the Government should have such a power as this, if they deal with it at all. They must take the responsibility, and we are bound to assume that the Government have no object in getting more than the fair duty which the importer is entitled to pay.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not object to that in the least, but I do not think the Minister of Customs has really shown that the individual aggrieved can feel he has every protection desirable. Of course I can understand it is necessary to protect the Government, but we should also not look upon every importer as a dishonest individual, and frame the law so as to punish almost every individual who may fall at times into the hands of the Government. I think the protection offered here to the importer is very little indeed.

On section 17,

Mr. BOWELL. Clauses 78, 79, 82, 83, 103, 124 and 125 are all changed so as to provide for the doing away with the giving of bonds, to which I called the attention of the House the other night. As the law now stands, bonds are required to be given in each case when goods are removed from one warehouse to another, thus entailing a large amount of labor on the part of the merchants as well as the custom house officers. About 30,000 to 35,000 bonds are passed during a year. The moment a party ex-warehousing goods from one warehouse to another or from one bonded warehouse in one Province to another, makes an entry, he becomes just as responsible for the delivery of the goods to the other warehouse as if he had given the bond, so that it relieves the merchant from giving the bond, and it relieves the custom officials in different parts of the Dominion from filling out some 30,000 to 40,000 bonds every year. The revenue will be just as safe as it is now, because the parties who give bonds do not give their sureties, but their own individual bonds, and if they can be held as responsible by a clause in the Act as by signing bonds, we do away with all the difficulty and at the same time protect the revenue.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do I understand that when the party warehousing a cargo and giving his bond, transfers it to a second party, whether the latter gives bonds or not, the original importer who has given his bond, and who loses all control of the goods after he has parted with them, is held responsible?

Mr. BOWELL. Do you mean that the goods remain in the bonded warehouse?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No; after they are delivered. For instance: If I import a cargo and give a bond, and then sell it to a refinery; they may either pass a bond, or not, as the case may be, but I, as the original importer, cease to be held responsible for the duty?

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the moment the transfer takes place, and the party who has purchased from you in bond transfers it from that warehouse to his own, he is responsible.

On section 18,

Mr. BOWELL. Clause 82 makes the acceptance of the transfer of goods in the warehouse equivalent to the bond heretofore exacted, and places the new owner under the same obligations as was the party who originally entered the goods for warehouse.

On section 19,

Mr. BOWELL. Section 86 is to give the officers of the Customs Department power to enter and examine a warehouse in which goods are stored in bond. At present such officer has no legal authority to enter and examine without the consent of the proprietor. It is manifestly necessary and proper that the right to enter and make an examination should be beyond dispute. At present, it is contended the officer has no power to demand entrance to your warehouse and pass through a free portion of it to enter the bonded portion. This will enable him, if he thinks anything is wrong, to demand entrance, and you are obliged to give it to him.

On section 20,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this provision is to keep the statistics right, so as to show the country to which the vessel belongs and from which it comes. This has always been the law.

On section 21,

Mr. BOWELL. That is the same clause, defining the time at which the articles seized may be sold, if the law is not complied with.

On section 22,

Mr. BOWELL. The object of this is to assist exporters and relieve them of a good deal of trouble to which they are now put. Take the case of an exporter of lumber from Buckingham by way of Rouse's Point. He is now compelled to come to Ottawa to make his entry, instead of making it at Rouse's Point, which would be more convenient. Take the case of lumber exported by rail from Alexandria, on the line of the Canada Atlantic Railway. The nearest custom house to that place is at Cornwall, which is some 40 miles out of the way, and he must make his entry there. I propose to allow him to make his export entry at the nearest place to that by which it is going out of the country. The other provision is a question of bonds again.

On section 23,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide for vessels which do not enter a regular port of entry. The penalty before was only fixed in regard to vessels which had dutiable goods on board, leaving a vessel which had no such goods to do practically what she pleased, and, therefore, to a certain extent enabling her to evade the necessity of reporting. It is also intended to reduce the penalty from the forfeiture of the vessel to a fine of \$400, in case the vessel is worth less than \$800, and then to authorise the sale of the vessel if the penalty is not paid within thirty days. It often occurs now that a vessel may run in for shelter or for smuggling purposes, but, as the law reads, you cannot do anything with her unless she enters a regular port of entry, and we want to make her report whether she has dutiable goods on her or not. The House will see that it would be very easy for her to run in and get rid of the dutiable goods, and afterwards to state: "We have no dutiable goods on board."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How will that affect the fishermen under the treaty?

Mr. BOWELL. It will not affect them, because they will be specially exempt under the law.

On section 25,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to cover a dispute which has arisen as to the right of a customs officer to make a seizure. It has been contended that no seizure can be made except under cover of a writ of assistance, or under a section of the old law. If that were the correct interpretation, it is not that under which customs officers have acted in the past, and the operation of the law would be impracticable unless we obtained from the courts a writ of assistance, and placed it in the hands of every customs officer. In the past when any customs official has had reason to suppose that there were smuggled goods, he considered that he had the right to make the seizure. I believe he had the right under but that the law, has been disputed, and it is better to make it clear.

On section 26,

Mr. BOWELL. This is to correct an absurd wording of the law. The old law refers to places where no justice can be found within five miles, and that has been struck out.

On section 27,

Mr. BOWELL. These words have been added to the original clause:

"And unless payment is made within thirty days, such vessel may, after the expiration of such delay, be sold to pay such penalty and any expenses incurred in detaining, keeping and selling the same."

It is only carrying out the provisions of the earlier clauses.

On section 28,

Mr. BOWELL. That is striking out the words "North-West Territories," as courts have been established in the Territories since.

On section 29,

Mr. BOWELL. These words are added:

"Which he has reasonable grounds to believe are liable to forfeiture."

On section 30,

Mr. BOWELL. This is somewhat of an important change, and I will give the House the reasons for it. The object of the amendment is to render more plain and unmistakable the intention of the law. While it would appear, by section 148 of the old law, that no action, suit or proceeding of any nature could be commenced against an officer making a seizure on account thereof, it has been contended that this does not include actions in replevin or revendication to recover possession of the thing seized. While it is impossible to deny that the owner or claimant of the thing seized has a right to an adjudication on the legality of the seizure, such opportunity should be afforded him to obtain a decision in regard to the ownership of the thing seized; but the intent and purpose of the law is not so clear at present as to debar the owner from taking action in replevin or revendication, and that necessarily tends to embarrass the officers of the Government, and in some cases to defeat the ends of justice. The amendment would prevent unnecessary and unprofitable litigation. The law in the United States provides that property seized under such circumstances shall be irrepleviable. We desire to prevent as much as possible the delay in settling these cases by lawyers replevining goods, and then keeping them standing in that position for a year. These cases have occurred, particularly in Montreal.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the right of replevin, the officer gets the condemnation. There is great doubt

whether a replevin applies at all. The 148th section seems to be entirely new. It says that action shall be brought against the Crown or any officer of customs until a decision has been first given either by the Minister of Customs or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in relation to the condemnation of the things seized. It seems to me that is rather cutting down the rights of the parties.

Mr. BOWELL. This amendment was made for the express purpose of facilitating the settlement of all these cases. When a seizure is so made a certain length of time is given for the Minister or the deputy to make his decision, but before that can be done, the goods have been, in many cases, replevined, and there they stand for a year, and you cannot touch them until that case is decided. This has been framed after a good deal of thought and consideration, as leading to the best and quickest possible mode of arriving at a decision.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But by section 147, any action must be brought within three months: it is possible no condemnation will take place before that three months; therefore the parties in the action may be completely barred. I think that section ought to be left out. By the sub-section of section 148, you declare that no action shall be brought until adjudication by the Minister of Customs, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, as to the condemnation of the thing seized. The previous section 147 limits the time for bringing the action within three months, and possibly a condemnation might not be arrived at and the party would be deprived of his remedy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The decision of the Minister will save it, "until a decision has been first given by the Minister of Customs, or by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But no action shall be brought within that time.

Mr. BOWELL. I think you will find, when we reach a later section, that there is a time fixed for giving his decision, or a reasonable time. But if the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will let that stand for consideration.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I would suggest three months after the decision, or after it has been passed upon.

On section 32,

Mr. BOWELL. You strike out the words "for entry" and "to hold the vessel in case of penalties being put," the contention being by some parties that you can only collect from the officer who committed the offence, and while it makes that provision, it also says you may detain the vessel. But the contention is that though you may detain the vessel, you cannot compel the owners to pay the penalties. This is provide against that. Whenever a captain has committed to an offence which makes him liable to a penalty, you not only detain the vessel, but you compel the owners to pay. That was evidently the original intention of the law, or they would not have given power to the officers to retain the vessel.

On section 33,

Mr. BOWELL. The present Civil Service Act confines the administering of the oath of allegiance to certain officers and officials in Ottawa. The object of this is to give inspectors of customs and certain other officials the power to do that which they formerly had power to do, that is, to administer the oath of allegiance and the oath of office to any new officer that may be appointed, without having to come to Ottawa to do it.

On section 34,

Mr. BOWELL. This gives power to the Minister in case of any dispute, as with the party who has been fined, that

instead of waiting for them to commence the investigation, you may transfer it at once to the courts.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). What is the difference between this and the old clause, as regards production of books and papers in case of seizure of goods?

Mr. BOWELL. Only that the three years' limitation is abolished. You can now seize for duties for any time. Many were confounding the collection of duties with penalties which have been imposed, which were limited to three years. By the provision of this section of the old Act, power is given to customs officers to examine the books of an importer respecting importations made within the three years next preceding the date of the seizure made by him. It is proposed to strike out this limitation.

Mr. WELDON. Then you will be able to go back any number of years?

Mr. BOWELL. Not unless there is reason to believe that there has been improper dealing.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Then the officers would be able to expose a man's business for any number of years?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, as can be done at the present time for three years. Suppose it is known that a man has been smuggling for ten years, why should he be exempted for seven years' fraud? That is really the point for the committee to decide—whether a man not having been caught for the three years is to be held to be innocent because the crime was committed three years before the time the fraud was discovered. The discovery may not take place for three years. It may be discovered, as has been done, that frauds have been continually perpetrated by importers for years and years. Under the present law, although his books may give evidence showing that he has committed those frauds, the Department can only secure penalties for three years.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has there not been a great deal of trouble in the United States respecting a provision of this character, and has it not been repealed there?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman may be right; we have no knowledge of it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the United States that power was exercised very harshly, and was attended by very serious consequences. It is a very harsh clause. There should be a limitation of some kind. This clause is giving very dictatorial power on very slender evidence.

Mr. BOWELL. The whole Customs Act is of a very dictatorial character, and it is only on information that custom house officers can act. Action is very often taken in this way: An importer has a manager or foreman who quarrels with his employer. Thereupon the employé enters a complaint with the customs against his employer, whom he accuses of being engaged in smuggling, and he gives such evidence of the fact as to justify the officers in entering his establishment and making a seizure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No doubt this Act is in the interest of the honest importer, but, at the same time, it gives great power to inflict annoyance and take action of an inquisitorial character that can be made very offensive. We know that it sometimes happens that an importer is subject to a pique on the part of some one who sends notice to the Customs Department that he has reason to believe that the importer is smuggling. On the faith of that statement the officer walks into the man's business premises and demands to have his whole business exposed for years. That is a most improper authority to give to any one, except under the most extraordinary circumstances. I am quite willing that the law should be of a nature to protect the honest importer, but this provision opens the door to a great deal of annoyance, and an honest importer may be annoyed

Mr. BOWELL.

by a man walking in and saying: I believe you are smuggling, and I demand to see your books and papers. Under this clause the importer, under a penalty of \$5,000 will be obliged to expose his business. Advantage may be taken of this by another man who wants to obtain knowledge of his business. Customs officers are not always above suspicion, and if a man wanted to obtain knowledge of his neighbor's business he could send to the customs officers a complaint that his neighbor was smuggling. His friend could thereupon examine the books and report as to where purchases were made and the rates paid. That is an authority which the hon. gentleman should not ask the committee to grant. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman, or any hon. gentleman responsible to this House, going himself to any importer and making an examination of the books; but to send every Tom, Dick and Harry that belongs to the department is, I think, asking too much. This clause can be, no doubt, operated so as to be very offensive indeed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are there any departmental regulations which would prevent a party who undertook to make an inspection of another man's business for the purpose of reporting to anyone else? Are the officers under an obligation to maintain secrecy?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the rules of the department any officer giving information subjects himself to dismissal. One of the complaints against the officers, is in the large cities and other places because they will not tell and have not told, and they have been accused of entering into collusion with merchants and others to take a certain sum and hush the matter up. But those people wanted the whole thing published in the papers. I have never known a case in the last ten years similar to that suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). His whole argument applies just as strongly to the three years' limit as to the ten years' limit. He will also understand that unless this power be given to customs officials—this work is not done by every Tom, Dick and Harry, but is done by responsible officers—you cannot reach cases of men who have been committing smuggling frauds that have only recently been discovered unless you can go back for some years. Take the cases which occurred in Montreal, in which it was declared that the importers had been systematically entering goods under false invoices; that they had been numbering their cases improperly, and that they would conceal one case containing very valuable goods while the other case which they had contained goods of very little value and, consequently, a lower rate of duty. We only found out the extent of the frauds by going to their establishment and demanding to see their books. It transpired there was an invoice upon which the entry had been made, and the entry in their books showed that they had paid a much larger sum for their goods, and it also proved that while they had entered and paid duty on one class of goods, they had actually purchased from an exporter in the other country goods of a much more valuable class and higher duty. If you eliminate that from the Act, there is no safety at all for the honest importers. In one case where parties in Montreal paid over \$32,000, the frauds were only reached by the means which I have pointed out. Experience told them, and their lawyers probably advised them, so, instead of giving up their books, we have reason to know they burned them, and the only penalty we could inflict on that person was a penalty of a thousand dollars. It was impossible to reach the frauds or the extent of them, because we could not have got their books. It is true I might have sent an officer to England or the great markets of the world where they bought their goods in order to find out the quantity and quality of the goods, they were purchasing. Suppose I had sent to Manchester, and an officer went into an establishment, even accredited

from the Government, the exporter might very properly have said: "It is none of your business, sir, walk out;" as they do sometimes. In other cases they gave us their books as they have done in New York, when it was shown they had sent goods to people in this country who were enabled by defrauding the customs to sell goods at half their value. This clause is only giving the Government power to send customs officers to demand their books, and if they try to prevent investigation to deal more severely with them.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I admit it is in the interests of the honest importer if properly carried out, but at the same time it opens the door to a good deal of annoyance.

Mr. BOWELL. So it does.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know of cases within my own knowledge where an intimation was given of a certain vessel having goods on board which were not reported, and merely to annoy the owner of that ship the customs officer examined her and nothing was found on board. The same principle would apply to any person having a large amount of goods in his store, and he would have to allow this officer to have knowledge of all his transactions for a number of years. I have it on authority that in many cases those officers do not exercise their power very judiciously or very impartially. I may be wrong, but I have heard that officers from the Minister of Customs' Department have been through our own Province and they have shown a remarkable avoidance of certain business premises in the country that were known to be more in sympathy with the views of the Government of the day, and they always scented out with an extraordinary amount of readiness and activity prominent business places conducted by gentlemen who did not sympathise with them. Now, this is one of the difficulties. I admit if the law was honestly carried out it would be all right, but it opens the door for such an inquisitorial interference with the honest trader and the business generally that it would be very objectionable and looked upon with very great disfavor by the commercial community generally.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The argument of the Minister of Customs seems irresistible, but suppose we confine the power to customs officers of the port alone. Here you say: "to any officer of customs." This would give the power to an understrapper, which he might exercise arbitrarily, and I suppose the intention of the Government is to confine it to a responsible officer.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It says: "or any other proper officer of customs."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Suppose you confine it to the customs collector himself.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In the first line of that clause, section 85, would it not be better to make it read "Whenever information has been given under oath."

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to that; let it be so. In order to meet the objection made by my hon. friend from St. John's (Mr. Weldon) I will confine the time to five years, and make it read, "And of all goods imported into Canada by him at any time within five years preceding such request or seizure." There are two or three other verbal corrections which I would make in that clause, such as changing the word "and" on the sixth line to "or," and make it read "either the exporter or the owner." There is an objection to making the officer the collector of customs alone, because the officer who discovers the fraud might be 20 or 30 miles away from the port in charge and the goods might be removed before the collector could act. We have found in our experience of sending a man from Ottawa, the moment that he is known to be an officer in any port they are on the *qui vive* at once, and

sometimes even the officers of the port will frustrate his action, because they conceive that if he succeeds that it is a reflection on them. It is absolutely necessary in order to catch smugglers, for a stranger to go to a port and wait there sometimes two or three weeks before the parties are discovered.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). As it stands now a tide-waiter who is not responsible might demand the books.

Mr. BOWELL. We never do that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). He has the power to demand the books.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, but the man sent is a man who occupies some position in the customs, and who knows what his duties are.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The objection is not to the seizure, it is to the demanding of the books by an inferior officer.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that. The amended section 186 fixes the penalty for refusing to give up the books at from \$1,000 to \$5,000. The law of the United States is that if the party refuses to give up the books, that is *prima facie* evidence of his guilt, and in case of a suit the decision is given accordingly. If it is alleged that a person has smuggled goods and there is no means of ascertaining the facts except by his books and he refuses to give up his books on an order of the court, we also provide that that shall be taken as *prima facie* evidence of his guilt.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The order of the court should not be taken unless the party has an opportunity of being heard. The books might be destroyed so that he might not be able to produce them.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a case we want to meet. I have in my mind a case that occurred in Montreal, in which, just as soon as the importer consulted his lawyer—I do not know that his lawyer advised him to do so—the books were burned, and we could not reach them. Therefore we thought it better, after a great deal of consideration, to adopt the American system in this respect. If a man is innocent, he will give up his books, and I think it will be in the discretion of the court to say whether his excuse is sufficient or not.

On section 35,

Mr. BOWELL. This amends section 192 so as to make a party guilty of smuggling or of an attempt to defraud subject to a penalty equal to the value of the goods. The Act as it exists provides for the forfeiture of the goods, which would be sufficient if the goods were found; but when they are not found, the party escapes after conviction with a penalty of from \$50 to \$200, as the magistrate may decide; but practically it is only \$50, for the sympathy, I am sorry to say, is with the smuggler and not with the Government, whereas the goods might be ten times that value.

On section 38,

Mr. BOWELL. This section provides that in cases where smuggled goods have been disposed of or are beyond the reach of seizure, the penalty for concealing them, &c., is the same as for smuggling, as provided in section 192. At present, the penalty for being an accessory is four times that of being a principal.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Why omit the word "knowingly?" You should make it "knowingly harbor, conceal, &c."

Mr. BOWELL. I will add that word.

On section 39,

Mr. BOWELL. The intention of this amendment is to make part of the offence any misdescription of goods in the invoice. At present the law only refers to misstatement of values, and frauds are frequently perpetrated by giving goods a name by which they can be entered free or at a lower rate than if they were properly named.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I brought before the hon. gentleman last year a case on which the goods were entered under a different name. Did the law not cover that case?

Mr. BOWELL. Not clearly. Of course we could call it a fraud, but a great deal of technical objections were raised by legal gentlemen. Parties have imported dye stuffs, per-citrate, as free, but the extract per-citrate or ground per-citrate is dutiable at 20 per cent. We have discovered, after seeing the correspondence, that these parties instructed the merchants in the foreign markets to invoice the goods simply as per-citrate; and to ascertain whether it was ground or the other, every barrel would have to be opened.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the case I brought up, there was clear misrepresentation. Would this be a convenient time to ask what was done in that case?

Mr. BOWELL. If you will give me the case and the name, I will let you know what was done.

On section 41,

Mr. BOWELL. This strikes out the name of the province, which I was advised was unnecessary and only encumbered the Act.

On section 44,

Mr. BOWELL. The clause in the old Act is obsolete and has never been acted on, and we have substituted this in its place to define what is meant by the commencement of an action, suit or proceeding. Under the Act differences of opinion have arisen. Strange to say, there are four or five different opinions as to when the time commences before the beginning of an action. Some eminent lawyers contend that the time begins to run the moment the offence is committed; others contend that is not until the discovery of the fraud has been made, while we have always acted upon the view that the time begins to run from the time the decision has been made by the Department, and this is to declare exactly when it does commence to run.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). That is in regard to any suit of the Crown under the Act?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

On section 45,

Mr. BOWELL. That defines the time within which proceedings must be commenced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not that conflict with the six years' provision which has been already made?

Mr. BOWELL. No, that is only in regard to books.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But supposing there was a seizure under that? It seems to me that this provision with conflict with the other.

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Justice tells me that it does not interfere at all.

On section 47,

Mr. BOWELL. This clause is simply to make the law as it now stands upon the Statute-book applicable to railways as well as to steamboats and vessels. There was no provision in the law applicable to railways, strange as it may appear.

Mr. BOWELL.

On section 48,

Mr. BOWELL. There is no provision in the law as it stands for disposing of the surplus.

On section 49,

Mr. BOWELL. I move to strike out of that repealing clause section 117, which is not repealed.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I should like to ask under what authority the Government claim the right by Order in Council to vary the duties or classify the duties on different articles from time to time. We frequently see an Order in Council issued changing the duties or fixing the duties on certain classes of goods. On more than one occasion, I heard that, when articles have been imported and admitted at a certain rate, when it was found that they rather interfered with some manufacturing interests—

Mr. BOWELL. Do not put it in that way.

Mr. JONES. I am well aware of that by the representations which have been made.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not always true.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In those cases, I have found that they have been changed. Have the Government any authority to do this by Order in Council under the Customs Act or under any special Act?

Mr. BOWELL. It often occurs that an article is imported, and sometimes the appraiser and sometimes the collector will rule the article under a certain clause of the tariff. When the entries are sent to the Department the check clerks often discover that the goods have been improperly entered, and these are, I think, the cases to which my hon. friend refers. The ninth section of the Customs Act provides that:

"Whenever any dispute arises as to whether any or what duty is payable on particular goods, and there is no previous decision in the matter by any competent tribunal, or there are decisions inconsistent with each other, the Governor in Council may declare the duty payable on the kind of goods in question or that such goods are exempt from duty; and any Order in Council containing such declaration and fixing such duty, if any, and published in the *Canada Gazette*, shall have the effect of law."

That provision is only taken advantage of when disputes arise as to the proper classification of goods, and the proper rate of duty to be levied upon them. There is another clause, however, which gives power to the Governor in Council to put articles on the free list which are used in the manufacture of other articles.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I do not object to that so much, because it is a relief from taxation. Perhaps it is not exactly in accordance with constitutional government to vest that authority in the Executive; still, we never complain when they relieve us from the burden of taxation, but, when, as is often the case, the duties are indirectly increased by an Order in Council, putting articles under different headings from those under which they have been previously admitted, it seems to me that the Government practically assume the functions of this Parliament to declare what duties shall be levied on those articles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government must construe the law if a question arises as to what the duty is.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We have not, I think, that implicit confidence in the Government which would lead us to believe that they will always rightly construe the law.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose that will occur, no matter what Government is in power.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That Act has been in operation now for several years, and still we constantly find Orders in Council passed placing goods under different heads, and I think the Government should have had sufficient time to decide as to what heads these articles ought to be placed under before this period.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend forgets that the tariff has been changed every year since 1873, except this year, and consequently the difficulties which he refers to are constantly occurring under every new tariff. We have those difficulties now under certain classes of iron. After we thought we had taken every possible precaution to define what scrap iron was, we have now different importers and manufacturers giving different interpretations as to what scrap iron is. There is another clause of the Customs Act which provides:

"If an article is enumerated in the tariff under two or more names or descriptions, and there is a difference of duty, the highest duty provided shall be charged and collected thereon."

Some collectors may impose the lower duty, and then our attention is brought to that by a manufacturer or an importer. Because when an importer has been charged the higher duty, and we learn that at another port his goods have been admitted at a lower duty, our attention is called to it, and then upon investigation, if we find the higher duty the correct one, we have so to rule. Those are the only cases in which duties, as the hon. gentleman says, may have been apparently increased, but they are not really increased.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I pointed out last year that certain dealers in agricultural implements found that they could get them from Montreal by rail to Halifax cheaper than they could import them from the United States direct. I am not sure whether that is still going on, but up to that time it had been going on for a number of years. Will the hon. gentleman look into it?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, we are constantly looking into cases of that kind; there is scarcely a month that these complaints do not come to our department. They arise, I dare say, much from the fact of the great number of ports in the country, and the diversity of ideas that collectors have as to the proper ruling upon articles which are imported. Then again it arises in this way: that a man may be importing into one small port an article at a very large undervaluation, and that would enable him, until it was found out, to do precisely what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This applies to a large port like Montreal. There were two cases that I mentioned to the hon. gentleman last year. The difference was so glaring that these goods could be imported in Montreal and sold in Halifax, paying all the expense over the Intercolonial Railway, at a lower rate than they could be imported to Halifax direct from the United States. This shows there was something wrong in Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is difficulty here. In the 185th section we extend the limits, and on explanation of the hon. Minister, we gave power to a person to examine the books, originally to go back any length of time—the hon. Minister has limited to six years the time within which he can examine the books of any importers who have entered. Well, what is the object in looking through a man's books for six years unless it is to discover the frauds committed during those six years?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, that is the meaning.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, he is not going to look through those books for fun, simply to ascertain whether the man did what was wrong or not. If you look back for six years, if it is thought that at any time during those six years a fraud has been committed, and that it will institute a suit to recover—is that the idea? Well, if I understand that section 240 that you passed a minute ago, it says:

"All seizures, prosecutions, or suits for the recovery or enforcement of any of the penalties or forfeitures imposed by this Act, or any other law relating to the Customs, may be made or commenced at any time

within three years after the offence was committed, or the cause of prosecution or suit arose, but not afterwards."

The difficulty I see is this: What is the use of looking through a man's books six years back to find frauds if you pass another Act declaring that the time is limited to three years within which an action will be brought?

Mr. BOWELL. I think that you will find that the 185th clause relates almost exclusively to payment of duties, while the three years' clause refers only to penalties which have been imposed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think you are wrong, but it is your own Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I am informed. If we find, as the hon. gentleman says, that there is a conflict, we will look at it, and I will ask to go back into committee so as to rectify it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister to look at section 5 again. I am certain, as it now stands, that it would not bear the construction that he puts upon it. I am referring to his substituted section. From the explanation the Minister gave, he proposed to impose a duty of 10 per cent. on the *ad valorem* duty of goods; but that is not what the clause says as it stands. It is 10 per cent. on the duty according to the *ad valorem* value.

Mr. BOWELL. No, it is not the intention to impose 10 per cent. on the value of the goods, the intention is to impose 10 per cent. upon the duty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, but the hon. gentleman, when he was giving the information, mentioned a case where there was \$450 charged, and where they valued the goods, as fixed by the customs, at \$600. He said there 10 per cent. would be \$60. Now, as this reads, 10 per cent. would be \$18, that is, it would be 10 per cent. on the *ad valorem* duty. The *ad valorem* duty is \$180, and 10 per cent. on that is \$18. But 10 per cent. on the value of the goods would be \$60, and that is not what the clause says. Now, the hon. gentleman, under this clause, could not collect \$60, but only \$18.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the *ad valorem* duty of the goods would be the whole \$180, because the value is \$600. In addition to that, a sum equal to the same percentage of the whole *ad valorem* duty is usually payable as the percentage of the under-valuation in the original bill of entry. The original bill was \$140, and it was deficient by \$150. Now, as \$450 is to \$150, so is the sum which he paid to the additional sum he would have to pay by this, and that would amount, I think, to \$60.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It would amount to \$45.

Mr. BOWELL. The principle upon which this clause is based is this: That if the goods be entered at 10 per cent. under the correct value, then the penalty is 10 per cent. duty in addition; if, as in the case referred to by my hon. friend, it was \$150, that would be 33⅓ per cent. under value, and that would be the proportion, not 10 per cent. of the whole. The penalty is not 10 per cent. upon every undervaluation. If it is 50 per cent., then it would carry with it 50 per cent. of the duty.

Mr. THOMPSON. In that particular case the goods were undervalued by 33 per cent., then there will be 33 per cent added to the actual duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will take the illustration the hon. member gave. Goods are introduced at \$450, which are worth \$600. These goods bear 30 per cent. duty. In that case, would the result be this, that the party would have to pay 30 per cent. on the \$150, which is \$45, and 33⅓ per cent. on the \$45, making \$60.

Mr. THOMPSON. He would have to pay the whole \$180 and the \$45 besides. It is 30 per cent. on the \$600.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A large portion of the \$180 has been paid in the first instance.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has only to make up the difference and the fine of \$45.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fine will be levied, \$45, on the whole \$180 he had to pay, not on the difference between the duty.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not understand the clause in that way. I thought the fine of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. was on the surplus duty, not on the whole amount of duty. As I now understand it, it is on the whole amount of duty.

Mr. BOWELL. In order to avoid detaining the committee I propose to strike out section 4.

Committee reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Minister of Finance propose to proceed on Tuesday next with the Budget speech?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may remind the hon. gentleman that when I mentioned it would be very desirable to have the Supplementary Estimates down, he expressed his intention, as I understood him, of bringing them down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope to have laid them on the Table when the House meets on Monday.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Printed by MCLISA, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, April 23, 1888.

No. 40.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 23rd April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, which was as follows:

LANDSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1888; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, April, 1888.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that said Supplementary Estimates be referred to Committee on Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS WHITE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I expected that my hon. friend and leader, the First Minister, would have been able to announce, as he wished to have done, the death of our worthy colleague, the Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior. His death was entirely unexpected, and is a terrible blow to his colleagues, and especially to the First Minister, whose intimate friend he was. I have no doubt that hon. members on both sides of the House sympathise with the bereaved family, and deplore with us the great loss which this House has met with in the death of Mr. White, and that the country has sustained by being deprived of his services. Mr. White, for many years, had been an active member of the press, and in that capacity had rendered great services to his country, and especially to his party. He was a good writer, but he was also a good friend, and although he fought his opponents vigorously, he was nevertheless always ready afterwards to shake hands with them; and he was always careful so to conduct his controversies with them that he could afterwards be their friend again. I must say that during the last ten or eleven years that he has occupied a seat in this House, my friend, Mr. White, showed that he was worthy of his position, worthy to occupy a seat in this House; and when, at the suggestion of, and on the selection of, the First

Minister, he was called to take a place in the Government, I know that on our side of the House, everybody applauded the choice, and his opponents likewise recognised that he was worthy of a seat alongside the other members of the Cabinet. Mr. White has lost his life in the service of his country. He was entirely devoted to his duties, and in order the better to be able to fulfil them faithfully and well, he visited the North-West twice, if I remember aright, and undertook a long voyage through that country in order to make himself perfectly acquainted with the needs and circumstances of that vast region the affairs of which he had to administer. He made himself perfectly *au fait* with the wants of that country, and during the last year or so, he was in a position to render those services that were expected of him, when, in the midst of his great labors, he has been taken away, and thus leaves a great void in the Government of the country. I have no doubt that the country at large will mourn his loss, and will say with us that a good and able man has disappeared from our midst. Of course, it is not for me to dwell upon the consequences of this loss, or upon the lesson which this sad event teaches us; but let me say, at all events, that he has passed away, leaving, I hope, not one single enemy in this House, or even outside the House. I have no doubt that although his opponents, and our opponents, found that he was sometimes a very formidable adversary, on the other hand they will recognise that he always tried to avoid such expressions as might wound their feelings. For myself, at all events, the lesson I drew from his example is, that we must always remember that though we are called here to perform a duty, nevertheless we must be lenient towards others if we would have others lenient towards us in the performance of our duties. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the First Minister, will move that this House, when it adjourns to-day, will stand adjourned until Wednesday at three o'clock in the afternoon. The reason for this adjournment is that the funeral will leave the house of the deceased to-morrow morning at nine o'clock, and a special train will leave the Canada Atlantic Station at 9:30 for Montreal, for the convenience of the family, of members of both Houses, the heads of departments, the officers of his own department, the press, and some other officials. The train will return to Ottawa the same afternoon, leaving Montreal at an hour which will be announced to the passengers on the train during the course of the voyage. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. In seconding the motion, I can scarcely find words to give expression to the very sad emotions which this occasion arouses. Engaged as we are in daily strife, divided as we are in aims and purposes, struggling as we are every day, and sometimes bitterly struggling for our own convictions, we are too apt to forget, what we readily realise to-day, that after all there is an universality about us; and when a man of Mr. White's eminence is removed from amongst us we all individually feel that we have suffered a loss, and perhaps for the first time we can see the full measure of the man's worth. It is, however, a misfortune of our nature that we never appreciate fully what we have

until we have lost it, and this feeling comes forcibly to me to-day. In Mr. White's death the whole nation has suffered a great loss, but I realise and understand that to his friends the blow must seem almost unbearable. His untiring energy and industry, his vast and wide knowledge of all political questions, his aptitude for business, his great administrative ability, his skill in debate, his eloquence, all were the happy combination of varied qualities which made him a tower of strength to those with whom he was associated, and we on this side of the House can never forget, as has been said by the Minister of Public Works, that upon all occasions, whether on the floor of Parliament or whether in his department as an executive officer of the Crown, he was always civil, courteous and obliging. But I am sure that great as the blow must be to the country at large, to his party and to his family, there is no one who feels it more deeply than the veteran Premier. We all can sympathise with him, and we do sympathise with him now, and much as we may differ from him in politics on various questions we all understand that at his time of life the death of a long trusted friend must deal a severe blow. Death with us has been of late unusually cruel, Mr. White is the ninth of our colleagues we have lost since last elections. Death has been unsparing, striking alike on all ages and stations, and this last blow coming as it does so suddenly and so unexpectedly after so many others, recalls very forcibly the words of Burke, "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, we meet to-day under circumstances different perhaps from any which have ever marked the assembling of the representatives of the people—the death of a Minister of the Crown during a Session of Parliament—the occasion, Sir, hushes all party strife and a feeling of profound sorrow fills every heart in this Chamber. As a companion of the boyhood days of the deceased Minister and a close and warm friend of maturer years, it is becoming that I should say a few words on this sad occasion. Not only as the head of an important department had our deceased friend rendered most valuable service to his country, but he for thirty years and more before he entered Parliament had been a leader in everything which tended to Canada's prosperity. Full of energy and high sense of right, he had administered the important Department of the Interior in such a way as to secure the confidence of the people of our great North-West and British Columbia. He faced every obstacle which beset him with sagacity and ability. He appreciated the needs of those great sections

of our country and he met them, inspiring the people with hope in their great future. Had his valuable life been spared it is impossible to predict how great would have been the results of his administration of the department. When he assumed the duties of the office he had mountains of difficulties to encounter, but he overcame them all and secured the grateful appreciation of those who were the most interested. I know, Sir, that hon. gentlemen who represent Manitoba and the North-West Territories and British Columbia will sustain me in this statement. We often fail in the bustle of life fully to recognise the merits of men until we lose them. It is so in this case. We shall all miss our deceased friend—miss his pleasant recognition and the hailing him by his familiar name. He was a man of talent and of truth, dealing with all questions in a spirit of equity and good judgment, inspiring the settlers with fresh courage, and as a Minister of the Crown ever most painstaking with the representatives whom the people sent here to look after their interest. In the adjudication of all matters brought before him, he did not "hew to the line," but met them in a spirit of concession. No man, Sir, I venture to say, has contributed so much to the prosperity of the North-West and our territory on the Pacific, present and prospective, as the Minister who has been called to his rest. Mr. Speaker, he was my friend. I knew him as perhaps few in this House did; he was always a true friend. The elevation to office made no change in him—a great man and one to whom the country looked for many years of still greater public usefulness has passed away at an age when it may be said he was in his prime. Truly, Sir, "his sun has set while it was yet day." Those of us who were permitted to enjoy his society in his happy home, surrounded by those among whom there was such mutual love, and of whom he was so proud, will not soon forget it. Full of manliness he was tender as a woman. We shall not again see his face or listen to his persuasive eloquence, but it will be long before the brilliant ability of Thomas White as a Minister of the Crown and the beauty of his whole character will be forgotten either by this House or the country.

"Death has moulded into calm completion
The statue of his life."

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:30 p.m., until Wednesday, 25th inst., at three o'clock, p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 25, 1888.

No. 41.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BANK OF LONDON.

Mr. MILLS moved;

That the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce relating to the Bill for winding up the affairs of the Bank of London be not now concurred in, but be referred back to the Committee with instructions to consider the Bill as soon as the shareholders of the bank have signified by resolution, at a special meeting called for the purpose, that they desire the proposed legislation.

Mr. HALL. The report that has been submitted shows that the committee declined to consider the Bill on the ground solely that the shareholders of the institution have not been consulted. As the motion which has been submitted recognises the necessity of such a consultation and is based upon it, there can be no objection to the second reference even by those who have opposed the consideration of the Bill already.

Motion agreed to.

ADVERTISING COUNTERFEIT MONEY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) respecting the advertising of counterfeit money. He said: As the name of this Bill signifies, it is desired to attach penalties to the advertising of counterfeit money.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CARE AND REFORMATION OF NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to provide for the care and reformation of children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians. He said: This Bill is brought in at the instance of the Humane Society of Toronto, and its object is to provide means whereby children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians may be brought before certain magistrates and by them admitted to institutions suitable for the reformation and care of such children. The Bill, so far as the first two clauses are concerned, is similar to the Bill already passed by the Ontario Legislature. The other clauses go a good deal further than that measure does. I have to admit at the outset that this Bill travels on that very narrow debatable ground lying between the civil jurisdiction of the Provinces and

the criminal law as administered by the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in regard to a Factory Act there is great difficulty in the way of that legislation, and it is very possible that one or two of the clauses in this Bill may necessarily be struck out on the ground of there being no jurisdiction. However, it is not proposed to go further with this measure, as there is no time to give it full consideration; but I bring it before the House that those hon. gentlemen who feel interested in it may have an opportunity of considering it, and at a later period the subject will be brought forward. It is a subject which may be considered upon its merits, as one entitled to the fullest consideration of all those who desire that the class of persons referred to shall have every protection the law can give them and every means by which they can be rescued from temptation, and enabled to be brought up in a condition of life which may be beneficial to themselves and to their fellow subjects.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This is a Bill on which I shall ask special action on the part of the House. A few weeks ago Mr. Justice Taschereau of the Supreme Court asked leave of absence for reasons which appeared to be quite sufficient at the time, and very shortly afterwards another of the judges became incapacitated by illness. The result is that only four judges remain to perform the duties which begin on Tuesday next in connection with the May term of the court. I understand the docket of the term is a long one, and it is very undesirable that the term should be passed over and the cases thus go into arrear. The present provision of the statute is that five judges shall form a quorum, and inasmuch as only four are available the term of the court must govern unless it is the pleasure of the House to pass this Bill, and to pass it without reference to the procedure which governs Bills in ordinary cases. This has been done occasionally in cases of emergency, and in asking leave to introduce the Bill, I will ask to have it expedited through its several stages to-day in order that it may be finally passed and sent to the Senate. The reason why I ask permission to proceed with it so urgently is that a number of practitioners in different parts of the Dominion desire to know this before they leave their homes for the term, and they desire to know whether the courts will be postponed or proceeded with. The Bill will contain one section only:

"Any five, or in the case of the illness, absence on leave, or any incapacity or the death of any judge, any four of the judges of the Supreme Court shall constitute a quorum, and may lawfully hold the court: Provided, however, that in such latter case, in the event of the judges being equally divided as to their decision upon any cause or matter heard before the court, there shall be a rehearing of such cause or matter before a court comprised of at least five judges; and provided also, that it shall not be necessary for all the judges who have heard the argument in any case to be present in order to constitute the court for delivery of judgment in such case, but in the absence of any judge, from illness or any other cause, judgment may be delivered by a majority of the judges who were present at the hearing; and any judge who has heard the case and is absent at the delivery of judgment may

hand his opinion in writing to any judge present at the delivery of judgment, to be read or announced in open court, and then to be left with the registrar or reporter of the court; and in such case it shall not be necessary for a quorum to be present at the delivery of such judgment."

And so on, as in the present section. The only new provision being that in the case of urgency which I have mentioned four judges shall constitute a quorum, and that in the event of their being equally divided it shall be argued again before the full court.

Mr. LAUBIER. The first reading, of course, may very well take place to-day, but I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask us to take any further stages. This is a very important Bill, and I am sure that the principle of it may be found very objectionable in many ways. I do not mean to say that it would negative the Bill altogether, but before we take this very important step it is nothing but fair that we should have an opportunity to read the Bill, and then if we can favorably consider the Bill we will do what we can to expedite business. I think that we should have an opportunity to consider the Bill and that it must take its usual course. I trust that the Bill will be printed and distributed at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In Quebec matters are managed differently. When a judge is unable to preside another judge is appointed to his place temporarily. It may be well for the Government to consider this.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 111) to provide for the crossing of railways by streets, drains and water mains.—(Mr. Lister.)

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the fact that a considerable number of the immigrants who have landed in Canada, of late years, have been necessitous persons, unfit for settlers, and that these parties have frequently become permanent charges on the charity of the people of Canada?

Mr. CARLING. 1. The attention of the Government has been directed to the character of the immigration to Canada, and it has been found that the numbers of the unsuitable are very small, being only a fractional percentage of the whole, and have not been of a nature to call for any exceptional measures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If so, what precautions? Will the hon. gentleman state that?

Mr. CARLING. The precautions taken by our agents in Liverpool, who are in attendance on the sailing of vessels and at the purchase of tickets, to prevent unsuitable immigrants being sent by those vessels.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked further, 2. Whether the Government have taken any precautions to prevent such necessitous and unfit persons being landed in Canada? And if so, what precautions? 3. Have any such persons been sent back to the countries from which they came? And if so, how many? 4. Is it in the power of the Government to inflict any penalties, and if so, what penalties on any steamship company, or other persons, bringing such people into Canada? 5. If in their own opinion Government do not possess adequate powers to prevent and punish the importation of such persons into Canada, is it their intention to ask Parliament for further powers during the present Session?

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. CARLING. 2. The Government has taken precautions to prevent the sailing of persons who would be unsuitable for settlement in Canada. 3. The answer to this question is substantially the same as that made to question 1. 4. The Government can exact a duty in the nature of a penalty if a vessel arrives without having observed the necessary sanitary measures, and also in addition to the duty, a bond of \$200, with sureties, for each lunatic passenger. 5. The Government has power, by proclamation, to take any steps necessary to prevent the landing of unsuitable persons, and sending them back at the ship's expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not understand the answer to question number four to be an answer to the question. As I understood the hon. Minister, he alluded to the case of steamships bringing diseased persons into Canada. He talked of sanitary precautions, and my question had reference to the case of the importation of persons unfit as immigrants to Canada.

THE VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. WELDON, St. John) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to suspend the revision of the Voters' Lists, under the Franchise Act, during the present year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the intention of the Government to present such a measure.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WHARVES AND PIERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What official, if any, in Prince Edward Island, has charge of the Dominion Government wharves and piers in that Province? Is there any such official, what are his powers? Has he any authority to cause necessary repairs to be made from time to time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My department sent an engineer there when wanted to look after those piers and to report. Besides that, there are the wharfingers under the department of my friend the Minister of Marine, who also report if repairs are required. That is communicated to my department, so that any of those repairs may be made, and in this way we are fully cognizant of what is going on.

MR. A. P. SHERWOOD.

Mr. COOK asked, Is Mr. A. P. Sherwood still occupying the position of Chief of the Dominion Police? If so, are the Government aware that he is engaged as agent or attorney for certain contractors on the Cape Breton Railway? Has he obtained permission from the Government to engage in such business? Has a member of the inside Civil Service the right to engage in business connected with the building of Government railways, or otherwise?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At the time the contract was taken out of the hands of Slater & Co., Mr. Sherwood was advised by the department that he could get leave of absence, which he did get for a few days, to go down to Cape Breton and ascertain just how matters stood in the interest of Mrs. Slater, the lady in whose hands the contract had remained, she having been surety for the contractors who had to put up the money. So it was in the interest of his family that he obtained leave of absence, to go and see how things were and report; Mrs. Slater is his mother-in-law.

Mr. COOK. The last part of the question is whether a member of the inside service has the right to engage in business of this kind?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He does not belong to the inside service.

QUAI PRÈS DE L'ISLE-AUX-NOIX.

M. BOURASSA: Le gouvernement se propose-t-il d'insérer une somme d'argent dans le budget supplémentaire, cette année, pour la construction d'un quai, au bout du chemin qui conduit à l'Île-aux-Noix, appelé "Chemin aux approches de l'Île-aux-Noix," en la paroisse de Saint-Valentin, comté de St-Jean, sur la rivière Richelieu, pour faciliter l'approche de l'Île-aux-Noix et le commerce des paroisses environnantes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Je suis fâché de ne pouvoir donner une réponse soit affirmative ou négative à l'honorable député, sur cette question: Quand les estimés supplémentaires seront devant la Chambre, ils contiendront toutes les informations voulues.

ANALYSIS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to require inspectors under the Food Adulteration Act to subject to analysis intoxicating liquors publicly offered for sale, in conformity with the suggestions of the Temperance Association?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the intention of the Government to require samples of intoxicating liquors to be subject to analysis.

MEDALS TO THE VETERANS OF 1866-70.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Has the Government had any communication with the Imperial Government with regard to the granting of medals to the veterans of 1866-70, in accordance with the promise made to a deputation from Montreal in 1887?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Communication has been had through His Excellency the Governor-General with the Imperial Government in reference to the granting of medals to the veterans of 1866-70, but no reply has yet been received.

MR. WILLIAM SHANNON'S DEFALCATIONS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether Government has paid or promised to pay any sums of money to any parties on account of Mr. Wm. Shannon's defalcations; and if so, what amount has been paid?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has not paid, nor has it promised to pay.

INSPECTOR OF RANCHES.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) asked, What are the duties and salary of the Inspector of Ranches? What is allowed for expenses in addition to salary? How long has he held the office? What work has he done in connection with his office, and what (if any) reports has he made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspector of ranches inspects such ranches as he is instructed to do from time to time by the Department of the Interior. He was appointed on the 1st of May, 1886. He receives a salary of \$600 a year, and is allowed actual travelling expenses in addition. He has reported from time to time, but I am not in a position to give the exact number of the reports.

HEADQUARTERS OF MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIS (Alberta) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to build police barracks at Edmonton and

remove the headquarters of police in that district to same; if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Fort Saskatchewan, about 20 miles north-east of Edmonton, has been the headquarters of the police in that district since the organisation of the force in 1874. It is now under the consideration of the Government whether the headquarters of that division had not better be transferred to Edmonton.

ERRORS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE LIST.

Mr. DAVIN asked, 1. Whether there is not a typographical error in the Civil Service List of Canada, 1887, on page 129, second column, as to description of official position of Thomas Albert Scott, "2nd" being printed instead of "3rd;" and 2. Whether Robert Montgomery (line 10) has not been transferred from the Manitoba division to the Ottawa division, or some other outside Manitoba and the Territories?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a typographical error. Thomas Albert Scott is a third-class clerk, not a second-class clerk. Robert Montgomery has been removed from the Manitoba division to some other division. The railway mail clerks are not supposed to be confined to any one division, but are removable.

LOSS OF THE BARGE ORIENTAL.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether in view of the report of Inspector Risley, upon the loss of the barge *Oriental*, the Government have caused proceedings to be taken against the owners of such barge, or whether they intend to do so?

Mr. FOSTER. The papers in this question have been handed to the Minister of Justice, with the request that he take such action upon them as he deems proper to take in the premises.

PROTECTION OF SAILORS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this Session to further protect sailors against wrecks or accidents, the result of vessels being unseaworthy?

Mr. FOSTER. The first page of the Order paper will be a sufficient answer to that question.

P. WATELET, EMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Whether P. Wateret is employed by Government, in Belgium, or elsewhere, as emigration agent, or in any other capacity? If so, what are his position and duties, and how are his services remunerated? How many immigrants have come to and settled in Canada through his agency during the past year? Is the Government aware that acting as a Canadian emigration agent, or pretending to be such, the said P. Wateret has very recently induced the removal from Belgium to Montreal of a number of artisans, under the promise and guarantee of immediate and profitable employment there; that since their arrival in Montreal a number of these men have not succeeded in obtaining employment, and that no effort has been made by him or by Government officials in that city to procure employment for them?

Mr. CARLING. This refers to Paul Watelet, not Wateret. He is not an agent of the Government, nor employed by it in any capacity. He is a steamship agent in Belgium, and is allowed the same commission as all other agents on the continent of Europe, for immigrants actually arriving in Manitoba, but not for any sent to any of the Provinces. The Government is not responsible for any immigrants he brings out, nor for any representations made

by him. As a consequence, however, of some statements furnished to the department, an enquiry is now being instituted respecting some immigrants brought by him to Montreal.

SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. GORDON moved for :

A return of all correspondence having reference to the seizure of Canadian vessels while engaged in the seal fisheries in Behring's Sea. He said : Mr. Speaker, this motion and the correspondence to which it refers are of too great importance to the people I represent to justify me in allowing the question to stand over any longer. My hon. friend who seconds the motion will deal particularly with the question involved, and other hon. gentlemen, I presume, will also discuss it. I am sure every hon. member here must be aware that the grossest injustice is inflicted on our fishermen who are in pursuit of what they consider to be their rights and interests in Behring's Sea. They want to know whether the rights of British subjects are to be as sacred in Behring's Sea as they are in the other great seas of the globe, or whether they are to be pursued by American cruisers and have their ships seized, towed into the ports of Alaska and confiscated, with their whole cargoes, and the captains and mates of their vessels sent to prison, and their crews, some of them sent to San Francisco to find their way back to British Columbia as best they can, and others allowed to coast 1,500 miles, reaching British Columbia in the greatest destitution. Circumstances of such a serious character as these are not to be allowed on my part to remain unnoticed. I am sure that the correspondence, if brought down, will show that this Government has taken every step in its power towards having those grievances redressed, and I have hope that the Imperial Government, through its jealous regard for the rights of its subjects in every part of the inhabited globe, will see that its distant subjects, pursuing their business in Behring's Sea, will have every care and protection.

Mr. PRIOR. I have great pleasure in rising to second the address of the hon. member for Vancouver, but I am sorry that, owing to indisposition, he has not been able to place the matter more fully before this House, because I am sure he could have done so more forcibly and more plainly than I can hope to do. This is a matter that deeply affects every man on Canadian soil, involving as it does the honor and credit of the whole country; but more especially does it affect the constituency that I have the honor to represent, as upon it has fallen, not only the indignities which have been offered, but also the heavy losses incident to the seizure of these vessels. As the territory of Alaska is one that is very little known, and as I, in common with other British Columbia members, claim that the representatives from other sections of this country in this House have equally with us a deep interest in this matter, and should assist us in endeavoring to obtain redress, I will give you, Sir, a short sketch of the country and of the events that have led up to the late outbreak. Alaska became a part of the Russian Empire in the year 1741, when the Russian traveller Behring first planted his country's flag on that portion of the North American continent, and gave his name to the sea, the jurisdiction over which is the question at present in dispute between the United States and the Dominion. During the next twenty years, the Russian ensign was planted over the whole of the Aleutian chain, from the Aleutian Islands to the mainland, many forts were established, and numerous trading enterprises founded, until the year 1772, when we find that no less than twenty-five different trading companies were engaged in catching seals that are so numerous in those waters. In 1779, a consolidation of these different trading

Mr. CARLING.

companies took place, and a company was formed under the name of the Russian-American Trading Company; and in 1821, the Russian Government issued an ordinance regulating traffic in its Asiatic and American possessions, and reserving exclusively to its subjects :

"The transactions of commerce, the pursuit of whaling and fishing or any other industry in the islands, in the harbors and inlets and in general along the north-western coast of America from Behring Straits to the 51st parallel of north latitude, and in the Aleutian Islands and along the coast of Siberia and on the Kurile Islands from Behring Straits to the south-eastern promontory of the Island of Urup, viz., as far south as latitude 45° and 50° north."

This really meant that Russia claimed sovereign jurisdiction over these seas 100 miles from shore. Previous to the issuing of this edict, British and American sealers had been in the habit of pursuing their trade in those waters, and of course as soon as this ordinance was promulgated, both British and American companies protested most emphatically against the claim of the Russian Government. The United States Minister at St. Petersburg made use of these words in his protest :

"The existence of territorial rights to the distance of 100 miles from the coasts upon two opposite continents, and the prohibition of approaching to the same distance from these coasts, or from those of all the intervening islands, are innovations in the law of nations and measures unexampled."

Well, the evidence goes to show that after protracted discussion, the Treaty of 1825 was drawn up and signed, by which Russia gave up her claim to the sole jurisdiction in Behring Sea. The treaty between Russia and the United States contained the following agreement :

"That in any part of the great ocean commonly called the Pacific Ocean, the respective citizens, subjects of the high contracting powers, should be neither disturbed or restrained in navigation or fishing."

A similar treaty was made between Russia and Great Britain. In 1867, the year when Confederation took place, the United States bought the territory of Alaska from the Russians for the sum of \$7,200,000; and just to show what a good bargain they made, I may say that at present, one gold mine in Alaska is yielding over \$1,000,000 per annum to its fortunate owners. After the United States bought Alaska territory, a good deal of trouble was caused by the different nationalities trying to get hold of the valuable sea fisheries. Vessels came from Japan, Honolulu, Australia, San Francisco, and almost from every port of the world, and there was no end of trouble and dispute until at last the Americans found it was necessary to do something to keep order. They, therefore, in 1870, called for tenders for the exclusive rights of catching seals on the Islands of St. George and St. Paul; and after the tenders were opened, it was found that a company trading under the name of "the Alaska Commercial Company" was the successful tenderer. That company got a charter, dated the 1st May, 1870, for a period of twenty years, giving it exclusive rights to trading on these islands. A few years ago, its annual payment to the United States Government for its rights and privileges over these fisheries was \$315,000, a sum sufficient to pay interest at the rate of four per cent. per annum on the whole purchase money which the United States gave for the territory, besides paying for the full cost of government of the territory. Under the Treaty of 1867, the Americans claimed jurisdiction over that part of Behring Sea, lying to the east of the westerly boundary of Alaska, which sea, in its widest part, is some 600 or 700 miles wide. Just to show how absurd this claim is, I will read to the House a portion of a despatch from Lord Lansdowne to Mr. Stanhope on the 29th November, 1886.

"The statements contained in the Report (i.e., the Report of the Privy Council) are sufficient to establish that the claim now put forward on the part of the United States to the sole right of taking fur-bearing animals within the limits laid down in the first article of the Treaty of 1867, is inconsistent with the rights secured to Great Britain under the convention of 1825, and is in substance the same as that which, when advanced by the Russian Government on occasions prior

to the cession of Alaska by Russia to the United States, was either strenuously resisted or treated with ridicule and contempt by the Government of the latter power."

And again :

"Under the Treaty of 1867, Russia ceded to the United States all the rights, franchises and privileges then belonging to her in the territory or dominion included within the limits described, but could not cede a right which, in the express terms of the Treaty of 1825, was recognised as belonging to the subjects of the British Crown as well as to those of Russia."

You will therefore see that our neighbors across the line do not believe in the old adage that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," because, when Russia claimed the right to those seas and the Americans wanted their vessels to go in, the United States protested most emphatically against the attempt to exclude them; but when the United States took over the rights which Russia had there, and Canadian sealers want to go into those seas, the boot is on the other leg. Relying on this preposterous claim, the United States vessels have seized our vessels, have imprisoned our crews and have confiscated our sealskins. They have been guilty of the greatest outrage which has ever been perpetrated by one civilised nation upon another. On the 1st August, 1886, three of our schooners were seized when they were plying their peaceful avocations on the high seas, not within the three-mile limit, but at distances varying from 139 miles to 68 miles from Ounalaska. The *Carolina* was seized at a distance of 139 miles, and the *Onward* and the *Thornton* at a distance of 68 miles from the coast. Not only did they seize these vessels, but the revenue cutter *Corwin* towed them to Sitka, the capital of the Territory of Alaska, and there the captains and mates were fined \$300 and \$200 respectively, and were also imprisoned, when they did not pay, for a long term. When they were let out of prison, they were turned out destitute. Some of them were taken to San Francisco, and turned adrift there, and had to make their way back to British Columbia as best they could. A few were taken to Nanaimo, but some were turned adrift destitute in Alaska. I cannot understand any more inhuman act than leaving these people destitute in that country. I was in those waters myself in 1874, and I know what a rugged and inhospitable country it is. There is no civilisation at all. There are no people there but savages. There is no language which I can make use of which is too strong to express the injustice which has been done to our people in this matter, which has crippled one of the most important industries on the Pacific coast, and has entailed great pecuniary loss on our citizens, because the three vessels and the skins they had on board when they were seized were worth \$33,000, besides the indirect loss in consequence of their not being able to finish their season's catch. Last Session, certain documents were brought down to the House—all the documents that could be got up to that time in relation to the matter—and I am glad to say that they proved that the present Government have been fully alive to the gravity of the affair, and have done all in their power to get the Imperial Government to bring about a settlement with the United States, but no such settlement has been arrived at. In 1887, that is, last year, although negotiations were pending between the different Governments, the United States cutters again seized, in the same place, six more of our sealers, under the same circumstances, and they also seized eight of their own sealers—in fact they seized every vessel which was not under the control of the company which has the right to fish on those islands. It seems to me that this means that the United States Government would rather seize British vessels there and tramp on the British flag, and afterwards pay compensation and make apologies, than they would allow the Alaska Commercial Company to lose its hold on the seal fisheries in the Behring Sea. This company has only the right to these two islands.

I will only read the clause of the lease which refers to this point, which is as follows:—

"That the said Secretary hereby leases to the said Alaska Commercial Company, without power to transfer, for the term of twenty years, from the 1st day of May, 1870, the right to engage in the business of taking fur seals on the islands of St. George and St. Paul, within the Territory of Alaska, and to send a vessel or vessels to said islands for the skins of such seals."

That is all the right they had given them. Further, Lord Lansdowne in a letter to Lord Idlesleigh says:—

"Outside of these Islands it holds no exclusive rights or franchise from the Government, nor does it pay any rent or royalty to the Government for the territory it occupies, or the furs it procures from the natives. It has no rights over any other citizen or company of citizens who may desire to trade in competition with it, and yet it has been aided by the revenue marine in suppressing competition from rival traders, for it appears that under instructions from the Treasury Department the revenue cruisers board and examine every trading vessel sighted in the Behring Sea, or on the north-west coast of Alaska, except the vessels of the company."

I am glad to say that a large portion of the American press, the most respectable portion of the American press, concur in condemning the action of their Government in seizing these vessels, especially as that action was contrary to the advice of the ablest of their own jurists. To show what is thought of that Alaska Commercial Company, I will read what Governor Swinford says in his report of last year:

"The fur trade of Alaska is practically monopolised by the company, a non-resident corporation, which does not confine its operations to the Seal Islands leased to it by the Government, but holds and possesses most of the Aleutian chain and the greater part of the mainland as a principality of its own, on which it exercises undisputed sway and control. Clothed by the Government with a monopoly of the seal fur trade, by which it has profited to the extent of many millions, it has, octopus like, thrown out its great tentacles, and gathered to itself about all there is of value in the fur trade of the whole Territory—it has by the power of its great wealth driven away all competition—its paid agents and lobbyists are kept at the National Capital to oppose any and every effort that may be made to loosen the grip of the company."

And yet this is the company which they are backing up against the wishes of their own people and against the wishes of every other nation. I hear that this year three revenue cutters have been ordered to cruise in the Behring Sea and in the Straits and to seize all sealing vessels, and that instructions have been issued from Washington to warn all vessels off except those belonging to the Company. I do not know whether this is true or not, but I have seen it stated in the newspapers. I have received a telegram from the owners of one of the sealers, and I believe my hon. colleague has received several others. The one I have received is as follows:—

"Official orders issued from Washington to seize all sealers this season in Behring Sea. We demand protection, otherwise must protect ourselves. Please urge Government."

Well, Sir, the Government sent out a warning to our vessels not to resist any armed force of the United States, as it might lead to grave difficulty, and I hope that advice will be taken. I see by the papers a statement that some gentlemen who owned those sealers have been to Sitka to try to obtain possession of the vessels and seals seized in 1886, but they could not get them. Now, I hope the Government will accede to the wishes of my hon. friend, and bring these papers down, if it is not considered prejudicial to the negotiations now going on; and I believe when they are brought down they will fully reveal the insults that were offered to our people, and I hope we shall also learn that some compensation has been granted to those men who have suffered by these seizures.

Mr. FOSTER. A few days ago when a question was asked across the floor of the House in reference to the Behring Sea papers, I replied that owing to the state in which the negotiations were at that time, it was not thought wise to lay the papers before the House. Negotiations are still in progress upon this question, and I may

say that since the other day I have received permission to bring down an assorted collection of the most important papers, covering the negotiations which have taken place from the date of the printed papers which are before the House, up to the present time, with some few exceptions of papers which it is not thought best, in the present state of the negotiations, to have made public. I think Mr. Speaker, the House owes the hon. junior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) a debt of gratitude for the clear and lucid explanation of this matter which he has made the House, and from the interest with which members on both sides listened to it, I am certain that they appreciate it as much as I do myself. The question is widened a little from its first position, since the United States Government have seized vessels of their own nationality as well as Canadian vessels which were sealing there, thus affirming the right of their law to prevent all from sealing in the Behring Sea except the trading company to which the monopoly was given. My hon. friend stated that the papers that were brought down last year showed that the Government had acted with vigor, and in the best interest of the sealing vessels that were more nearly in question, and in the interest of the country at large. That, I think, was true, and I think it will be found, when the papers are brought down, that the Government has not been remiss in its exertions up to the present time. Of course, it is a large Imperial matter, and the British Government are now engaged in close negotiations with the Government of the United States, and the course of these will be largely shown by the papers which will be brought down, and the result, I hope, will be favorable alike to those whose interests have been injuriously affected, and to the larger rights of the country that are in question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This, Sir, is a very important question, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House very much regret that it was not made a subject of negotiation in the recent conference at Washington. This is a matter of very great importance to this country. It relates to a question which was supposed to have been settled more than half a century ago. The Russian Government, at a very early period, claimed, in consequence of holding the territories on both sides of Behring Sea, jurisdiction over that as a portion of the Russian territory, and they held that Behring Sea was wholly within the dominion of the Russian Empire. That pretension was contested, both by the Government of the United States, represented by John Quincy Adams, and by the Government of Great Britain. Russia, in the treaties to which the hon. gentleman has referred, conceded the pretension put forward both by the United States and by Great Britain. It is clear that it is quite impossible that the United States could claim to have received from Russia, along with the cession of Alaska, any portion of the high seas over which Russia had herself abandoned her pretensions, especially so when she abandoned those pretensions at the instance of the United States. Now, Sir, it does seem to me very extraordinary that when the United States Government were contesting our rights to any portion of the inlets upon our coasts that were more than six miles wide, she should claim to exercise sovereignty over a sea that is nearly three thousand miles in width, and that has long been recognised as part of the Pacific Ocean. It does seem to me, so far as we could judge from the information placed before us, that this measure has not been pressed with the energy that we had a right to expect—I do not say with a want of energy on the part of the Government of Canada, but I refer especially to the want of energy on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom. Why, Sir, look at the facts. The United States has herself put forward a claim to fish in those seas, as a part of the open ocean, more

Mr. FOSTER.

than half a century ago. Her pretensions in that respect were conceded when Russia owned both coasts; now, after she has acquired possession of the coast of Alaska, it would give her no more claim over the Pacific Ocean, at least in those latitudes, than it would over the Pacific Ocean further south. She revives the original claim, owning one coast of Behring Sea, and puts forward, aggressively, a pretension that denies to us a right which we had for many years exercised. I think this House would be remiss in its duty if it failed to express its opinion as to its right, as to the aggressive policy that has been pursued by our neighbors with reference to our rights to fish in those waters. Sir, it does seem to me that the Government of the United Kingdom would have been justified in placing there a portion of the navy for the purpose of protecting us in the exercise of those rights which we had before claimed, which we had before exercised, and with reference to which, if they were improperly claimed and improperly exercised, it was the duty of the United States to exercise forbearance until their rights against us were established. But, instead of that being done, there has been usurpation; we have been denied rights that we exercised for half a century without molestation from the Government that owned both coasts. I think it is the duty of the Government here, sustained by Parliament, to press the claim of Canada in those waters with energy, and to insist upon the British Government giving to this country adequate protection. Sir, we have heard hon. gentleman on that side, not long since, tell what protection the English Government were prepared to give us, stating how ready they were to sacrifice the last man and the last shilling in our defence. Now, here is a matter where our pretensions are undoubted, and where those that were set up adversely to us, are of recent growth, and if there ever was a case when a Government would be justified in taking strong measures for the protection of its citizens, of a sovereign for the protection of his subjects, it is the case of Canada in the right to fish in the Behring Sea.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I join with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in thanking the junior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) for having brought this subject up and placed it in such a clear and distinct light before the House. I rise for the purpose of making a single remark in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that there was a failure on the part of Her Majesty's Government in pressing this question before the recent conference that took place at Washington. I may say that the British side were prepared to take this question up there, but they were met on the part of the Administration of the United States by the statement that it had not reached that stage, that the claims had not been distinctly formulated on the part of the British Government, and that it would be time enough when the Government of the United States refused to admit a claim formulated and pressed upon them by Her Majesty's Government to have it made the subject of reference to a conference. The question was undergoing diplomatic investigation between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain, and although my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had, with his usual industry and assiduity, collected all the facts, a very considerable time was necessarily involved in preparing such a clear and succinct statement on the part of the British subjects of Canada of the injuries that have been inflicted on them, and it was only very recently that full and complete information was placed in the hands of Her Majesty's Government so as to enable them to state what amount of claim they made against the Government of the United States. My hon. friend must have noticed the remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

that the Government of the United States, in carrying out what they hold to be the law in reference to this matter, have applied it both to American subjects, to subjects of their own Government, and to British subjects, so that the case was not exactly one of a nation taking a ground against the claims of another nation distinct and apart as between the claims of American subjects on the one side and British subjects on the other. That the position taken by the Government of the United States is one entirely unfounded in justice, that it is one entirely unsupported by the original treaty between Russia and Great Britain, upon which this claim must rest on the part of the United States and from which they seem to be entirely estopped from proceeding, because, as the junior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has already informed the House, the United States were as strong in their denunciation of the claim in reference to Behring Sea set up by Russia, under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, as was Great Britain herself. No doubt they were entirely estopped from setting up any such claim, and that the result of this must be that the Government of the United States will be obliged to make full and ample reparation for all injuries done to British subjects in Canada, in connection with these matters, I entertain no possible doubt; but I merely rose to explain that we were precluded from pressing it by the statement of the Administration of the United States that, until the claim had been distinctly formulated by Her Majesty's Government and had been refused by them, it could not properly be taken out of diplomatic negotiation, and its consideration entered upon by a conference arranged for the settlement of the difficulties between the two countries.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Has the Canadian Government any right to a voice in the negotiations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not exactly understand the purport of the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman said negotiations were now proceeding. Who are carrying on the negotiations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I now understand the question asked by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and I am happy to be able to tell him that Her Majesty's Government alone are the parties who can negotiate with respect to this question and settle the question between the United States and Great Britain. But Her Majesty's Government, on this, as on all occasions in which the interests of Canada are affected, are obtaining the fullest and most complete information from the Government of Canada, which, I think, has been as anxious as it was possible for any Government to be to collect the most full and complete data to place before Her Majesty's Government so as to enable them to obtain complete redress for the injuries inflicted; and I can only assure the hon. gentleman that the greatest anxiety has been exhibited by Her Majesty's Government to obtain the most full and complete information; and I have no hesitation in saying that I am satisfied it will be found that they will urge the question of redress quite as promptly as it would be possible for any Government to urge the settlement of a question upon another Government.

Mr. MILLS. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The hon. gentleman says that the matter was not sufficiently matured, nor had they the necessary specific information to deal with the subject at Washington. The hon. gentleman will, however, see that there are two distinct questions: the right to compensation to be made to parties who have been injured, and the question of jurisdiction. The question of jurisdiction over the waters could not at all be dependent upon the specific wrongs that have

been done. Were the United States willing to consider the question of jurisdiction?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. I may say to my hon. friend that the United States Government declined to have that subject referred to the conference, on the ground that that question, which is the one on which finally the question of damages must rest, was at present a subject of diplomatic negotiation and communication between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that the explanation of the Finance Minister is anything but a satisfactory explanation to the country, and is equally unsatisfactory to this House. The point taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a good one. The answer which the Minister gave as coming from the United States Government to the British portion of the commission was, that the claims for injuries, which the hon. gentleman states were undoubtedly committed, which were undoubtedly outrages committed by the Americans upon the Government and people of this country—that those claims formulated on the part of the British commissioners could not be submitted to or dealt with by the commission because they had not been formulated in a sufficiently distinct way in such a specific form that the conference would be justified in taking them up and dealing with them. But that is an entirely different point from the question of jurisdiction, to which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred. These outrages are going on to-day; the Americans are still exercising jurisdiction over that sea; and I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether that feature of the question was brought before the conference by Her Majesty's commissioners at Washington or not? It is quite clear, if what the hon. gentleman says is true, that this outrage by a neighboring nation to attempt to exercise control and jurisdiction over a sea 300 or 600 or 1,000 miles from the shore, this attempt to exercise that jurisdiction at the very moment they are claiming the right to come within three miles of our shores on the Atlantic, is preposterous and turns the whole affair into a burlesque, and the people of British Columbia have a right to expect not only that Her Majesty's Government will take the matter in hand and carry out the negotiations without delay, and see that no injury is done to our people on the Pacific coast, but also that this Government will press, and press continually, on the British Government the necessity of prompt, speedy and immediate action to prevent outrages being continued. The question of compensation for outrages already committed is entirely outside of the question we are discussing to-day. That these people will get compensation for their damages either from Her Majesty's Government or from the United States, on the proper settlement of the matter, no one can doubt, if our rights to the common user of Behring's Sea is recognised. But are we going to allow that nation quietly to go on and continue to commit outrages, to place additional cruisers in that sea, to seize and destroy our traffic and trade during another season? It is the duty of the Government to protest against that state of things being continued, and if difficulty exists let them exercise the right for which Canada is contending, that her people should be allowed to exercise the right of catching fur-bearing animals or fish in those seas on the Pacific Coast. Let both parties, and let this country press upon the British Government the necessity of placing those pretensions of the Americans in abeyance until the whole question can be dealt with by a commission as this other Fishery Commission has dealt with the fisheries on the Atlantic Coast. This Government have not done their duty if they have not protested strongly against the injuries that have been committed in the past and an attempt to exercise those rights which are in dispute in the present or in the future. That is the point to

be taken and considered in the question before the House. I am not condemning this Government. They may have done everything that lies in their power, and I am not going to say they have not, for I will reserve my judgment on the case until the papers come before the House. Perhaps when those papers do come down they may not be complete, and we may not be able to judge even then, for the Government may think it unwise in the interests of Canada to bring down all the papers even to justify themselves. It is the duty of this House, and let the gentlemen who control the interests of Canada know it, to press these matters on the British Government, as they have been pressed on a former occasion in relation to the Atlantic fisheries. The hon. gentleman says that he has no doubt the British Government have used every means in this matter. I cannot think so. We have some experience in this country of how the British Government treated Canada in neglecting matters connected with her fisheries, and I have no hesitation in saying that there has been an amount of tardy action again on this question. Those unjust assumptions to the right of those seas on the part of the United States have been allowed to go on for two years, and so far as we know no definite action has been taken to arrest or stay the exercise of that authority. Take the document before this House which I read the other day, where a protest was made against the rights of Canada being in abeyance for a single moment in 1870, or take the despatch which led to the Washington Treaty, and which was read here. Take them and you will find a forecast of what was going to happen when our fisheries were frittered away—those rights which came into operation in 1866 when a subsequent treaty expired. It was then predicted that if we allowed the Americans to use our fisheries, as they afterwards were permitted to use them under the strong remonstrance of the British Government, the result would be that our interests would be frittered away, and our whole case given away as the matter stands to-day. It will be the same thing in this case. I warned those British Columbians who support this Administration, that it is their duty—and I believe their constituents will hold them responsible for it—to press upon the Administration the necessity of urging the British Government not to repeat on the Pacific coast what they carried out on the Atlantic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the conduct of the British Government—and I do not now refer to the conduct of the Canadian Government in this matter—has been exceedingly unfair and unjustly prejudicial to the just rights of Canada. Every man of common sense who considers the situation of our claims in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the coasts adjacent, and of the American claims in the Behring Sea and the coasts adjacent, must see that it was in the highest degree in the interest of Canada that these two questions should be considered together, for they had reference to subjects of precisely the same character—with this difference, that every argument that the Americans could advance to substantiate their claims as regards the St. Lawrence fisheries, could be brought to bear with tenfold and hundredfold greater force against their claims to exclude our people from the Alaskan fur fisheries. I cannot but feel that, in dealing with any other country whatever, the British Government would never have consented to allow one section of the same question to be treated of, and that section, it must be remembered, the section in which the claim was against us, while they ignored entirely our just claims as regards a similar dispute at the other end of our Dominion. Considering the lapse of time, and considering the extraordinary character of the outrages as stated to us by the hon. members for British Columbia, I think that the British Government have been guilty of great laches towards us. I think, Sir, it is just another

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

proof, and a substantial proof of the statements made again and again from this side of the House, that the British Government from various causes are not by any manner of means so well qualified to deal with those questions as the Government of Canada, and that we would be better off—the hon. the Finance Minister of the country notwithstanding, because we could not be worse off, in my opinion, than we are now—if we had to deal directly with this Administration at Washington. Here, Sir, we find, as it has been stated on the floor of this House again and again, that British subjects, pursuing their calling on the high seas a hundred miles from shore, are violently arrested by American cruisers, their ships confiscated, or, at all events, laid up, and they themselves cast into prison and severely fined. We find that after two years have elapsed all the consolation we get is that the claim is not formulated in any sufficiently decisive character. This is a repetition of what occurred in the case of the first Treaty of Washington, when the Americans pressing their claims for damages done by the *Alabama*, which claims could not have been recognised, they delayed at the same time the just claims of Canada for compensation for grosser outrages committed on Canadian territory by American citizens. We know what happened then. We know, to satisfy the interests of certain American politicians and to consolidate certain votes that they were desirous of securing, that Canada's just claims were ignored. Just the same thing has been done in this case. Canada's just claims have been ignored. We find that concessions have been made on our part and no recognition has been had or obtained, and not likely will be had or obtained for years to come of far juster claims, by their own showing, of Canadian seamen and fishermen carrying on their industry in waters where they have enjoyed undisturbed privileges for nearly half a century. I cannot say how far the Government have gone, but I do say the Imperial Government have acted very unjustly by us in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how the British Government, from anything that has appeared in this House or from anything which appears to the public, is in any way to be blamed. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the two questions are identical. The conference that took place at Washington was by virtue of mutual correspondence and agreement in order to settle the construction of a treaty between the two nations and affecting especially Canada. That has been settled. It would have been very well, I think, if the United States had agreed to have this question about their jurisdiction in the Behring Seas submitted to the same conference, but they did not agree to that and it was no portion of either the unofficial or semi-official correspondence between Mr. Bayard and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, or no portion of the subsequent correspondence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why was it not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because this Atlantic question pressed specially upon us here, and because the question respecting the Behring Seas is not exclusively a Canadian question as that was. The one affected the trade along Canadian coasts, in the construction of the convention of 1818 and the subsequent commissions which were alleged to have affected and varied that convention of 1818. It was altogether a Canadian question. The other question about the Behring Seas is as much a matter of interest for all the marine powers as it is for the United States, for Canada or for England. English whalers are in every sea, in the Arctic ocean and in the Antarctic ocean, and England is as much bound to see that the freedom of those seas is preserved, as if a Canadian vessel never sailed there. So is France, so is Holland, so are all those nations which

send whalers into any sea in the world. These are alleged captures in the open sea. It was alleged that certain Canadian vessels were seized while pursuing their lawful avocation in the open sea. That allegation was either true or false. Those vessels were brought by American cruisers and put under the jurisdiction of local courts, and it appears they were condemned by the local courts. The owners of those vessels complained to the Canadian Government, and I have no doubt they also complained directly to Her Majesty's Government in England. The Canadian Government lost no time in calling the attention of Her Majesty's Government in the strongest terms to the necessity of an enquiry into this matter. England, I presume—because we have not the papers before us, and we cannot well discuss them with any particularity—said, Well, give us authenticated statements of any such breaches of maritime law and the law of nations, and we shall press them upon the attention of the United States; and ever since that time that process has been going on. But there seems to be a disposition to suppose that England is neglecting her duties towards us. I am quite sure that when the correspondence is brought down, it will show, first, that the Canadian Government, as soon as possible and as earnestly as possible, pressed the claims presented to us, and next, that Her Majesty's Government is fully conscious of its duty to her Canadian subjects and has been as energetic and earnest as the Canadian Government. That there have been delays is true, but we have delays on the Atlantic coast. We find vessels hung up there for two years, I suppose; there is the law's delay. The appeal from the course taken by the local tribunals has been made in the strongest terms; but the nations must proceed by diplomatic action, and not declare war against each other. We certainly will not declare war because there has been some delay, not in having enquired, but in having adjusted these various claims. That the claims will be settled, I have no doubt; that ample compensation, with interest, will be made to those people who have suffered, I have no doubt; but it is futile in us to attempt to interpose any argument, I may almost say discussion, like this, into a subject which is now solemnly being discussed by two great nations, the United States and England, and I would not be at all surprised that, when the papers are brought down, it will be found that other maritime powers have taken up the question as well, and that it is a matter for diplomacy among all maritime powers, and not exclusively between England and the United States. However that may be, I think I may venture to state to this House that it will answer no good purpose to throw out merely imaginary charges or complaints against Her Majesty's Government for negligence and delay that has not taken place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite justified in characterising the charges formulated to-day with such great clearness by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) as imaginary charges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say they were imaginary charges.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nor is he justified in making that charge against the complaints which have been alleged on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman has hardly, I think, stated the case as fairly as he ought to have done. There is no disposition to prejudice the action of Great Britain in this matter; but hon. members on either side of the House cannot shut their eyes to the facts plainly before them. These grievances about outrages committed on our vessels in Behring's Sea, were grievances existing concurrently with the grievances the Americans claimed they had suffered in the Bay of Chaleurs, the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Diplomatic correspondence was going on between the Governments with reference to those

several grievances. There is a very marked and important distinction between the private claims which the parties who owned those ships may have against the Government for wrong done to them, and which may be recognised, and the general right of the Dominion of Canada that its citizens shall have preserved to them the right which they always supposed they had of fishing in the high seas. If the United States maintained their contention on the general subject, it is perfectly clear that private citizens cannot get compensation at all. If the United States have a right to seize vessels 100 miles from land in the open sea, it is clear that the owners of those vessels cannot receive compensation. The two subjects are entirely distinct; and while the private claims may not have been formulated, either through the inadvertence or negligence of the parties themselves, or through the inadvertence or negligence of some department of this Government or the English Government, or while those claims might be left in abeyance, the great question of the right of the citizens of the Dominion of Canada to fish in the high seas of either ocean was one that we say should have been pressed upon and settled in the conference at Washington, which met to settle the fishery questions between the two countries. It is well enough for the hon. gentleman to say that they confined their settlement to the difficulties arising in connection with the fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence; but our contention is that diplomatic action should have been taken by Great Britain on the question as it existed in Behring's Sea as well, not only in 1885 and 1886, when those difficulties arose, but as the hon. gentleman has shown, in 1887 as well. The whole fishing interest is being paralysed because the United States are insisting on the right to drive our vessels off the sea altogether. If they get that right, private citizens will obtain no compensation at all. But what we insist on is that there does not appear to be that determined and persistent action on the part of the British Government which the outrages committed on our citizens require, and which, if insisted on as persistently and determinedly as the United States insisted on her case, would have brought about a settlement before the Fishery Commission at Washington. There appears to have been gross delay on the part of the British Government. The hon. gentleman who brought forward this motion pointed out that those rights, which to the ordinary mind appear to be so perfectly clear, were maintained by the United States themselves before they bought Alaska; and if Great Britain had sent one or two of her cruisers there to preserve the rights of her subjects, I do not think those outrages would have been continued. If Great Britain had shown one-half the desire to protect the rights of her fishermen there that the United States did to protect her fishermen in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, there would have been none of these difficulties. But the matter appears to have been managed in such a way that our fishing interests are in danger of being destroyed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the Government have requested the Imperial authorities to put a cruiser there for the purpose of protecting the Canadian seal fishermen?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is in the public interest to make any statement of the course that has been taken by the Government in carrying on these diplomatic arrangements.

Mr. McNEILL. I venture to think that it would meet the approbation of this House and also the approbation of this country, if hon. gentlemen would refrain from accusing the Imperial Government of misdeeds or negligence of the interests of the people of this country, until they had some evidence, however slight, that such misdeeds and such negligence really exist and are chargeable to the Imperial Government. There is not an hon. gentleman on the other

side who has risen to speak on this question, who has not hurled accusations of that kind against the Government of the mother country. If the home Government have been neglectful of our interests, it is only right we should state so fearlessly, frankly and fairly in this House; but when we are assured by hon. members of this Government of this country, who are responsible to the Canadian people, that such statements are absolutely unfounded—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) No.

Mr. McNEILL. The right hon. the First Minister has said so, the hon. the Minister of Finance has said so; and yet, despite the assertions of these hon. gentlemen, we have these charges repeated, without variation, by every hon. gentleman who rises in his place on the other side. These hon. gentlemen do not accuse the United States Government of negligence; on the contrary, they have always for the Americans word of praise, but for the people or the Government of the mother country they cannot find one good word to say. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite really have in their hearts this feeling which their language in this House would indicate they had; I do not believe that in private conversation they would give expression to such feeling. I believe, on the contrary, they are better disposed in their hearts to the mother country and its Government; but it is unfortunate that they should allow their politics so far to run away with their sense of right as to lead them make these statements in the House. We have heard a great deal of the manner in which the Government of the mother country have sacrificed the interests of the Canadian people with reference to our fisheries on the Atlantic coast, and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has not been at all careful to measure his words when speaking on that question. But distinct statements have been made by members of the Dominion Government to the effect that these attacks on the home Government were unfounded.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have given the evidence.

Mr. McNEILL. And that the Government of the mother country have been most careful of our interests.

Mr. MITCHELL. I gave evidence that they were not.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of recent negotiations with regard to the fisheries. The hon. gentlemen perhaps understood me to refer to what has passed in by-gone times.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a certain amount of truth in the statement that politicians of the mother country in by-gone times have paid almost as little respect to Canadian interests which were unrepresented there, as Canadian politicians have paid to distant and unrepresented interests in Canada itself. I am speaking now, however, of the question before the House, that is, with reference to this Behring Sea fisheries and the observations that fell from some hon. gentlemen opposite, a moment or two ago, with regard to the betrayal of our interests lately by the mother country in the fishery negotiations at Washington. I have said that members of our Government have declared that the home Government were especially anxious to guard our interests, and I was met with cries of "No" from the other side. Now, I wish to say that if those statements were not sufficiently explicit, I am authorized by the hon. the Minister of Justice—with whom I had a conversation some three or four weeks ago on the subject, and whose permission I asked and was kindly given to use the information he then gave me—to make this explicit statement. The hon. gentleman is present and can correct me if I, in any degree, misrepresent what he then said. He told me that, so far as Mr. Chamberlain was concerned, had he been a patriotic native-born Canadian, he could not have shown

Mr. McNEILL.

more earnest desire to safeguard the interests of Canada than he did, and the hon. gentleman authorized me to say further that the main object of Mr. Chamberlain seemed to be to discover what the wishes of his Canadian associates were and to carry out those wishes to the utmost.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about his speech before he left England?

Mr. McNEILL. If those statements are not sufficiently explicit—

Mr. MITCHELL. What about his speech before he left England?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman does not like to be always interrupted himself. I think it is very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman, knowing that to be the fact, should continue, notwithstanding the statements I have made on the authority of one of the members of the Government, to reiterate charges which are absolutely and utterly void of truth.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not so.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chamberlain, as every one knows, who knows anything of the history of the matter, is one of those men who are pervaded with the spirit of Imperial unity. He is one of that body of men who is rapidly increasing, I am glad to say, who believe and hold that the interests of Canada and the colonies are identical with the interests of the mother country; and when hon. gentlemen tell us that Mr. Chamberlain came over to Canada to give away the interests of Canada, they tell us virtually that he came over to do what he believed would be to give away the interests of the mother country.

Mr. MITCHELL. He did it anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I congratulate the First Minister on obtaining a mouthpiece to convey information to this House.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has constituted himself the champion of the British Empire in this House for some time past. It would seem as if, in his opinion, the British lion was utterly decrepit and utterly unable to take care of itself, because, in season and out of season, he rises in this House to take the part of the British Empire against Canadian interests. I wonder how long native Canadians on both sides of the House are going to be lectured by that hon. gentleman without giving him an answer. There are Canadians on both sides, who, I am sure, are perfectly satisfied that they understand what loyalty in Canada is perfectly well, without the hon. member for Bruce—a very recent importation in Canada—telling them what it is. I hold it would be well, if the hon. gentleman must lecture somebody on loyalty, that he should leave native Canadians alone for a while, and go back to his native Ireland, where they can afford to be lectured on loyalty a little more than we can. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand what most of us do in this House, that native Canadians have a strong feeling in their hearts for the land of their birth, and although we give hearty welcome to all strangers who come to us from England, Ireland or Scotland or anywhere else, we native Canadians on both sides of the House have a fellow feeling, and do not want to be lectured, in season and out of season, on our loyalty to England.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not rise to make any lengthy remarks upon the subject which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Victoria, (Mr. Prior). I only wish to say that I think it does not become the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to make any imputation against the loyalty of that part of the British Empire which happens to be located in the Emerald Isle. The people of Ireland have been agitating for Home

Rule, and, if I mistake not, the hon. member for West Ontario voted for a resolution in favor of Home Rule. It is therefore rather out of place for him to call the agitation for Home Rule a disloyal agitation, he himself having voted in favor of it.

Mr. BAKER. I regret exceedingly the turn this discussion has taken, and feel in a measure personally responsible for it, because had I risen at an earlier period of the debate to speak, I think I would, as I have on my desk materials for a six-hour speech, have choked off all discussions of this nature. I was afraid to speak at an earlier date, one reason being that I did not really feel equal to the task which I had for myself undertaken, and secondly, because I thought it was more essentially necessary, and more calculated to be productive of good to my constituents, and to the whole of those interested in the seal fisheries of British Columbia, that a discussion should arise of a legitimate nature in this House, which would be beneficial to them, and would serve as a guide for the future as to what would be likely to be done in regard to this industry. I do not think there is anyone who occupies a position on the floor of this House who can speak more feelingly on this subject than I can, for the reason that I am financially interested in the matter. I was very anxious to hear what other members might say on this subject, and to listen to the opinions of hon. members on both sides of the House. It is of vital importance, not only to the Province of British Columbia from which I come, but to Canada as a whole, and I do not think that the discussion should partake of the nature of party politics at all. I am sorry to say that very frequently matters which come before this House, which should have the freest possible discussion, in regard to which the opinions of everyone in this House who cares to speak upon them should be listened to, are discussed from the point of party politics rather than from a point which is relevant to the matters under discussion. I do not accuse hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of this more than I do those belonging to the party of which I am one of its humblest members; but, in regard to the matter which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) has brought before the House, he has moved for certain papers to be brought down, but I think that is according to the practice in other cases, for the purpose of engendering a discussion upon a question which is considered to be of interest to hon. members and to the public generally. In introducing this motion, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon) spoke generally on the subject now before this House. My hon. colleague (Mr. Prior) has traversed the ground and placed before you many matters of interest, more particularly as regards the early history of Alaska, the treaty which was entered into, and the rights, real or imaginary, which the Alaska Commercial Fur Company has under its charter from the United States; and he has also generally mentioned what has taken place in the Behring Sea in regard to the seizure of Canadian vessels. I think, however, that I have a few matters which will be of interest to this House which have not been mentioned by previous speakers. In the first place, there are 16 or 17 vessels that go up every year to the Behring Sea. In 1886, the vessels which went up there, with the names of their captains, and their registered tonnage were as follows:—

| Name. | Captain. | Tonnage. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| <i>Carolina</i> | James Ogilvie..... | 32 |
| <i>Onward</i> | Daniel Munroe..... | 35 |
| <i>Thornton</i> | Hans Guttorensen..... | 33 |
| <i>Alfred Adams</i> | W. H. Dyer..... | 69.75 |
| <i>Anna Beck</i> | Louis Olsen..... | 41 |
| <i>W. P. Sayward</i> | Geo. R. Ferey..... | 135½ |
| <i>Dolphin</i> | J. D. Warren..... | 174 |
| <i>Grace</i> | Wm. Petit..... | 182 |
| <i>Ada</i> | Jas. Gaudin..... | 65 |

The mates of the *Carolina*, the *Onward*, and the *Thornton*, were respectively James Blake, John Margotich and Harry Norman. Out of these vessels whose names I have given, three were seized in 1886, in the latitude, longitude and distance from shore which is shown in this statement:—

VESSELS SEIZED IN 1886.

| Name. | Lat. | Long. | Distance from Ounalaska. |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|
| <i>Carolina</i> | 55 50 N. | 163 53 W. | 139 miles. |
| <i>Onward</i> | 54 52 N. | 167 55 W. | 68 " |
| <i>Thornton</i> | 54 52 N. | 167 55 W. | 68 " |

The vessels seized in 1887, and their distance from shore, is shown in the following statement:—

VESSELS SEIZED IN 1887.

| Name. | Lat. | Long. | Distance from Ounalaska. |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|
| <i>Alfred Adams</i> | 54 48 N. | 167 49 W. | 62 miles. |
| <i>Anna Beck</i> | 54 58 N. | 167 26 W. | 66 " |
| <i>W. P. Sayward</i> | 54 43 N. | 167 51 W. | 58 " |
| <i>Dolphin</i> | 54 38 N. | 167 03 W. | 42 " |
| <i>Grace</i> | 55 03 N. | 168 40 W. | 92 " |
| <i>Ada</i> | 54 09 N. | 166 40 W. | 15 " |

So hon. members will notice that the nearest point to any United States territory at which any of these vessels was seized was 15 miles, and some of them were seized at a distance of about 140 miles. No doubt, it will be of some interest to the House to know what crews manned these vessels, to learn something in regard to their outfit, the amount which they are paid, and also something in regard to the season's catch. The crew usually consists of a master, mate, cook, steward, and 4 men to navigate the vessel. Each vessel carries from 6 to 8 boats, each boat has one hunter and two pullers; each hunter gets \$1.50 per skin, each boat puller 50 cents per skin; so that the number on board an vessel would vary from 22 to 30 men. Where Indians are employed the number will exceed these figures by about 50 per cent. Each skin therefore costs \$2.50 for the hunter and his crew. To this must be added the cost of outfit, wages of master and crew, and interest on capital invested. The master is usually upon what is known as a "lay out" which combines wages, which range from \$50 to \$65 a month, with practically a commission on the catch, amounting to about 25 cents or 30 cents a skin. One case will fairly illustrate the many:—Hans Guttorensen, master of the *Thornton*, left Victoria Harbor on the 15th February, upon what is known as a sealing and fishing voyage and cleared at the custom house for the Behring Sea, put into Clayoquot Sound on 25th May, thence west of Vancouver Island to Behring Sea, entering said sea about the 6th June. The vessel which he commanded was seized on the 1st August, and in addition to the forfeiture of his skins, he was fined the sum of \$500 and imprisoned 30 days. He was, in addition to that, robbed of his sextant—for I can use no milder term—valued at \$50, and a chronometer, worth \$125. His instruments were his personal property, and in addition to the loss of his vessel and skins, he individually loses the remainder of the season's catch in which he is interested, and the remainder of the wages, which cease directly his vessel is seized, and he also loses the prospective employment of the vessel and what his wages would be under that prospective employment. I mention these facts, Mr. Speaker, to show that not only has he lost the cost of the vessel's equipment, her outfit, her apparel and provisions, ammunition and small arms, and the kit, and every thing belonging to the men on board the vessel, but the ship master and the mate lose, in addition to what they had on board and their wages and their interest in the season's catch, the prospective employment of the vessel during the winter months. Now, the value of the outfits of the three vessels that were seized in 1886, amounts to \$22,000; the wages and layout payable to

the crew amounted to \$17,100; the value of the skins on board was \$10,423; value of the probable catch was estimated at \$21,000 for each of the vessels, which would be \$63,000; legal and other expenses, \$3,000; loss to the schooner *Favorite* through having received orders to quit the sealing, and to get out of Behring Sea, \$3,000; the indemnity claimed for the masters of the three vessels, namely: Munroe, Guttorensen, and Ogilvie, and the mates, Magolitch, Norman and Black, were respectively \$8,000 for the masters, and \$5,000 for the mates; therefore the total amount at risk, when these vessels were seized, foots up the nice little sum of \$154,523. Now, this will show to the House the amount of money that it is necessary to have to embark, even in a small scale, in the Behring Sea fishery, and if it had not been for the interference of these American revenue cruisers, a very large number of vessels would have fitted out, and would have considerably enhanced the value of the sealing industry of British Columbia. The ground covered by the sealing fleet previous to going into Behring Sea is, roughly, 1,560 miles. The distance from Victoria to Cape Flattery is 63 miles; from Cape Flattery to Queen Charlotte Island, 400 miles; from Queen Charlotte Island to the entrance of Behring Sea, 1,100; making a total of 1,563 miles from, we will say, Victoria harbor to the entrance of Behring Sea. Some of these vessels were warned outside the group of islands known as the Aleutian Islands, not to go into the Behring Sea, and if I am not greatly in error, one vessel had her skins taken from on board outside the Aleutian Islands, and not within the Behring Sea at all. Now, it will be interesting to this House to know that previous to these vessels going into the Behring Sea, they made what is called their preliminary trip, down south in the direction of San Francisco, 670 miles, to the south of Vancouver Island. They go down as far as Cape Mendocino, then they work up on the north-west coast towards Vancouver Island, then strike across to Queen Charlotte Island, and then on the north-west coast to the entrance of Behring Sea. Several vessels have made large catches without going into Behring Sea at all. When these vessels got into Behring Sea, it was impossible for the revenue cruisers to discriminate between what skins we reactually taken south of the Aleutian Islands, and what skins were the result of the kill in Behring Sea, and all the skins on board the vessels at the time were seized. Now, there is another little matter which will be interesting to members of this House, while on the subject, and that is the distance from point to point and place to place in and about Behring Sea. Now, from Unalaska Island to the south-east point of St. George's Island, is 182 miles; from the north-west point of St. George's Island to the south point of St. Paul's Island, 36 miles; north point of St. Paul's Island to south-east point of St. Matthew's Island, 197 miles; north-east point of St. Matthew's Island to south-west point of St. Lawrence Island, 178 miles; from St. Lawrence Island and Cape Prince of Wales Island, in Alaska territory, 140 miles; total distance a vessel would probably make it, from the island known as Unalaska to the Behring Straits (entrance of the Arctic Ocean) that is, entrance of Behring Sea to entrance of Behring Straits is 733 miles. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that there is a difference between Behring Sea and Behring Straits, therefore I give these distances. The total distance from the centre of Unalak Pass, passing 10 miles west of Nunivak Island, to Cape Prince of Wales, at the east entrance of Behring Strait, is 700 miles. The width of Unalak Pass, that is, from south-west point of Unalak Island to east point of Akun Island, the usual pass used is from $22\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 miles. There is another pass called the Amukleta Pass, between Amukleta and Siguan Islands, which is 37 miles wide. The Akutam Pass, between Akutam and Unalak Island, is only eight miles wide, that is

Mr. BAKER.

the narrowest entrance between that point and Behring Sea. The width of the entrance of Behring Straits from Cape Prince of Wales to Cape Kregugin, is 70 miles; width of entrance of Behring Straits from Cape Prince of Wales, in Alaska, to East Cape, on the eastern shore of Siberia, is 51 miles. A line dividing the straits of Behring Sea, passes within 23 miles of Cape Prince of Wales, and 47 miles from Cape Kregugin, and 27 miles from Cape Chakotski. The Aleutian Islands cover a width, as hon. gentlemen will see, of 900 miles, that is, from the North East Bay, with a sweep up to the north-west, is a distance of 900 miles, all inside of which is the Behring Sea, which will give hon. members some idea, if they have not already looked at the map themselves, of the immense volume of water there is in that sea, and the immense amount of sea territory, so to speak, which is claimed by the United States as an inland sea. The sealing grounds in the Behring Sea are principally between 55 and 60 parallels of latitude, and 165 and 175 meridians of longitude. The foregoing information is taken from United States Coast and Geodetic Survey of Alaska and adjoining territory, 1884, by J. E. Hilgard, Superintendent; C. O. Boutelle, assistant in charge of office, as reissued with additions up to April, 1884—Compiled from all accessible data by W. H. Dale, assistant, U.S.C.S., and including results of recent explorations by Capt. Beardslee and Lieut. Perry, U.S. Navy; Lieuts. Kay and Schwaka, U.S. Army; Capt. Hooper, U.S. Rev. Mar.; the officers of the *Vega* expedition and of the Coast Survey and other well-known surveyors and hydrographers, giving data to October, 1883. It is a little peculiar, Mr. Speaker, when we take into consideration the contention of the United States on the Atlantic shores, that they should make, or attempt to make, Behrings Sea a closed sea, especially in view of the liberty enjoyed by United States whalers from New Bedford in Hudson Bay, which is wholly surrounded by our Canadian territory and is entered by passing through an archipelago by channels less than 30 miles in width. I have shown that the channels entering into Behring Sea are respectively 37 miles in width, 51 miles, the principal channel, and the one least used eight miles. Hon. gentlemen will remember the contention of the United States in regard to our bays on the Atlantic coast. Some of those bays are as follows:—Bay Chaleurs, New Brunswick, 15 miles wide; Miramichi Bay, 14 miles; Egmont Bay, 17 miles; St. Mary's Bay, Nova Scotia, between Long Island and Bryn Island, nine miles; Banington Bay, eastern entrance $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles, western entrance $6\frac{1}{2}$; Chedabucto Bay, Gut of Canso, two entrances; nine and ten miles respectively; St. Ann's Bay, 17 miles; Mince Bay, five or seven miles; Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, 22 miles; Hamilton Sound, 12 or 16 miles; Fortune Bay, three miles. Now, if the United States contend that they have the right or that the concessions should be granted to enter bays of such narrow width, equally, I think, and indeed with greater force, can we contend that we have the right to pass through the narrow entrances to Behring Sea, because in passing through any one of those entrances a vessel does not approach within 15 miles of the shore. It has been said by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject that great indifference has been shown either by the Federal Government or by the Imperial Government. I certainly do think, with all deference to hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that there has been apparent apathy or indifference amounting, to use the mildest term, to apparent neglect on the part of the Imperial Government—and I speak as an Englishman proud of the British flag, and proud of holding a seat in this House as a Canadian—because I must say that from 1st August, 1886, to 25th April, 1888, there has been ample time for some one upon whom the responsibility rested to have promised that there should not be a recurrence of the seizures. I am

quite convinced that so far as the Canadian Government are concerned every legislative endeavor has been made, all the persuasive eloquence that could be brought to bear has been used by telegram and letter to induce the Imperial Government to take that step which we would like to see taken yet, namely, to send there an armed vessel, and, if necessary, take out our vessels, as was done in old times, with shot and shell. That is about the only way to take them. As far back as 12th May, 1886, I received a letter from a gentleman named T. Lubbe who was interested at that time in the sealing fleet sailing from Victoria. I consider that telegram was really the firing of the first shot in defense of our rights as Canadians to fish anywhere we please on the high seas, including Behring Sea. I was requested at that time to get the matter before the Government, which I most promptly did. That telegram, which was dated 12th May, 1886, simply said:

"Has the Minister of Justice not yet decided?"

"T. LUBBE."

To that telegram I sent the following reply:

"The Minister of Justice gives opinion in your favor and against American contentions. He has recommended attention of Imperial Government being called to the subject in order that views of Canadian Government be then sustained and enforced."

Now, Mr. Speaker, no less than 23 months have passed since the Federal Government sent either a telegram or a very emphatic and unmistakable letter to the Imperial Government, urging the enforcement of the position taken by the Government of Canada, namely, that our rights should be protected on the high seas, and up to the present nothing practical has been done. The reason why we in British Columbia are anxious at the present time that something should be done, not only in the matter of restitution for seizures that took place in 1886-87, but in reference to our rights in Behring Sea, is because a certain amount of uncertainty and scepticism prevails as to whether the United States will continue to make seizures of vessels or not. Had it not been for that feeling I am quite confident that to-day, instead of there being 17 or 18 vessels sailing from Victoria to Behring Sea, there would have been at least three times that number, and even to-day we are not assured that protection will be given to our vessels. If we were assured of protection being given to the vessels, I think by this time there would have been a vessel flying the British flag somewhere in that vicinity, but until the Union Jack of old England is seen flying there so long will the American Eagle, represented by the Stars and Stripes, pounce down on our vessels and take them to Alaska. Only the other day an item appeared in one of the San Francisco newspapers, having an appearance of authenticity, to the effect that all vessels operating within certain limits set forth would be liable to the penalties prescribed by law against the killing of fur-bearing animals. It is equally possible that all vessels sailing from Victoria Harbor or any other port in British Columbia, if they did not see this notice at the custom house in San Francisco, had it communicated to them by agents there; so that at the present moment vessels fitted out in Victoria and going into Behring Sea have no guarantee that they will not be seized as were other Canadian vessels in 1886-87. In fact everything shows that such will be the case. I do not know that anything more can be done so far as the Canadian Government are concerned. They have urged the matter up to a point which is satisfactory to the Canadian Government and this position is supported by facts of which we are in possession, and no doubt there may be some very good reasons for the Government not laying certain diplomatic correspondence before the House, or until a certain period has passed. But what we really want practically in British Columbia and in the vicinity of the Behring Sea are two things: We want compensation for the vessels seized and the damage done, and we want a

prevention of the recurrence of such a thing in future. I will not weary the House by reading the Alaska Commercial Company's charter from the United States Government or the Act for the prevention of the extermination of seals in the Behring Sea, but I will simply give a reference to them so that hon. members can refer to them themselves. The Act for the prevention of the extermination of seals in the Behring Sea will be found on No. 120 of that little blue book issued last year when the correspondence was called for. While I am referring to the matter of extermination of seals in the Behring Sea I will take this occasion to repudiate a statement which has got wind, to the effect that one of the reasons for preventing persons from killing seals in the Behring Sea is that they kill indiscriminately; that they kill the female seal with pups, and seals under two years old. I have taken the trouble of critically going into this matter, and I have enquired from masters, officers, mates and the crews of these vessels as to what percentage of the seals killed would come under that category. I have the very best of assurance that out of possibly 21,000 or 22,000 sealkins brought down by each vessel from Behring Sea to Victoria Harbor, that there will not be 2 per cent. of them belonging to seals such as should not be killed, which is a very small percentage indeed. Then, as regards the Commercial Company's lease, that will be found a little further on in those papers of last year, to which I have already alluded. Although I have lots of material here that I would like to refer to and place on record, the ground has been so well covered by those who have spoken that the patience of the House must have been fully tested upon this subject. The only excuse I can offer for taking up so much time of the House is that British Columbians do not usually occupy the time of the House, unless it is some important matter having particular reference to their own Province, such as a question of this kind, in which possibly some of us have an individual interest, as I have already stated I have. There are many matters which come up before this House, such as the Fishery Treaty, and some hon. gentleman may say: Why do not British Columbians speak on that subject? One very good reason may be given for this and that is that on some subjects "silence is golden." There are some questions which come up which immediately it would be in the interest of British Columbia to adopt but which in the near future I rather apprehend it would be in the interest of the Province not to adopt, and considering the future and the present and the conflict between them it is just as well to say nothing on them. Upon this subject I think I can voice the sentiment of every man in British Columbia when I say that the rights of Canadian vessels on the Pacific can fairly claim as much protection, and that their case should equally be urged on the Imperial Government, as the rights of our vessels upon the Atlantic Ocean have been urged. It is, I think, a matter of regret that this question was not referred to the United States plenipotentiaries so that the necessity of calling for the papers in this House would have been avoided.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF ARCHIBALD CULBERTSON.

Mr. BURDETT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, charges, papers and orders touching or relating to the dismissal of Archibald Culbertson from the office of Indian Councillor of the Mohawk Band.

He said: I should like to say a few words in respect to this motion affecting the status of the Mohawk band. I believe, according to a statute of the Dominion, chap. 43, sec. 75, the Government have the power and have exercised that power of permitting the bands to elect councillors to manage their local affairs. They have, under the same statute, the right to remove those councillors for four specified reasons, viz.,

dishonesty, intemperance, immorality and incompetence. I should say here that if the Government possessed this power in all cases as well as those referring to Indians, and if they exercised it as they endeavored to exercise it in this case, we would possibly have a pretty large political house-cleaning. This man, Archibald Culbertson, has been, I am told, elected for a number of years, and has served with efficiency and zeal the band to which he belongs. Last winter before the election, he writes me, that he was told if he interfered punishment would be meted out to him. After the elections similar threats were made, and they were carried out, and he was summarily dismissed from his position. He made enquiries of Mr. Dingman, an officer of the Department, and asked if any charges were made against him, and if there were he asked that they should be mentioned to him. Mr. Dingman said no charges were made, but as the Government had directed him to do so he would make enquiries. Archibald Culbertson informs me that on the 11th of August he received a letter summarily dismissing him from his position as a member of the council. I understand that this man occupied an analogous position to an alderman or a member of a municipality or township, and that he ought not to be dismissed without specific charges and for good cause. The courts are open to persons guilty of any error, and they may be removed for proper cause and on proper grounds. We were told here in the Queen's County election case that the courts were open and that those who objected to Mr. Baird's election could move in that direction. I think it would have been highly proper if the courts had moved in this direction instead of the Executive at Ottawa. This gentleman writes me that he was dismissed without accusation, without a charge and without an opportunity of defending himself before his accusers, or to show his innocence or justify his conduct. If this be true it rests with the Government in justice to this man to show why he was dismissed and for what cause. In support of the position that he directs me to take I have two letters written him from the department. The first is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 19th October, 1887.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant asking to be furnished with copies of certain papers, &c., connected with the Order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council deposing you from the chieftainship of the Tyendinaga band of Indians, I have to inform you that the department declines to furnish you with the document asked for.

"R. SINCLAIR,

"Acting Deputy of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs."

The second letter is as follows:

OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1888.

"SIR,—With reference to your verbal request on the 4th instant to be furnished with copies of the papers containing charges against you under which you were deposed from the chieftainship of the Tyendinaga band of Indians I beg to refer you to the letter from this department of the 19th October last, informing you that the department was unwilling to furnish you with the document asked for.

L. VANKOUGHNET,

Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs."

I cannot understand why a man who occupies a position like this, to which he has been elected by the people, should be deposed without having an opportunity to answer his accusers. Even the French translators had that opportunity. I am told that the Irishmen on the Lachine Canal had not the same privilege. Possibly it is only Irishmen and Indians who are denied the right which is granted to Frenchmen and Canadians. This is the first occasion on which I have known a man to be removed from a position that he has acceptably filled without some cause or reason being given. There may have been good cause for his dismissal; I do not know whether there was or not; but I do say that in justice to him and to his people, he ought to have had an opportunity to answer those charges. Further, he informs me that although he was dismissed on

Mr. BURDETT.

the 11th of August, in a summary manner, nothing was done to fill his office until the 22nd of January. We find that when it became necessary, through death, to fill vacancies in this House, in the cases of West Hastings and Missisquoi, there was no delay, but in the cases of Prince Edward, Kent, Russell, Shelburne and Yarmouth, considerable and unnecessary delay occurred. Delay also happened in the appointment of the successor of this man: He also informs me that although his dismissal did not imply disqualification, men in the employ of the Government informed him that the Government would not accept him if he ran and was elected. He tells me that the person who nominated his opponent would have supported him if he had known that he was not objectionable to the Government. It was bad enough to be dismissed without cause and without charges, but it was still worse to have it circulated that he could not be re-elected and would not be acceptable to the powers that be. I do not believe the Government authorised anybody to say that he would not be acceptable to them if he was re-elected. In conclusion he writes to me:

"It seems to me very unjust to allow any man to prefer a charge against another, and the answer not to be delivered, and the accused not to be allowed to defend himself."

It is only right to say that he informed me that some of them said he was dismissed for intemperance—because he had, in common language, got "tight." That may be true or it may not be true; but if the Government have decided to dismiss officials in their employ for intemperance, I am glad to hear it. I hope that the application of that principle will not be limited to Indians alone. If the Government state that they will dismiss all in their employ who can be proved not only to get "tight," but to go on a common, everyday "drunk," we will give them more employment. If this rule is to be applied, it will be more effective than any Scott Act can be to clear the country of intemperance, and if they do decide to undertake that work, I will give them a few subjects to act on. What I say is that this man, who was a ward of the Government, complains to me that he was dismissed without any accusation being made against him, and without a chance to answer, and that others, in order to deprive him of an opportunity to be re-elected, stated that the Government would not accept him if he were re-elected. I say that the Government should place themselves right on this matter, and should let those men know that now that they have the franchise they have a right to exercise it freely and without fear of molestation from the Government or any of their officials.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know little or nothing of this case myself, but I am quite sure that the head of the department, in acting as he is alleged to have done, in the first place, acted according to what he believed was within the scope of his duty, and in the second place, believed that he was acting in the interest of the band of whom Mr. Culbertson is stated to have been a councillor. The hon. gentleman is right in stating that the charge brought against him was intemperance and violence, extreme violence, during the time he was so intemperate, and that not in a few but in many instances, and in the interest of the band and the cause of good order he was removed. However, I cannot speak of the particulars because they are not before me. The papers will be brought down.

Mr. BURDETT. The law provides for the punishment of an Indian for intemperance; but it is the duty of the Government not only to punish the Indian, but the person who gave him the liquor. If this man is to be removed for intemperance and violence, he writes to me about his successor, whom the Government seems to accept as satisfactory, in these words:

"Jacob B. Brant was the man that went home drunk, broke his stove, cut up some of the furniture and some of the house, and run his wife

away from her home, and she was obliged to have him committed to jail, and who will get drunk whenever he gets an opportunity."

The rule that the Government have applied to Mr. Culbertson ought to apply to his successor, and if the hon. gentleman thinks he has not served in jail, he will find his name on the jailer's book in Belleville.

Motion agreed to.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 86) to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie for Railway and Passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: This Bill, I may say, is a formal one, and perhaps, to a great extent, its usefulness is already gone—it has gone, at all events, so far as the county from which I come is concerned, as quite recently the Scott Act has been repealed in that county by a large majority. But there are still a number of counties where the Scott Act is in force, and the object of this measure is to simplify and make plain the voting, either for the repeal or the introduction of the Scott Act. At present the voter is very much puzzled to know when he is voting for the petition to bring the Act into force, or voting for the repeal—he is puzzled to know whether he is voting for or against the measure. The object of this Bill is to enable the elector to understand what he is voting for. He knows, of course, if he votes for the Act it is for the purpose of bringing the Act into force, and he ought also to know that if he is voting against the Act, it is for the repeal of the Act so far as it affects his constituency. Now, the Bill is simply framed with that object. I do not anticipate any opposition to the measure from any part of the House. I think all must agree that it is important that the electors should have the matter made as plain and simple as possible, and they should understand whether they are voting for the Act or against it. But it may be important perhaps that I should bring this matter up that it may be embodied in this Bill and a provision be inserted that in counties where the Act has been repealed it should be brought into force at the earliest possible date. In no less than nine counties, including the unions, and I believe represented in this House, by no less than fifteen members, the Scott Act has been repealed and repealed by very large majorities, but under the provisions of that repeal it cannot come into force for one year yet. The result is that for a year to come this law against which the people have pronounced is practically paralysed. It has ceased to be of the slightest effect though it is still technically in force, but there is no public opinion behind it, and I do not think any person will take the slightest trouble to enforce its provisions. Practically free trade in liquor will prevail in those counties. I think we had better at the earliest possible moment in those counties

where the people have pronounced upon this question bring this Act into force and allow the Crooks Act or the license law for the regulation of the liquor traffic to be carried into effect. However, in this Bill I am simply dealing at present with the matter I have mentioned.

Mr. JAMIESON. The mover of the Bill has made a very candid confession in regard to it, and that is that its usefulness is gone. My own impression about this Bill, and I do not place myself as a very good authority, is that the last clause of the Bill is the only one that is going to be of any service. I think that what my hon. friend has said in reference to a change in the ballot is quite true, and that a change in that respect would be an advantage not only to those who are in favor of the law but to those who are opposed to the law. My hon. friend may be quite right in regard to the effect of the vote which took place on Thursday last and with regard to which I shall have some further remarks to make in the course of the evening, but my impression of the law is quite different to that which my hon. friend holds. I have not looked into the matter carefully, but my impression is that the Act will become repealed and the license law of the Province will go into effect at the expiration of ninety days; that is that the Order in Council revoking the Act can be passed at the expiration of sixty days after the vote in favor of the repeal of the Act, and after the expiration of thirty days from that time the Act will be repealed. I do not know whether my hon. friend proposes to move the House into committee to-night, but so far as I am concerned I think the last clause is the only one that is of any importance, and in regard to that I would suggest, and no doubt my hon. friend will make no objection, that the form of the ballot prescribed should be made applicable not only to the adoption of the Act but to the repeal of the Act, and I think the affirmative should be placed first, that is for the Act. So far as the other provisions of the Bill are concerned I think my hon. friend will concede that no difficulties have arisen on that score so far as the repeal votes that have already taken place are concerned, and no difficulty is likely to arise in the future. They seem to have adopted the provisions of the law according to the statute, *mutatis mutandis* for the repeal, and I think the only provision in this Bill which should be considered by the House, and I think my hon. friend will not dispute this, is the one in regard to the change in the ballot.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understood the hon. gentleman he confined his remarks to the last section of the Bill, that is to say to the section in regard to the ballot. I notice that the first section is to amend clause 96 of the Act. Will the hon. gentleman kindly give the House any explanation he has to offer in regard to the proposed amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no change contemplated in the law.

Mr. LAURIER. Then what is the object of the amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. The object is to make it plain and clear in connection with the repeal of the Act. The hon. gentleman will understand that the procedure for bringing the Act into force is the procedure in the original statute. The procedure for the repeal of the Act is stated in a general way, that *mutatis mutandis* the forms are to be adopted for the repeal of the Act. That has created a good deal of confusion, especially in regard to the ballot. The form of the ballot is for the petition. The change is proposed with a view to make it clear to a voter whether he is voting for or against the Act. Clause 96 reads in the original Act, in substance, the same as in the proposed amending Act. Clause 96 is as follows:

"No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the date of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act."

I have put these provisions into separate sections. Section 96 is repealed and the following substituted for the first part of the section:

"Sections five, six, seven and eight following and the forms in the schedule to this Act shall be read as if embodied in the first part of the said Act, but shall relate to proceedings for revoking the Order in Council which has brought the second part of the said Act into force."

Section 5, which has reference to part of Section 96, precedes as follows:—

"A petition to the Governor in Council praying for the revocation of any Order in Council, passed for bringing the second part of this Act into force, may be in the form O of the schedule hereto or to the like effect.

Section 6 is as follows:—

"Such petition may be embodied, as in form O in the schedule to this Act, in the notice in writing addressed to the Secretary of State of Canada and signed by electors qualified to vote at the election of a member of the House of Commons in a county or city, to the effect that the signers desire that the votes of such electors as under the provisions of the said Act are entitled to vote for the bringing into force of the second part of the said Act, be taken for and against the revocation of the Order in Council bringing the second part of the said Act into force."

Mr. MILLS. I desire some information in regard to an observation made by the hon. gentleman. I understood the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to say that in those counties where the Act has been repealed the Act will still operate for one year, notwithstanding the vote taken. As I understood the original law—I have not examined it in the Revised Statutes—there was no possibility of taking a vote in regard to the Act until at the expiration of three years.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not correct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was the original provision.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Act must remain in force three years; but there was no provision on the Statute-book such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. An Order in Council was passed providing that the Act when adopted should remain in force for three years; so the vote did not take place until March or April. But the hon. gentleman will find, now that the Act has been repealed, sixty days must elapse before the proclamation can issue, then either 30 or 60 days after that again before the law comes into force, and then again not to become operative until, as I understand it the next license year, although there may be some doubt with regard to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the spirit of the law was to bring it into operation and then take a vote to ascertain public sentiment, but not until the three years had about expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. We cannot help dealing with things as they are.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Public opinion might change before the time expires and people might take a different view. Clearly the intention of the law is that a vote should be taken at the close of the period.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the House into committee on the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. Yes, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that the Bill should be taken later on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let us go into the committee now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has suggested amendments and provisions that are not in the Bill. I think it is only fair that the House should have an oppor-

Mr. McCARTHY.

tunity of considering them. It might be desirable that further amendments would be proposed. The hon. gentleman will see that when we go into committee that our opportunity for consideration would have expired when the committee rises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have the third reading and concurrence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The right hon. gentleman knows from an experience of 20 years that the opportunities in concurrence are not very great. The proper time to consider them is in committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says: Let us do so, but has the hon. gentleman considered the subject? If he had he would hardly have taken a vote of the people on the repeal of the Bill twelve months before it should be repealed.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says: "No." The hon. gentleman himself has admitted that repeal of the Scott Act has been carried in several counties although the Act has still a year to operate. Unless Parliament interferes that Act will continue to operate under the statute although the people have decided it ought to be repealed. The intention of the law was that an Order in Council authorising a vote to be taken ought not to have been issued until the three years had about expired. Clearly it never was the intention of Parliament that there should be a vote taken on a measure that is actually in operation, before the time has expired or about to expire within which that measure is to operate. The hon. gentleman says we can consider it in committee. He has not considered what he has done himself and the least that can be done is to give us an opportunity of considering the Bill. I do not say it is to be opposed. I say it is highly mischievous to have a law in operation after the people have condemned it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt of that, but it is a remarkable condition of things that the people should be called upon to say whether they approve or disapprove of a measure, which the statute says should operate for another year. The Government administering the law have not carried out the intentions of Parliament.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman either does not know what he is talking about or he is misrepresenting what the law is, because if the Government had waited five years before they submitted it to a vote people would have to wait another year before it could come into force. The facts are that they did wait three years less fifteen days, in every one of those seven counties, so that at the time of the vote there was only fifteen days to wait. If you waited five years you would still have to wait another year according to the explanation of the law given by the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If the hon. gentleman will take up this Bill he will see it has been distributed for over a month and if the hon. gentleman had not time to consider it he ought to have found time. The members in charge of it have considered it. I think the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has shown no cause for delay and that we should go into committee at once.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me remind the hon. gentleman the mover of this Bill proposes certain conditions which are not in the present Bill at all.

Mr. TISDALE. That is not the question. It is whether we are to go into committee or not.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what provisions he proposes to make to prevent a vote being taken until the three years has expired. The hon. gentleman sees there is no such provision in the statute.

Mr. MCCARTHY. You had better move it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is the hon. gentleman's Bill. His hon. friend beside him has fully considered the subject and has no doubt an amendment ready.

Mr. TISDALE. If I have I will move it at the proper time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The time has come now. The clause in the Bill reads thus:

"No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the date of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act.

The hon. gentleman certainly must see that it is highly desirable that the Bill should not remain in force and continue to operate after the people have voted in favor of repeal, and therefore such vote ought not to be taken until after the time expires.

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no doubt a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says, but that does not interfere with this section. The hon. gentleman will see I am copying from his own Bill, for he was a member of the Government that brought in this Scott Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The hon. gentleman ought not to go back on his own measure. As I explained before I am distributing this section 96 into three or four sections without altering the Scott Act in any way. I am quite willing the hon. gentleman should make such a motion and speaking for myself am quite willing to adopt it as far as I can; that the vote for the repeal should not take place until a certain limited time within the three years; but that need not at all conflict with this section, which means that the Act need not be repealed by Order in Council until after three years.

On section 8,

Mr. TISDALE. Owing to the vote that took place the other day in no less than nine counties in the Province of Ontario, a very anomalous state of law exists. Although by a very large majority the qualified electors decided that the Scott Act is not law, it will still remain law for a year. I think as a matter of principle that is wrong, and it will put all those counties in this extraordinary position, that there will be no possibility of a license being issued, while the Scott Act, after the people have said they do not want it, will be comparatively impossible of enforcement. Therefore, in my opinion, it is the duty of this House to pass some legislation that will prevent this state of things. In moving the amendment that I have in my hand, I wish to state that last year when the motion was brought into the House for the repeal of the Scott Act, I was one of those who, though opposed to that Act, felt that we should not repeal it, on the ground that we should not take from the electors the right to say whether an Act should be law or not after Parliament had delegated that power to them. Now, the electors having said in those different large counties, by thousands in the aggregate majority, that they wish no more of that Act, I think it is wrong to leave those counties in this position, that they cannot get rid of it for a year. Therefore I move:

That in all counties in which a petition for the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act has been adopted by a vote of the qualified electors,

and in the manner and according to the provisions of the said Act, the Governor in Council may forthwith, after the adoption thereof, pass an Order in Council declaring that the said Act is repealed in the said county, and the said Act shall, from the publication of the said Order in Council in the *Canada Gazette*, be repealed accordingly.

I wish to add one word in moving the resolution—one word which, I think, after all, so far as an individual is concerned, is the strongest sort of evidence—my own observation as to the effect that will follow in my own county, if some such provision is not adopted. While the Scott Act was in force, so far as the temperance cause is concerned, I regret exceedingly to say that in my opinion it did more harm than good. At the time the petition for the adoption of the Act was before the people, I was so staggered myself by the earnestness and the statements of the advocates of it, that I did not vote. But during the years that it has been in existence, particularly during the late elections for the Local Legislature and for this House, I was surprised and grieved, as I went through the county, to find the state of affairs that existed, as contrasted with the condition of the county a few years before, when we were under the License Act; and I believe things will be worse now unless we take some steps in this House to provide that, as soon as the people vote to repeal the Act, they can return to the license system.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him under what section of the Act he pretends that the Act will remain in force one year after its repeal is voted by the people?

Mr. TISDALE. Under several sections of the Act. I confess that, although in my own opinion a reasonably fair lawyer, I do not understand the Act; and I have conversed with several legal gentlemen who I thought knew better than myself, and they all arrived at the conclusion that it is uncertain; some say a year and some say ninety days. At all events the consensus of opinion that I have been able to gather in consulting eminent legal gentlemen, without respect to their political opinions, is that it will be a year before a license can properly be issued under the laws of Ontario. It can do no harm if I am wrong; but when there is such a consensus of opinion, will the hon. gentleman tell me there is no doubt under that Act, under the license laws of Ontario, that we can get a license within a year?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not answering the question.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not the fault of the Act; it is the fault of the law of Ontario.

Mr. TISDALE. It is an effect of the law. I propose to deal with principles, and I say it is a question of principle, and a most important principle, so far as one county, at all events, is concerned. I do not want to see a state of affairs continue to exist, which, for the past two years especially, have existed in some parts of the riding I have the honor to represent; and to prevent that I want to see that no doubt shall remain under this law, and that after the sense of the people has been proclaimed by a large majority in favor of repeal, we shall be able to go back to the old state of things, or to a better state of things.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not put the question with the view of carping at the amendment, but only to obtain information. I do not pretend to be familiar with the Act. The hon. gentleman has affirmed that the amendment together with the effect of the legislation, such as it exists, will be that when the Act will be repealed by the vote of the people, it will still remain in force for one year. I ask him to give me the section on which he bases that assertion, and he tells me it is the result of several sections. Those are the very sections concerning which I would like to be informed. The hon. gentleman must be familiar with

them since he has undertaken to remove them from the statutes and replace them by something else. The hon. gentleman says that he cannot say whether the Act will remain in force for a year, but that at all events it will for ninety days.

Mr. TISDALE. No doubt of that.

Mr. LAURIER. I ask him to point to the sections which would have that effect?

Mr. TISDALE. It is sometime since I examined the Act, perhaps two or three weeks ago, before the vote took place, and I cannot now remember the sections or the particulars.

Mr. LAURIER. A moment ago my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked that the Bill be postponed until another sitting, in order to consider it, but the hon. gentleman said he was quite ready now, and rather taunted my hon. friend for not being ready. He said he had had the Act for a month in his hands, and was quite ready now to discuss it, and I inferred from that that he was quite ready to give the information I asked for.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me there are entirely too many doctors about this patient. We have heard a good many opinions expressed on this Act, and a little time has been asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). What I think ought to be done is this: It is a public Bill which affects public interests, and the hon. the Minister of Justice should look into this point, and let the House really know what the effect of the law really is, as it stands, and what would be the effect of the proposed change. We ought not to go blindly into a question that may lead to endless litigation. Before dealing with an Act about which there are so many conflicting opinions, we ought to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the position we will be in should this legislation be adopted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps I may be able to point out the meaning of the law, as I understand it, and the effect of the proposed amendment. The hon. the leader of the Opposition will find that the latter part of section 96 provides that the vote upon the repeal shall take effect, *mutatis mutandis*, according to the preceding sections 94 and 95 of the statute. It is as follows:—

“And each and all of the provisions of the preceding sections of this Act shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to every case of a petition and notice for the revocation of an Order in Council under this section and to the proceedings to be had and taken thereon, and in respect of the powers to be exercised and the offences that may be committed, and the penalties that may be incurred in the course of and in connection with such proceedings.”

Therefore, we have to look at sections 94 and 95 to see when this petition, having been adopted by the people will become effective. Section 95 says:

“When any petition embodied, as aforesaid, in any notice and in any proclamation under this part of this Act, has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named therein and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may—”

That has taken place with regard to the appeal. The petition has been adopted.

—“at any time after the expiration of sixty days from the date on which the same was adopted—”

That is the first delay of sixty days. There is a delay of two months before the proclamation can issue.

—“by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire.”

Of course there are no licenses in force in such county or city; but if there were, they would be in force for the year ending next April. The consequence is although the proclamation may be made two months hence, that proclamation has to declare the law shall not become effective until

Mr. LAURIER.

the expiration of the license year. The difficulty created in the construction of the statute is by sub-section 2, between which and the section I have just read there appears to be a contradiction. Sub-section 2 says:

“If, in any county or city, there are no licenses in force when the petition mentioned in the first part of this Act is adopted, the second part of this Act shall become and be in force and take effect in such county or city after the expiration of thirty days from the date of such Order in Council.”

That makes the ninety days that are spoken of. So that it is either ninety days from the time the Act is adopted or it is the year of the license. In either case, the mischief we are seeking to avoid will exist. In the one case it would exist twelve months and in the other case three months. My hon. friend proposes in amendment that the law should come at once into force, that the Governor in Council should have power to proclaim that a petition has been adopted and that the repeal should become at once effective. It would then be the duty of the provincial authorities to issue licenses; or, if they find that they cannot issue licenses, the provincial liquor license law, which is quite as stringent as this law, should be enforced, and we will not have the case of the people having determined that the law should not govern them and yet have that law in force. I would, however, suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps the amendment should better follow the words of the Act, so as to prevent any confusion or any of that litigation which the hon. member for Northumberland seems to desire so properly to avoid. Therefore, I propose that the amendment should read as follows:—

“And when any petition embodied, as aforesaid, for the repeal of the Act, has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may, at any time after the adoption, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the second part of this Act shall be no longer in force.”

Mr. TISDALE. I do not care how the amendment is worded; it is only the principle I care about.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the amendment is quite appropriate, but I think the word “forthwith” is perhaps not the best that could be used under the circumstances. The object of the delay, as I understand it, was to allow any party that had petitions to present to the Government against putting the proclamation in force, to present them.

Mr. McCARTHY. We will say “thirty days” instead of “forthwith.”

Mr. FISHER. I think it is requisite that another addition should be made to this amendment, if this amendment be carried. I am not prepared to say that such an amendment ought not to be passed. I quite appreciate the difficulty which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has explained might occur, and, if the people of a county desire that there should be licenses in their midst instead of the Scott Act, I am quite prepared to grant them that right. But there has been in days past a great deal of difficulty in regard to the period at which repeal votes might be taken. An interpretation has been given to the Act which would allow a repeal vote to take place within a very short time after the original vote adopting the Act had been passed; and, although section 95 says that:

“No Order in Council issued under this Act shall be revoked until after the expiration of three years from the day of the coming into force under it of the second part of this Act.”

Still, under certain conditions and circumstances, a vote upon a repeal petition has been allowed very much before the three years have expired. If the amendment is passed, unless some change is made, there might be a vote taken upon a repeal petition within a year after the adoption of the Act, and the repeal would come into force immediately after the vote was taken. It was an essential principle of

the Act originally that no repeal should or could take place until the Act had been tried for three years. I am aware that quite recently the Government have issued an Order in Council by which a repeal vote cannot be taken until fifteen days after the expiration of the three years, and I quite agree with and appreciate the motive of that Order in Council; but, if this amendment were to be made part of the Act, and a change were made in the Order in Council, which the Government are quite competent to make at any time without reference to Parliament and according to their own will, they might make a repeal vote competent to be taken within a very much shorter time, and the Act might be repealed just after it was adopted, which would be entirely contrary to the principle of the Act. Therefore, if this amendment is to be adopted, there ought to be incorporated in it a declaration that no repeal vote shall take place until fifteen days after three years have elapsed from the time of the adoption of the Act. If that decision is come to, and is embodied in the Act, I shall be very glad to support the amendment, but otherwise, if the Order in Council were to be revoked or changed in any way, I point out the danger which there would be in the adoption of this amendment, and I warn the temperance people in this House of the great danger there would be of the Act being repealed very soon after its adoption, and thus one of the first principles of the Act as originally adopted would be completely obliterated.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must congratulate the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) on the extraordinary legal knowledge he showed in regard to the statute which is under discussion. He had the frankness to inform the House that I knew nothing of the subject under discussion, but let him have an opportunity of showing what he knew and he would convince the House that he was thoroughly familiar with the subject, that he knew as much about it as he did about his alphabet. He got up, and, with great confidence and great legal learning and familiarity with the statute, he said he was familiar with it a fortnight ago, but that now when it was under discussion he had forgotten all he knew before. I think he would have exhibited greater taste if he had shown a little more modesty. When he assured the House that he was so thoroughly familiar with the subject, he ought to have informed us how it was that no change could be made in the law for a year, although the people had voted for its repeal. I ask the attention of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whose Bill is now under consideration, to the provision of the law which he has quoted, which it seems to me is not applicable to a repeal of the Act, but has simply to do with the bringing into operation of the Canada Temperance Act. Section 95 says:

"When in any county or city one-half or more of all the votes polled have been against the adoption of any petition embodied as aforesaid in any notice and in any proclamation, under this the first part of this Act, no similar petition shall be put to the vote of the electors of such county or city for a period of three years from the day on which such vote was taken."

That clearly refers to bringing the Act into operation for the first time. It has no reference to the repeal. The next section says:

"When any petition embodied as aforesaid in any notice and in any proclamation under this the first part of this Act has been adopted by the electors of the county or city named therein and to which the same relates, the Governor General in Council may, at any time after the expiration of sixty days from the day of which the same was adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette* declare that the second part of this Act shall be in force and take effect in such county or city upon, from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual license for the sale of spirituous liquors then in force in such county or city will expire."

Now it is clear what the provisions of the law are and what the intention was. Here is a licensing system in operation at the time the vote is taken, and the law simply

provides that the licenses must expire before the Act goes into operation. While that puts restrictions upon the effect of the law as far as bringing it into operation is concerned, it in no way imposes any restrictions on the repeal. It is true that it may be in operation in some Provinces where licenses might not be in operation, but this section refers only to the bringing of the Act into operation. It is said that these licenses may not expire for some weeks, and it is provided that, until the time has expired during which they are to operate, the Act shall not be in force. That is the provision, and it is clear that that is the intention of the law; and, when the hon. gentleman said that a year must expire before a licensing system could be brought into operation, he stated what is not the fact, and there is no such provisions in the statute, and there is no such regulation.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman has tried to show that he is capable of sitting upon a young member of this House, but I do not feel at all sat upon, to use a common phrase. The Act I referred to was the Act of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I say that it is so simple that any gentleman can understand it. The Act which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) accuses me of not understanding is an Act which he drew himself, and I do not think that any other legal gentleman understands it except himself—that is, the Canada Temperance Act. I had to acknowledge to the leader of the Opposition that I did not understand it, that I could not make head or tail of it. I believe in endeavoring to legislate upon principles, and not to attempt to split hairs. I think it may have been unintentionally confused, and I do not think I am as well able as the hon. gentleman to deal with matters of that kind in which hair splitting is required, but I propose to deal with material principles, and not to take up so much time in order to see whether one hon. gentleman or another expresses himself clearly or not. It was the principle I was after, and that, I think, should be the foundation of all legislation. I am very glad the hon. leader of the Opposition made the suggestion with regard to the 30 days. I think I was wrong, and I think the Government should be limited to a certain reasonable time to allow other parties to be heard. I am perfectly willing to accept that correction, and the amended phraseology as suggested by the hon. member in charge of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. With regard to the observations of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), I think his suggestion is very well worthy the consideration of the committee. It appears to me it would be well to provide by statute, instead of leaving it to Order in Council, that the vote should not take place for a repeal until within a short period before the Act may be brought to an end. It is not, however, at all germane to the proposition now before the Chair. I think it would be better, if my hon. friend would frame, as I suggested to him privately a moment ago, another clause with that object. I propose the following, if my hon. friend from South Norfolk will agree to allow this to be substituted for the amendment he has put into your hand:

When a petition for the revocation of an Order in Council for the bringing into operation of the second part has been adopted by the electors of the county or the city named therein, and to which the same relates, the Governor in Council may, at any time after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which the same was so adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare the second part of this Act shall no longer be in force.

I do not propose to answer my hon. friend from Bothwell about the construction of the law. It appears to me that it bears that construction, but to so high an authority I will not attempt, on any material matter of that kind, to waste the time of the committee. All I think the hon. member for South Norfolk meant to say was, that he had forgotten

more about this Bill than ever the hon. gentleman for Bothwell knew.

Amendment of Mr. Tisdale, as modified, agreed to.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I have an amendment which more properly applies to the second part of the Canada Temperance Act. It is within the knowledge of some hon. members that all suits under this Act are brought under the Summary Convictions Act; and there is a clause in that Summary Convictions Act to this effect:

"Every one who aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of any offence punishable on summary conviction, may be proceeded against and convicted either in the territorial division or place where the principal offender may be convicted, or in that in which the offence of aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring was committed."

I desire to introduce an amendment that will prevent a witness, on being asked if he had, at a certain time, bought any liquor of any person, from refusing to reply, taking advantage of that clause and saying that he does not wish to criminate himself. There is just such a clause that applies to the first part of the Canada Temperance Act, which, however, does not apply to the second. I can see no reason, and other legal gentlemen can see no reason why a witness should be allowed to take advantage, on being placed on the witness stand, of that part of the Summary Convictions Act, and refuse to answer questions and say that he does not wish to criminate himself. Therefore I copy the wording of the clause in the first part of the Canada Temperance Act, and would move this amendment:

No person shall be excused from answering any question put to him in any action, suit or other proceeding, in any court or before any judge, justice, or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate or other tribunal touching or concerning any infraction of the provisions of this Act, on the ground of any privilege or on the ground that the answer to such questions will tend to criminate such person; but no answer given by any person claiming to be excused on the ground of privilege or on the ground that such answer will tend to criminate himself, shall be used in any criminal proceeding against such person other than an indictment for perjury, if the judge, or justice or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate, or president of the tribunal, gives to the witness a certificate that he claimed the right to be excused, on either of the grounds aforesaid, and made full and true answers to the satisfaction of the judge, justice, or justices of the peace, stipendiary magistrate or tribunal.

I desire to have this amendment made, because in the constituency I represent, this Canada Temperance Act is in good working order, and it has been countenanced by the municipality, which has given an unlimited license, so far as funds are concerned, to carry out the provisions of the Act; and a firm of solicitors have been employed to see that the prosecutions are carried on in a proper manner. I may say that they have been very successful in that county in carrying out this Act, and the selling of liquor is reduced to a minimum. You can hardly find a shop in the county where liquor is to be sold, and if any infraction of the law is discovered, it is promptly put before the inspector, who just as promptly brings it before the proper tribunal. The inspector in that county has called my attention to this discrepancy in the Act, and I was asked to bring it before the House and to secure the proper amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that amendment properly belongs to the next Bill, which is one for the amendment of the same Act, in the hands of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I am afraid this provision would conflict with the amendment which my hon. friend has submitted to the committee. We had better deal with one thing at a time. I could not vote for the amendment. My feeling would be to expunge the clause from the Act compelling people to commit perjury or criminate themselves. But we had better not interfere with that matter in the present measure. I purposely dropped out from the Bill of last year everything of a controversial character, and this Bill is to simplify matters and is introduced practically with the consent of both sides and of all parties in the House.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to offer a suggestion in regard to this subject, and it is this: that there should be no procedure under this Act with respect to the mode of trial, the giving of testimony and the summoning of witnesses which does not apply to every other kind of conviction. I would rather suggest to the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, not in the line taken by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that this amendment belongs to the next Bill, but rather that it belongs to the Summary Convictions Amendment Act, and I have a Bill to amend that Act which I will introduce to-morrow, and it could come into that Bill more appropriately. If the principle is admitted and adopted, it should apply to all summary convictions, and if it is not a wise provision in regard to Summary Convictions Act it should not be adopted in regard to this Act.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. FISHER. I move an amendment as follows:—

No provision for the revocation of the Order in Council which declares the Canada Temperance Act in force shall be submitted to a vote of the electors more than fifteen days before the expiration of three years from the date of the Order in Council, which declared that the Act was in force in such county or city.

I have followed as closely as possible the wording of the Order in Council passed by the Government last summer, which fixes the date I have given, namely, not more than fifteen days before the expiration of the three years. I also propose that the amendment should come in before section No. 4. I move it after consulting with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who accepts the amendment and agrees that it should be inserted at the place I have indicated.

Mr. MILLS. It would be very convenient in those Provinces where there is a fixed date for issuing the licenses that there should be a provision in the Bill that the vote either for bringing the Act into operation or for its repeal should be taken very near the time at which licenses issue. The hon. gentleman will see that it would be highly convenient wherever there is a fixed date to issue the licenses to provide that voting on the Act shall take place immediately preceding that time. In Ontario, the date for issuing licenses is 1st May. Suppose the Act was repealed in July, what would be the condition of things from that month until May following?

Mr. McCARTHY. The law will come into force on 1st May, whatever time it may have been carried. The amendment provides that the vote for the repeal must take place during the last fifteen days of April, so that the mischief which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks may happen, cannot possibly occur. There might be an advantage if the voting took place on 1st January at the time of the municipal election, but on the other hand there would be a hiatus between January and 1st May when the law would not be in practical operation in the event of repeal.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IVES. I move:

That in cases where a county is divided for municipal purposes after having adopted the Canada Temperance Act of 1864 or the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, the vote for the repeal of the same or either thereof may be taken precisely as it might have been taken if said county had not been divided."

The difficulty is this: That under the Canada Temperance Act of 1864, sub-section 13 of section 4, provides for the case of repeal. It says that a by-law so approved or adopted, as the case may be, may be repealed by a by-law of the council of the municipality affected thereby and such by-law shall be submitted for approval to the electors in the manner and with the formalities provided by the foregoing sub-section. In the case of the division of a county into

two parts after the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act of 1864, there is no provision in the law for the passing of a repeal by-law or for a vote being taken to repeal that by-law. I am quite sure that if the committee or the House appreciates the difficulty they would be willing to adopt an amendment which would remove the difficulty in a case of this kind. Take the case of the county of Richmond, one of the counties which I represent. A by-law was passed by the county of Richmond several years ago under the old Dunkin Act or Canada Temperance Act of 1864 and since that by-law was adopted the county of Richmond has been divided for municipal purposes, and the town of Richmond has been incorporated as a municipality and has been separated entirely for municipal purposes from the county of Richmond. Legal gentlemen have advised the warden of the county that, under the Act, there is no machinery by which a repeal of the by-law can be passed upon at all. The council of the town of Richmond cannot adopt a by-law and have it submitted either to the town or county of Richmond, and the county of Richmond cannot adopt a by-law and have it submitted either to that part of the county which remains after deducting the town of Richmond from the county, nor can they submit it to the whole county as the law now stands. What I desire is that the part of the county which originally adopted this by-law should be permitted to repeal it, and that the machinery shall be adopted by the whole county as it originally stood at the time this by-law was adopted, and again vote upon the question of the continuance or repeal of this by-law. I once before introduced a resolution to this House on this subject and in that case I think my resolution was that the town of Richmond should be permitted to repeal the Act for the town of Richmond. That was refused by the House some years ago. At the present time I can see no good reason why the House should not be willing to afford a remedy in this case. I think there would be no disposition on the part of the House to condemn the county of Richmond to remain forever under the Act if the people did not wish to do so. I presume there is no disposition on the part of anyone to take advantage of a defect in the law, or the machinery, as it now exists. I am quite sure that the committee would be disposed to permit the whole county of Richmond to vote for its repeal, and that it would be willing to have an amendment to this Bill passed which would enable the whole county to adopt the by-law and to vote upon it as in the case of the Canada Temperance Act. I therefore place this motion in your hands, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would point out in the first place that there is no Canada Temperance Act of 1878 in existence, and in addition to that I think a very great difficulty may arise if that amendment is passed. It may not arise in connection with the territory to which the hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) refers, but I know of some counties in the Province of Ontario where if that amendment were adopted it would be utterly impossible to repeal the law. Take for instance the counties of Lennox and Addington. If the county of Lennox under that amendment could repeal the Scott Act which they probably could do because there is a sheriff and registrar's office in that county, but in the county of Addington there is neither a sheriff's nor a registrar's office, and there would be no place to deposit the petition, so that the Act would remain in force in perpetuity in one or other of those counties. That is the difficulty I see in connection with the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) if there has been any judicial decision upon the difficulty which he has just referred to? Has there been a decision from the court at Sherbrooke?

Mr. IVES. There has been a decision to this effect, that the Local Legislature in incorporating the town of Richmond, permitted, by the Act of incorporation, the town of Richmond to repeal the Dunkin Act and to issue licenses. The courts declared that to be *ultra vires* of the Local Legislature, and the state of affairs there now is that the council are granting certificates to the hotel keepers, which the hotel keepers are paying for, and the Local Government are refusing to issue licenses, and the sale of liquor is going on under municipal certificates, without licenses. A legal opinion has been obtained from several legal gentlemen, to the effect that under the Canada Temperance Act there is no machinery by which a vote can be taken. The law says a council may pass a repealing by-law, but there are two councils in this case, the council of the county and the council of the town, having no more connection than the county of Drummond with the county of Richmond. The first difficulty is that there is no council that has power to pass a repealing by-law. Then the law says the municipal officer shall be the returning officer, but there is no officer of that kind in common with the town and the county. Therefore there is no machinery for holding a poll, even if it were possible to get the repealing by-law passed. So the county is in a deadlock.

Mr. LAURIER. It strikes me that the objection is not so serious as the hon. gentleman would lead us to believe. If it were, it would follow that it would be in the power of the Provincial Legislature altogether to defeat the legislation of this Parliament. Now, I do not conceive that anything can be done by a Local Legislature which would have that effect. It is true, legal gentlemen may have given their opinion in that way, but legal gentlemen have also given the opposite opinion, and it seems to me it would be better to leave the question to be settled by the courts than to attempt to do it by new legislation, which I think would only make confusion worse confounded.

Mr. IVES. I would ask leave to withdraw the amendment I proposed, and to substitute this one, which has been kindly suggested to me by the hon. Minister of Justice:

The provisions of section 97 of the Canada Temperance Act shall be applicable to counties which have been divided for municipal purposes after the adoption of the Temperance Act of 1864.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the hon. Minister of opinion that this meets the objection?

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand from the discussion that the difficulty has arisen under section 97 of the Canada Temperance Act, owing to an opinion having been given from the bench that the provisions of that section can only be made applicable to the municipality that adopted the by-law, and that, therefore, they are not applicable where a county has been divided. I cannot conceive of any other objection than that arising, and it may be that that is the true construction of section 97, although I would hardly say that it is.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not say that the amendment may not be necessary, but in consequence of the Provincial Legislature—

Mr. IVES. In consequence of the division of the county. Mr. LAURIER. Divided under the legislation of the Provincial Legislature, and it would therefore be in the power of the Local Legislature to defeat any Act of this Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. That might have been the effect, as the body that had power to pass the repealing by-law no longer exists.

Mr. LAURIER. It opens up a very large question.

Mr. McCARTHY. That seems to be the effect of clause 97. An amendment of this kind is necessary so far as the

Dunkin Act is concerned, but not so far as the Canada Temperance Act is concerned. We ought to recognise the divisions made by the Local Legislature, and allow the council of a county formed out of any portion of an old county to petition. Since the adoption of the Act, the Muskoka portion has been taken from the county of Simcoe, and also from Victoria, and it has been formed into a new municipal district; and it appears to me that the principle we ought to follow is this: that where a new county has been created by the provincial body, that county ought to have the power to repeal the Act. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) shakes his head. I do not see why one county should be obliged to retain the Act by a vote of the majority in another county with which it was formerly connected. If it is separated from the old county for one purpose, it seems to me it ought to be separated for all purposes.

Mr. FISHER. I shook my head on this account: that the Canada Temperance Act comes within the electoral divisions established by the Acts of this Parliament, and has no reference whatever to either provincial or municipal divisions. In the Province of Ontario, it was not the electoral division established by the Local Legislature which voted on the Scott Act, but the Gerrymander divisions established by this Parliament. I do not see that it is necessary to have any reference whatever to the municipal or provincial divisions which may arise.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend is in error. The petition comes, not from the electoral divisions, but from the county. For instance, the County of Simcoe embraces a part of Muskoka for other purposes, and there are four or five electoral divisions in that county. I presume that my hon. friend's objection will be withdrawn, as it was made under misapprehension.

Committee rose and reported.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. JAMIESON moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: I trust that this Bill will receive the same kindly treatment which has been given to the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). In my opinion the measure is a far more important one, and one that should have received the attention of the House long ago. In fact many of its provisions were adopted by this House three years ago, but unfortunately the Upper Chamber would not consent to pass the Bill, at all events, in the shape in which it left this House. I propose, in the first instance, to give a very short explanation of the provisions of this Bill, and then to make some remarks on the present position of the Canada Temperance Act. The first provision is for the purpose of remedying a defect which was discovered in the application of the law. Those conversant with the law will recollect that a petition has to be deposited either in the registry office of the county or in the office of the sheriff of the county; and in the county of Perth, where a petition was deposited in one of the registry offices, there being two in the county, the result was that the people lost their petition. Now, I think that the purposes of this Act will be served if the petition is simply deposited in one registry office, and it is proposed to amend the law in that respect. The second and third clause of the Bill are for the purpose of making the Canada Temperance Act applicable to the Province of British Columbia, where, I understand, there are no municipal counties; and in order to make the Act applicable to that Province, we have provided that the petition shall be deposited in the office of the registrar of voters in the electoral divisions, as constituted for representation in the Dominion Parliament. It is not necessary for me to make any further reference to that point, because I think it was

Mr. McCARTHY.

the original intention of Parliament that the Act should apply to the whole Dominion. We also propose to make it applicable to the temporary judicial districts in the Province of Ontario, and, when such exists, in the other Provinces also, as there is no reason why, if the people of these temporary judicial districts should adopt the law, they should be deprived of it. The fifth clause of the Bill is no longer necessary because the hon. member for Brome has embodied the same amendment in the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe which has just passed through the committee, so that I shall have to ask the committee to allow me to expunge that clause. Now we propose making a change in section 94, but we think it will answer the purpose better to repeal the section and remodel it altogether rather than make changes by interlineation. We propose, in the first place, in repealing the old and enacting a new section, that medical men may prescribe in any quantities they think proper. At present they can only prescribe in quantities a pint and over, and I never could understand why the law was framed in that way. Frequently it is necessary for a medical man to prescribe small quantities of liquor, but under the present law it is impossible for them to do so. In addition to that we propose that a penalty shall be imposed on medical men giving colorless certificates. I do not think any respectable, honorable medical man can take offence at any provisions of this kind. But there are unfortunately in the medical as in other professions black sheep who will prostitute their position for the purpose of pecuniary gain, and who delight in evading the law. We propose also to repeal section 103, and to re-enact it in a simpler form. In the original Act, it will be observed, there is a special rule made for each Province. I am referring now to the judicial or magisterial authority before whom prosecutions may be brought, and it is proposed to simplify the procedure so that there will be one joint rule for the whole Dominion. Two or three of the following sections are simply for the purpose of making the law conform to the amendment to which I have just directed attention. One of the most important provisions of this Bill is in reference to the search clause. Difficulties have arisen in my own Province in reference to the administration of the law under section 108. Our courts have held that a search warrant, notwithstanding the provisions of that clause, cannot issue until after there has been a conviction. If the search clause is to be effective at all, it must be obvious that provision should be made by which a search should be made at any time and prior to a conviction. We propose to change the law in two respects. We propose that, on the oath of a credible witness that he has good cause to suspect and believe that liquor is kept for sale in violation of the second part of the statute, a magistrate may issue a search warrant; and we propose to extend the right of search to any hour. Perhaps some objection may be taken to this by hon. members of this House, but a much stronger provision than this exists in the license law of my own Province. I am not familiar with the license laws of the other Provinces, and I cannot speak in reference to them on this point, but I know that in my own Province there is a provision in the law by which search may be made at any time; and moreover, the right which is given under that law is so strong that a police officer or constable or inspector may at any time enter into any place where liquor is reputed to be sold, without any search warrant at all. Then, there is a provision in reference to the destruction of the liquor, and we propose also to provide a set of forms for the guidance of justices of the peace. There are some amendments which I shall be compelled to ask for when we go into committee. Lastly, I will refer to the last clause of the Bill, which provides for the application of the penalty. I

think it is only reasonable and proper that whatever authority—be it provincial or otherwise—undertakes the burden of enforcing the law should also have the benefits to be derived from it. That is all I have to say by way of explanation of the Bill, but I have some further remarks to make, and I shall proceed now to make them. It may be said, perhaps, that, after the result of the voting which took place on Thursday last on the Canada Temperance Act, its usefulness has gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is hard to understand what is the meaning of those "hear, hears," but, if the Canada Temperance Act has become unpopular, it is largely in consequence of its not being enforced properly, and I am afraid that the responsibility for that rests not so much upon this House as upon the Upper Chamber, where reasonable amendments to this law have been repeatedly refused. I believe there are other reasons which exist for the unpopularity of the law and one is that the law has not been efficiently enforced. I am now speaking in reference to my own Province. I may take for instance my own county. We had two inspectors appointed by the Ontario Government. We also had a police magistrate appointed. Shortly after the Act came into force a police magistrate was appointed by the Province of Ontario, but the courts held that the appointment, as far as the Canada Temperance Act was concerned, was invalid, and consequently he could act no longer, he could adjudicate on prosecutions no longer. What should have been done, in my judgment, was that he should have been re-appointed in a proper way. In the first instance, he was only appointed for each riding separately, and he should have been re-appointed for the whole county; but, instead of that being done the matter was allowed to stand in that loose way for some months, until practically the law was a dead letter on the Statute-book. All through the Province of Ontario we have had difficulties arising in connection with the enforcement of the law of this nature, and my contention is that, until a very recent period, if at all, the law has not had fair play as far as my own Province is concerned; but, if the law has not been effective, that is the greater reason why proper amendments should be made to it, so that, if it can be made effective, those who are promoting the law may have some reasonable means of operating it and standing behind it. It is quite true, and I recognise the fact, that on Thursday last a very serious blow was dealt to the Canada Temperance Act, and it may be possible that a series of disasters may follow; but the fact remains that, for another year at least, in from 50 to 60 counties in this Dominion, this law will be upon the Statute-book, and I believe it is the duty, not only of this Parliament, but of every subject in this Dominion, to do all in his power to aid in enforcing the law. Further, this law, as far as the temperance people of this Dominion were concerned, was of a tentative character in the first instance. I have stated before, and I repeat, that in the first place the temperance people of the Dominion never asked for a local option law, or at least not for the Canada Temperance Act. I am not sure but that, in the first instance, they asked for the old Dunkin Act. In 1875, the temperance people of this Dominion asked for a *plebiscite*, for a popular vote on this subject throughout the whole Dominion. The Government of that day refused to grant that request, but, in lieu of it, they offered this improved local option law. Well, the temperance people, of course, did not think proper to refuse it. They did not get all they wanted, but they accepted what they were offered. Now, when, in 1883, this Parliament was very largely petitioned in favor of the principle of general prohibition, we were told on every hand that we had a law on the Statute-book and it was our duty to operate that, that we could sound public opinion in regard to prohibition in that way, and that, in any case, we could have prohibi-

tion in any section where the people were favorable to it. Possibly that was a reasonable ground for Parliament to take. The temperance people immediately afterwards laid hold of the Canada Temperance Act. They adopted it over a large area of this Dominion, and, if the Canada Temperance Act has not proved as satisfactory as the friends of temperance could have desired, it is not the fault of the temperance people, and they are now in a position to come back to Parliament and say: "We have done what you told us to do, and now we make a further demand, and that is the demand of general prohibition." In my judgment, Sir, the vote which took place on Thursday last is no indication that the temperance or prohibition sentiment in this country is waning in any degree. It is quite true that an unfavorable gale has struck the prohibition ship, and she has lurched for a time, but we live in hope that a favorable gale from heaven will soon fill her sails and waft her on to the destined haven.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is only blessed spirits which come from heaven.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am not prepared to admit that the Canada Temperance Act has been a failure. I am prepared to admit that so far it has not realised the expectations of those who framed it; but that it has been a failure in every sense of the word I most emphatically deny. I have some figures here that I intend to give to the House, which satisfy me, at all events, that the Act has proved effective in curtailing the traffic in intoxicating liquor. I refer to the license report published by the Provincial Secretary for the Province of Ontario. From that report I take 20 counties in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force. I take the number of convictions or commitments to prison for drunkenness in 1884, when the Canada Temperance Act was only in force in one county in the Province of Ontario, that is, the county of Halton; and I take the number of commitments for the year 1887, when the Canada Temperance Act was in force in 20 and more counties in that Province. In those counties the number of commitments in the year 1882 was 756; in 1887, in the same counties, under the Canada Temperance Act, the number of commitments was only 214, or a deduction of 542 cases. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this indicates in the strongest possible way that the Canada Temperance Act has, to a certain degree, been effective in preventing drunkenness. It has been said that there has been an increase in certain counties, and Brant, Carleton, Frontenac, and Middlesex have been instanced as counties in which the Scott Act was in force, and the number of commitments for drunkenness has increased. Now, Sir, those who used that argument have not been honest in doing so. The fact must not be overlooked that these counties have attached to them cities of considerable size in which the Canada Temperance Act has not been in force. For instance, the county of Brant has the city of Brantford attached to it; the county of Carleton has the city of Ottawa attached to it; the county of Frontenac has the city of Kingston, and the county of Middlesex the city of London. Now, I would refer to the commitments for drunkenness in some 13 counties in which the Canada Temperance Act has not been in force, and compare the year 1884 with the year 1887. In 1884 the number of commitments was 3,280; in 1887 the number was 2,851. It will be seen there was a decrease of a little over 400, or a decrease of about one-seventh in the counties in which the Canada Temperance Act was not in force, whereas there has been a decrease of about one-third in those counties in which the Act has been in force. Then, again, I shall refer the House to a few figures in reference to the consumption of spirits since 1880 up to the present time, for the purpose of showing that the Canada Temperance Act, or some other good influence, is decreasing the con-

sumption of liquor. It will be observed that from 1880 up to a certain period the consumption of spirits in this Dominion increased, whereas since 1886, there has been a decrease. In 1880, the quantity of spirits manufactured for home consumption was 2,296,987 gallons; the quantity imported for the same purpose was 1,445,009 gallons. In 1881, there was a slight decrease. In 1882, the quantity ran up to 4,029,067 gallons manufactured for home consumption, and the imports were 1,666,173. In 1885, the quantity manufactured for home consumption was 4,274,722 gallons, and there were imported for home consumption 964,181 gallons. In 1886, when the Canada Temperance Act, came into force in a large section of this Dominion, the quantity of liquor manufactured for home consumption fell to 2,478,098 gallons, and the imports fell to 906,019 gallons. Last year again there was a considerable decrease. Now, Sir, in my judgment the good influence that has been at work is the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, which has reduced the consumption of liquor in this Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more remarks to make before I sit down. I was placed in a very embarrassing position on Wednesday last in reference to this question in this House, and this is the first opportunity I have had of entering into an explanation of my connection with it, and I am quite sure the House will indulge me for a short time while I make reference to it. I was charged by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with having obstructed, rather than advanced, amendments to the Canada Temperance Act; and he referred to the occasion, last year, when an effort was about to be made to advance the Bill out of its proper order in the same way that was done three years ago; and the hon. member for Bothwell charged me with having opposed that movement. Well, Sir, I made an explanation a week ago, on Monday last, in this House, as to the manner in which we have co-operated on both sides of this House in temperance legislation. I stated, in answer to the hon. member for Bothwell, that the action I took on the occasion to which he refers, was the result of a conference had between the temperance men of the two political parties in this House. I now make that statement just as emphatically as I made it on that occasion. Unfortunately the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) had forgotten a meeting to which I made reference. The Bill was not introduced last year as soon as it might have been under other circumstances. The circumstances which preceded the introduction of the Bill were these: The Dominion Alliance, which has advised us all through, was here when the House was in session, and I was not requested until the meeting of the Alliance was held to introduce this Bill last session. It was down on the Order Paper in the ordinary way. When it was found impossible to reach the measure in the ordinary way, I had a conference with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), and we concluded to call a meeting of the friends of temperance in this House—we had called them together on former occasions—not a large meeting but a few of those who took some interest in the cause of temperance. I was to notify hon. members on my side of the House and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was to notify hon. members on his side of the House. That meeting was held. There are, I think, in the House, I do not know whether they are in the House to-night or not, but I can give the names of the gentlemen present at that meeting, and it may refresh the memory of the hon. member for Brome. I would not enter into this explanation if it were not for the fact that in the public press I have been grossly misrepresented in this matter, and I am resolved with the indulgence of the House to put myself right. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was present at that meeting, and I think he will corroborate what I say in regard to it. The hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), was also present. The hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman), was also present.

Mr. JAMIESON.

Senator Vidal presided at the meeting. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was present, and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who sits on the other side of the House, informed me the other day that he was present at the meeting. I do not charge the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) with wrong-doing in the matter, but I think it is unfortunate, so far as I am personally concerned, that his memory is at fault, because the meeting was certainly held and my action in regard to this Bill was governed entirely by the action of that meeting. I have no desire to allow the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to misrepresent me before this House. I can tell that hon. gentleman that I have a record upon this question to which he cannot point. When the Dunkin Act was submitted in my county I took the platform in favor of it and it was adopted. Afterwards when the Scott Act was being promoted in my county I pursued a similar course, and in so doing gave offence to a large number of my political supporters; I risked my seat in the House on that question, and I am not prepared to submit to any taunt from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in regard to my course upon the temperance question in this House. I should like to ask if the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has in his capacity as an elector of the Dominion ever cast a vote for the Temperance Act? I should like to know if that hon. gentleman ever stood on a public platform to advocate the cause of temperance, more especially in the interests of the Canada Temperance Act? I should like to know what course that hon. gentleman pursued in this House last session when the question of prohibition was before the House? When that question was introduced into the House by myself, at the request of the Dominion Alliance, there were several amendments proposed to it. There was a wine and beer amendment, there was a repeal of the Scott Act amendment. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stood his ground and voted upon those two amendments; but when the crucial question came, the question of compensation and the main motion in reference to prohibition, where was the hon. gentleman to be found? Not in this Chamber—he slunk out of the Chamber.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. JAMIESON. I say he slunk out of the Chamber. He beat the record of Maud S. in getting out of the Chamber when the prohibition vote was before the House.

Mr. MILLS. I voted.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) stood up valiantly four times, but I have no doubt that the old poetic adage that—

“He who fights and runs away,
Will live to fight another day,”

occurred to him, and he retreated and was not to be found when the main motion and the money compensation amendment were disposed of by this House.

Mr. MILLS. I voted on it. I voted against prohibition.

Mr. JAMIESON. No; I beg your pardon. It is not in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS. I was here and voted, and my vote was recorded.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have little more to say on this question, but I am resolved that at all events I will place my position before the House and I trust to some extent before the country, because my record is clear upon this question, and I am not open to the charge of inconsistency which was hurled across the floor on a former occasion this Session when the question of prohibition was before the House. I will refer to one other matter. Because I voted against the resolution or rather an amendment introduced by the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to the reformation or reconstitution of the Senate, foresooth I must be charged with voting against temperance. I referred the other day to the fact that in 1874 the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) introduced a resolution into this House and submitted a motion in regard to the reconstitution of the Senate, that resolution received the assent of this House or of the House then assembled. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) afterwards entered the Cabinet of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and he did not take one single step in the direction in which the resolution pointed. If he were sincere upon that question he ought, while a member of the Cabinet, while his friends were in power and in a large majority, to have placed in some practical form upon the Statute book of the country his scheme in reference to the reformation of the Senate. I am at one with him in reference to the constitution of the Senate, but the hon. gentleman excused himself the other day on the ground that he believed the course he pursued last year was the proper course in bringing up a matter of that kind. But the hon. gentleman forgets that last year he placed upon the notice paper a similar resolution to the one which he introduced in 1874 in reference to the constitution of the Senate. So that, on two occasions he introduced the question as a substantive motion and only on one occasion as a motion of a want of confidence in the Government. But I said then—I believe I was misrepresented in regard to the last motion which the hon. gentleman made in this House—on the amendment moved on going into Committee of Supply that I did not vote against the amendment on the ground that it was a motion of want of confidence in the Government. I voted it on the ground that it would be a breach of the understanding which has existed for years between the temperance men in the two political parties in this country. It is an understood principle, a formulated principle on which the Dominion Alliance is based that all action in reference to the temperance question shall emanate from that Alliance and that they shall receive the support as far as possible of the temperance men of both sides of this House. The other day when I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I voted consistently. I voted on the lines laid down by the Dominion Alliance and if I had voted otherwise I would have been voting want of confidence in the Dominion Alliance of which I am a member. I have no hesitation in saying here to-night that the course that the member for Bothwell has pursued has been a most disastrous one for the cause of temperance in this country. A paid agent of the opponents of prohibition in this House could not have pursued a course more detrimental to the interests of temperance than the course pursued by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have placed my views on this question before the House and I am sorry I was obliged to go into this personal matter, but there was considerable provocation and perhaps this is the only occasion on which I will have an opportunity of doing so. I believe that I have succeeded in showing, in the judgment at all events of every reasonable man, that my course upon the prohibition and temperance question has been a consistent one not only in my own county, but also in this the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rather regret that this personal question has entered into the discussion at so early a stage, upon the second reading of what I believe to be a very important measure in the interests of the people of Canada. After the words which have fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and since my name has been mentioned so often by him I think it necessary that I should say a few words upon this point. In the first place I wish to allude to the discussion which occurred here a little while ago upon the motion for total prohibition, moved by that hon. gentleman. On that

occasion my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was speaking to that motion and in the course of his remarks he alluded to the action of my hon. friend from Lanark. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), interrupting him, made some remarks which, I confess, I did not thoroughly understand nor catch. In those remarks he made reference to my name. I did not then make any reply, but later on, in the course of that debate, I did make use of a few words which I will now read. I said:

"What meeting are you referring to?"

"Mr. JAMIESON. The one that was called last year to bring up this question. You recollect it."

I replied:

"I am not aware of any meeting at which it was decided that we should not push the temperance question as fast as we can."

I think those words explain themselves. In case they do not completely I may say this; I understood the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to imply that the temperance members of this House connected with the Alliance had held a meeting at which they decided not to push the Scott Act amendments then before the House. I denied that, because I knew they had no meeting at which the members of this House representing the Alliance came to any such conclusion as that they would not push their own Bill as far as possible. I find on reference to the *Hansard* that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) when he made reference to that meeting stated that that meeting had decided that we should not ask the Government to take up the Bill we had before the House. I misunderstood him. Had I understood him I would have agreed with him that there was a meeting of members of the Alliance which had decided not to ask the Government to press that motion. I may say in reference to that question that I myself was desirous of asking the Government to take up the Scott Act amendments of last Session and make them law. When I found, as I did find, that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House were prepared to vote against such a motion asking the Government to take up the measure, I did not wish to make any split between myself and those hon. temperance gentlemen who are working with me, and, therefore, I did not propose the resolution or the question at the meeting under reference. I, myself, believe it would be in the interest of the people of this country that the Government should take up those amendments to the Scott Act, and I would be glad to see them do it. When I did arrange, as I had arranged in the earlier part of the Session, to work in conjunction with several gentlemen on the lines of this Temperance amendment Bill, I was anxious that there should not be any split between us on the motion before this House. As far as I was concerned I, therefore, refrained from making any motion or urging any motion which would make a split between the temperance members of this House who belonged to the Dominion Alliance. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has just now alluded to the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) which was made this Session, and I must take most serious exception to some of the references he made in regard to the Dominion Alliance. It is true, Sir, that those hon. members of this House, who are members of the Dominion Alliance, met together for the discussion of their business and their work before this House. In so far as these gentlemen are members of the Alliance, I believe it to be their duty to work in harmony and to support such motions as may be authorised and as may be introduced into this House by them, as members of the Dominion Alliance. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman goes further and intimates that temperance people in this House are only to work on the lines which the Dominion Alliance lays down I most seriously differ from him

and emphatically say that I cannot allow such an inference to go abroad, or such a statement of the opinions of the Dominion Alliance to go on record here in Parliament, for such is not the case. The Dominion Alliance has certain views and the Dominion Alliance by means of the members of that body who are members of this House introduced certain resolutions or motions. As far as those motions are concerned, I, as a member of the council of the Dominion Alliance, felt it to be my duty to support them, and to act in accordance with the spirit of them, but as far as my action on temperance matters as a member of this House is concerned, and as representing a constituency in this House, that I shall allow myself or my motions or my speeches to be trammelled by the Dominion Alliance, or by the council of the Dominion Alliance, I emphatically deny. I do not believe for an instant that is the temper or the spirit of the council of the Dominion Alliance. Last session of the Alliance when the Council held their meeting in Ottawa the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) made some such statement. I denied it there, and I informed the council of the Alliance that if that was their opinion, and their views on my duty as a member, I must withdraw from the council. But, Sir, did the council endorse my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson)? Not a bit of it. They sat silent and did not endorse his action, but they practically accepted the explanation of their views and their objects which I laid down, and did not for an instant suggest that his interpretation of their views was right. This motion, which is now before us, is a motion which has been framed in the lines of the Dominion Alliance, and as such I had, in former years, the pleasure of seconding the motion moved by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) in the introduction of a similar Bill to this. It happened this year that I was out of the House when the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) moved for leave to introduce this Bill, and my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) acted as seconder to the motion. I am glad to see it so. Although I am not to-day the seconder of the motion, as I have been in times past, I thoroughly endorse it, I thoroughly concur in the views expressed in this Bill, and I trust it will pass the House and become law. I may say that last winter, before this House met, having had in view the experience of the members of the Alliance who had introduced this Bill previously and that when we introduced it it was late in the Session and could not become law; I took upon myself as one interested in this question to write to a member of the Executive Council of the Dominion Alliance and I urged that gentleman that the council should ask Mr. Jamieson to introduce this measure before the council met in Ottawa pointing out the fact that if the council of the Dominion Alliance wished afterwards to make any amendment or introduce any changes in the Bill, that might be done when the Bill went into committee. I am glad that the Executive Council of the Dominion Alliance followed out that plan of action, and wrote to Mr. Jamieson requesting him to introduce this Bill as early in the Session as possible; and I am glad to know that the hon. member for Lanark did introduce the Bill very much earlier than it has generally been introduced into the House, and I trust that in consequence of this fact, the Bill may become law this Session. I will not now go into the details of the Bill. My hon. friend from Lanark, I think, has carefully and successfully explained them, and, perhaps, in the unsatisfactory state of my voice, I would not have made these remarks had I not deemed it necessary that some correction should be made of the statements made by the hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think, before this House is asked for exceptional legislation in the promotion of a movement which certainly does not stand before the country as well as it did some time ago, its advocates should at least settle

Mr. FISHER,

their own quarrels, and not take up the time of the House with them. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) endeavored to explain the reason why the Scott Act has been rejected in nine counties in the Province of Ontario; but I do not think he at all touched the real reason, which is, in my opinion, not only that the Act has not been effective, but because the people of this country have determined that they will not submit to the sort of tyrannical dictation that has been sought to be forced upon them by those who have been advocating what has been erroneously called the temperance movement. I deny the right of these gentlemen to that name, because temperance and total abstinence are two different things. I claim for myself, as well as for the majority of this House, and perhaps every man in it, the right to be called temperance men, but the claim of total abstainers to that title is an assumption that cannot be too often condemned. Temperance does not consist in total abstinence; it does not consist in denying oneself absolutely; but it does consist in using things in a manner consistent with the exercise of the various faculties given to us and in obedience to the laws of this country. I say the real cause of the rejection of the Scott Act is that the people have revolted from the spiritual dictation which women of the Christian Temperance Union and the various total abstinence bodies have put upon them during the last few years. Will any one tell us that the failure on the Dominion Government to do what they were called on to do, or the failure of Ontario magistrates and inspectors to enforce the Act, could have brought about a change of 1,400 majority in favor of the Act in one year to a majority of 3,000 against it three years afterwards? I do not think the cause can be found in any of these sources. The cause of the failure, I believe, is that the people have come to the conclusion that the whole attempt to force total abstinence upon them by law is a mistake, contrary to common sense, contrary to experience, contrary to the reasoning of every man who exercises his reason, and also due to the fact that those who have had control of this Act and have had ample power to carry it out, have failed to do so, and the Act has been inoperative. In the county of Simcoe, from the very first month that Act was nominally in force, it was not carried out. During the whole of those three years, with the exception of a few months, liquor has been sold openly in every bar in the county. In the town of Barrie, where I live, there has not been one month during those three years during which liquor has not been openly and avowedly sold without any attempt at prevention. Of course, a few prosecutions have taken place, and the hotel-keepers have been fined, but not having to pay for licenses, they could afford to pay the fines inflicted, and even very much heavier ones. But the fact is that those who voted for the Act were apparently indifferent whether it was carried out or not, and they made no serious attempt to carry it out. They did get a magistrate appointed to carry it out, and he was not in office more than a few months when, strong partisan as he was, the Ontario Government dismissed him for malfeasance. I think, under these circumstances, it will be folly in us to give the advocates of this measure any greater powers than those they now possess. Last year, when this question was up, I thought it was only fair, considering that the Act had been passed in a great many counties, that those who advocated it should have every opportunity to carry it out, and I for one voted against its repeal, not because I had any faith in it or thought it could be effective, but because I thought its advocates should have every opportunity to carry it out. Now, Sir, they have had their three years, and they have failed ignominiously. I venture to say that in every county in which it has been adopted there has been more liquor sold, more drunkenness, and from my own observation I can say there has been more perjury and ill-feeling created by the Scott Act than by any other law that

we have ever had on the Statute-book of this country. If the Act merely failed to stop the sale of liquor, that would be comparatively a small thing; but when we consider the perjury and prevarication which it has caused, and the nefarious means resorted to by its advocates to get prosecutions, it has brought the law into contempt. What is the effect of having a law that the people will not respect? It has the effect of making them disregard all law. Therefore, I think this House is justified, after the experience the country has had of this legislation, in saying that it will not be any further extended. The evils that it has caused are far greater than any good it has effected. It has had this effect, that there has practically been free trade in liquor. Where liquor was sold in ten or a dozen houses before the Scott Act came into force, since it has been in operation it has been sold in fifty or sixty places without any restriction whatever. We know that the inspectors, men appointed by Mr. Mowat himself, and supposed to be competent to carry out this law, occasionally, for the sake of making a little show, bring up the proprietor of a respectable public house and fine him, but they never attempt to enforce the law in the fifty or sixty places where liquor was known to be sold in much larger quantities than it would be in respectable houses. To show you how unfairly the Act works, in my own constituency there were two or three public houses within two or three miles of each other. In one of them, when the Scott Act came in force, the publican said he would sell no more liquor, he closed his bar, disposed of his stock and did not sell another glass. Another man, three miles off, set the law at defiance, and sold more liquor than he ever did before. The consequence was that the first man, a friend of mine, who stopped selling liquor and kept a temperance house in obedience to the law, lost his business was starved out, and had to shut up his house altogether, while the man who continued to sell liquor has been going on selling it ever since. Two or three prosecutions were brought against him, but they failed; and even if he had been fined two or three times, he could well afford to pay the fines because he made more money under the Scott Act than ever he did before. Knowing from experience that this law has not only been inoperative but has done an immense deal of mischief and been the cause of any amount of ill-feeling and false swearing, and brought all law into contempt, and has failed in every respect to secure its object, this is not the time of day for the advocates of that measure to ask for increased legislation. Holding these views, not being afraid to act up to my convictions, I move that this Bill be read this day six months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I intend to say but very little with reference to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, and desire only to make a few observations with regard to the speech which was addressed to the House by this hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill. The hon. gentleman said that I am not so zealous a supporter of the cause of prohibition as he. He declared that he has taken the platform in favor of prohibition outside of the House, that he has supported prohibition here, that whenever he opposed it he had good reason, and he assures the House that when the Bill was before the House last year I shirked the vote. I knew that statement was not correct; I knew that the hon. gentleman, with his usual accuracy, whether in speaking of himself or somebody else, addressed to this House observations that were not warranted in fact. I hold the Journals of the House of last year, and I find in them that the House was called on last year, on the 13th June, to vote on this question. Four divisions were taken on the subject. On the first division 38 voted yea and 145 nay. My name is recorded as one of the 145. On the second division 47 voted yea and 136 nay, and I find my name recorded as one of the 136. On the third division 91 voted yea

and 88 nay, and I was one of the 91. On the fourth division 70 voted yea and 112 nay, and my name is one of the 112. These are all the divisions that took place, and in every one of them I voted. Yet the hon. gentleman not only informed us that I shirked the vote, but informed us with what celerity I left my place when I shirked the vote on that occasion. The House will full appreciate from this that although the hon. gentleman may be a zealous advocate of temperance, he has not a very great regard for accuracy in any statement he may make. The hon. gentleman's observations, in criticising my actions last year, are, as the House will see, as worthy of credence as the hon. gentleman's declaration that he is a zealous supporter of temperance. I have said that the hon. gentleman supported the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who is notoriously opposed to this Bill, and I believe the hon. member for South Lanark supported the hon. gentleman who professes to be a zealous advocate of prohibition. I said that they hunted in couples, that the hon. member for South Lanark brought the support of those opposed to prohibition to the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman secured the support of the prohibitionists to the hon. member for South Lanark.

Mr. JAMIESON. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me—

Mr. MILLS. I do not intend that the hon. gentleman shall interrupt me. If he wishes to make any more incorrect statements, he can take some other occasion to make them. There was a local election in the hon. gentleman's constituency, and the president of the prohibition committee and a member of the Temperance Alliance was a candidate. Whom did the hon. gentleman support in opposition to that candidate? He supported a party who was notoriously opposed to prohibition; and yet the hon. gentleman comes here and poses not only as an apostle of prohibition, but as the very Messiah of a measure of that sort. The hon. gentleman tells us he is a zealous, warm and sincere advocate of the cause of temperance. I remember not long ago being at a railway station in the city of St. Thomas, where there was a party who seemed rather the worse of something stronger than cold water, and he was assuring a clergyman standing by that he was a very great advocate of prohibition. "Well," said the clergyman, "let me tell you a story. A friend of mine on the Mohawk had a tame woodchuck which could occasionally stand up beside to him and seem to say: 'I am your woodchuck.' Well, said he, there was a little animal with white stripes down its back, which would stand up and say: 'I am your woodchuck;' and when I kicked him out of the way, I found he did not smell like it." So the hon. gentleman may be a zealous advocate of prohibition, but his conduct in and out of the House does not look like that of a prohibitionist. The hon. gentleman said that my statement the other night in reply to him was incorrect. Why, when the First Minister proposed to take Wednesdays as Government days, I proposed that the hon. gentleman should put his motion on the Government Notices in order that it might be reached, and I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) to make a motion to that effect. He told me he had gone to the hon. gentleman and asked him to propose to put this Bill on the Government Orders, and what reply did he make? He told him he would serve his party first.

Mr. JAMIESON. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) He said more. He said: If the Government would not agree to such a proposition, he would vote for the Government and against the proposition to put the motion on Government Orders. That is the authority for my statement. The hon. gentleman came here and told me that at the time. The hon. gentleman would not come into the House and ask the First Minister to put

his Bill upon the Government Orders, because the Government were taking a day from private members. While he wished to appear before the country and to pose as the apostle of temperance, he was not prepared to take the first step to carry it out. The hon. gentleman asks what the member for Bothwell has done for prohibition—has he ever appeared on a public platform in regard to it, has he ever spoken at a public meeting in favor of it? Well, Sir, I have told my constituents my views on this subject, and, as a member of the Government, I assisted in putting upon the Statute-book the only measure which has been put there by a Government. The Dominion Alliance stated that it was the duty of the Government to deal with the subject. The Dominion Alliance employed Mr. Watson, who was afterwards, I believe, taken in as a Government official, to lecture the people in regard to it, and in every speech he made Mr. Watson declared that it was the duty of the Government to take up that subject and to deal with it. We agreed with that, we did take it up, and we dealt with it, but when we suggested that the men whom the hon. gentleman supports should deal with it, and should deal with it as public opinion had shown it was necessary to deal with it, what course did the hon. gentleman take? He voted against the proposition we made, in which our sincerity was shown by our having done what we suggested that they should do. In what position does the hon. gentleman appear before the country? He appears before the country as the impediment of the temperance movement. If there is any sincerity in what he says, why did he not vote for the amendment, why did he not say that the Government whom he supports and to whom he has given his confidence should act in this way? The people have acted in favor of this measure in many cases, they have actively put it into force, and he was entitled to ask the Government of which he is a supporter either to repeal the measure or to adopt such amendments as experience had shown to be necessary. He did neither. He went before the Alliance and said: Our measure has been rejected by the Senate chamber, and I am henceforth in favor of an elective Senate. But, when I proposed that we should make the Senate elective, what did he say? Notwithstanding the pledge which he had given to the Alliance, notwithstanding his statement that he would seek to change the constitution of that House which stands in the way of progressive legislation, he said, I will stand by my party and vote against my convictions and against my principles, and I will not vote for any change in the constitution of the Senate. What excuse did he offer for his course in that matter? That it was a party movement. If we agreed with the hon. gentleman in every view he has ever expressed, he is ready to support those with whom he does not agree; because it is a party question, and he would vote against his principles in order to support his party. Yet, the hon. gentlemen says, I am here as the apostle of temperance and as the exponent of the views of the Alliance. The hon. gentleman talks as if this House had no right to deal with the temperance question unless the Alliance is allowed to dictate to it the measure it should support, and the kind of legislation which should be carried through. I do not admit any such doctrine. If any special class of the community is aggrieved, I am ready to listen to their grievance, and, if the grievance is well founded, I am ready to be the exponent of justice in the matter, and to redress the wrong; but when any portion of the community proposes a measure to affect the community at large, then I say that their voice is merged in that of the whole community, and I decline to be the exponent of a particular class. We dealt with this matter as a Government. We investigated the matter for ourselves, we framed our own measure and carried it through on our own responsibility, taking the risk of defeat; and, if the hon. gentleman's colleagues, or his masters rather, were to deal with the matter, I am sure that they

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

would judge for themselves and would not consent to be merely the mouthpiece of an Alliance. Those gentlemen are entitled to respect, but, when the hon. gentleman comes here and professes to speak for the Alliance, and for the Alliance alone, he does not sit as a member of Parliament, he does not vote as a member of the Parliament of Canada, but he professes to vote and act as something altogether different from a member of this Parliament. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says that he is opposed to this legislation altogether. He says it has not been efficient or operative. Why not?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Because public opinion was against it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If public opinion was against it, it would not have been adopted. It is only where public opinion favors it that it comes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows well that the chief difficulty in the operation of this law is the refusal of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to assume the responsibility of legislating on the subject in the way which experience has shown to be necessary. The hon. First Minister knows that the House at the other end of this building is his creature; he created it; they are the sheep of his pasture; they will do what he bids them, and, if he proposed any legislation on this subject, there would be no difficulty in carrying it through that House. It is true that a majority might not agree with the legislation he proposed, but we know that nine times out of ten the majority on the other side of this House do not agree with the legislation he proposes, but they vote for it nevertheless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They say "no," but there have been cases in the past month in regard to which hon. gentlemen on that side have changed two or three times, and the hon. gentleman who sits beside the First Minister has proposed that they shall change again. I do not intend to discuss that matter, but I simply refer to it in order to show the extraordinary power which the hon. gentleman and his colleague possess over the members on that side of the House. The hon. the First Minister possesses even still more power over the Chamber at the other end of this building. Therefore it was necessary that the hon. gentleman should have proposed this measure and carried it through this House, and, my word for it, there would not have been the slightest hesitation in carrying it through the House at the other end of this building. For that reason especially, if not for that reason more than any other, I thought it important to press upon the House the propriety of the Government taking this question up. If the Government think the law is wrong they ought to propose its repeal, and if they do not, the hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) ought to propose an expression of regret that the Government have not proposed its repeal; but if the Government agree with the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), they ought to propose the amendments which are necessary to the measure, and ought to assume the responsibility of carrying them through that House through which alone it will be carried by the aid and support of the Government.

Mr. FREEMAN. I beg to say to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that he has been talking as though he had made a motion in this House tending to prohibition or to the amendment of the Scott Act. I never heard of such a motion from him. If he had done so, I certainly should have voted for it; I could not have voted against it; but, if I understood properly what he proposed, he wanted some one else to take it up, he wanted the Government to take it up. Now that is a very nice way for people to get rid of doing a thing they do not like to do themselves, to call upon somebody else to do it. Had the hon. member for Bothwell taken up these resolutions, had he made that

motion before the House, he would have found every temperance man on this side of the House with him. Now, he says that the First Minister can have this House to follow him wherever he chooses. I wonder if anybody follows the hon. member for Bothwell. What did he do the other night when he wanted to press the Government to do that which they did not wish to take upon themselves? Hon. gentlemen opposite voted solid for him, if I recollect correctly. Certainly some of them are not temperance men; they do not generally vote with us upon this temperance question, but they followed him because he was their leader for the time being, they followed him just as closely as any body of men could follow their leader. Why, then, does he find fault when we follow our leader? But what he says with regard to the following on this side is not the case. I mean to say distinctly and emphatically that the statements made in that regard are wholly incorrect. Now, I wish to say a word with regard to my vote on that occasion. The hon. gentleman tries to mystify the matter very much. I was at the Dominion Alliance the day on which the hon. member for Bothwell brought in his resolution. I formed one of the committee on legislation, and as we sat at the table the question arose whether we should press this matter upon the Government, and the committee decided that the Government should not be asked to take that question in hand, but that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should take it in hand. That was the position of that committee of the Dominion Alliance. And we could do nothing else. If we wanted to act like men at all in the matter, after having decided that was the course we should pursue in this House, it was our duty to pursue that course, and we did it. At the same time, if the hon. gentleman for Bothwell had stepped in and taken the matter out of the hands of the hon. member for Lanark, I dare say the hon. member for Lanark would not have found any great fault; I am sure he would not, and that he would have voted for him. But the hon. member for Bothwell did not do that, and now he is trying to get into the position of a leader of the temperance party in this House, as if he had done all that was to be done, and that we were faithless because we did not follow him. I do not know the hon. gentleman's record upon this temperance question, but I cannot learn anything of it that would lead me to follow him very closely. I have made enquiries and I have asked: "What position has the hon. member for Bothwell occupied in this temperance reform for the last 50 years?" I said: "Did you ever know him to be a foremost man; what has he done; has he stood out upon the platform and vindicated the cause of temperance when we had scores and hundreds of just such men as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) opposed to us? When we had all the ability of the land opposed to us, when we were weak, few and despised? Did the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) then stand up with us? But, to day Sir, when it has become somewhat fashionable, he wants to make favor with us. And, Sir, no man in the country would hail him quicker than myself as one of our leaders if he would come out with us heart and soul and not stand in the position so many hon. gentlemen stand in to-day, saying: "I am a very temperate man, only, mark you, I am not a fanatic." Those kind of men had better stand away from us. I think the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) takes a much more creditable course than some others. He says: "I am opposed to you, I am opposed to your pulpits, I am opposed to your ministers, I am opposed to your women societies," and I do not know but that he is opposed to the women also. When we deal with that hon. gentleman we know where we are. Now, Sir, I will come to the point in hand. I beg to say to hon. gentlemen that I am not here to make sport for anybody. I am arguing in the cause of justice and right, I am arguing for what I believe is of more importance to this country than any thing that has ever been before this

Parliament. I believe this prohibition cause is one upon which the prosperity of this country in a large measure depends. The lives of hundreds of people are hanging upon this very question. There are thousands of orphans to-day that are crying for bread because of this rum traffic which we are denouncing, and it is not to me a cause for mirth, at all events. It is a cause that is to-day making the hearts of many men and women to grieve, and making them to bow their heads in anguish. Now, in relation to this Temperance Act, there are some hon. gentlemen who wish to hurl their shafts against prohibition. We will not quarrel with the hon. gentlemen about the word "temperance." We know what the meaning of the word "temperance" is, but the total abstinence have adopted that word by which their principles of total abstinence are understood. I hope hon. gentlemen will not find too much fault with us about that. We say distinctly that by temperance we mean total abstinence; if they do not, we will not quarrel with them. But they do not mean the same kind of temperance that we mean. I say that when they hurl their shafts of ignominy and ridicule at the Canada Temperance Act, I beg them to remember that we do not think them at all damaging to the cause of prohibition. Now, because of the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act in several counties of Ontario, they tell us that we must collapse, that this whole temperance reform of ours must go back, that we are defeated. Sir, I do not think so at all. For my part I am very little discouraged from the fact that these seven counties have repealed the Act. You have to remember that a few years ago they adopted the Act by a large majority, and they are only to-day going back to where they were before. Now, what has the Canada Temperance Act done since it was first brought into operation? The House will bear in mind that it was not forced on any county, it cannot be forced on any county, or on any section of the people, or on any riding, as you call counties in Ontario. Any county that chooses to adopt the Scott Act, will do so; and any county that prefers not to adopt it, will not do so; so it is altogether a local option Act. But what has it done during the last eight years? Nova Scotia has 18 counties and one city, of which 13 counties have adopted the Act. New Brunswick has 14 counties and two cities, of which ten counties and two cities have adopted the Act. Manitoba has five counties and one city, of which two counties have adopted the Act. Prince Edward Island has three counties and one city, all of which have adopted the Act. Ontario has thirty-eight counties and union of counties and 11 cities, of which 25 counties and two cities have adopted the Act; one of these has repealed it. Quebec has 56 counties and four cities, five counties of which have adopted the Act. British Columbia has five parliamentary constituencies, none of which have adopted the Act. In all, up the present time, 81 cities and counties have voted upon the Scott Act, and 63 have adopted it. Nine counties and cities voted twice and five three times, making an aggregate of 95 contests, out of which we have been victorious in 73. I do not think we need be ashamed of this showing or that it should cause us to be much discouraged. The leaders and friends of the liquor traffic in getting seven counties to repeal the Act have not so very much of which to boast. Let them crow and rejoice, but I think rejoicing will not be for any great period. I have examined the leading papers of the Upper Province, the exponents of public opinion, the *Globe*, the *Mail*, the *Empire*, and also the *Montreal Gazette*, and I fail to find any of those papers attribute the repeal of the Act to a falling off in temperance sentiment throughout the Dominion or in those individual counties. They gave various reasons, and all through there are political reasons mixed up with others. The *Globe* points out that it is due to the abominable Franchise Act; then the roads were bad and the farmers could not get in to vote, and such reasons. Papers

on the other side gave other reasons. The Ontario Government was said to be false, and they had the appointment of the officials, who were said to have done all they could to prevent the Act from being carried out—and thus political prejudices seem to prevail. It is difficult to get at the real cause, but in no case have I seen it stated that the Act was repealed because of decline in the temperance sentiment. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that the Act had never been enforced. Let us see how it has been enforced in one county at all events. In East Simcoe, according to a statement of the convictions and fines imposed in the license district of East Simcoe, between the 1st day of May, 1886, and 7th April, 1888, the amount of fines imposed was \$4,950, number of convictions 96. Probable gain to the county \$2,263. If there were 96 convictions in that county it was surely a good attempt to enforce the Act. Dundas county was prepared to carry out the Act, and it has done so with beneficial effect. I read:

"The Scott Act is being vigorously carried out in this county at present, and is having a very beneficial effect. The efficient enforcement of the Act during the past few months will greatly help the temperance people in the coming contest for repeal. Mrs. Rocksy-ault, of Irene, a noted character, has been fined for two convictions of the Act and it is expected she will be brought up for a third offence in a short time. She has become thoroughly frightened and has promised faithfully to break the law no more. This lady has been selling whisky in defiance of law for a number of years. Before the Scott Act came in force she sold without a license in defiance of the Crooks' Act, but managed to escape detection, although an honest attempt was made by the license inspector to convict her."

Here is a fair test as between officers of the Scott Act and officers of the license law. It would appear that an old offender under license law, who could not be got hold of, had been got hold of by the Scott Act officers. I have a number of other cases with which I will not, however, weary the House. A casual examination will show that there has been a good deal of enforcement of the Scott Act. There have been difficulties in the way. I am not prepared to give an opinion in regard to some counties, but the temperance body of the Dominion will not regard the repeal vote in the different counties during the week as a matter to discourage them. On the other hand, I believe the defeat will nerve them to renewed effort. Of what material do hon. gentlemen think temperance men are made when they express the opinion with pleasure that since these reverses the temperance movement is finished? They mistake the character of the men altogether. When we had but a handful of men fighting for this reform, when we had fashion against us, when we had, to some extent, the pulpit against us and the leading men of the country against us, when strong appetites and habits were against us much more than they are now, we fought the battle of temperance. We contended for those principles, and to-day we can hardly find a man who does not want to be acknowledged as a temperance man, and to-day the great majority of the people are in favor of prohibition, and, instead of being frightened out of our senses by the repeal of the Scott Act in those counties, the next effort that will be made will be an effort to obtain total prohibition. I for one feel that such is necessary. As a prohibitionist of some years standing, and I believe an honest friend of the cause, I believe that in order to be successful we must have the body of the electors behind us, we must have a large measure of public sympathy with us, the people must be with us in this work if we are going to succeed in prohibition, and it will be a question for the temperance reformers seriously to consider whether the people are so fully at their backs as to enable them to press for a prohibitory measure. If not, then I advise them to go on in the same way as they have been going and to use such efforts and appliances as they have been using, and which have brought them up to their present grand position. Let us rely more on moral effort and less upon law. But I believe this country

Mr. FREEMAN.

wants a prohibitory law; I believe such is necessary to put down this terrible evil of drunkenness. I am not going into the consideration of this evil. I might show that this evil is now sapping the very life of this country, how the use of liquor in the old country is destroying 28 per cent. of the valuable lives there; and that the lives in this Dominion are being destroyed in proportion by it. I could show how it is destroying the families of the people, how it is bringing discord into the homes of the people which should represent heaven. I could show these facts but they do not enter into this question. All we ask to-night is to obtain amendments to the Scott Act which are necessary to make it effective in the different counties throughout the Dominion in which it is now in operation. The complaint against the Scott Act is that it is not really enforced. There have been many difficulties in the way of its enforcement. I need not enumerate them but some provisions are found for the removal of them in the Bill the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has introduced. We ask this House to give us those amendments and if the Scott Act with those amendments cannot be worked then perhaps other counties will repeal it. Let us do what we can for those amendments. I appeal to every man who desires to see the drinking habits of the country lessened, I appeal to every man who desires to see good order in the country, I appeal to every man who wants to assist us in this good work. It is a measure which will not conflict with the drinking habits of any one. They can go and take their glass of brandy if they wish it and they can go on and indulge to any extent they please. I appeal to you to give the temperance people the amendments to this Act which we ask for here to-night and let us have the Act in a workable condition. If I would turn to the *Hansard* I could show you what the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie the then leader of the Government declared when he introduced the measure that he believed the sentiment of the country demanded it. He believed it was in answer to the demand of the temperance sentiment in this country, that he gave them the Scott Act and he also indicated it was but a step towards a larger and fuller measure, a measure of prohibition. I believe that hon. gentleman desired the Act should be perfect, I believe it was in his heart to make the measure as perfect as it ought to be. From time to time the friends of temperance have been before Parliament asking for amendments, and some times they have succeeded and more times not succeeded. While this House has been willing that those amendments should be passed they have been blocked in another chamber. This has aroused a feeling in the minds of the temperance people of this country which at the proper time will find such an expression, as will wake up in the country the slumbering embers of dissatisfaction that lie in the breasts of the people, at the action of the Legislative Chamber in this matter. I trust that the reasonable demands of the temperance people may not be thrown out. I hope their reasonable requests will be listened to and that those amendments will pass the House and become the law of the land. I do not think it necessary for me to say anything more on this subject, but before I sit down I would say that I regret exceedingly that there should have been so much political animus in this discussion. I have regarded it with a great deal of regret for I think it is possible for the two political parties in Canada to fight their political battles without dragging the temperance question into those battles. I believe that the Opposition will get into power just as quickly and that the Government will retain power just as long without dragging this temperance question into politics. I believe it will be wise of both political parties to let that question lie outside of politics altogether. Let hon. members on both sides of the House take hold of it as a great moral question, and deal with it as a question in which we have all a mutual interest, and in which our families and our

children after us are interested. Let us cast politics aside, and let us vote as men of principle, let us vote as manly men, men who desire to see our country prosper, men who desire to see the evils of intemperance reduced to a minimum, men who desire to see all the floodgates of vice opened by the liquor traffic closed up forever and our country prosperous whether under a Conservative or a Liberal Government. Let us throw aside political feelings and vote on this question as accountable beings, accountable to our children and accountable to our God.

Mr. JAMIESON. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The first statement that I made that he had shirked a vote was made on the authority of *Hansard*, which is the official record of the House. If the hon. gentleman examines *Hansard* he will find that it is not there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will find my name in the Journals of the House. I told him I voted and he made a statement that was not true.

Mr. JAMIESON. Both are official records recognised by the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I stated that I had voted.

Mr. JAMIESON. I made my statement on the authority of the official *Hansard*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The *Hansard* is not the official record of the votes.

Mr. JAMIESON. There are a few remarks I would like to make in reply to statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), statements which are as untrue as it is possible for them to be. In the first place he states that I have supported and taken part in the elections of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I wish to make the statement that I never cast a vote. I never attended a meeting, I never took part in any shape or form in a political content in South Lanark in my life and for the good reason that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) does not require my assistance or that of any other outsider in order to secure his election in that county, so that the hon. gentleman's statement in that respect is entirely without foundation. So far as my position in North Lanark in the local election is concerned I may tell the hon. gentleman that just before the last local election took place there was a sort of temperance convention held in North Lanark. At that convention it was proposed that two temperance candidates should be put in the field—there were two in the field at that time and it was resolved that they should be supported. One Conservative moved and another seconded a motion to that effect, but there was not a single individual belonging to the Liberal party who would say he would support the man. The candidates for the Local House were there, they were quite prepared to give their support to the local candidates, but of course when it came to the candidate for the House of Commons they were not prepared to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. That was a horse of another color.

Mr. JAMIESON. That was a horse of another color. Under those circumstances we supported the man who was pledged to temperance legislation—just as much so as the Liberal candidate in the north of the county. The hon. gentleman pretends to ignore the Dominion Alliance. I am not prepared to say that the Dominion Alliance is entitled to dictate over all the members of this House or to the Government of this country, but when the Government, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, was in power in 1878 it was not beneath his dignity to consult the Dominion Alliance. In fact, I have a record in my hand, in which it is stated that at a meeting held in the city of Ottawa a draft of the Canada Temperance Act was made by a com-

mittee of the Alliance and presented to the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. So that after all, the Canada Temperance Act was not framed by that Government, but by a committee of the Dominion Alliance. I have here the Year Book of 1883, in which that is stated, and I believe it to be correct. Now, Sir, so far as my position is concerned, it is this: In 1885, at a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, it was resolved to ask the Government of this Dominion to take charge of amendments to the Scott Act. It was resolved that in the event of the Government not doing so, I should be requested to do so, and to press the Bill as expeditiously as I possibly could. My position was this: The moment the Dominion Government refused to take charge of the amending Bill, and it as placed in my hands, I had to carry out the instructions given me by the Dominion Alliance, or throw up the measure altogether. My position further is this, that so long as I act on lines laid down by the Dominion Alliance, it does not rest with any hon. member in this House, or any man outside of this House, to charge me with inconsistency. That is my position, and I am satisfied I shall be backed up by every member of the Dominion Alliance, unless his views are distorted for party purposes. There was a statement made, I do not know whether on the authority of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) or not. If it is, I am only sorry, Mr. Speaker, that parliamentary usage will not permit me to characterise that statement as I would like to do. It is stated that in answer to an urgent request on his part that I should endeavor to place the Bill of which I had charge on Government Orders, I said I would serve my party first. Sir, the statement is as false as the bottomless pit; I never made such a statement in my life, and the hon. member who says so is stating—well, the House understands what I mean; I will not go any further. This is about all I have to say in reference to this matter. I do trust we shall reach a vote on this Bill to-night, instead of letting it stand over for another occasion.

Mr. HAGGART. As I have some remarks to make on this question, and, as it is evident at this late hour that we shall not be able to conclude this debate to-night, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I do not very often interfere with temperance questions, but I feel that the occasion to-night is one, on which for once as a friend to the temperance cause, I am entitled to say a word. Before dealing with the question on its merits, perhaps I may be allowed to refer to one or two statements that have been made by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) in respect to the action which is said to have been taken by the Dominion Alliance on a previous occasion. He complains that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speaks lightly of the Dominion Alliance, and refers to the fact that in 1878 the Government of which my hon. friend was a member had so much confidence in the Dominion Alliance that they submitted to it the draft of the Canada Temperance Act for its approval. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can refer to the time when his leader, since then, ever proposed any amendment to the Canada Temperance Act; and I would like to know when he ever got up in his place as a temperance man in this House, and indicated that he was not in party accord with his leader, when his leader was so systematically using his influence to prevent this Canada Temperance Act being amended. I say, so far as his position is concerned, that it ill becomes the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to refer in any way to the action of the Dominion Alliance or of the two Governments as to their treatment of this question. I have a distinct recollection of how this question came before the House on that occasion. I remember how the petitions were poured in on us, and how this matter was urged on

the House and the Government from year to year; and I remember that when it came to be dealt with, and when the temperance members of the House were asked to meet together and discuss the matter, we had not the face of a single Conservative to discuss the question or to tell us how the law could be put on the Statute-book or made effective; but, forsooth, when they were on this side of the House they were the men who were urging on the Government to take action in this matter. Sir, it sounded to me like ancient history when I saw my hon. friend's notice of an independent motion in favor of prohibition, and in favor of the Government enforcing it. Sir, just let me draw his attention to a resolution worded like that, and adopted by this House some years ago, and then ask ourselves how much progress these agitators have made in connection with this question. On the 15th of March, 1875, Mr. Schultz, then member for Lisgar, moved:

"That it is the opinion of this House that a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evils complained of, and it is the duty of the Government to submit such measures for the approval of Parliament at the earliest moment practicable."

That sounds very much like the motion my friend voted down the other day, to re-affirm the abstract principle, after we have had the Canada Temperance Act a few years, and have pleaded and implored the leaders of this House to take some action, not that it should be made stronger or more prohibitive, but made fairly operative; and now my hon. friend stands up and complains because we ask the Government to move as his friends asked the Government to move then. I find that on that occasion the hon. Minister of Customs had something to say about this question, and I may say that the Government then were just like the Government now, a little slow to move, and the temperance men had to keep them up to their work. The hon. Minister of Customs delivered himself on that occasion in this fashion:

"The House was as well prepared now as it would be in a fortnight hence, after sixteen caucuses had been held, to come to a direct vote on the subject. The country was as well prepared now as it would be ten years hence, to decide whether it would have a prohibitory law, for the question had been discussed since he was a boy, and was agitated every year. The question should be left with the Government to grapple with."

That was the opinion of the hon. Minister of Customs when the difference was just this, that he was on this side of the House, and the Government of my hon. friend from East York was on that side. Now it strikes me that when our friends opposite talk so loudly about how they had advocated this great moral principle, and what they suffered and endured in the cause of temperance, when it was not so popular as it is now, and how they regret it has been made a political question, would it not be much better if they would stiffen up their backs and say to their leader: We intend to support you on all political questions, but as the price of our support we insist that you give us, not prohibitory legislation, but that you make the law fairly workable. If they would do this instead of coming down here to throw dust in the eyes of the people with these motions which mean nothing and saying it is a great pity a question of this kind should have been made a football of in the political arena, we might have some confidence in their protestations. I was amused at the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) when he expressed his regret that a great moral question like this should have been made a political question and declared that the Government ought to initiate legislation of this kind. He forgets that when his friends were out of office and when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House showed their faith and their principles by passing legislation, imperfect and contradictory, I admit, but at the moment the best that could be had, not one of hon. gentlemen opposite lifted a little finger to help them to improve the details of that measure. On the contrary, it had to be passed in the teeth of their active hostility or neutral opposition. Yet

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

these hon. gentlemen to-day say to us that this should not be made a political question. I tell you, Sir, if the electorate would just stiffen the backs of these representatives by telling them instead of being Tories first and temperance men afterwards, you must be temperance men first, or we will leave you at the next elections and put honest men at your place, who will display more zeal than simply move resolutions that it is the duty of the Government to pass prohibitory legislation, and thus quietly strangle out of existence the temperant sentiment by your do-nothing policy, we would find a change in their mode of conduct. There is another gentleman who holds his position in this House to the stand he took at one time in connection with the temperance movement. I do not wish for a moment to throw discredit on a public man who, in the early days of his public life, advocated temperance principles and was paid for his advocacy; that is perfectly legitimate. But let me quote a few of the sentences which the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries uttered in 1885, when discussing one of the Bills which the hon. member for Lanark has brought up so often in the House that he has grown hoary and grey, and yet they are just as far from becoming the law of the land as when he first took them in hand. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a little tiff with the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who presides over the Factory Act, which is another measure that is a long time coming to maturity, and there was a little feeling as to which should come first, but finally the Factory Act had to stand back. The hon. the Minister of Marine said, and his words express exactly my sentiments, and I should have honored the man who had uttered such sentiments and stand by them:

"In the first place it is necessary, in order to carry out the good faith of Parliament, which was shown first in the enactments passed in 1878, and which was equally shown by making the law stronger in 1883, under which two pledges the people on 71 different occasions have come up to vote on this Act, and carried it in 59 by large majorities. Of those counties and cities which have adopted the Act, over 40 will be under its operation from 1st May, this year—and are looking to this Parliament—and a population of one million and a half of people are asking this Parliament to do its simple duty in the premises—keep its faith—and take away obstructions—not which the people have placed in the way—but which Parliament placed in the way of the Act and undesignedly too."

Further on he continued:

"If Parliament made a blunder, as in the opinion of the court of New Brunswick it did, and unwittingly cut away the machinery and the power from under that Act, it is in the carrying out of the good faith which should subsist between Parliament and the people that they should remedy that mistake and should give to the people what was asked for—and what was supposed to be given—a fairly workable Act. That is all we ask for."

And again:

"All we ask for, all the temperance people ask for, is that Parliament should carry out its pledged faith with a view of giving them a Canada Temperance Act which is made workable, and if under those conditions it proves a failure, the temperance people will be the first to move for the abolition of that law."

These are, to my mind, words that have the correct ring. They are words that indicate, as far as words can, a hearty and earnest belief in the duty of Parliament to promote temperance. There was no hesitation in the hon. gentleman saying what he then thought Parliament ought to do. But how is it that since then we have heard no more of these ardent utterances in favor of Parliament taking some action. This was on the 8th of April, 1885, and some time in December, 1885, the hon. gentleman became Minister of Marine. Is it possible that the yoke was so tight around his neck that he is no longer able to give utterance to those noble sentiments on behalf of the very cause that warmed him into existence and made a man of him. I respect a man who honestly changes his opinions, but I despise a man who sells himself for position and goes back on the men who warmed him into public life. How and in what view has the legislation of the Government with re-

gard to temperance been introduced? Did it come to pass by the Government consulting the Dominion Temperance Alliance for the purpose of improving the Act? No; it came from the desire of the Government to grasp the power vested in the Local Legislatures and control the licenses for the purpose of giving a stroke at the Premier of Ontario, who stood in the way of the ambitions of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was through that action, it was not by any accidental circumstance, it was by the very decided action of the majority of this House that that decision became a matter of law in New Brunswick, which my hon. friend mourned on that occasion, and, as far as I know, has gone on mourning from that day onwards, until the Supreme Court said it was to be swept from the Statute-book and it was not worth the paper it was written on. My hon. friends are never done lamenting about the difficulties which surround the carrying out of this Act. I am inclined to join with them in that lament as long as they retain their present position. I do not find any fault with the leader of the Government for not doing better in regard to this Act, when he finds that the men around him who profess to support it do not stand up to their principles better than that, when he knows that they will get down on their knees whenever they are told to get down. I think I would do the same thing myself. If I knew that, when I said to my temperance friends, I do not think it is very handy for me to do this now, and you had better postpone it, they would be only too happy to postpone it, I think I would act that way myself, in view of those on the other side of the question. The liquor element is a great element in this country, and the Premier must consider it. When we had to fight for our rights, we had to fight, and I may say that anything that has rallied against the Scott Act is nothing to the future, but is simply the kindling of a great fire. But, when the Premier knows that, whenever he says to those hon. gentlemen, get down and be still, they will get down and be still, it is not likely that he will do anything to rouse them. It certainly does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to speak about the wonderful actions of the Dominion Alliance, when they have accepted so meekly their treatment by the Government. I was once foolish enough to go on a deputation to the Premier. The Dominion Alliance got it into their heads that this Act was not in good working order. No doubt there was something in that, and I was told—for I was not present at the meeting—that they had appointed a deputation to wait on the Government. You see, they had got accustomed to the Government paying attention to their statements, and they thought that, when our Conservative friends came into office, they would also have some respect for them, and I was told, we are going to wait on the Government, and we want you to go, as we want to have a delegation from the Alliance which will be non-political. I notice that they are very particular nowadays on the non-political question. However, I remember we made a great, big deputation. We filled the Premier's room so full that we had to stand up quite close against him, and there was scarcely room for my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was the mouthpiece of the deputation on that occasion, to say what he was instructed to say. I never was a worshipper of that hon. gentleman since he stumped my county in the temperance interest against me, but I must say that on that occasion he presented the cause of the Dominion Alliance with moderation and firmness and definiteness and brevity, and I thought our cause was well put, and I thought the Premier, as I believe he always is on these occasions, was very courteous to us, very courteous. So I thought our deputation was going to do something, and I remember that the Premier just simply said, in a non-committal sort of way: It seems reasonable that an Act which is on the Statute-book of the country, and is not fairly workable, should be made so. I thought that looked reasonable,

41-1888-5

and I thought our spokesman had put our case in such a fashion as to convince even the Premier. We went away saying that we would hear about it. Well, it passed for a week, and then it passed for another week, and I do not know how others felt, but I began to feel that we had been sold, and I felt indignant when I saw that, in another branch of the Legislature, the leader of the Government there indicated that they did not intend to take any action in regard to the amendments to the Canada Temperance Act. If those hon. gentlemen opposite knew the indignation which existed, or felt it themselves, I think they would have constituted themselves at once another deputation and would have told the Premier formally that they were in earnest, that they believed these amendments were necessary, and that, in the glowing words of my hon. friend, it was necessary to keep faith with the people and to make this Act workable. But, as usual, they got down on their knees and accepted the situation, and from that time downwards, the Dominion Alliance and our friends who support the Government, have lost their grip on the temperance question, and from that time it was simply that they must do as the Government saw fit. I do not blame the Government, but I say the men who professed to have temperance principles made a great mistake. Their knees were too weak, and the result has certainly justified the statement of the leader of the Government in the Senate. Again, we find the Dominion Alliance, though, may be, they might have overtaken the Government by the exercise of some firmness, sending another deputation in 1886, suggesting a readjustment of the fines. I did not go on the deputation that time, but the published report is to the effect that the Dominion Alliance sent another deputation to my friend the Premier to urge certain reasons why there should be readjustment of the fines and penalties imposed under the Canada Temperance Act. Did they succeed any better than before? Let the Order in Council of the 15th December, 1886, show, in which, instead of travelling in the direction the deputation asked, the Government travelled in exactly the opposite direction. But I did not hear that the Dominion Alliance protested. My friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) may have protested, but he did not vote that way, and the man who protests, and then votes for those against whom he has protested, does not amount to much, no matter on which side of the House he is. I do not think the Government, on the whole, have treated the Alliance with the degree of consideration to which they have been entitled, but, as the Alliance have accepted it, I think that justifies the Government, and they are simply getting the treatment they deserve. I think the ground taken by my friend the Minister of Customs in connection with the temperance legislation of the country was the correct one. I think it is simply trifling with the temperance sentiment of this country, and casting dust in the eyes of the electors for any private member of this House to go on year after year introducing an Act as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has been doing, professing to amend the Canada Temperance Act. They may go on in that way till doomsday, they may go on until that Act is greyhaired, without getting any further. I want to quote here an authority high up in the temperance ranks, an authority so high up that, every time these gentlemen have anything to do, they put him in the seat of honor and get him to preside over them. That authority is Senator Vidal, who, as an hon. member near me states, is the president of the Alliance. I know he has been identified nominally with temperance ever since I can remember, as president, figure head, and general showman, and all this kind of thing; but I never heard of his voting against the Government, and until a man's faith is strong enough to lead him to do that, through a sense of right, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the temperance reform is not going to make much progress. Now, the occasion I refer to was

one on which the Premier introduced an Act to amend this Canada Temperance Act. It appeared that the original Act was defective in this respect, that the courts held that where there were no licenses in existence in a county, the Canada Temperance Act could not come into effect, for the simple reason that there was no time on which licenses expired, and the court apparently held that where there was no licenses to expire, the Act never could come into force. The Premier did agree to introduce legislation, and that was amended at his instance. Now, in looking over the Senate Report the other day I find some remarks delivered by Senator Vidal, on the 4th April, 1884, in connection with the amendment I have referred to. I may say, by-the-by, that the Premier, in introducing that matter to the House, made this remark: "It is quite clear that so long as the Act is on the Statute-book it should be made workable." A very good sentiment, but unfortunately the active operation of that sentiment stopped at about the time he got this amendment passed, and he pursued a retrograde course, or rather, as he expressed himself the other day, he did not know the Act required any amendments now. But on this occasion the hon. Senator alluded to spoke as follows:—

"Very earnest letters came to us from Nova Scotia saying we must if possible obtain this amendment. We told them what has turned out to be the case that immediately on the introduction of the Bill in either House in all probability these would be an amendment offered to the Act by some opponent, which while professing to be friendly to it would really be fatal to its very existence. A conference of the members interested was held and we came to this conclusion: That it was no use for any private member to introduce a Bill of this nature. There is a moral certainty that if it is done by a private member it will just meet the fate which has attended former efforts to obtain such an amendment."

Now, these are sentiments uttered by the gentleman who is to-day president of the Dominion Temperance Alliance. Since 1884 have the appointments to the Senate, with one solitary exception, been likely to favor prohibitory legislation or have they been the reverse? Every child in the country knows, every temperance man in the country knows, how grieved he was when certain of those appointments were made—with one exception from Toronto. They felt, so far as the Senate was concerned, that it was hostile to that class of legislation formally, and that that hostility was being reinforced by recent additions to the Senate. Yet, so hopeless was the position in 1884 that Senator Vidal, an active temperance man, then openly and avowedly expressed the opinion that it was utterly useless to attempt to carry legislation through the House unless it was a Government measure. He went on to say:

"Between 20 and 30 members of Parliament waited on Sir John and his colleagues, stated their case and this Bill was the result. Mr. Wark enquired if it was a Government measure. Mr. Vidal said: This is what we understood because if it was introduced by a private member it would fail, and our only object in going to the Government to ask them to introduce a measure was that it should be a Government measure."

Mr. Speaker, could words be more distinct than that? Here was a man who knew of what he spoke, a man who has been in the inside centre of the temperance reform, and know all that has been going on in connection with temperance ever since I have known anything of the temperance cause. Yet, here was a man, in 1884, who had been a consistent supporter of this Government and a life-long Conservative, who said that it is utterly idle to attempt to pass legislation in this House unless it is a Government measure. Yet we find the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) going on from year to year, with the consent of this very Alliance of which this Senator is the head in this country, introducing legislation and expecting to get it passed. Now, Sir, I say it is an insult to the temperance men of Canada, it is an insult to the thousands of Conservative temperance men, because there are thousands of them, in spite of their political proclivities, who honestly believe that temperance laws could be enforced if they had a fair chance. and, Sir, to-day we see the result. Worried, worn, badgered, Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

tired with the fruitless attempts to coax a Government not in sympathy with the cause, the result has been that on every resent occasion on which the repeal of the Scott Act has been submitted to the electorate in counties where three years ago it was carried by large majorities, those men have, by their vote, censured the Government and those temperance men that have idly stood by and allowed that Act to be killed by its own friends in this House. I said to my Conservative temperance friends at home: You do not need to leave the ranks of your own party, get your temperance representation made perfect, just set on the backs of the candidates you put in the field, and tell them you are in earnest." Did we not have a sample of that a year ago in this House? Look at the enormous vote that was cast to keep the Scott Act in existence, but the moment you undertook to amend it, that vote dwindled down until they were prepared to do anything rather than amend that Act. That showed that there were a lot of men in this House who knew full well that if they expressed openly their convictions on this matter, they dared not go back and face their constituents, or they would have been put to the right-about face. Yet this is the way this measure has been played with until the temperance sentiment of the country is worn out, and to day after all this disappointment, the result will probably be that the moment the Scott Act is submitted in these other counties it will be repealed, and then temperance men will be driven to another long and arduous fight to bring the Act up to that position where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it could be made fairly workable; then if it had proved a failure, all parties would have had agreed that it was desirable to repeal it. But now, baffled, wearied, betrayed, by the very men who professed to be their friends in Parliament, temperance men are left with an Act unworkable, and confronted with every obstacle that can be put in their way. Yet they come here, year after year, introducing this legislation. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time the covering was torn off this class of legislation. Let us have some attempt at honestly dealing with this question. Sir, I have stood up in this House very little to open my mouth in connection with the temperance question, but when I came here at an early date I made up my mind to be found on the side of temperance always, and I hope I shall always be found there, whether it is pleasing or displeasing to hon. gentleman on either side of the House. All I have to say is this: That I expect to be a friend of the temperance cause in the country and in this House when the people shall wake up to the fact that they need to send men of better timber on the Conservative side than ever they have sent here yet, or else we will never get prohibition. I say, in so far as the operation of the Crooks Act is concerned in Ontario, the temperance people have no reason to be discouraged with the movement of temperance sentiments in the country. I say there is a steady, solid growth of sentiment in the country in the direction of restriction, and in the direction of reducing the consumption of liquor. I say it is a matter of extreme regret that this Act should not have been put in a fairly workable position. Let me draw your attention to one feature in connection with that much abused Act, called the Crooks Act, but which now even liquor men extol to the heavens as a grand matter. I had the curiosity to look into the report of the Ontario Government the other day to see what were the results in connection with the reduction of licenses and the general enforcement of that Act. I find that in 1875, when that legislation was initiated, there were 4,793 tavern licenses issued in the Province of Ontario, and 1,307 shop licenses. In the next ten years ending 1885 when only one or two counties had adopted the Act and when the whole country was still operating under the Crooks License Act, we find that the licenses had been reduced to 3,252 tavern licenses and 675 shop licenses, being a reduction of more than one-

half in shop licenses and about one-third in tavern licenses issued in the various counties of the Province. In connection with this matter the temperance sentiment of the country has shown itself by a steady restriction of the licenses in counties that have not adopted the Canada Temperance Act, and to-day, as a consequence, public temperance sentiment is healthier and firmer in those counties than where the Canada Temperance Act has been enforced in a demoralised manner by the base neglect of its friends in the House, where it has been placed in a position such as to disgust its friends, and which has resulted in either one or two things as shown by the recent vote: either that its supporters were disgusted and stayed away from the polls, or else they took no interest in the matter. I believe in temperance legislation, at all events I should like to see a fair trial made; but I feel that the temperance sentiment of the country has been seriously misrepresented by many of the members of the House who have pretended to represent it, and while I can echo the sentiment of the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman) that the question should be lifted out of the political arena, I tell that hon. gentleman that he and his friends have done more to discourage and damn the temperance cause by temperance legislation during the last four or five years than all the acts of the liquor dealers during the last twenty years put together.

Mr. FISHER. After the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) it is not necessary for me to deal with this question at any length; but the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago made some remarks in regard to myself to which I must say a few words. I have alluded this evening to what the hon. gentleman has said as to the occurrences at the meeting last year to which he is so fond of alluding. I am not going to take up the time of the House at this late hour by repeating this statement. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago said this is a question of veracity between he and I. I should prefer to believe it is merely a question of memory, and I do not wish to impute motives to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson).

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not recollect stating it was a question of veracity.

Mr. FISHER. I understood so. I have already stated this evening my remembrance of those occurrences, and I have no reason to change that statement one whit or one iota. That may have been, as I said, a question of memory between the hon. gentleman and myself, but in regard to what the hon. member for Lanark has said about the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and his vote and action in this House upon this question, that is not a question of memory at all, but I regret to say emphatically a question of fact. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a little while ago said that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not vote on that occasion last year. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), interrupting him, stated he did vote, and according to the rules of the House, after that denial of the hon. member for Bothwell, it was the duty of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to have accepted the hon. gentleman's statement and withdrawn the assertion he made in regard to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He did not do so. But a few minutes afterwards the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) placed the record of the Journals before the House showing that his name was in each one of the divisions. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) ought then, I say, to have withdrawn his statement. But no; he then tried to hide himself under what he said was contained in the record of the *Hansard*, and he said that the *Hansard* record, which I hold under my hand, and which is exactly the same volume as the hon. gentleman had under his hand, did not contain the name of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have

here the four votes that took place on 13th June last, and in every one of those votes, in the same volume which the hon. member for Lanark had, appeared the name of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it is not so. It does not appear on the main motion.

Mr. FISHER. I will read the record, and it will show what was the statement when he had this volume under his hands, and when he professed to appeal to this volume and to quote it. First, there is the vote on the amendment of Mr. Cargill, which was for a repeal of the Scott Act. Under nays I find the name of Mr. Jamieson, and further down the name of Mr. Mills (Bothwell).

Mr. JAMIESON. Yes; I said so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; you said I did not vote.

Mr. FISHER. The *Hansard* report to-morrow will perhaps show what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman has an extraordinary memory. I said that he voted on the amendment, but when it came to the main motion his name did not appear. That is what I said.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman will weigh a little more carefully what he is saying, he will find that I will be able to prove that he is wrong even in that statement.

Mr. JAMIESON. I appeal to *Hansard* when it comes out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I told you my name appeared in the Journals of the House.

Mr. FISHER. The next amendment is that of Mr. Girouard, and I find Mr. Mills (Bothwell) voting there.

Mr. HAGGART. That is correct; he said so.

Mr. FISHER. Again, there is the amendment I moved myself, which was to obviate a vote upon the amendment of Mr. Sproule in reference to compensation. I find there also Mr. Jamieson and Mr. Mills again voted on the same side.

Mr. JAMIESON. Turn to the next division.

Mr. FISHER. In the division on the main motion as amended I find among the yeas Mr. Jamieson and among the nays Mr. Mills (Bothwell).

Mr. JAMIESON. I beg your pardon. If that is so, I am certainly mistaken. I examined it carefully and I could not find it.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should have allowed himself to make such a statement impugning the veracity of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in this House on such a cursory examination of the record as he evidently made.

Mr. JAMIESON. And other members examined it with me.

Mr. FISHER. Then the hon. gentleman was in very bad company.

Mr. JAMIESON. Will the hon. gentleman pass the book across here?

Mr. FISHER. It was the duty of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to have accepted the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); but instead of doing so, he chose to deny it and even to deny the statement of the records of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Send it over; let us see if it is there.

Mr. FISHER. I will not continue this controversy any further. I will simply say this in reference to the motion the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) now before the House, that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read this day six months. I must say I am

surprised that the hon. member for Muskoka should have made this motion. He is a member who, I believe, has the courage of his convictions. I believe he sincerely desires to see the Scott Act repealed. I believe he is also glad to see that in his own county the Scott Act has been repealed, and he desires to see it removed from the Statute-book; but if the Act is to remain on the Statute-book he should be willing to make it as perfect as possible. Even those opposed in principle to the Act should allow us on this occasion to amend it. I have but one further remark to make in connection with the statement made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) this evening, that the action of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was contrary to the declared opinion of the Dominion Alliance. I cannot allow that to go forth as being the truth in regard to the Dominion Alliance. They have made no utterance and passed no resolution whatever in that regard. Neither the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) nor any of the other gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House made a motion at the Dominion Alliance condemning the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). They had not the courage in the Dominion Alliance to object to that action, or to say that the Dominion Alliance was against the motion, yet long after they come here and they emphatically state that, contrary to the desires of the Dominion Alliance. They have no foundation on which to make that statement whatever. I think I know enough of the Dominion Alliance to know that the Alliance does not pretend to look to itself as being the only exponent of temperance people in this country, or to insist that no temperance action should be taken in this House except from that enforcement. I may say also the Dominion Alliance on many occasions have made an effort to induce the Government to adopt the Scott Act amendments as their Bill, and they have invariably failed to obtain that action on the part of the Government. I believe as I have stated over and over again in the council of the Dominion Alliance, that until the Government do take up that Bill under their protection and make it their Bill it cannot be law. As a member of the Dominion Alliance I believe it our duty to endorse that action. I emphatically deny that all the members of the Dominion Alliance believe that this is the only way in which temperance legislation can be obtained in this House. The Dominion Alliance has made no utterance whatever on this motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and I know that the hon. members opposite had no foundation whatever to make the statements which they did here to-night.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the question of whether the Scott Act is a good Act or not, but I rise to discuss the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). The affect of that amendment would be to leave things exactly as they are now and it would merely leave the Scott Act with all its imperfections, which are acknowledged by its friends and opponents and which we all know it possesses. If I were asked for my opinion on the Scott Act as it now stands I must say that the Scott Act at present does not nearly as much restrain the sale of liquor as the Crooks Act in Ontario. I think there is more restriction to liquor selling in Toronto under the Crooks Act than there is in St. Thomas which is under the Scott Act. In Ottawa or in Toronto tavern keepers have to observe certain regulations while in St. Thomas where there are no licenses there are no regulations, and a man who sells at all will sell any day of the week and at any hour of the night Saturday and Sunday. There is no restriction in Scott Act counties except the fear of getting caught. I verily believe the Scott Act has really led rather to an increase than a decrease in the consumption of liquor in the county which I have the honor to represent and in the city of St. Thomas, the county town. This failure of

Mr. FISHER.

the Scott Act is not due to any failure on the part of the local officers. The inspector for West Elgin, which includes the city of St. Thomas, is one of the most devoted temperance men and prohibitionists in the country. He has been frequently complimented by different temperance bodies for his strenuous efforts to enforce the Act and he has secured a great many convictions, but at the same time the sale of liquor goes on more freely there than it does in Ottawa to-day. That is my impression of the Scott Act as it stands. I do not see how I can vote for the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) for it does not remove this inefficient Act from the Statute-book, but leaves it with all its acknowledged imperfections to continue in its failure in the purpose for which it was intended. Neither am I sure that any amendments that can be made to this Act will make it workable; however, I think it is only fair play to give the supporters of the Act an opportunity to show what amendments they propose to make and to convince us, if possible, that those amendments will make it workable, and in reality a prohibitory liquor law. If they fail to show that it will make it a moral Act, I cannot support it, and I will vote at the third reading, but in the meantime until we see what the amendments proposed in the committee are, I find it necessary to vote for the second reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the question is put I just wish to say this: I had very distinct recollection of my vote relating to the temperance question in the House last year. The hon. member for North Lanark said I left the House with the speed of a "Maud S." The hon. gentleman had a distinct recollection of that fact. I sent out for the Journals of the House and I knew my vote would be there recorded, but the hon. gentleman not was satisfied. He declared there was some other official record than the Journals, and that it was there recorded that I did not vote. Well, Sir, notwithstanding the Hibernianism of the hon. gentleman I find that even in the official report of the Debates my vote is there recorded, and yet the hon. gentleman stood up in this House thinking that nobody else would examine the reports, or that we would take his statement for granted, and declare that in the official reports there was no record of my vote. The official report has been examined by other parties. My vote is there recorded and the House now sees how much credit is to be attached to a statement of the hon. gentleman who with a copy of the *Hansard* debates in his hand in which my vote is there recorded attempts to mislead the House on this question.

Mr. JAMIESON. I believe I have made a mistake on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. JAMIESON. As a member of Parliament and a gentleman it is my duty to withdraw the statement. I am not the first hon. member who has made a mistake. I certainly examined the record and other parties with me, and any gentleman who takes the *Hansard* will see how the mistake occurred. The name does not appear in order. I certainly made a mistake in that way and I wish to apologise.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the speed of "Maud S."

Mr. JAMIESON. I have made my statement.

The House divided on the motion to adjourn the debate.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),
Bergeron,
Be gin,
Burdett,
Burns,
Cargill,
Carling,

Dessaint,
Dupont,
Fiset,
Gauchois,
Guay,
Haggart,
Hickey,

Madill,
Marshall,
O'Brien,
Prior,
Putnam,
Skinner,
Small,

Caron (Sir Adolphe), Kenny,
Oimon, Labelle,
Gostigan, Labrosse,
Coughlin, Langevin (Sir Hector),
Couture, McCarthy,
Daly, McDougall (O. Breton),
Davin, McGreevy,
Denison, McMillan (Vaudreuil),

Smith (Ontario),
Tisiale,
Tupper (Pictou),
Tyrwhitt,
Wilson (Argenteuil),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wright.—44.

Doyon,
Edgar,
Eisenhauer,
Ellis,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Fisher,
Foster,
Freeman,
Gauthier,
Gillmor,

Lovitt,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGulla,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McIntyre,
McLelan,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,

Trow,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Tarcot,
Wallace,
Watson,
White (Renfrew),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Elgin), and
Wilson (Lennox),

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Wentworth),
Barron,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Brien,
Brown,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Carpenter,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),
Casey,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cook,
Davies,
De St. Georges,
Dickinson,

Girouard,
Guilbault,
Guillet,
Hale,
Henderson,
Hesson,
Holton,
Hudspeth,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Jones (Digby),
Jones (Halifax),
Kirk,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lang,
Laurie,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,

McNeill,
Meigs,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Mitchell,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Platt,
Rinfret,
Robertson,
Roome,
Rowand,
Rykert,
St. Marie,
Scriver,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thérien,
Thompson,

Motion to adjourn the debate negatived.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I understand that there is a general wish on the part of the members that this Bill should go to the committee, and therefore with the consent of the House, I am quite willing to withdraw my motion for the six months' hoist.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Thursday.)

Printed by McLEAN, ROSS & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 26, 1888.

No. 42.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ACT RESPECTING THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. FOSTER moved first reading of Bill (No. 112) to amend the Revised Statutes, chap. 77, respecting the safety of ships. He said: The object aimed at in this Bill is to make greater provision for the safety of vessels, chiefly in two ways: first, by providing better machinery for the inspection and surveying of vessels leaving our ports when they are supposed to be, or charged to be unseaworthy; and in the second place, it provides certain rules and precautions in reference to the storage of grain cargoes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if it is intended to apply to sea-going vessels, or only to lake vessels?

Mr. FOSTER. To sea-going vessels as well as to lake vessels.

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved first reading of Bill (No. 113) to amend the Summary Convictions Act. He said: The principal objects of this Bill are to give greater facilities for procuring the attendance of witnesses. It empowers Justices of the Peace to issue subpoenas into other counties outside of their jurisdiction, and it likewise contains compulsory provisions as regards witnesses who fail to obey subpoenas. It likewise establishes the competency of witnesses in proceedings under this Act, notwithstanding they have a pecuniary interest, and it provides further for the methods of appeal.

RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of Sir Charles Tupper, I beg to move that the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That in view of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having agreed with the Government of Canada to relinquish, for the consideration and upon the conditions herein set forth, the exclusive privilege possessed by it in virtue of Article fifteen of the agreement between Her Majesty and the Company, contained in the schedule to the Act 44th Victoria, chapter 1, it is expedient to provide that:

42-1888-1

(a) The Government of Canada will guarantee the payment of interest, until maturity, at three and a half per cent on bonds of the Company to an amount not exceeding fifteen millions of dollars; the principal of such bonds to be payable not later than fifty years from their date, and the principal and interest to be secured as hereinafter set forth.

(b) Such bonds shall be secured by deed of bargain and sale to Trustees of all the Company's title to the unsold lands forming part of the Company's land grant under the said Act, and such deed shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

(c) The proceeds of the sales of the lands hereinbefore mentioned shall be paid over to the Government of Canada, together with any other sums which the Company pays over, for the purpose, to the Government, and the whole shall constitute a fund which shall be held by the Government for the exclusive purpose of satisfying the principal of the said bonds.

(d) On the amount so set apart, not exceeding the amount necessary to redeem the bonds hereinbefore mentioned, the Government shall pay to the Company interest at the rate of three and a half per cent., such interest to be applied in satisfaction of interest of the bonds as the same accrues: but if the Company makes default in the payment of any interest falling due on any of the bonds aforesaid, the Company shall, if required by the Government, pay over all interest collected under uncompleted sales, upon the price of lands sold as well as principal realised from sales thereof, and the Government shall allow on the amount of such payments, interest at the rate hereinbefore mentioned, and shall apply the same and all interest accrued on the principal fund towards the payment of the interest on the said bonds.

(e) So soon as the aggregate amount of the said fund, in the hands of the Government, equals the principal of all the bonds of the said issue then outstanding, the Company may pay in a further sum to cover any interest up to date, and thereupon the mortgage shall be discharged, and thereafter all interest on such bonds shall be paid by the Government, as also the principal at maturity, but the Government shall be in no way liable for the payment of any part of the principal except so far as the Company have provided it with a fund for the purpose.

(f) Such Minister as is designated by the Government shall be one of the Trustees under the said mortgage deed, and the appointment of the other Trustees shall be subject to the approval of the Government.

(g) All land grant bonds which form part of the former issue by the Company and are now held by it shall be cancelled, and the mortgage hereinbefore mentioned shall be subject to the payment of such of the said land grant bonds as are outstanding, but all sums due or to become due for unpaid purchase money to the company on account of lands heretofore sold shall be applied to the payment of such land grant bonds according to the terms of the mortgage securing the same.

(h) If the Company, under any powers granted to it, sells or leases the branch of its railway east of Red River, between St. Boniface and the boundary of the United States, any incorporated company to whom such sale or lease is made, may operate such branch as if it had been incorporated for the purpose, but the moneys resulting from such sale or lease shall be applied either towards the payment of the bonds secured by the railway or towards increasing the security for such bonds by expenditure on the railway, or partly in one way or partly in the other.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the resolution be taken to-morrow? We will have the budget to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is merely a formal motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will lay before the House all the correspondence with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that the papers which are laid on the Table containing the correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial authorities in reference to this disallowance question, have yet been printed. If they have not yet been printed they ought to be printed and put in our hands, as it is very necessary we should have them in printed form before the discussion proceeds. Will the hon. Minister see that the proper authorities get this done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know whether these papers have been printed, but of course we will have the matter looked into at once and the papers brought down, if they have not already been laid on the Table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE *NORTHERN LIGHT*.

Mr. WELSH. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine when the balance of those papers will be laid on the Table of this House connected with the men employed on the *Northern Light*?

Mr. FOSTER. I think very shortly. We had to write down to an agent at Charlottetown for the particular items. Just as soon as they come back they will be laid on the Table.

Mr. WELSH. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine if he has not the accounts from the men employed on the *Northern Light* last summer? They must be received in the department before this, and paid for. If those accounts had been sent into the department and paid, what necessity is there to write down for further documents?

Mr. FOSTER. If there was no occasion to write down for further information, it is not probable I would take the trouble to do so. The hon. gentleman was precise in asking a certain minute information, and I propose that he will get all information and get it as minute as it can possibly be.

Mr. WELSH. Those papers were moved for in the first Orders of the House.

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 92) to amend Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 31,

Mr. BOWELL. This is the only clause that was not passed. It was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), in order to ascertain how the amendment to section 148 would affect the time given for the entry of an action under clause 147. A careful reading of the two sections will show that section 145 relates to proceedings that may be taken against the individual officer of customs, whereas the proposed sub-section to 148, which was purposely worded as far as possible the same as section 145, refers to suits for the recovery of the thing seized. The one section refers to the individual, and the other to the thing. But still, for fear that any misunderstanding might arise in the administration of these two sections, I propose to add to sub-section 2 of section 148, the following words:—

Every such action, suit or proceeding shall be brought within three months after such decision has been given.

This, I am informed by the Minister of Justice, will meet the objection that was made to the sections as they now stand.

Mr. GILLMOR. What time have they now?

Mr. THOMPSON. Three months from the time the offence is committed, and this change makes it three months after the decision is given.

Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

FRAUDULENT TRADE MARKS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 91) to amend the law relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose that this clause should pass. I had some doubt as to the propriety of the proviso, as it is somewhat of a novelty in this country. I think this is the only case in which a person charged before a court of summary jurisdiction has the option to demand a trial on indictment for the offence. However, the clause is in the English Act, and I think it is well to have the procedure no more severe here than it is there.

Mr. LAURIER. It is always an inconvenience to have conflicting laws, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to endeavor to have the laws on that subject made uniform instead of exceptional.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a great deal of force in that view, and I will ask to have the proviso struck out.

On section 10,

Mr. THOMPSON. I had doubts at first as to the right of Parliament to enact a section which treats of the contract of sale, but, on reflection, I am inclined to think it is within our powers. We have, of course, unlimited powers with respect to criminal matters, and this is simply an enactment that when a contract of sale is made it shall imply a guarantee that a crime has not been committed.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is merely a matter of civil right. The Minister of Justice is not dealing with this criminally at all; he is not dealing with it as an incident of crime, when he declares that a contract made between two parties, where a trade mark is involved, shall have a certain effect, by declaring that the vendor shall be a warrantor that the goods are the goods of the party entitled to use the trade mark. That is clearly a civil right. It is clearly a matter of civil contract, an ordinary matter of sale. Under our constitution, the Local Legislatures, in matters of civil rights, have the right to enact such criminal laws as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of those rights. While the criminal law generally is under our jurisdiction, special offences committed against the jurisdiction and authority or against the public policy of a Local Legislature may be dealt with by the Local Legislature itself. For instance, suppose that a Local Legislature provides for the trial of a general election, and the Province wishes to provide for the protection of the polls and for the punishment of fraudulent votes, clearly it has the power, under the constitution, to give effect to its own legislation and its own policy by criminal enactment. That is specially provided for in the 16th sub-section, and so it would be in a matter of this sort. If a party improperly uses a trade mark, the Local Legislatures may provide that he shall be punished or be held to warrant the goods he sold. That is within their jurisdiction, and it does not seem to me we have the power to extend our jurisdiction over civil matters by undertaking to deal with certain criminal features of it. The Minister would act more in consonance with our rights by abstaining from any legislation of this sort.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not overlooked any of the points which my hon. friend has urged. They are certainly the views which present themselves on the first examination of the clause, but I cannot agree that the clause is entirely beyond our power. In fact, while I had some doubt on the subject at first, I feel strongly convinced now that the clause is within our power. We are making legislation on the subject of trade marks to this extent: we are declaring that the fabrication of a trade mark shall be a forgery; we are going further, we are providing that the goods with fabricated trade marks on them shall be seized by the Customs authorities, and we are therefore depriving the purchaser of his property in those goods and invading to that extent

his civil rights. We have a right to go further, and say that the individual whom we have deprived of the right of property in those goods shall have recourse against the vendor, on the principle that the vendor must be taken to have warranted that the crime of forgery was not committed in respect of those trade marks. We have numerous illustrations of the same kind of legislation and of the way in which such legislation may be necessary. Supposing a promissory note was given for the purchase of a vote at a parliamentary election, that would be valid ; but in the course of our legislation for the prevention of corrupt practices, we certainly not only have the right to punish such a transaction with penalties, but to declare that the civil contract for which that note was a consideration should be null and void. If we assume that the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors is within our jurisdiction, and we forbid the entrance of intoxicating liquors into, and their sale in the country, we can legislate, with the view of frustrating the sale, that any civil contract made for the purchase of intoxicating liquors shall be null and void. It is with these views that I think the clause is within our jurisdiction ; and, if it were doubtful, as I admit it seemed to me at the first blush to be, I would still ask the House to enact this, unless it were clearly beyond our powers, because it can do no practical injury by being enacted. It confers a right in regard to which necessarily litigation must take place for its enforcement, and it must come before the courts for adjudication. If the view which I have taken is not upheld, it will be declared beyond our competence, but we should not refuse to enact a provision which is in force in all these other countries, unless it is clear that the clause is without our jurisdiction. If we did not, we would leave ourselves open to the objection that, having undertaken to adopt this convention and having become parties to it, we have omitted the legislation which might be a material part of it, and we might not be entitled to the representation at the convention to be held next year, or to the protection which the trade marks are entitled to in all countries which form the union. For all these reasons, feeling that this can do no harm, even if the view which I take and am strongly convinced of, is not a right one, I think it is wise to pass this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It seems to me that the objection which has been taken has not been answered by the Minister of Justice. The objection, as I understand, is that by this Statute we are creating new offences. We have gone a step further than we are entitled to go, and have imported into a contract a stipulation for certain covenants which are not placed there under the common law. This section alters the entire import of the contract which the parties have made. It is not, as far as I can see, essential to the purpose of the legislation which is now before us. So far as it was essential, it might be argued that it was within our powers, but here we are going outside of our powers in saying that this contract shall have this additional condition imported into it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is made criminal.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) That may be all right. I do not understand that my hon. friend called in question any part of the Bill which has that effect. The Bill in regard to this matter says that :

"On the sale or in the contract for the sale of any goods to which a trade mark, or mark or trade description has been applied, the vendor shall be deemed to warrant that the mark is a genuine trade mark, and not forged or falsely applied, or that the trade description is not a false trade description within the meaning of this Act, unless the contrary is expressed in some writing signed by or on behalf of the vendor and delivered at the time of the sale or contract to and accepted by the vendee."

Under the common law, the provisions would be very different. Here you import a guarantee which is not to be

found at common law. You are going beyond your powers, and I feel that it is dangerous legislation for us to adopt, when we have all authority against us, and for us to leave it to the courts afterwards to determine this matter, unless we are perfectly clear that we are within our powers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). By the 13th section clause of the 92nd section of the British North America Act, the Local Legislatures are given jurisdiction over "property and civil rights in the Province." The 15th clause of the same section says :

"The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section."

What are the civil rights? Clearly they are the rights which are regulated by law. It is true that, while generally the Local Legislatures have the right to deal with civil rights, there are certain special civil rights which are left to the jurisdiction of this Legislature. But, as those are named, they are limited. Everything which is not embraced within these specified limits falls within the general provision in regard to civil rights which are controlled by civil law, which the party may act upon so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. It is clear from the provisions of section 92 of the British North America Act that this Parliament cannot obtain jurisdiction over a subject by declaring that it shall be punishable in a certain sense criminally. If the policy of the law is that the civil right, in order to secure its due enforcement, requires punitive legislation, that belongs, not to this Parliament, but to the Local Legislature ; but if the criminal features of the transaction are made the chief features of the legislation, then it falls under the criminal law, and comes within the jurisdiction of this Legislature. The hon. gentleman proposes to deal with this matter from the criminal point of view, and, so far as he has made the criminal features paramount, and has dealt with this fraudulent use of trade marks as a part of the criminal law, I do not object to it ; but when he goes beyond that, and infringes on the civil rights of the parties, and provides that persons other than the principals may be affected by the provisions of this Bill, I think he is clearly invading the province of the Local Legislature, and that is exhibited in the provisions of the 17th section, in which he says :

"On the sale or in the contract for the sale of any goods to which a trade mark, or mark or trade description has been applied, the vendor shall be deemed to warrant that the mark is a genuine trade mark."

Suppose the mark is genuine. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has the right to put the party to the proof? That is not criminal. There has been no criminal offence committed. The use is legitimate, and he proposes to make a provision which in a civil contract, a contract of sale, would put the party to the necessity of proving a certain fact before that sale could be effected. Clearly that cannot be done. The hon. gentleman is creating a limitation under the existing civil right when he says that a party who has clearly a civil right in regard to a civil contract shall have that right limited in a particular way, and that that right shall not be effected unless a certain fact is established. That is formally an invasion of the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, and has nothing whatever to do with the criminal law. This Bill cannot be confined to the offender. The hon. gentleman imposes certain penalties on a party who has not violated the law, and he says, unless you do certain things and prove them, your law is inoperative. I think the hon. gentleman will see that this is something which this Legislature cannot do.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself entertain very different views as to the extent to which this Bill affects civil rights. In my opinion, when we are in reality, substantially, and in good faith, dealing with these matters over which we have juris-

diction, we have a right, in so far as it is, in our judgment, essential to legislate fully on these subjects, to take possession of any subject that is relegated to the Local Legislature, civil rights included. Every time we deal with the subject of criminal law, every time we establish an offence which is not an offence at common law, we deal with the subject of civil rights. Every time we legislate in respect to interest, bills of exchange, or promissory notes, we affect civil procedure and civil rights; and every time we legislate with respect to the criminal law, as I said before, in creating a statutory offence, we are directly invading the province of civil rights. The hon. member says these are given to us. We are given power to legislate with respect to these subjects, and the giving of that power implies the power to legislate so fully that it may be necessary for us to take up other subjects which are not given to us at all. Every time we legislate with respect to rivers, harbors or the public domain, with respect to the erection of public buildings, lighthouses, and so on, we take power to expropriate private property, and invade in that way, and necessarily, in the fulfilment of our function, the domain of civil rights in its very citadel, the rights with respect to real estate in the Provinces. Now, are we doing so here or not? If the hon. member does not agree with me in this view of the constitution, of course I cannot expect to convince him; but if he agrees with me that that is the extent of our powers in legislating over matters which are given to our Parliament, I should hope to convince him that here we are doing nothing more than this: having made this a crime, as we have a right to do; having prevented the importation into the country, as we have a right to do; having prevented its sale in the country, as we have a right to do, we have also a right to nullify a sale, or to attach conditions to the contract or the sale itself. We have a right, even, to say that the making of that contract shall be a crime; we have a right to make that a felony, if we please; we have a right to attach any punishment, capital punishment, if necessary, to the making of that contract.

Mr. EDGAR. But you do not do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, we do not do it. We do a little less, but we do what is involved in that principle. Having the right to punish the making of a contract, having the right to declare it invalid, we have surely the right, although we punish parties for having made it, although we invalidate it, to attach conditions to it which will give the innocent purchaser a remedy for that in respect to which we have punished him. Now, the hon. gentleman is mistaken, as a matter of argument, in his contention that, in the case of a purchaser of goods properly paid for, we are putting the proof upon him of his innocence. No question can arise at all unless there has been proof that the trade mark was forged, that the crime was committed; but we are in no respect putting the burden of proof upon him, no more than you are putting it upon me if you accuse me, in any court of justice, of a crime that I did not commit. I am availing myself of my rights to that extent. Every man against whom there is evidence of an offence must be put upon proof that the offence was committed. But, as I said before, if we were imposing a criminal penalty which might be beyond our power, if we were doing anything by which the subject could be harassed or oppressed, I would think it well to keep far within the limits of our jurisdiction; and so I would say as to any kind of legislation which might have the effect of harassing or distressing the subject. But here we are dealing simply with the party to a fraudulent contract; the party who has committed a forgery, and where the matter must necessarily come before the court for adjudication before an innocent party could get the redress which we are endeavoring to give him. It does seem to me than no

Mr. THOMPSON.

injury can result from the adoption of this, even if I am all wrong as to our powers.

Mr. EDGAR. If an ordinary letter relating to the sale of an article which may be trade marked, is brought to a lawyer, and his advice is sought as to the liability of the party on that ordinary letter, with no warning, with no reference whatever to the trade mark, does not the Minister of Justice see how exceedingly unreasonable it would be that he should have to search all over the criminal laws of the Dominion to see if, by accident, some clause might not be inserted creating that to be a contract which does not appear to be so on its face, and when, in respect of that very contract, no criminal liability is attached? It does look to me as if the Minister of Justice were trying, whenever the subject of criminal law is before the House, to reach out in all directions to see if, by any ingenuity, he can bring a civil matter, a civil contract, into this legislation. I can not imagine, for instance, that the Minister of Justice would ever think of proposing such a clause in the criminal law of his own motion; but he finds it in a law which is of the nature of a treaty, and which it is considered advisable for this Parliament to pass. But a question of this kind can never have arisen in any of the countries which are concerned, because the Legislatures who enacted it have supreme power on all those questions. Surely it would be far better, if there is nothing essential in the criminal part of this statute, that the Minister of Justice should make the whole statute more nearly within the jurisdiction of this Legislature, by leaving that out or modifying it in some way, so that it would be connected with the criminal portion of the Act. Now it is distinct.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He overlooks one feature of this altogether, because he bases his argument, to a great extent, on the supposition that we are not making the contract an offence. But the hon. gentleman will remember, when I recall it to his attention, that the making of that contract, that is, the contract of sale of fraudulently marked merchandise, is just precisely what we are making it, the committing of a forgery, by this act. Now, having made that a forgery, we say the forger shall be liable, not only to the penalty which we prescribe in this Parliament, but his contract shall be voided to the extent of the purchaser being able to recover back the amount of his purchase money.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, I think, goes further than that. Under the section we are now considering, you are merely determining how far the contract shall be deemed to apply, while the party selling may be perfectly innocent. He may be knowingly selling an article with a trade mark on it, or he may be doing it innocently, but in any case you are importing into the contract a stipulation which is not there at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has committed the offence.

Mr. DAVIES. Not if he does it innocently.

Mr. THOMPSON. He has committed the offence.

Mr. EDGAR. Under what section?

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the section which makes it an offence to sell goods with the trade mark attached. But we have relieved him from the penalty. If he goes into court and the burden of proof being upon him, proves that he did it innocently, we relieve him of the penalty, but the offence has been committed. The moment he has made this contract of sale, although he has done it innocently, we say the contract shall be practically voided. That is about all we are doing. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) spoke of the difficulty of counsel advising. I do not think that is a practical objection to the legislation. Counsel must be assumed to know the law

and the legislation with reference to trade marks, and if there was brought to counsel a letter which constitutes the contract of sale and he was asked to put the proper construction on it, he would enquire whether that contract related to goods which had trade marks, and if so he would tell his client the conditions attached thereto. The difficulty of searching applies in this as well as in all copyright legislation, yet such legislation is necessary as a matter of public policy.

Mr. LAUNIER. I would be disposed to agree at the first blush to the principle which has been laid down by the Minister of Justice; that is to say, when we have power to legislate over matters here we have a consequent power to invade civil rights in so far as may be necessary to give effect to our legislation. Take the instance given by the Minister himself. We have power to legislate over election matters, and if this Parliament declares that a certain contract shall be a corrupt practice and be treated as such, we, I imagine, have the consequent power to destroy the civil effect of that contract by declaring it to be a corrupt practice and therefore within our jurisdiction. But it seems to me that this principle does not apply here. I could understand the reasoning of the Minister if the effect of the clause were to destroy the effect of the civil contract which is made a criminal offence; for instance, to declare that the sale of trade marks relating to spurious articles should be null and void. Then you would destroy the civil effect of the contract. The offence respecting the trade mark would be made a criminal offence, and so the civil offence would be null and void. That is not what is done by this section. The section is not to give effect to our legislation, but it is to import a new element into the contract. Suppose, instead of having our divided legislative power, we had full and paramount power in this House, what would be the effect of this section? The effect would be clearly to enable the party who would be the sufferer to bring a civil action to recover from the vendor damages upon that contract. This is not giving effect to our legislation, but it is importing an altogether foreign element which is not at all a consequence of the civil offence.

Committee reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice whether the Government have considered the suggestion which I made the other day, or which I submitted for a third party, touching the time at which this Act will be proclaimed?

Mr. THOMPSON. I did consider the matter, and I am convinced the writer of the letter misunderstood the purport of the Bill, because there can be no reason for delaying bringing this Act into force in so far as inconveniencing persons making importations. The importation of improper trade-marked goods is fully forbidden by the present law, so that if this Act were not in force the present law would apply.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 93) further to amend the Speedy Trials Act, chap. 175 of the Revised Statutes.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire further to make this Act applicable to British Columbia. This has been requested by the Judiciary there and by the Provincial Government. I propose to provide that in the Province of British Columbia the judges shall be the Chief Justice or a Puisné Judge of the Supreme Court or a Judge of the County Court.

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That certainly is not the Bill before us.

Mr. THOMPSON. It merely makes it applicable to British Columbia, at a request received from there after I introduced the Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. THOMPSON. It is precisely the same as in the existing Act, the words added being "British Columbia."

Committee rose and reported.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 60) to amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. He said: It is a matter of mere detail and can be explained in committee. The first section gives to the clerk of the Printing Committee of both Houses the performing of the duties which in the Act formerly was given to the Clerk of the House or the Clerk of the Senate. It is proposed that the orders to be given to the Printing Department should be, first, by the deputy heads of each department; second, by the Clerk of each House, and third, for the common printing of both Houses, by the Joint Committee of Printing or by their clerk. The second section only changes the old Bill, in exempting from the necessity of an order of the department the stationery and books which are supplied to penitentiaries by chaplains, or for other books, and for books of the library, which was an oversight in the former Bill. The third section reinstates the Queen's Printer as a deputy head. The importance of the situation and the new duties which will devolve upon the Queen's Printer have decided the Government to make him a deputy Minister in the full sense of the word; meaning salary as well as position. When it is known that the Queen's Printer will control an expenditure, left to his own personal supervision, of over \$400,000 or \$500,000, we have considered that his duties would entitle him to the salary of a deputy Minister. The fourth section is as to the right to appoint in the printing office, officers by the Superintendent of Printing, who shall not be necessarily members of the Civil Service. We want to make that printing department really a commercial department. When I say "commercial" I don't want to say the Government will engage in trading, but that the department will be conducted on a commercial basis, that is to say, the officers there and employés will not be subjected to the provisions of the Civil Service—for instance, working from half-past nine to four o'clock. The Superintendent of Printing said: "I want my men to work like myself, beginning at eight, and finishing their work at six o'clock. The fifth section only says that the pay-lists for the officers may be made fortnightly as well as monthly. The sixth section is only continuing the provisions of the first section, that is to say, giving the duties to the clerks of both Houses, to the deputy chiefs of the department, and to the joint clerk of the Printing Committee to give the orders to the printing and stationery department. The seventh section is a consequence of the preceding one, and the last provides that the auditor may take stock annually instead of quarterly as in an ordinary commercial office. These are the only provisions in this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

House resolved itself into Committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move to add, after the words "the clerk of the Joint Committee of the two Houses on Printing," the words "or other officer specially designated by that committee."

Mr. EDGAR. This section makes a decided change in the discipline of this House. I understand that all the subordinate clerks, including the clerk of the Printing Committee, are under the control of the Clerk of this House and subject to his discipline. This secures uniformity of action and avoids interference by outsiders with the affairs of this House, because, perhaps, Ministers may sometimes be called outsiders with regard to the affairs of this House. I have no reason to suppose that the present efficient clerk of the Printing Committee would cease to be an efficient officer, but we do not know how soon he may be superseded or retired, and I think it may be a serious thing to interfere with the control of an important functionary like the clerk of the Printing Committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no difference in that respect. The discipline of the House will be preserved. The clerk of the Printing Committee will be under the clerk of the House, as usual. But in giving orders for the printing work of the Session, he is not more under the control of the clerk of the House now than he will be under this Bill. The committee is a joint committee of both Houses, and the orders given by the joint committee are orders given both by the Senate and the House of Commons, and his duties provided for in this clause are only to give the orders required for printing and printing paper during the Session. There is no abrogation of the rule, and certainly no usurpation of power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that for some days you, Sir, (Mr. Rykert) have had to discharge the duties of Deputy Speaker, and it does seem to me rather extraordinary that we should have a Deputy Speaker at a very considerable salary, and that for at least a fortnight he has not been here. I think, Sir, that while we have this Bill under consideration, it would be a very important duty on the part of the Administration to tell us why the business of the House is not conducted in accordance with the provisions of the law. The hon. First Minister sometime ago provided that there should be a Deputy Speaker, and that those duties should not be undertaken by an ordinary member of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Is the hon. member in order?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the very question of order, the irregularity of these proceedings, about which I am making these observations. I am not at all objecting to your fitness, Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances; but I am asking the Government how it is that the ordinary proceedings of the House have been interfered with, and this irregular mode of procedure adopted under existing circumstances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that discussion is altogether out of order. We are discussing a certain Bill, and are considering the first clause of that Bill. What has that to do with the Deputy Speaker? I really cannot see. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman information respecting the absence of the Deputy Speaker. I presume he has a good reason for being absent, or he would be here, just as the Minister of Railways has a good reason for being absent. I have no doubt that the regularity of the proceedings or the legality of the measure we may pass with the hon. member for Lincoln in the chair will not be disputed. The hon. gentleman may dispute it, because he is in a disputatious humor sometimes, but I do not think the courts will say that the measure we may pass through

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

committee is in any way affected by the absence of the Deputy Speaker. As the hon. gentleman has brought up the matter, I will cause enquiry to be made, and ascertain whether his absence may be due to ill-health or to some other reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to say that I am serious in my proposition. The hon. gentleman knows right well that this House could not proceed with business in the absence of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. There is a certain regular and proper mode of procedure required. The Speaker is required to be in the chair when the House is conducting business. The House undertook to amend the rules, and provided that there should be a Deputy Speaker, who should take the chair in the absence of the Speaker, and should take the chair when the House went into Committee. That change was made at the instance of the hon. First Minister. Now, the Deputy Speaker is absent, and an ordinary member of the House is called on to take the chair and discharge his duties. This may have been a regular proceeding before we created that office; I do not question that at all; but we amended the law at the instance of the hon. First Minister, who told us that it was quite unfair to call on an ordinary member to be constantly here to discharge those duties. The hon. gentleman now undertakes to treat the matter as a huge joke. If it is, his Bill is a huge joke, and the charge upon the public treasury is a huge joke.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a little unreasonable in this matter. It is well known that it has become the practice and the habit of this House to allow the servants of the House, when important political exigencies demand their absence in the interests of the party, to leave the House, and go and attend to those interests. We know that within a very recent date three officers were punished by dismissal for leaving their duties and going to speak at political meetings. The hon. First Minister would imply that ill-health is the cause of the absence of the Deputy Speaker. I think I can give my hon. friend a better reason than that. I understand that the Deputy is in Missisquoi at this moment, aiding in the contest there for the Local House. I do not know what course may be taken by the House, but if the House is consistent with itself, and the hon. gentleman does his duty in this case, having discharged Messrs Tremblay and Poirier for taking part in political elections while in the pay of the House, if it is proved that the Deputy Speaker at this moment is in Missisquoi with the view of carrying the flag in triumph to the Local House of Quebec, surely my right hon. friend will feel it his duty, or the Secretary of State will feel it his duty, following out the rule he has laid down and the precedent he established the other night, to ask for the dismissal of Mr. Colby from his position of Deputy Speaker. At all events, if we can afford to have him absent from the House, his pay should not be inserted in the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is fair to bring on this discussion while the hon. gentleman is absent. I may explain that on Thursday evening the Deputy Speaker told me he had very important personal business to attend to at home, that his daughter was coming from Winnipeg, and asked me, as a favor, if I would allow him to go home. I did not think at the time that his absence would cause this awkward constitutional point to be raised, and I thought that in giving him leave I was only imposing on myself the obligation of remaining in the chair nearly all the time, and that my personal discomfort would alone be the result. I told the Deputy Speaker, therefore, that I had certainly no objection to his leaving. I understand he arrived here last night and is now in the city, but that he is tired and unwell or he would be with us to-day.

Mr. IVES. He has not been in Missisquoi at all.

Mr. LAURIER. I am only too glad to accept the statement of the Speaker that the Deputy Speaker was absent on private affairs. Otherwise I would agree with the hon. member for Northumberland that his conduct was outrageous in absenting himself to go electioneering, and there would be but one voice in this House on both sides to condemn his action. I may be pardoned for bringing to the notice of the Speaker and the House the fact that several officers of this House, not later than last Saturday, were on the hustings in the county of Missisquoi.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware of the fact, and no officer has been given a *congé* for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. I quite believe that no officer would dare go to you, Sir, and ask leave to go to Missisquoi in order to electioneer against the Liberal party; but still it appears that officers did go there, and did electioneer, without asking your permission. I have been told by parties who were present that translators of this House,—not Mr. Poirier or either of the Tremblays—but general translators of this House, were on the hustings last Saturday in Missisquoi.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry my poor little Bill has been the cause of so much trouble.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend ought to be glad that I brought this to his notice, because he is rather touchy on that point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend wants to make an impression on the House, and takes the occasion of my presentation of this Bill to do so. I must say with regard to his last remark, as I was one of those who brought before the House the matter of officers dealing disrespectfully—personally—and discourteously with the members of this House, that his remarks do not alter the position which I then took and which the House endorsed; and if he or any of his friends will show that any one of the officers of this House has behaved on the hustings in a discourteous manner or interfered with the action of members of this House, such officer ought certainly to be punished. To come back to my Bill, I move that the amendment I suggested should be carried.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not given any reason why the committee should be empowered to appoint any other officer than the clerk of the committee to do the work which was assigned to the clerk of the committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is at the request of the Printing Committee, a delegation of which asked me to give them this power.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the object of this?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have stated that the Queen's Printer is a deputy head, and now that the establishment of the printing office is an established fact, he is entitled to the salary of a deputy head. Last year that was objected to because the bureau was not then organised.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the Superintendent of Stationery?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Young, who is, unfortunately, very sick, and who will likely have to be superseded. By the next clause we ask power to name the Superintendent of Printing, the Superintendent of Stationery and the Chief Accountant at a lower class, if the Government think fit, should it be necessary at any time to make new appointments.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the Superintendent of Printing?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. André Senécal is the Superintendent of Printing and Mr. Gliddon is the Accountant, both old officers of the department.

Mr. EDGAR. In section 4, the person selected to be Superintendent of Printing must have five years' experience in Canada. Is the choice to be restricted to Canada?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to take away the words "in Canada." We might have some very good printers from the United States; and we have taken away the word "management" in the sixth line because a man might not be a manager and still be a very good man for the position.

On section 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We want the Superintendent of Printing to appoint the officers necessary. This is for the good management of the printing office.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman has left out the words "skilled hands."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to restore those words.

On section 6,

Mr. EDGAR. I see that the Clerk of the House is still to furnish estimates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Clerk of the House and the Clerk of the Senate will give the necessary orders for each House, as in the departments the orders are given for each department, and the clerk of the Printing Committee will give the order for the printing and printing paper for both Houses.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. The former provision was that the Auditor General should check the accounts quarterly; now it is annually—why is that change made?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The stock on hand will be so much as to devolve upon the Auditor and the other officers work which is certainly unnecessary, and this clause has been inserted at the special demand of the skilled officer of the Department and the Auditor himself, and we know that the Auditor does not shrink from the responsibility of keeping the accounts close.

Bill reported, and amendments agreed to.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No 106) further to amend the Indian Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that the sixteenth and seventeenth lines are new. Under the statute as it stood, the half-breeds were allowed to withdraw from the treaty on their own motion, without any consent being required from the Indian Commissioner, or the Assistant Indian Commissioner. I see also that the two last lines of the section are new also, which embrace in the withdrawal the minor unmarried children. Has it been found necessary in the interest of the half-breeds to take away from them the power of determining for themselves when they shall withdraw, and putting this into the hands of the Indian Commissioner?

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that the withdrawal is to be surrounded with a great many difficulties. He has to

signify his desire in writing, and that has to be sworn to and witnessed before two men. In addition, he has got to get the consent of the Indian Commissioner. What is the object of all that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Many of the half-breeds have been accounted as Indians, because they have lived with a band for some time. When scrip is given to the half-breeds, they all become white men in order to get it. Then they withdraw from the white men to get the advantage of the annuities and then they want to get back into the band again. Having received their scrip as white men, and having expended it, they want to get back into the treaty again, to be considered Indians once more, and to receive their share of the annuities and supplies given to the Indians. We wish to prevent them moving from one stage to another, from being half-breeds now, then being Indians, and back again to be half-breeds, it, perhaps, being forgotten that they previously got scrip. To prevent this we provide that there shall be a consent given in writing by the Indian Commissioner. There is also, at the end of the clause, a provision that such withdrawal shall include the minor or unmarried children of such half-breeds—the children shall go with the parents.

Mr. EDGAR. All these new restrictions are to prevent them from getting out of the treaty. The old restrictions are in the first part of the clause, which prevent them getting anything except under special circumstances to be determined by the Superintendent General, or his agent. Now, the difficulty the Minister is trying to get over, apparently, is to prevent them getting out of the treaty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With a knowledge of all the facts of the case.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask if many half-breeds or Indians are asking to get back into the treaty again?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not sufficiently aware to be able to state positively; but I have little doubt that a great deal of inconvenience has been caused by the half-breeds wasting their scrip and going back to the band, and then, by-and-bye, in a year or two, leaving the band again and becoming white men, and setting up a new claim for a second grant of scrip. In order to prevent any fraud of this kind, this provision is inserted. I think the hon. gentleman will see it is very necessary.

Mr. WATSON. I think it is very necessary, because it has been reported to me, in fact I know it is the case, that a large number of Indians were advised to take scrip by speculators.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. WATSON. In fact I have been given to understand—I cannot prove it, of course—than an Indian agent benefited to the extent of \$10 a piece on every Indian that he could advise to get out of the treaty and to take scrip. He advised these Indians that if they applied for scrip they would get it at that time, but that if they waited for two or three years the chances were that the Government would wipe out this annuity altogether, and they would receive nothing at the end of that time; and unless they received scrip before July, 1887, they would not be entitled to scrip at all. It was done for that purpose, and also for the purpose of placing these Indians on the voters' lists. A great number of these Indians were placed on the voters' lists during the local elections in Manitoba. The Indians I refer to particularly now, are the Indians around Lake Manitoba, and the name of the agent who has been reported to me as advising these people to get out of the treaty, is Martineau.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is he agent now?

Mr. WATSON. He is agent still, I believe.

Mr. EDGAR.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will enquire about that.

Mr. WATSON. There is quite a number of those Indians that are not fit to go out of the treaty. They have spent all they received for their scrip, and they are now in a destitute state. I have no doubt that they are now, as the Minister stated, anxious to get back into the treaty and to get their little annuity when the paymaster comes round. These people should never have gone out of the treaty at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think every case of that sort is a proper subject for enquiry, and that where land so acquired is still held by the speculators, it should be resumed by the Crown. In every case where scrip has been obtained, and land obtained on that scrip by the speculators, it ought to be resumed by the Crown, and the Indians ought to be allowed to come back.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the Indians should not be allowed to belong to the Indian band, and then, simply for the purpose of acquiring the right to vote, be permitted to leave the band by the permission of the Indian agent, and then allowed to resume their positions as Indians again. If they are entitled to vote as Indians, they ought to have a vote, in Manitoba, as well as elsewhere, and not evade the law. As I understand my hon. friend, this has been done in the local elections in Manitoba. But, in any case, it seems to me that if the person desires to withdraw and does withdraw, he should give reasons for it; and now, when power is taken from him to get out upon his own request, and leave is given him by the Indian Commissioner, it seems to me he should remain out. I see by the first part of the clause that only on very special circumstances can he re-enter, but then it is possible that the Government might consider some case of that kind as a special circumstance that would warrant him in being reinstated when it was not special. Not having full confidence in the Government, I consider this is giving them too much power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, when a change takes place and when my hon. friend becomes Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, I shall have every confidence in his attending to the matter honestly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I shall be sold, then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that where an Indian agent has persuaded the Indians to leave the band, and has speculated out of the change, that agent should be dismissed, but I do not think the Indians ought to be punished by exclusion. The Government have acted upon the principle that the Indians are minors, and of course they could not hold them responsible to the same extent that other parties are held. If he is holding land himself, that is good reason for treating him as an emancipated Indian, and leaving him in possession of the land; but where the land has gone into the hands of speculators on scrip given to the Indians, it seems to me the proper course is for the Crown to cancel the scrip, to resume possession of the land, and ignore the party who has acquired the land altogether. It is a fraud upon the Crown, and there ought not to be for one moment any hesitation in refusing to recognise any claim so obtained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, of course, upon the fraud being proven the scrip should be cancelled, and the cancelled land, if possible, reclaimed. This clause, however, does not apply to Indians at all, emancipated or otherwise; it applies to half-breeds. The hon. member who was Minister of the Interior and managed the Indian Department knows perfectly well that the line between a pure blooded Indian and a half breed is very indistinct. If an Indian has some white blood in him he remains an Indian, and remains in the band until it becomes an advantage to him to say that he is a white man and not an Indian. I take it that a

very considerable percentage of Indians, even in the North-West, are not pure Indians; they are considered to be Indians, but they are really half-breeds, having white blood in them. These men, having expended their substance, having thrown away their land into the hands of speculators, now want to get back to their former position. I hope the hon. gentleman was misinformed when he said that an Indian agent or a land agent had connived with speculators in regard to dealings in Indian lands, and it is a matter that will be enquired into. I have no doubt that every Indian with the slightest pretence to have white blood in his veins claimed to be a white man, and on their establishing that they had white blood they came under the law and became entitled to scrip. Now their complexions are dark and they are full-blooded Indians again, and they want to go back to their former position, for the reasons mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and we must have a check on them in that regard, and this must be done only by the consent, not of a subordinate, but of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or the Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. WATSON. It is very difficult to find full-blooded Indians in Manitoba. Among the Indians around Lake Manitoba and those on Lake St. Peter Reserve, I question if there is one full-blooded Indian in either of the bands. I hold that an Indian agent or any person entrusted with the care of the wards of the Government, who has done wrong, should be punished; but so far as the cancellation of lands is concerned, they might have been purchased by scrip obtained from Indians originally and resold to innocent parties, and it would be unfair to cancel lands purchased by this scrip. I do not bring it in the form of a charge, although I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this House, that it has been reported to me on very good authority that an Indian agent did advise Indians to take scrip and that he received some consideration for giving that advice. I hope the Government will enquire into the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I think, moreover, there will be sufficient evidence to back up my statement. The parties who should be punished are those who have thus advised the Indians and not innocent individuals who have purchased lands with scrip originally obtained from Indians. No doubt the Indians were led to believe they had as much right to vote as white men in the local elections in Manitoba, and they were so advised by the men who expected to get their votes. They did vote, but the spectacle presented at the polling place was very disgraceful. Indians walked up to the polls and on being asked their name did not know it, they did not know what name was put on the voters' list. They were afterwards told their names by the persons interested in the election of a certain candidate, and they were told how to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What was your majority?

Mr. WATSON. They did not vote in the Dominion elections in Manitoba. This was in the local elections, and I may say that a candidate who received 19 majority of the intelligent electors was defeated by 58 majority by this particular Indian vote. Some of them, no doubt, were intelligent men, but a large number of them were men whose names should never have been placed on the voters' list. So much is the case that the Local Government of Manitoba have seen fit, under the new Election Act which they are preparing, to disfranchise all Indians, or at least to provide that an Indian must have been outside the reservation and independent of the Government for three years before he shall be entitled to vote. This is done so that Indians who have come out from the treaty a year or a year and a half or two years ago shall not be entitled to vote. The intention is to give them time to become

sufficiently well acquainted with the questions of the day, to be able to give an intelligent vote, before they are given the privilege.

On section 2,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This and the next three sections seem to be new provisions of the law, and they seem to be necessary. Has there been no provision in the Indian Act to cover this point before.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. These provisions are very much the same as those contained in the Ontario Land Act. The seventh sub-section of this Bill makes provision that deeds shall be registered in the office of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. In Ontario and in Provinces where there are registry offices the ordinary registry laws should be made to apply, and in Ontario in case of sales by the sheriff for taxes there is a provision in the law that the deeds shall be registered within six months, and thus priority is preserved. It is unfortunate to make separate provision with respect to time and place for registering title-deeds in Provinces where there are registry laws now in operation.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is discretionary with the Superintendent General whether he will recognise certain conveyances, and it is quite necessary to provide that no person shall have a right to call upon him to exercise that discretion. The registration must be done within two years.

On section 3,

Mr. LISTER. I would like to ask, is it the intention of the Government under this Act to provide for cases now being examined into by a commission respecting the right of Indians to participate in Indian lands and bounties? I understand that the Chippewa tribe, and I believe other tribes, are very much exercised on account of a certain investigation which is being proceeded with by the Inspector of Indian Agencies throughout the western part of Ontario. Any person who has had dealings with the Indians knows that they are of a very suspicious nature, and this investigation to which I refer has created the greatest possible uneasiness among the Indian bands of western Ontario. Under the Treaty of 1827 made between the Government and the Indians, whereby the Indians relinquished to the Government the land, and in return secured certain reserves and an annuity to them and their descendants for all time to come, this treaty was signed only by a few members of the band, the chief, and I think some eighteen of the others. Since 1827 those people have been in receipt of annuities from the Government and have been in occupation of the land upon those reserves. At that time there were Indians living with the Chippewa band, who were, strictly speaking, not members of the band, but who were recognised as members, and whose children and grand-children living on the reserves have been participating in the annuities ever since that time. At that time the Pottawattamies were living with the Chippewas and became mixed with them. It appears now that some people say that they should not participate in the annuity. I may say that this tribe are in the large majority to-day, and to all intents and purposes they have more Chippewa blood than original Pottawattamies blood. It appears that a complaint has been made that they should be excluded from the same privileges as the Chippewa Indians, and this is the investigation which is going on among the Indians. Suspicious as they are, they believe the scheme is set on foot for depriving them of the lands on which they were born and which they were told belonged to them, and for depriving them of their share of annuity monies. I may inform the Government of a fact that perhaps they are not aware of, although I believe they are desirous of acting fairly in every way with the

Indians. The great majority of the Indians on this reserve are unquestionably entitled to be called Chippewa Indians, and the band have passed resolutions acquiescing in the claims of those so-called foreign Indians and requesting that those proceedings should not be continued. But, in the face of this resolution and in the face of this action on the part of the principal men of the tribe, those proceedings are being continued. I think it is very unfortunate indeed, in the face of the action by those Indians themselves, that this investigation should go on. It can result in no good, for the Indians are willing that those people who have intermarried with their tribe and who have been recognised and looked upon as Chippewas in every sense of the word, should be allowed to participate in the rights and privileges of the Chippewas. I desire to bring this matter before the attention of the First Minister, and I may say that I have petitions and affidavits here proving the statement that I make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The subject that the hon. gentleman has just alluded to does not come within the provisions of the Bill, and I see he has availed himself of the opportunity when we were discussing a measure relating to the Indians, to bring the matter up. This is a question I was formerly familiar with when I was Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. It is a very difficult question. The original Chippewas allowed the Pottawattamies to come among them. They allowed them certain privileges and they intermarried; but now a portion of the original Chippewas have pretended that they have no rights at all, and that they only afforded to the Pottawattamies Indian hospitality while among them. That is the story they have given. I know that the Chippewas, at least a portion of them, and I do not know how many, instead of being willing that the Pottawattamies should be recognised as the original Chippewas, have themselves complained some years ago when I was head of the department. I presume that to-day the Superintendent had those papers before him and he caused an enquiry to be made into it. If the Chippewas withdraw their demands for investigation into the position of the Pottawattamies, of course there is an end to the whole affair, but I fancy that is not the case. I fancy that they are still pressing. However, I will take an opportunity to enquire into it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that, so far as I can judge at present, those Pottawattamies, after mixing with the original Chippewas for so many years and intermingling their blood, that it is quite impossible now to oust them out of their houses which they and their fathers before them have occupied.

Mr. LISTER. The great-grandchildren of some of them are there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is quite right in that regard.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will ask the hon. gentleman, while on the subject, although not relevant to the Bill, whether that enquiry extends to the disputes between the Chippewas and Pottawattamies, and whether they are within the purview of this commission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it does not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice on section 3, to the fact that this clause is new from the word "taxation," in the fourth line, and provides for Indian lands which have been surrendered being liable to taxation. I should judge that was right. There is, however, an exception made against the Crown, and any Indian locating on the land. I wish to ask why the exception is made as regards an Indian being located upon it? It is surrendered land; it is no longer a portion of the reserve at all, and any Indian living on surrendered

Mr. LISTER.

land seems to me to be in the same position as other citizens, and that the land that is occupied by him would be liable to taxation the same as the adjacent land held by a white person; that it should contribute its share of taxation towards repairing roads, the maintenance of bridges, and the other municipal purposes for which adjacent property is taxed. Why is exemption given to an Indian if he ceases to be an Indian and lives on surrendered land?

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member has correctly stated the meaning of the clause. There is a reason for the land not being taxed as against the Crown, and the intention of the draftsmen evidently was that in making the liberal extension which we have by this Bill to the right of taxation by municipal authorities, we should prevent the Indian who is our ward upon those lands being ousted as the result of taxation. I would not object to that, I think it is right and as the Minister says it is a liberal provision which is being made in favor of the municipalities, but is an Indian living on surrendered land really in the full sense of the term a ward of the Government or not? I know he has not become an enfranchised Indian, but still he is not living on the reserve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume he may be held to be living on the reserve. The Indians surrender the title to the Crown, so that a certain portion of the land can be disposed of for their benefit. Until it is sold it is *de facto* a portion of the reserve, and the Indians live on it; but having surrendered the legal title to the Crown, when any portion is disposed of, the Indians have to leave it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a good deal of force in that. They might be living there after the land has been surrendered, and any white person purchasing would purchase it knowing that that difficulty was in the way.

On section 4,

Mr. EDGAR. I see that, apart from some verbal changes, the chief change in this section seems to be that non-treaty Indians are proposed to be taken out of the class who are protected by the law from having intoxicants sold to them. The words "non-treaty Indians" are left out of that portion of the section. According to the Interpretation Act, a non-treaty Indian is not covered by the word "Indian," so that this must be a distinct change of policy, and I do not think it can be meant; it must be a mistake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "non-treaty" should be in; it is an omission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another point on which I would like to have some information through the First Minister or the Minister of Justice. I observe that in the Province of Manitoba and the Province of British Columbia, on the evidence of the informer alone, if he is a credible person, two justices of the peace can sentence any person accused of giving liquor to Indians to no less than six months imprisonment with hard labor and a fine of \$300. It appears to me that is putting in the hands of two justices of the peace an extremely large discretion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it has operated unhappily. In the North-West, the hon. gentleman knows that population is very sparse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is not the North-West alone that is concerned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In Manitoba the population is almost as sparse, and in British Columbia, where there is a great deal of liquor drinking among the Indians flocking from the mountains, if there is to be any protection at all, a single witness must be sufficient. If it is necessary to have two witnesses, there will be very few convictions.

And then, we have the power of pardoning in case there is any suspicion of injustice. Although the statute is more rigid than we would like to have it in the more settled parts of the country, in the interests of quiet and order the people on the confines of civilisation must submit to it. The fine is heavy, but the profits made by the men engaged in smuggling are enormous, and unless the punishment is exceedingly severe, the introduction of intoxicants cannot be prevented. The profits are so great that, notwithstanding this severe statute, there is an enormous amount of smuggling, and great quantities of spirits have been seized and destroyed, and the smugglers have been properly punished. We have had no complaints of any injustice having been done by the measure, and if there had been any, I think I would have heard of them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is quite true up to the present time, but the Province of Manitoba in particular is becoming much more densely inhabited than the North-West Territories, and it is to be hoped that that province will speedily become very much more densely populated than it is at present. The hon. gentleman will notice that the objection I take is not to police magistrates or judges or stipendiary magistrates having this power. It is simply to two justices of the peace, and he must know as well as I that justices of the peace are in many cases appointed without any great regard to their judicial skill or attainments. I have known justices of the peace who, having such a statute, would feel themselves obliged to commit anybody, even the hon. gentleman himself, on the evidence of any person who came before them. It is quite true that the power may not have been abused up to the present time, but I am speaking of the chance of danger in the future. I do not know the extent to which justices of the peace are appointed in Manitoba, but I have known counties where every fourth man was a justice of the peace.

Mr. BARRON. I suggest that there ought to be the power of appeal from the two justices of the peace. I do not think it would be right to give the power of conviction to them without appeal, especially when they can convict on the testimony of one witness.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Act provides for an appeal. It is perfectly true that some of the magistrates cannot be very fit for their duties. My experience of the decisions of unpaid magistrates in the country is that they are more liable to let people off than to enforce the law with great severity. The complaint is generally is that they do not inflict the law with sufficient promptness or severity.

Mr. DAVIN. I may add, for the information of the committee, that in the case of persons charged with selling liquor to Indians, there are always circumstances attending the sale that make up really a very strong case. Those persons are generally engaged in bartering with the Indians, from whom they get goods such as furs and other goods at such low rates that the business is very profitable. The Indians, once they get a few glasses of whiskey, will sell their furs for a hundredth part of what they are really worth, and hence it is necessary that a severe penalty should be inflicted, and that justice should be sharp and quick in order to prevent the Indians being tampered with.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the old clause these words are found: "Or causes or procures the same to be done, or attempts the same or connives thereat—" that is, furnishing Indians with intoxicants. I would like to know whether leaving these words out, the law will reach persons who would buy liquor for the Indians with the money of the Indians. For instance, an Indian enters a town; he cannot go to a merchant and buy liquor himself, but he may get some disreputable white man and give him the money to go and purchase the liquor for him. That person purchases the liquor from the merchant and then brings it to the

Indian. The old section would cover this case, but I question whether the new section will.

Mr. THOMPSON. The words "supplies or gives" cover the case.

Mr. WATSON. I was going to suggest that it would be in the interest of the general public to have such a clause as the one which the Minister has given. It would be necessary in Manitoba, because we are not provided with all first-class justices of the peace in that country. We have some justices of the peace there who are not fit for the position at all. A year or two ago, about every other man was a justice of the peace. Every other man expected to be in the employ of the Dominion or the Local Government, and if there was no other position for him, he was made a justice of the peace. I called the attention of the First Minister, when he was at the head of Indian Affairs, to the importance of having some mounted police on the northern portion of Lake Manitoba, because a great number of Indians secure liquor from the traders who go there and who give whiskey in exchange for fish, &c. This is doing a great deal of harm, and one or two mounted policemen should be stationed at some point where they could watch those traders and follow them up. The trouble with us is that there are not enough informers. Even the fine does not induce them to inform, and in many cases the liquor is furnished by a third person. Men are known to make a living by simply waiting for the Indians, then taking their money and buying whiskey for them. Liquor is doing an immense amount of injury to the Indians throughout Manitoba. The settlement of the country is bringing the Indians in contact with the whites, and the Indians are becoming very much degraded through the influence of liquor, and the Government cannot be too strict in dealing with people who furnish the Indians with intoxicants. I thoroughly approve of the penalty, and would willingly see it increased.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the law will be much plainer if we would insert the words of the old section to which I drew the hon. gentleman's attention. The question might arise as to whether a disreputable white person who purchased liquor with the Indian's money could be said to have supplied or given the liquor. It might be argued that as it was the Indian's money with which the liquor was paid for, the liquor was at no time the property of the white man who bought it, and that the white man simply procured the liquor for the Indian. I think the words of the old clause would leave no room for doubt: "Causes or procures the same to be done, or attempts the same or connives thereat."

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no doubt the clause does cover the case the hon. gentleman refers to, but I have no objection to add those words in order to make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. BARRON. The Act provides that no appeal shall lie from the fourteen sections next preceding except to a judge. That appears to assume that there is an appeal under the Summary Convictions Act, but I understand that that appeal is only from one justice of the peace, and not from two, and I do not think this section meets the case, because, under this Bill, the hon. gentleman is introducing an appeal from two justices.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have always acted upon that.

On section 5,

Mr. EDGAR. What is the intention of this?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is general legislation by which, where the disposition of a fine is not specially designated in the Act, it is to go to the Indian fund. It has been considered desirable that, in the Province of

British Columbia, we should give the fines to the Provincial authorities, the Provincial Government undertaking the administration of justice under this Act.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the Minister of Justice prepared to make any statement in regard to the Supreme Court Bill, which he said was urgent, and he intended to proceed with at once?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would have moved the Bill a further stage to-day, but I understood it would be objected to unless it was printed, and it does not appear on the Order paper as having been printed, and therefore I have not moved it. Unless the Bill were passed to-day, we could not give the notice to those who are engaged in sufficient time, and I am afraid that, as it did not meet with unanimous approval, we shall have to abandon it.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CABLE BETWEEN PELEE ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Speaker leave the chair for the House to again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BRIEN. I desire to occupy a few moments, because some additional information has come to my hands of late in regard to a matter which, I believe, the Government have now under consideration, that is, in regard to laying a cable between Pelee Island and the mainland. I believe members on both sides of the House are willing to facilitate this work, and the Government have already a vast amount of information as to the necessity of this submarine cable. Every day there is some further evidence coming forward as to the necessity of this cable being laid. It is not so much a matter of local importance as it is a national question. It is of great interest to all those who are engaged in navigation, and a vast amount of shipping passes through the narrow channel between Pelee Island and the mainland, which is interspersed with reefs and shoals, making it very dangerous to navigation. Petition after petition has been placed in the hands of the Government, representing the case pretty fully, but so far we have not any definite information as to the conclusion the Government have come to. The people in that section will be very much disappointed, and all those who are engaged in navigation will be seriously disappointed if that cable is not laid immediately. Life and property are in danger. Several wrecks occurred there during last year. I cannot do better than read a letter which I received lately from a captain who is sailing upon the water in that section during most of his time:

"KINGSVILLE, March 5th, 1888.

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 29th February at hand, and contents fully noted. During the time I have been on the waters, I have become more acquainted with the waters at the head of Lake Erie, especially around Pelee Island. All the boats that pass through the Detroit River go between Pelee Island and Pelee Point, which is the natural channel. But you will remember that there are reefs extending north-east, from one to two miles from the north-east point on Pelee Island, which render it very dangerous to navigation. These reefs are called the Middle Grounds. Any boats getting on these reefs are plainly visible from the Island, and greatly exposed to all north-easterly and easterly gales, and a place that all mariners dread on account of there being no communications near by. In 1887 I relieved two steamers from the reefs, happening to see them from the Island. Again in 1887, there other crafts went to pieces near Pelee, over on Point Pelee, a distance of 7 miles from Pelee Island, and is visible from Pelee. The other two went to pieces on the south-west point on Pelee Island. In 1886 the big schooner *Maggy McGray* went ashore on the west side of Pelee Island.

Mr. THOMPSON.

and would undoubtedly have been dashed to pieces if I had not just happened to be passing with my boat, and released her just before another big gale came up. The captain was making arrangements to row from Pelee to main shore to telegraph for assistance, and would have had to do so, had I not happened to be around. The life of Captain Duich might have been saved if there had been any communications to the Island. At that time my boat was lying at Kingsville, and could undoubtedly have saved him if I had known it, and a great many other wrecks I could mention if it be necessary. Now, Sir, the loss of life and property is more or less due to the want of communication between Pelee Island and main shore. I would beg of you not to leave anything undone that would press on the minds of the authorities that there is great necessity of a cable being laid between mainland and Pelee Island. Besides what I have mentioned, it adds greatly to the convenience of the Island. Hoping to hear of a success of a cable being laid, I remain,

"Yours respectfully,

"CAPT. N. J. WIGLE,

"Kingsville, Ont.

"J. BRIEN, M.P.,

"House of Commons, Canada."

Any further information than this is scarcely necessary for the Government, I think. The estimated cost of this work would be only some \$7,000 or \$8,000; and that amount of property would be saved in one season. Now, considering the dangerous character of that coast, and the importance of that section of the country, the large interests at stake, and considering that the Government are taking every possible means, and very laudably so, to facilitate navigation, I hope that they will not forget that section of the country. It is a matter that is not only of local importance. I hope that the Government will give this matter their most serious consideration. I believe the Minister of Public Works is already convinced of its feasibility. If he can only convince his colleagues—and we are well aware that if he gets their consent, when we remember his activity and the energy which he brings to bear in every work he undertakes—the work will soon be accomplished. Therefore, without detaining the House any longer, I ask the Government to give this matter their most serious consideration. It is not a party question, it is not a local question, but one in which all are interested. If the Government will undertake this work, I do not think there will be a dissenting voice, either in the House or the country, and I am sure they will have the thanks and goodwill of all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman, in bringing this matter before the House, gives me an opportunity of saying a few words on the subject. The hon. gentleman was not in the House in 1884 and the following years, when this matter was brought before the House and before the Government by the gentlemen who then represented South Essex and North Essex, I think Mr. Patterson and Mr. Wigle. But at that time we had not the necessary data to give an affirmative answer to the request and petitions that were presented to us on that subject. Since that time Mr. Patterson has prosecuted the scheme with the persistence he is known to possess. The hon. gentleman knows that when the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) begins a matter of that kind, he sticks to it as long as there is a chance of carrying it to a successful completion. Well, the hon. gentleman has continued in the same course, and has presented petitions in 1886-87-88, as the hon. member now representing South Essex (Mr. Brien) is doing. The surveys have been made, and have proved that the petitions that were presented were such as would warrant the Government in going on with this work, if the revenues of the country would allow us. But as the hon. gentleman must see, I am not in a position just now to say what would be the policy of the Government on this matter. If, in conformity with the petitions which have been presented from time to time, and the pressure which has been brought to bear, the Government decide in asking Parliament to come to the relief of the settlers there, and especially to come to the relief of trade and the vessels, a sum will appear to that purpose in the Supplementary

Estimates. Of course, if the revenues of the country will not allow us to do so this year, we will have to ask Parliament to wait for another year; but as I said just now, I am not in a position at the present moment to inform the hon. gentleman what course will be followed by the Government.

DEFALCATIONS IN THE KINGSTON POST OFFICE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In conformity with the notice which I gave last night, I desire to call the attention of the House to what appears to be a very serious miscarriage of justice in the case of certain defalcations which lately occurred in the post office at Kingston. If the facts have been correctly stated to me, they are of a rather important character. For some months back, in fact, I believe, for some years back, there have been complaints of a number of robberies committed in the post office at Kingston, and very recently, if my memory serves, since this House met, an important official in the post office, the deputy postmaster of Kingston, Wm. Shannon, was caught *in flagrante delicto* by one of the officials of the post office, in the act, as I am informed, of feloniously opening letters and extracting their contents. This was publicly known, and notwithstanding that, apparently, 24 hours was allowed to elapse without any action being taken by the post office authorities, and the culprit made his way to the United States. After remaining some time there, he returned, and it was known that he had returned, as I am informed. He was in Kingston, and I believe he carried away with him a considerable amount of money, largely composed, at least so it is alleged, of the balances he had collected in this way. I desire to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to the fact that a number of persons allege they have been ruined presumably by William Shannon, and the Government, according to the statement made by the Postmaster General yesterday, do not intend to recompense those parties. That, however, is a minor detail. What appears to me to be very serious indeed is that, if the facts were correctly stated to me, if this officer was detected by another officer—as I am informed by no less a person than the deputy inspector of post offices in that district—in the act of feloniously opening letters, and if he was allowed 24 hours law and then escaped to the United States, it appears to me there has been a very gross miscarriage of justice, and I cannot understand how the officers of the post office could have permitted a culprit under those circumstances to escape without being arrested. A very considerable number of persons have expressed their astonishment to me in this matter, and there is no doubt whatever that it does look exceedingly as if, by reason of the influential connections which this officer may have, he had escaped punishment which would undoubtedly have been meted out under such circumstances to any subordinate officer connected with the department. I shall be glad if there is any explanation to be made relieving those officers from what appears to me to be a grossly neglected duty; but most undoubtedly when we come to consider the nature of the offence, and the fact that this is only one, apparently, of a whole series of similar offences, it does seem that there has been very gross negligence in this man being allowed to escape, and after having escaped, to be allowed to return and pass through Kingston and move a considerable amount of property along with him, to the great prejudice of parties ruined by him; also, I think, to the great scandal of the Government if an officer in their service, after committing such offences as these, is allowed to escape without being brought to justice. I shall be very glad to hear any explanation which the hon. the Postmaster General may have to offer on the subject.

Mr. McLELAN. I admit there has been some want of vigilance and promptness on the part of my officers at Kingston in this matter, and the excuse they give for it is this: That Wm. Shannon had been for a generation an officer in that department; he had never been suspected of doing anything wrong; he was a man well advanced in life, he being some 64 years old. When he was caught handling letters improperly by one of the clerks, the clerk gave information to the inspector. The inspector sent for Mr. Shannon, and he admitted he had three letters in his possession and showed them. They were unregistered letters, ordinary letters passing through the mail; one of the letters contained five cents in coin and twenty cents in postage stamps. The other two letters were without enclosures. The inspector, as he stated himself, was so overwhelmed with surprise that he did not act promptly, and delayed until he could make further inquiries, and when he communicated the next day with the department here, he also stated the fact that he had found Shannon had left the country. The hon. gentleman, I think, has been misinformed as to Mr. Shannon's return. I am informed by the inspector, who has recently reported, that, so far as he can ascertain, Shannon has not been within the Dominion since 17th March.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My information came from persons of credibility who stated that they had seen him.

Mr. McLELAN. The information conveyed to the department here was that he had returned, and immediately I caused a telegram to be sent to have him arrested. An information was laid by the county attorney against him, but the officers were not able to find him and they reported that he had not been in the city. I stated yesterday, in answer to the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the Government had not paid anything. The question was, Had the Government paid anything?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or agreed to pay.

Mr. McLELAN. I may state now in answer to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Shannon's friends have lodged with the officers of the Department a certain amount to meet any losses that may have been sustained by private individuals, as soon as we can calculate what those losses are. None of the letters were registered. Some complaints have been made that letters which should have passed through the Kingston post office in their natural course had not reached their destinations, and the statement is made by the senders that they contained enclosures of money. My officers are making enquiries into these cases, and when it is clearly ascertained and when it has been clearly traced that those letters passed in a mail that went through the hands of Shannon, in all probability the losses will be met from the amount placed in the hands of my officers by Shannon's friends. I need not state the amount, because perhaps that might induce persons to make claims, but every care is being taken to ascertain what letters have been lost of those that really passed through the office and through the hands of Shannon. It has already been ascertained that some letters said to have passed through Shannon's hands were sent at dates when he was not in the office; so all these matters will have to be investigated and the truth ascertained as far as possible that justice may be done to the parties who have suffered loss. I may say that I regret as much as any one can that my officers did not act with that promptness which they should have shown immediately on detecting the wrongs of which Shannon had been guilty. But the explanation they gave is this, that Shannon, an old man, an old servant of twenty-five or thirty years' service in the department, had not been suspected through all that lifetime of doing anything wrong, and the officers were so overwhelmed with surprise

at what had been done and at the insignificance of the amount traced in his hands at the time, twenty-five cents, that they refrained from acting with that promptness which they should have shown, and they express regret for it.

Mr. WILSON. I certainly think the explanation offered by the Postmaster General is a weak one indeed. As I understand it, the post office clerks are supposed to be directly responsible to the Government. They are civil servants in the employ of the Government, and it is, therefore, the bounden duty of the Government to see that they perform their duties faithfully. I am also surprised to hear that the inspector, having ascertained without any doubt that this man Shannon had been guilty of meddling with letters in the post office, whether the amounts were large or small, did not proceed at once to execute the law and take steps that the man might be punished. The plea that he was an old servant and about 60 years of age put forward by the Postmaster General to this House as an excuse for the negligence of his officers, is a frivolous excuse indeed. Many people deposit their money in the Post Office Savings Bank or send their money through the mail, considering that the Government are responsible for the safe delivery to the parties to whom they are sent, and if the public feel there is an uncertainty as to the safety of the letters, the fact will very materially interfere with the efficiency of our post office service. Not only that, but if it becomes known, as it appears, that the Postmaster General indicated to-night that there are delays to compensate to those who lose money under such circumstances, this will cause distrust in the efficiency of the service. But perhaps the mover of this motion is a little too hard. It may possibly be found that this man Shannon was not an ordinary friend of the Government, and it may be found that, perhaps, in years gone by this man Shannon or some of his friends or relations had been very intimately connected with the then representative of the city of Kingston. It may have been that, perhaps, this man Shannon may have had some information that if he had been arrested, and an attempt made to punish him for his wrong-doing, he might possibly have been in a position to have divulged something that would not be very creditable to the Government of the day. It is possible that this leniency may have been caused by that, instead of on account of the small amount contained in the letters that he had abstracted from the Post Office Department. I maintain that this ought to have been examined into, and whether the man stole five cents or five hundred dollars he was equally guilty of wrong-doing as a civil servant, and he was equally responsible to the Government of the day. Perhaps, if we refer back a few years, we may find that a Mr. Shannon had performed an important service in that locality, and we may be able, perhaps, to come to some conclusion why it was that the Postmaster General was so kind towards this man Shannon, and that he, through his inspector, neglected to perform the duties that were incumbent upon him. Let me call your attention to an election trial that took place in Kingston some time ago, and not very many years ago for it was in 1874. I have no doubt the First Minister will remember the election trial that took place at that time, and I have no doubt he will remember that he had a very ardent friend, and whether it was this Mr. Shannon or some of his relations, it certainly was a Shannon, and, perhaps, it was on that account the Postmaster General felt it would not be hardly right for him to proceed very actively against this man, but to wait until a telegram should be sent down to him asking him what he should do under the circumstances. This particular old friend had got into a difficulty, and he ought to proceed and punish him as they would any other criminal under the circumstances, but, perhaps, it was on account of past services rendered and the

Mr. McLELAN.

strong attachment between himself and the First Minister, that it was considered whether it would not be a little better to give him an opportunity that he might get out of the country and not divulge some secrets that might be in his possession. We find that a trial took place at Kingston when the First Minister was being tried for bribery and corruption. To his credit be it said, that no personal charges on that occasion were proven against him. He was situated on that occasion pretty well, but not as well as he was on the last trial, for although in 1874 he retained his qualification, his seat was voided. It was sworn on that election trial as follows:

"James Shannon sworn. I live in Kingston and took an active interest in anything that concerned Sir John A. Macdonald."

I believe that is the present Premier.

"Was not a member of the committee, at least did not remember that I was, had some doubts whether a committee was formed. Spent about \$400 in election. This was not my own, received this and also \$500 from Sir John A. Macdonald, and \$1,000 more, part from Mr. Patton."

I suppose the First Minister will remember Patton.

"I got \$1,000 from other parties, which was not all spent. I gave the balance \$900 back to the Hon. Mr. Campbell with a memorandum showing the disposition of the money that had been spent."

I think Mr. Campbell was not at the trial on that occasion and I suppose the First Minister will state why he was not there.

An hon. MEMBER. He was in the States.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). My friend says he was in the States. You don't suppose a Conservative would run to the States in order to avoid giving evidence at an election trial. It would be too horrid to imagine anything of the kind.

"Q. Why did you give it to Mr. Campbell?"

"A. He was acting for Sir John A. I received the money from Sir J. A. personally in Kingston, it was for election expenses. I think it was by cheque."

"Q. What was Sir John giving the money for? What did he say?"

"A. He gave no directions. I knew what the money was, it was for necessary expenses. Sir John asked me to take charge of it. I had charge of money for Sir John previously."

"Q. What did you do with it?"

"A. I did not spend over \$400 or \$500, speaking in round numbers."

This may turn out to be the same Shannon who took the letters in the post office. He continues:

"I gave to different friends of Sir John \$30 or \$40; to Armstrong McCormick, about \$30; Isaac McNabb, \$20; Jos. O'Brien, \$10; telegraph company, \$25; to bill-sticker, \$25; Flanagan, for cab-hire, \$18, and \$10 to Courroy."

Then comes another portion of the evidence, showing that Shannon was working earnestly in the Kingston election. Parkhill sent Hunter to Shannon with the following letter:

"The bearer, James Hunter, is an elector; has a horse and sleigh; had better look after him. J. O.'s men are looking after him this morning. Must do something now, else it will be too late, put him in the way at once."

J. A. PARKHILL."

Now as it would appear, we have found there are several Shannons in this locality, and that they had been friends of the First Minister, and if the First Minister possesses one good quality it is the quality of remembering old friends. He being the leader of the Government, perhaps, the Postmaster General was not so much to blame for the course he took, because after receiving instructions from his inspector in that locality he would have to make enquiries as to this man Shannon—whether it was the Shannon who worked so energetically at the time the election took place there—before he could move in the matter. At all events 24 hours elapsed and, therefore, Mr. Shannon escaped to the other side. The Postmaster General says that he is back in the country, but as far as that is concerned he should never have had an opportunity of getting away to the United States. I repeat again that I think the lax manner in which the civil servants perform their duty in the post office should be carefully looked to. People

depositing their money there, many of them poor people, should be protected by the Government. The Government should feel that for every dollar lost in the post office they should be held accountable. I hope my hon. friend from South Oxford will not feel too hardly against the Government on this occasion, because very likely he will find, if he examines carefully into the matter, that this man Shannon had been a useful and important individual in an election trial, and deserved some consideration at the hands of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot conceive for a moment that this is a concerted scene between the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. gentleman who has just sat down; but the coincidence is rather remarkable. When the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety for the public interest, and to see that crime is punished and that the official performs his duty, brings this matter up, it is rather a singular coincidence that the hon. member for East Elgin should have hunted up the records of my trial in 1874, in which I was unseated. It looks very like as if the question was put and the remark made, not for the purpose of public justice, but to give the hon. member for East Elgin an opportunity of exercising his malignity by trying to drag my name into this matter respecting Mr. Shannon. It looks marvellously like it, and it will take a good deal to white-wash the hon. member for South Oxford from the suspicion that this is a concerted arrangement. The only thing that makes me doubt it is that the hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree; he has waked up the wrong passenger; he has got the wrong Shannon. The Shannon he speaks of is Mr. James Shannon, who is a friend of mine and a most respectable man; and the hon. gentleman having been elected for one of the ridings of Elgin, must be supposed to be a respectable man, but he would be higher in the estimation of the hon. members of this House than he is now if he held the character of Mr. James Shannon. Mr. James Shannon was the trusted bookkeeper and accountant of my firm for many years; he took care of my money, took care of my accounts, and managed my affairs; and although this person who opened these letters is a relative of Mr. James Shannon, I may tell the hon. gentleman, if he would like to know it, that the two brothers have not spoken or had any communication except on business for many years; and I suppose the fact that that was known must have been the reason why the clerk, instead of going to Mr. James Shannon, the postmaster, went to the post office inspector. The hon. gentleman, in his desire, I may say his malignant desire, to make an attack, says what? He says the Postmaster General has been guilty of great laches, and, in order to favor a supposed friend of mine, neglected to have him arrested. The hon. gentleman heard what the Postmaster General said. He said that the first intimation he had of the matter was in the letter he received from the post office inspector, who resides at Kingston, informing him that the deputy postmaster there had been discovered opening letters, that the clerk who discovered him had informed him, but that the inspector did not cause him to be arrested as he ought to have done; and when he got instructions to arrest, which he did the moment the Postmaster General heard of it, the bird had flown, the man had gone. The hon. gentleman heard this statement, and yet he has the face to get up in this House and make this statement. It only shows how far political malignity can go, that he could try to make a little capital by reviving the recollections of the trial against me in 1874, and making the defalcations of this officer in 1888 a peg to hang a malignant attack on.

Mr. RYKERT. I would like to change the subject for a few minutes in order to bring to the notice of the Government and of the House what I consider to be a very important matter, that is, the claim of Mrs. Gowanlock. In the early part of this Session the hon. member for North

Victoria (Mr. Barron) asked the Government whether or not they intended to pay Mrs. Gowanlock, the widow of J. A. Gowanlock, who was killed by Indians at Frog Lake in the North-West rebellion, a pension in the same manner and to the same extent as they had paid Mrs. Delaney. The House will recollect that during the late rebellion Mrs. Delaney and Mrs. Gowanlock were seized by the Indians immediately after their husbands were murdered by the Indians at Frog Lake; and hon. members will recollect what an excitement there was throughout the country about the fate of those two ladies. I venture to state that if this House had been asked at that time to restore these ladies to their homes, it would have granted almost any sum of money. The hon. Minister of the Interior, in reply to the question of my hon. friend from North Victoria, stated that Mrs. Gowanlock's husband was not an employé of the Dominion Government, while Mrs. Delaney's husband was. The ground taken by the Minister of the Interior and the Government has been that Mrs. Gowanlock's husband not being an employé of the Government, she was not entitled to compensation or a pension. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that during the late Parliament a pension of \$400 a year was granted to Mrs. Delaney. Now, I think I can show by documents which have been brought down to the House that Mr. Gowanlock was considered an employé of the Government. The facts are these. The Indian Department were desirous to have a mill erected at a place called Onion Lake in the North-West Territories, and called for tenders for the erection of that mill. Mr. Gowanlock and Mr. Laurie, his partner, put in tenders for the work, and entered into an agreement with the Government to run that mill for ten years. The agreement bears date the 17th of September, 1884, and is between the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, Indian Commissioner for Manitoba and the North-West Territories, of the first part, and John Alexander Gowanlock and Richard Carney Laurie, of the second part, and provides:

"Witnesseth that the party of the first part being desirous of having a saw and grist mill established at a point adjacent to Onion Lake Reserve near Fort Pitt in the North-West Territories, upon the conditions and terms following, that is to say: First,—The parties of the second part agree to erect a good substantial building according to the plans and specifications hereto attached, marked No. 1, and that the capacity of the saw and grist and machinery used in construction with the same will be according to the specifications hereto attached, marked No. 2.

"The mill to be erected and in operation by the fifteenth January, 1885.

"The parties of the second part agree that they will keep the said mill in good operation for at least ten years; that they will constantly have a competent miller in attendance at said mill, that the Indians shall have the preference over other customers in the gisting of their grain and that they shall be charged less toll by one-fourth for two years, and one-sixth for the eight succeeding years than white customers.

"In consideration of the above, the party of the first part binds himself to pay to the parties of the second part the sum of \$2,500, the said sum to be paid as follows: \$1,500 when the machinery is on the ground and the balance, namely, \$1,000, on completion of the work."

It is well known that although \$1,500 were advanced by the Government for building that mill, the mill was destroyed before it was completed, and as the late hon. the Minister of the Interior stated, upon an investigation made into the pecuniary loss sustained by the firm, a certain amount was awarded to the firm for the material and the building which was destroyed, from which was deducted the \$1,500 granted by the Government. It is said that Mr. Gowanlock was not an employé of the Government. I have before me two letters from the Department of Indian Affairs, in which the department very plainly referred to Mr. Gowanlock as an employé of the Government; but I say whether he was so or not, the Government are bound to take notice of the facts and to place Mrs. Gowanlock in the same position as Mrs. Delaney. This will establish no precedent whatever, as the circumstances never can occur again.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know about that.

Mr. RYKERT. Humanity alone demands for this woman, placed in this sad position, consideration at the hands of the Government. Mrs. Gowanlock lives in my constituency. I see her frequently, and I know that she may not live many years in consequence of the trials and sufferings she endured; and the circumstances of her case are such that they will justify the Government in showing more liberality towards her by giving her fair and reasonable compensation, and I am sure that the House will endorse the Government in any action it may take to this end. I have a letter of the 21st April, 1887, from Mr. P. B. Douglas, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, addressed to Mr. Henry Johnson, the father of Mrs. Gowanlock. In this letter, Mr. Douglas says:

"I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th inst., and to inform you that a copy of that portion which relates to the pension desired for Mrs. Gowanlock has been referred to the Department of Indian Affairs, of which her husband during his lifetime was an employé."

I find also a letter addressed by Mr. Douglas to Mr. L. Vankoughnet, dated 21st April, 1887, in which I find the following:

"I have the honor, by direction, to refer to you, herewith enclosed, an extract from a letter from Mr. Henry Johnson, Tintern, Ont., asking that a pension be granted to Theresa Gowanlock, widow of the late John Gowanlock, who was in his lifetime an employé of your department, such pension to be maintained to her during her widowhood."

These letters clearly indicate that Mr. Gowanlock was in the service of the Government. At any rate, we have the fact before us that he was bound, under heavy penalty, to carry on his mill for a period of ten years, and to grind grain for the Indians at a cheaper rate than for the whites. In that respect, he was as much an employé of the Government as any other person. It seems to me this is a case deserving the favorable consideration of the Government, and I hope that the Government, on considering the facts, will show generosity towards the petitioner. Mrs. Gowanlock saw her husband killed before her eyes, she was submitted to indignities and insults by the Indians for two months, and if any case was ever worthy of consideration, it is hers.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have much pleasure in sharing in the recommendation of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). The case of Mrs. Gowanlock is one of extreme hardship. Mrs. Delaney was with Mrs. Gowanlock and suffered the same great calamity. Both of them lost their husbands at the same time. Mrs. Delaney was born in the county I represent, and I have known her from my childhood. She has told me of the terrible incidents of that terrible time, and I do think, under the circumstances, as the hon. member for Lincoln has pointed out, that Mrs. Gowanlock is entitled to the same privileges and indemnity, to the same kindness and consideration, at the hands of this House and the Government as Mrs. Delaney. I had great pleasure in bringing the case of Mrs. Delaney under the notice of the hon. First Minister. He received me with the utmost kindness and consideration, and granted her a very proper indemnity which will make her comfortable for life. I think that, under the circumstances, the representations of the hon. member for Lincoln should receive consideration, and I am sure they will receive consideration at the hands of the Government. I am quite sure that every hon. member from the Province of Quebec will be quite willing to accord to the woman of Ontario the same rights, privileges and indemnity which they accorded to the woman of Quebec.

Mr. BARRON. I am exceedingly glad that this matter has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Lincoln, and I sincerely hope that his efforts in the direction of getting justice done to Mrs. Gowanlock will meet with a more favorable result than mine in the past. It will be in the recollection of this House that I brought

Mr. RYKERT.

up the case of Mrs. Gowanlock last Session, and also a short time ago this Session. I confess I have not been able yet to appreciate what I consider to be the invidious distinction drawn between the case of Mrs. Delaney and that of Mrs. Gowanlock. As the hon. member for Lincoln has stated, the distinction is sought to be drawn from the alleged fact that the husband of Mrs. Delaney was in the employ of the Government at the time of his death, and that such was not the case with the husband of Mrs. Gowanlock. That statement was made last Session by the hon. the Finance Minister and also this Session by the late hon. the Minister of the Interior. Without going into the question at present as to whether or not Mr. Gowanlock was really in the employ of the Government, I do not think that can be a reason for always refusing what one would suppose was only justice to the widow and children of the deceased person. That cannot be a reason in this case. If in Mrs. Delaney's case it was a reason for granting the pension, then, in every case in which an employé of the Government dies, his widow and children could advance that argument that because their husband or their father as the case might be, was, during his lifetime and at the time of his death in the employ of the Government they should receive a pension. But that was not the sole reason. There was something else for granting Mrs. Delaney a pension. What was that other reason? It was the sad, harrowing circumstances under which her husband met his death, and those circumstances apply just as much in the case of Mrs. Gowanlock as they did in the case of Mrs. Delaney. And therefore what was done for Mrs. Delaney should, on the very self-same argument and for the self-same reasons, be done for Mrs. Gowanlock. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has stated shortly the sad circumstances under which Mr. Gowanlock met his death. Will the House allow me for a moment to read Mrs. Gowanlock's own statement from her own lips of the circumstances under which her husband met his sad death:

"Neither I nor my husband understood the Indian language, and so were not addressed by them, but we understood we were prisoners and had to go with the rest. When we left Mrs. Delaney's house no one knew what was going to happen, and I do not think it was really supposed any of us were in danger. We all left Mrs. Delaney's house together. My husband at the time was outside, and as we left the house he met me and took me with him and we walked on together. We had only got a few paces from the house when the Indians began firing. Mr. Dill, Mr. Quinn, and Mr. Gilchrist were shot first, though I did not see them shot, but as soon as I saw Mr. Willscroft, an old greyheaded man, fall in front of us I then knew all were being killed. I became greatly alarmed. I saw an Indian aiming at my husband by my side. In a moment he fell, reaching out his arms towards me as he fell. I caught him, and we fell together. I laid upon him, resting my face upon his, and his breath was scarcely gone when I was forced away by an Indian. It was not the Indian who fired that dragged me from my husband. I was almost crazy with grief, but I remember seeing the two priests shot and also Mr. Delaney. They were in front of me. One of the priests when shot was leaning over Mr. Delaney."

I have also here Mrs. Delaney's statement, taken from her shortly after she was rescued from the Indians, and her statement is almost the same as that of Mrs. Gowanlock. It will be seen that the exceptional circumstances—because they were and are very exceptional circumstances—that induced the Government to grant a pension to Mrs. Delaney apply equally to the case of Mrs. Gowanlock. Their husbands were at that time doing their best, as they thought, to defend the lives of the people who were then more or less under their care, and I therefore heartily join with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in hoping that the Government will do justice to Mrs. Gowanlock, apart altogether from the question of whether her husband was or was not an employé of the Government at the time of his death. But I think I can also support my hon. friend in his argument that Mr. Gowanlock was at that time, if not technically, at least sufficiently for the purposes of the argument, in the employ of the Government. My hon. friend from Lincoln has read the agreement which was made with

him, and I think the preamble of that agreement shows that Mr. Gowanlock was to go to Onion Lake to construct a mill which was to be of invaluable use to the settlers in that locality; and he also read a letter showing that officers of the department treated Mr. Gowanlock as being at that time in the employ of the Government. Therefore I think that not only from the standpoint of justice, but also from the fact, as I maintain, that the husband was in the employ of the Government, Mrs. Gowanlock should be treated in the same way as Mrs. Delaney. But I find, on looking into the granting of pensions in England, that they do not confine these pensions by any means to the widows and children of husbands who have been in the employ of the Government. I find that on the 31st July, 1885, Mrs. Sherwin was granted a pension of £100 on the ground of the literary merits of her sister, the late Mrs. Jameson. I find that Miss Leech was also granted a pension on account of the merits of her brother, the late Mr. John Leech, as an artist; and several other sisters are also granted pensions on the same ground. Then, Mr. Huxley was granted a pension because of his eminent services to science. This shows that the rule is not inflexible that the person at the time of his death must necessarily be in the employ of the Government, and I think, as has been stated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), that members on both sides of the House will join heartily in supporting the Government in granting to Mrs. Gowanlock the same pension that was granted to Mrs. Delaney. Perhaps the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) stated what, I am afraid, is correct, that if a pension is granted to Mrs. Gowanlock, she will not be permitted, owing to the serious trouble and anxiety which she suffered in the North-West, to enjoy it very long. I hope this House will grant it to her, and will in that way perform an act of justice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has last spoken has strengthened his case by quoting the pensions granted in England to Mr. Huxley and to the sister of John Leech the artist, because, though he may not be aware of it, there is an annual sum of £1,200 voted by Parliament under a statutory provision for the purpose of granting pensions to persons who have gained such rewards for literary and artistic services. That is voted annually, and is divided, on the advice of one of the Ministers, among artists and literary people who have become in rather reduced circumstances. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that Mrs. Gowanlock's case is a very sad one. She saw her husband murdered before her eyes, and she suffered a great deal in mind and body as well as did Mrs. Delaney. It would be always an agreeable task for the Government of the day, who have hearts in their bosoms, to deal with such cases of hardship, and I may say of horror, if they thought it was their duty to do so, if they thought it was within their power to do so; but it is very easy for a Government to be very liberal with the money of other people, with the money of the public, and we had to consider in these two cases what we had a right to do, and what we had power to do. Of course, without coming to Parliament, we could not in any way whatever be justified in granting a pension to Mrs. Gowanlock. Her husband was in no way an employé of the Government. The case was simply this: The Indians on that reserve had raised a good deal of grain, but they had no means whatever of using it because there was no mill there. The Indian Department tried to find some person enterprising enough to put up a grist mill, and it was stated, as the House will well understand, that it was a country which would naturally be settled by whites, and that a bonus would be given if anyone would go at once and establish a mill, which, it was expected, would not be profitable when it simply had to grind the scanty crops of the Indians, and, therefore, a bonus would be given until it be-

came a profitable milling establishment in consequence of settlement. Tenders were called for, and Mr. Gowanlock succeeded in getting the contract. It was simply a case of contract, by which he was told, if you put a mill of a certain size there and grind for a reasonable rate the grain of the Indians, and if you will continue, when the white settlers come in, to give the preference to the Indians and not to shove them away with their little crops, and will give security that you will maintain that mill for a certain number of years, we will give you a bonus of \$1,500 for that time. His death by the hand of an Indian, although it took place under the most dreadful circumstances, and at the same time when the clergymen were killed, and Delaney, the civil servant, was killed, and other men were killed, still the Government had to look at the circumstances. The case stood in the same position as if an Indian had killed a white man in any other part of the North-West. And we had to consider that giving a pension to Mrs. Gowanlock might be held to establish a precedent that in any cases where murders were caused by Indians—and they generally act with very considerable barbarity if their blood is up—that in any honorable case of this kind, where a white man was slain by an Indian, his relatives had a claim on the public treasury for a pension. We had to consider that, it was our bounden duty to consider it. As I have already said, it would be a very agreeable duty for us to ask Parliament to confer a pension upon Mrs. Gowanlock; if that is the general consent, the Government will be ready to come down.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is, Sir John.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If that is the general consent of the House; but we know perfectly well, in the first place, that the two cases do not stand on the same footing at all. All Governments take care to provide for the families of their civil and military officers who have fallen in their service. Delaney was an officer there on the outskirts, in the very act of dealing out food to these Indians when he was barbarously murdered. He was a civil servant, he had moved there with his family at the orders of the Government. As I have said, in such cases all Governments provide for the families of their servants slain on duty, but that is not the case with Mrs. Gowanlock. Parliament is not very partial to granting pensions, but if I can gather that it is the general consent of this House that this should be made an exception, and if they are not afraid of setting a precedent, Government will take this case into favorable consideration.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has exhibited a regard for the public purse to which he has not accustomed us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to say one word more. I think that full compensation was given to the estate of Mr. Gowanlock for his property which was destroyed at the time of his death.

Mr. LAURIER. However, I think in this instance Parliament will not grudge the money that will be given to the widow; not only for the reasons which were mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and in which I would be disposed largely to concur, but also for this other reason, that Mr. Gowanlock was one of the first victims of the rebellion. Now, we have had a commission sitting to investigate the claims of losses sustained in consequence of the rebellion, and I can see no reason why, if we should compensate a man who has been a victim of the rebellion in losing property, we should not also indemnify his family for the loss of his life.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is opening a very wide door.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps it is, but, after all, the rebellion was caused by the action of the Government, and I cannot see why the country should not compensate the evil that has been done. In this matter I believe the Government will see their way to allow a grant to the widow, and that both sides of the House would be glad to ratify the action of the Government in this matter. Now, there is another matter to which I want to refer, and to which I was about to refer when the hon. member for Lincoln rose, and that is the case which was brought forward by the hon. member for Oxford a moment ago. The Prime Minister, in answering the speech of the hon. member for Elgin, said that no doubt it was a mere coincidence that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had brought the subject up, and that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had spoken in the manner he did. Well, coincidences will sometimes occur. It was, perhaps, a mere coincidence that there was a thief in Kingston by the name of Shannon, and at the same time another man in Kingston by the name of Shannon, who happened to be a bosom friend of the Prime Minister. It was, perhaps, a mere coincidence that prevented the arrest of the one who was guilty, and that another man bore the same name was the friend of the First Minister. I would have been disposed to consider it a mere coincidence, but after having witnessed the exhibition of temper which the First Minister gave us a moment ago, I began to suspect that, after all, the hon. member for West Elgin had touched the true spot. No one who listened to the Postmaster General but must have come to the conclusion that the reasons which he gave to explain why this man was not arrested when he was caught in the act, were extremely flimsy, to say the least. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the language of the Postmaster General himself, that there were grave irregularities in the post office; and I believe, from the little that has been said,—for I never heard the statement before to-day—I believe from the little that has been said by the Postmaster General, that the deputy inspector who was there, and who caught the thief in the act, was there for the purpose of detecting the guilty party who had been committing frauds for some time previous. The hon. gentleman says no, but it is evident from his language, at all events, that frauds were going on. He said, and I took note of his words, that parties were making claims to-day for money lost at the post office, upon the friends of Shannon. It was said that money had been extracted when Shannon was not in the post office, and that consequently he was not the guilty party. Therefore it is evident that at the time this man was caught in the act, there were great irregularities going on, since claims are made to-day which cannot reach the guilty party, but which must reach other parties as well. Therefore, I say it is probable, at all events, that the deputy inspector was there to investigate that case, and to find the guilty party, but finding, probably, the man whom he did not expect to find guilty, finding a man by the name of Shannon—

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is not correct. The deputy inspector lives in Kingston, and has his office in the post office. The clerk went up and told the inspector.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, he went up and told the inspector. He could not have told the inspector that Shannon was the guilty party, since, according to the statement made by the Postmaster General, the deputy inspector caught Shannon in the act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. McLELAN. The clerk saw him handling the letters improperly and he told the deputy inspector, and the inspector sent for Shannon to come up to his room.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well, let it be so—is there any difference? The moment the man had been caught in the act, why was he not arrested?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And so he ought to have been.

Mr. LAURIER. But instead of arresting him, the gentleman thinks he must consult the authorities at Ottawa. Why? If it had been any other man than the man who bore the name of Shannon, probably he would have been arrested in the act. I can see no reason why he was not arrested in the act, and why in such a glaring matter of crime as that, the deputy inspector should not have arrested the man at once, instead of sending to Ottawa. No explanation has been given why this man was not arrested at once, and why it was thought proper to consult the authorities at Ottawa before ordering the arrest.

Mr. McLELAN. No, he did not consult the authorities at Ottawa. When he conveyed the information that the crime had been committed, he at the same time conveyed the information that the criminal had left the country.

Mr. LAURIER. It makes the case simply worse. Instead of consulting the department the officer thought he would let him go, and after giving him 24 hours leave he writes to Ottawa and states that the man has left the country. Why was not the man arrested? That is a circumstance which requires explanation. My hon. friend behind me thinks the explanation is this, that this man was related to a gentleman who was a friend of the Prime Minister in former years, and who was a friend at a trial which was of great moment to the First Minister at that time; and probably he said, as he naturally may have said: I being an officer of the Government, it would be too bad to bring disgrace on the name of a man who is related to the friend of the Prime Minister, and I will give him a chance. I see no other reason for the conduct of the official, and this is the reason which my hon. friend behind me gave. Whatever was the conclusion at which my hon. friend arrived, whether it was right or wrong, the First Minister had no right to impute motives to him in the disrespectful manner in which he did impute them. This is a free Parliament and every member has a right to express his views so long as it is done in parliamentary language, and the First Minister should be the last man to reflect on a member who in the discharge of his duty may use language rather warm. My hon. friend did nothing but discharge his duty to the best of his ability, and certainly no man in this Parliament should be taken to task because he discharged his duty in that manner.

Mr. McLELAN. I desire to say in explanation to the hon. gentleman that there has been no complaints against the Kingston office in particular. Notice had been given that letters were missing which had passed through a circuit 100 or 150 miles and through a number of post offices, and as they were not registered they were not under the direct supervision of any one particular officer. There was no special suspicion directed against the Kingston office until the clerk saw the assistant postmaster improperly handling two or three letters. He then went up stairs to the inspector's room and informed him of the fact, and he sent for Shannon, who confessed to having three letters, in one of which there was 25 cents, the other two containing no enclosures whatever. I may state further that the greatest attention is given to the security of money transmitted by post, and to induce people to aid the post office officials in tracing letters, the fee for registration has been placed at a merely nominal sum; we only charge 2 cents for registration while ten cents is charged in the United States. Out of three and a half millions of letters registered during the past year, 1887, there have only been lost 58 to the

million, which is an infinitesimal percentage of letters registered and placed in a position that the post office officials can trace them. The letters that have been lost in this case or on this circuit, passing through some twelve or twenty post offices, were unregistered, and the letters that Shannon tampered with were also unregistered. Since he was detected in that act enquiry has been directed to special transactions in the Kingston office under the suspicion that Shannon had tampered with other letters passing over that circuit, and information is being gathered and facts obtained which I think will lead to the restitution to parties who claim to have lost money from letters passing over that circuit in which Kingston is one of the offices.

Mr. LISTER. While this post office matter is before the House, I have a small case which I wish to bring before the attention of the Postmaster General, and I think this is an exceedingly suitable opportunity to do so. It appears, so far as my experience of the management of the post offices of the country is concerned, that if the incumbents of the post offices happen to be supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they are treated with extreme leniency, but if they happen to have been appointed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House when they occupied the Treasury benches, the slightest pretext is seized by the Government to dismiss those gentlemen from the offices, and often this is done without any intimation being given to those officers as to the nature of the charges made against them. It seems to me from the slight experience I have had in these matters, that the post office inspectors are officers appointed by the Government for the particular duty of dismissing officials who are offensive to the Government of the day. In my own county there is a village called Arkona, and in 1870 when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leader of the Government, a reputable and responsible citizen, a man respected by the whole community, was appointed postmaster. He is responsible in every way, financially and otherwise; but this Government recently, without any charge being made against him, without any investigation of any charges being made, summarily dismissed him from the office which he held for the past ten years. The letter which I hold in my hand is the only information that gentleman received that his services as postmaster of the village of Arkona were dispensed with by this Government, and it is in these words:

"I am to acquaint you that on receipt of the books the post office of Arkona will be transferred from your charge to that of Robert Dunn. Please govern yourself accordingly."

Why was he dismissed? I know that in my county postmasters have been in arrear and in default in connection with the money order department, that those charges have been known to the Government and the inspector, and yet those men have been retained in the office and hold their office to-day. No such charge has ever been made against Mr. Everest; it could not be made against him, for he is eminently responsible for everything in connection with the office; and yet he has been dismissed in this summary way because he happens to be a Liberal in politics. The Postmaster General has had no ground whatever for dismissing him from office except that it was necessary to find a place for a supporter of the gentleman who opposed the late member for East Lambton. What excuse do the Government give? They say that Mr. Everest is not a resident of Arkona, but that he has been become a resident of the village of Forrest. That is only partly true. He owns business establishments in both places. He carries on a drug store in Forrest. His family are as capable as he is of attending to the business of the department, and the office has been attended to. There have been no complaints made against him, and yet the Postmaster General without any investigation dismissed him in this

summary manner. The inspectors of the Government are apparently in office for the purpose of making places by removing men who are holding positions. I have nothing to say against the man whom the Government have selected; he supported the Government with all his might, and of course it was necessary that some place should be found for him, and in order to do it the Government have removed an honorable, reputable and responsible official to make a place for this Mr. Dunn who now holds the post office. If that is to be the game let us know it. Our men will go out, but God help yours when we came in, that is all there is about it,—and we will get there before long. If this system is to be the policy we want to know it, for these gentlemen should not be dispossessed and turned out of office until some substantial complaints have been made and proved against them. The conduct of the Government, so far as this man is concerned, is unjust, and it is unworthy of hon. gentlemen occupying the position that hon. gentlemen do governing the country to-day.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had been disposed to do what was right in this matter, he would have followed the example of his leader from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and have given notice of the particular charge he intended to make to-night.

Mr. LISTER. What would have been the good of the notice. We would never have got to it.

Mr. McLELAN. Oh, yes, you would.

Mr. LISTER. Not this Session.

Mr. McLELAN. If you had given an intimation that you would bring up the matter I would have been prepared with the facts bearing on the case. I have only to deny the charges that he has made; that this Government has appointed post office inspectors for the purpose of making reports against postmasters of Liberal politics. It is not true that I have ever enquired what are the politics of any inspector on the staff. I have been told by members of Parliament, and I have been told by residents in different parts of Ontario, that a number of the inspectors are in politics Liberal, and opposed to the present Government. I have never supposed that those men would have had their reports affected by their politics. Not at all. I have felt confidence in every inspector that he will discharge his duty fairly and honorably by the department, and by the offices under his control. So far as my experience goes they have all done that, whether they have been Liberal or Conservative in politics. Now, as regards this particular case. My recollection of it is this and I speak only from memory, because with the multitude of post offices we have and the number of incidents connected with almost every office in the country, it is impossible to remember all the details. My recollection of it is this: that some two years ago the inspector reported that the man who had charge of the post office at Arkona was resident out of the town of Arkona for six days out of the seven, and it was only on the Sabbath that he was a resident of the town of Arkona, also that the business of the office was kept in a slovenly manner and that it was the practice of the postmaster on Sunday when he was home to sign, in blank, the returns necessary to carry on the business of the office and leave them in blank in charge of somebody. A few months ago the question again arose that the postmaster was still an absentee from the town and that the same practice was being continued. I asked the inspector to make a report and he reported substantially the same; that this gentleman was doing business in the town of Forrest, some miles away, where he spent six days out of the seven, returning to Arkona on Saturday evening, remaining over the Sabbath, and leaving the post office in the hands of some assistant, and with blanks signed in charge of the assistant.

This having been the second report, I thought it was an improper practice and I changed the postmaster.

Mr. LISTER. Without notifying him.

Mr. McLELAN. Two years ago when the matter was reported on, it was brought to his notice that he was an absentee. In any case if I know of any similar instance whether the postmaster be grit or conservative, I should feel it my duty to change the postmaster who was responsible for the office, and see that he was a resident of the town so as to oversee the business of the post office.

Mr. LISTER. Is it so or is it not so, within the hon. gentleman's own knowledge that he has retained postmasters who have been behind in their money order accounts?

Mr. McLELAN. I find that there are a great many postmasters who are in arrears in their accounts, and I am making extra exertions to have those collected. I want to ascertain whether this is in consequence of neglect, or whether the arrears in the accounts are not brought to their cognizance by officers in the department—whether it is really a fraud or detention of moneys. I am making exertions to have all those accounts brought square before the 30th of June, and to make an entire change in the style.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not stated whether he notified this postmaster of any complaint before dismissing him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand the Postmaster General he has laid down the principle in appointing postmasters that a resident of the town should be appointed to the position.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was what he said.

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A vacancy occurred in the village of Plattsville caused by the death of the former postmaster, and a petition was got up by the residents of that village signed by almost every person in that village and neighborhood, asking that the post office be kept in the family of the deceased gentleman who had occupied that position for a great many years; but the Postmaster General did not comply with that. Even the Conservative paper on the borders of the riding in Woodstock complained that the Postmaster General had not appointed a member of the family of the deceased postmaster but went outside of the village of Plattsville and hunted up a boy—a son of the Government candidate who opposed me in the last elections—and forced him upon the residents of that village against the expressed desire, by petition, of the whole of the residents. This does not coincide with the statement of the Postmaster General that he wishes to appoint a resident to a position of that kind.

Mr. LISTER. The Postmaster General did not inform this House that this postmaster in Arkona had a deputy. It was not necessary that he did live in the village of Arkona so long as the duties of the office were properly discharged. He had a deputy to discharge the duties properly and there was never a complaint except that the papers were kept slovenly. He was not of the right complexion and that was the real trouble.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised to hear the Postmaster General say that no one was ever dismissed on account of his political opinions. I can mention a case that I know personally. Mr. James C. McDonald of Duart was dismissed because he was a Reformer and voted for the Reform candidate. The hon. gentleman's predecessor offered the position to a Mr. McCallum who refused to take it, and it was given to a man who was in the habit of carrying the mail, a Mr. Curtis, who was utterly incompetent

Mr. McLELAN.

and who was obliged to employ someone else to take charge of this office on his behalf. In making this statement I state what I know personally, and I have no doubt there are many other cases in which precisely the same thing has been done. I am rather surprised at the statement the hon. gentleman has made in regard to the impartiality of the inspectors. I would like to know is there not a Mr. Griffin the inspector at Kingston who was the former inspector at London, and had not the Government some reason for removing Mr. Griffin from London to Kingston? Will the hon. gentleman bring down the papers regarding the change of Mr. Griffin from London to Kingston? Does he not know there were serious irregularities in the post office?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does he not know that a person was persuaded to resign his position in the London post office to save the guilty parties.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I have papers in my possession which will inform the hon. gentleman. I do not wish to delay the House, but I think it would be worth while to bring the matter to the attention of the House, for it does seem to me that very serious irregularities have grown up in connection with many post offices in this country.

Mr. COOK. I wish to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that there is a vacancy in the customs house in the town of Penetanguishene, in the county of Simcoe. The customs officer sometime ago resigned his position, and I believe there are a great many applicants for the vacancy. The appointment should be made at once, because I can tell the Government that the petition against the member for East Simcoe is withdrawn and there is no necessity for keeping the place open.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to separate the cases of Mrs. Gowanlock and Mr. Shannon. The hon. First Minister kindly stated that if both sides of the House would express an opinion on the subject of Mrs. Gowanlock's claim, he would look into it. I have seen this unhappy woman, on whose brow still rests the shadow of the great peril that befel her, and who is not long for this world; and I hope the hon. First Minister will treat her with the same kindness that he did Mrs. Delaney. I think both sides of this House will gladly join in expressing the opinion that the Government should do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From what has been said on both sides of the House, I take it that there is a general assent, and therefore I may state that the Government will submit a proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the case of Mrs. Gowanlock is out of the way, I would venture to make a remark to the Postmaster General about a vacancy in the post office at Newcastle. It will be in his recollection that last year I called his attention to the great neglect that occurred in that post office in the delivery of that leading organ of public opinion, the *Montreal Herald*, of which I sent a good many copies to my constituents in order to prevent misrepresentation, to keep them right, and to let them know what was going on in this House. I think I stated to the hon. gentleman last year that a great many copies of the paper, particularly just preceding the election, were thrown aside, some into the furnace. I have not heard that the hon. gentleman made any enquiries which he told me he would make. The occupant of the post office at the time was a son of the postmaster himself, who had been an invalid for a number of years. He was a very respectable man, and I am sure, had he been in his place, he would never have countenanced the disposal of the papers in the manner in which they were disposed of by the son, who was acting for him. The postmaster has

been dead for some months, and I have not heard that a successor has been appointed. I did see that the Conservative Association, presided over by the gentleman whom I honored by beating him, had a meeting, or rather several meetings, of what is called the Liberal Conservative party in that town, and had several ballots, as to which of the numerous applicants should get the appointment; but I am not aware that any recommendation was made by that body to the Postmaster General on the subject. I would like the hon. gentleman to answer me, first, as to whether he made any enquiry into the complaints I made of the disposal of the newspapers which I thought it in my interest to send to some hundreds of my constituents, and next, whether any recommendation has been made by the Liberal Conservative club of that town, and if so, who has been appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. I called the attention of my officers to the remarks made previously by the hon. gentleman and directed them to remedy anything that was wrong. I may state that an appointment has been made to the post office.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask who it is?

Mr. McLELAN. I can scarcely give the name now; I can hardly recollect it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps you will let me know tomorrow.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I approve of the conduct of the Government with respect to Mrs. Gowanlock. I think it is desirable that she should receive some compensation for the great hardships she has sustained. But I must say I think it an unfortunate thing, and calculated to create just and well-grounded suspicion on the part of the people of Canada, that the Postmaster General has no better explanation to offer than that which he has given to the House, of the most scandalous and infamous failure of justice that took place, whereby a felon, a man caught in the act of felony, was allowed, for whatever reason it may be, to escape to another country, whereby the ends of justice have been utterly defeated. If any man deserved to be sent to prison, it was a man who, in the position of deputy postmaster at Kingston, was found tampering with letters. I think the hon. Minister has been misinformed on one point. I would state to him that I have been informed that it was known to the postmaster for many months that irregularities were committed, and that officials were kept under suspicion of being the guilty parties.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad the Government have come to the conclusion to give some compensation to Mrs. Gowanlock. The discussion on the subject of the postal service generally I do not think will be amiss. If there is one subject on which this House should give a decided and united expression of opinion, it is that when the people's mail matter is entrusted to the officials of the Government, it should be forwarded to its destination without being tampered with; and it will be a very unfortunate thing if it should go forth to the postmasters that any laches on their part will be condoned by the Government. I very much regretted the tone of the hon. First Minister's remarks to night, because they will be taken as a palliation of the conduct of postmasters who tamper with the people's letters. The Opposition in this House have always held that the Post Office Department should be administered for the people, and when the Government have asked for money for that purpose, it has readily been granted; and because I feel that that department should be administered, not in the interest of party, but in the interest of the people of this country, I very much regretted the tone of the Premier's observations, because it may lead those in charge of the postal service to take for granted that if they are faithful to the Government they may tamper with the people's

mails and open their letters, and will still be retained in the service. It is most unfortunate and most calamitous to the officials of the country that any such sentiment should go abroad that those guilty of wrong-doing in the postal service are to be maintained in office so long as they are faithful to the party. That principle should be stamped out on both sides, and the Government should be particular that no utterance of theirs would give the slightest sanction to public servants in the post office believing that they might with impunity, so long as they were true to party allegiance, tamper with or delay the mails or filch money from the letters. A gentleman has just showed me a telegram stating that a letter which he mailed from Ottawa to Mount Forest on the 4th April, did not reach Mount Forest until to-night. If we are to be treated to the excuses and palliative utterances, which the hon. the First Minister gave us to-night, we will have these delays repeated. Last year there were lost of registered letters 204 in the Dominion of Canada, and of letters not registered 273. This should not be. Why should those letters have been lost? They were not stolen but they were lost in Toronto in the mail. In my riding, a letter was sent by the bank to a distance of 11 miles, and although this letter contained \$690, it did not reach its destination for six months. There has been no prosecution, there have been no dismissals, but every official has been kept in office. I must presume those officials were appointed by the Government, and the Government gave them to understand that so long as they were faithful to the Government it did not matter what became of the letters. In view of these facts, the remarks of the hon. the First Minister to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) were not at all justified; and the hon. member for Elgin struck at the root of the evil when he said the conduct of the postal service should not be ruled by party feeling. The postal service should be administered for the people, and the safe transmission of letters should be the paramount consideration of the Government. No sanction should be given to any wrong-doing on the part of the officials. I entirely disapprove of a gentleman holding the position the First Minister does, sanctioning a crime such as was committed at Kingston, where letters were opened and the money taken out, and then ridiculing an hon. gentleman who made a statement in accordance with the facts, and which struck at the root of the evil. I have no personal feeling towards the right hon. gentleman, but I say it is not consistent with the high position he holds that he should condone a crime and try to divert attention from it by ridicule. If more severity were exercised in the treatment of officials guilty of wrong-doings, we would not find so many letters going astray and so many delays in their transmission.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dorchester Penitentiary \$46,304 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know how far the building has progressed and what quantity of land the penitentiary has under cultivation and what work is done by the convicts?

Mr. THOMPSON. The buildings are completed, and we expect to occupy the new wing on the first of May. There is a large tract of land under cultivation. The convicts have been fully employed so far. We have very satisfactory workshops and also manufacturing machinery which give employment to the convicts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I wanted to know was whether any satisfactory arrangement had been made for employing them in the way of anything like a permanent manufacture.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have not made any permanent arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that they are employed in work in the prison and about the farm, and in the manufacture of buckets.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wonder if this will be affected by Mr. Abbott's Bill in regard to bucket shops.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... \$49,914 48

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the Penitentiary Act of last Session, there was a maximum allowance for a surgeon of \$1,200. Dr. Sutherland had been the surgeon of the Manitoba penitentiary for some time, and had been receiving \$600, but he had not been required to give his whole time to the prison. He was living in Winnipeg, and the fact that he had to go so far to attend to the penitentiary was found to be a great inconvenience. It is a prison in which there is an unusual number of prisoners requiring medical and surgical aid, and it was found, especially in winter, that it was impossible for a surgeon living in Winnipeg to properly attend to the wants of the prisoners, so it was thought better to require him to live at Stony Mountain and to give his whole time to the Penitentiary, and so he was allowed the maximum of the amount granted for surgeons, \$1,200. The other increases, as regards salaries, are in accordance with the statute of last year—they are simply statutory increases—except that an additional guard has been provided for, and indeed was provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last year. In the maintenance, there has been a decrease of 307, because so much convict clothing is not expected to be required. In the working expenses, there is an increase of \$369, the principal item being in connection with the maintenance of buildings, for small repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the hon. gentleman observed that the convicts in this Penitentiary require a great deal of medicine, and I agree with him, for I see that \$639 was expended for these 100 convicts for drugs and medicine, while only \$271 was expended for 175 convicts in the Dorchester penitentiary. It certainly appears to me that that is a monstrous disproportion.

Mr. THOMPSON. I made some remarks on this question before, and the only explanation I can give is the same as I gave then, that a very much larger quantity of medicines and drugs is required in Manitoba than elsewhere. We have there a number of Indians and half-breeds, and these are persons who, after a short period of confinement, almost invariably develop disease, and require care and stimulants and medical aid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many Indians are there?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot state the exact number.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there twenty?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; I think about fifteen.

Mr. WILSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean by "stimulants" supplied to Indians liquors, or what?

Mr. THOMPSON. We have some there who are far advanced in consumption, and occasionally liquors have to be provided for Indians.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that the Minister took power in a Bill which was passed to-day to provide that, if anyone gave spirits of any description to an Indian—whether it was a doctor or anyone else—he would be liable to a fine and to imprisonment. Am I to understand that the Minister is making provision now to give spirits to the Indians and to make the doctors violate the law and make themselves liable to be fined and imprisoned. Either

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the Government must amend the law passed this afternoon, or they must do away with the spirits. It seems to be very absurd that they should provide that this surgeon Sutherland should be fined every day for supplying liquors to Indians, while they furnish the whiskey for the purpose. I do not understand it. I think the warden must be very weak and delicate and must require a great deal of stimulants, because I see in the warden's department there is no less than \$129 45 paid for drugs and medicine. I should like the Minister to explain how this happens. Perhaps he will state whether there are any Indian patients in the warden's department who require stimulants and nourishment on account of lung disease.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are no such patients in the warden's department. I hope the hon. gentleman will acquit me of any desire to lead astray any member of his profession. I could not hope to do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know exactly what sort of rations may be required in the Manitoba penitentiary, but it does appear to me that the quantities set down here for a year's consumption is rather extravagant for 100 convicts and some 20 or 25 guards. I find there are 211 lbs. of bacon, which is not extravagant, 57,353 lbs. of beef, 927 lbs. of mutton, 3 barrels of pork, and 182 lbs. of veal. It seems to me that those rations are calculated on a very extraordinary scale. Speaking roughly, I should say it would amount to a ration of about 2 lbs. of meat *per diem* for each man, which seems very much in excess of the ordinary prison allowance, and I think is very much in excess of the rations allowed to Her Majesty's soldiers. I think a pound of meat *per diem* is all that is allowed to a soldier, and if I am wrong the Minister of Militia can correct me. However, it is clear that these allowances are out of all proportion to what might be supposed to keep a man in health and strength during the year. I have no objection whatever to these men being properly fed. It would be very improper to deprive them of a reasonable amount of nutriment, but, if the hon. gentleman will make the calculation for himself, I think he will agree with me that this amount is unreasonable.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the old system, the guards were supplied with rations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are only 25 of them.

Mr. THOMPSON. We supply them no longer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but the hon. gentleman should know that 100 convicts and 25 guards could hardly be expected to consume the quantities I have alluded to. It is enormously in excess of the rations granted in the military service, and those are supposed to be quite sufficient to keep men at the very top of their condition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire whether it is the intention to continue this extra allowance of \$400 to Mr. Bedson, the warden.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot give the hon. gentleman any explanation as to the rations, but I will promise to do so the next time we go into Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it should be looked into, because it is vastly in excess of what it ought to be. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the rations in other cases, he will see that it is enormously in excess of what seems to be supplied there. Now, by way of comparison, if he will look at Dorchester penitentiary, he will see there that the quantity of beef is 16,000 lbs. as against 57,000 lbs. There is a little more pork, apparently—24 barrels of pork, and only three here, but as far as I can see, running my eye over it, the rations received in Dorchester

Penitentiary, would, per head, hardly be one-third part of those that are alleged to have been consumed in Manitoba.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think when on this item before, the drugs used in Manitoba penitentiary in the warden's department, came up incidentally and the Minister promised us that he would be able to give us later more detailed explanations as to the nature of this item. I have been waiting patiently for his explanation, and deferred my remarks until we came to the item. I hope he will now fulfil his promise.

Mr. THOMPSON. If I made the hon. gentleman that promise, it has escaped my memory altogether. I suppose the explanations I gave the other evening were satisfactory, but if he will allow me, I will promise to make the explanations the next time we go into Supply.

Mr. TROW. I notice an unusual number of guards employed at that penitentiary. It is well known that the warden of that penitentiary is a very large herder of buffalos, that roam at large over the prairies, and I am persuaded that some of these guards are employed in keeping them within reasonable limits. He has some 35 or 40 buffalos. I know that they are guarded, and I would like to know whether he employs the guards of the penitentiary for that purpose.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are no guards employed at any work of that kind, and none of the present employes. I may give as one reason why so many guards are required, the fact that there is no wall and no fence at all about the present grounds.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think we have not had such full explanations as we ought to have in reference to this penitentiary. A number of years ago I remember distinctly that the reasons given why the expenses were so unusually large were on account of the cost of living, and the cost of maintenance in that locality. But to-day, although they have good facilities, and the expense of living ought not to be any greater than in any other province, we find that the expenditure *per capita* in Manitoba is increasing from year to year. The expenses of running that institution are becoming greater. We find, according to their own estimates, that in 1886-87, the cost per head was \$1.53; in 1885-86 it was \$1.43, and in 1884-85 it was \$1.31. Now, that shows a gradual running up, contrary to what they promised. They told us that, after a time, as the cost of living decreased, the expenses of the institution would decrease. Now, what is the reason of the constant increase? I must confess I do not think we have had any sufficient explanation. Is it the warden who is at fault? Does he make requisitions upon the Government that they cannot resist? If the Government find that the warden is more extravagant than he ought to be, let them take steps accordingly. He may be an efficient man, but it is their duty at once to refuse to grant the requisitions he makes upon them. I cannot for the life of me see why the expense should be so enormous. I know there is a large number of Indians usually sent to this institution, and the expenditure increased on account of their being there. I believe you will find that the cause of the increased expenditure, I may say the reckless extravagance, in the institution is traceable to the warden himself, and the sooner the Government make full investigation and curtail the expenses, the more satisfactory will it be to the House. While I am perfectly willing that every facilities should be given to the unfortunate inmates, I am afraid, judging from the appearance of the amount, and judging from the explanation given to us by the Minister, that the unfortunate inmates are not the extravagant ones, that these various extra delicacies are not intended for the inmates, but they are intended for the officers, and I think it is high time for the Minister to make an examination and try to

conduct the institution in the future in somewhat such a manner as it ought to be conducted. When we take all the various items, we find that the expenditure is much larger than it is in any other institution of the kind, either in this or any other country, and I cannot for the life of me see why the Government should allow it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is understood, of course, that on these items as to which the hon. gentleman promises further explanation, full discussion will be allowed on concurrence. Now, in support of the statement of my hon. friend behind me, I may just point out a sample instance of how things are managed in the Manitoba penitentiary. I see a charge of \$52 for a single item of ink. Well, now, in the name of all that is wonderful, how is it that the ordinary correspondence of the officers of a penitentiary like that in Manitoba could require \$52 worth of ink in one year. I find that at Kingston \$30 was sufficient, although that institution has 600 convicts. I think when the hon. gentleman comes to overhaul the accounts of the Manitoba penitentiary he will find that there has been great laxity somewhere.

Mr. WATSON. There is no doubt that there is ground for complaint with regard to the management of this penitentiary as compared with other penitentiaries; and if we look at the items it must be apparent to every member that there is gross extravagance in connection with that institution. The heavy expenditures in connection with the Manitoba penitentiary are apparent when we consider those made for other penitentiaries. While the expenditure for rations is \$69.33 per head in Manitoba it is only \$46.20 in British Columbia, and yet rations can be purchased as cheap if not cheaper in Manitoba than British Columbia. Take the items as between Manitoba and British Columbia. Wardens and officers' quarters, Manitoba, average cost, \$11.86; British Columbia, 17 cents; travelling expenses of inspector, Manitoba, \$6.36; British Columbia, 4 cents; livery and feed Manitoba, \$4.41; British Columbia, nothing. The quantity of fuel consumed in Manitoba penitentiary is something enormous; coal 486 tons, costing \$3,251; wood, 2,117 cords, costing \$7,582. These are very extravagant items. Then there is also the warden's salary of \$2,000, which is all right, but there is also the warden's storekeeper and accountant. I do not know who he is, for his name is not mentioned, possibly it may be Mr. Bedson himself.

Mr. THOMPSON. The name is McGowan.

Mr. WATSON. I supposed that, perhaps, Mr. Bedson might keep his own accounts, judging from the way in which they are kept. In the tailoring department there is a tailor and an instructor of tailoring. Is it necessary to have an instructor of tailoring when a tailor is employed?

Mr. THOMPSON. The only tailor now employed is now engaged in instructing the convicts in tailoring.

Mr. WATSON. Then as to the cost of living. We explain to people coming to Manitoba that it is a cheap country to live in. But the cost of maintenance at the Manitoba penitentiary increased from \$1.31 per day per convict in 1884-85 to \$1.43 in 1885-86 and \$1.53 in 1886-87. I submit that these figures should be reversed, because the cost of living is cheaper now than it was in 1885. I especially desire that some explanation should be given with respect to the travelling expenses.

Mr. THOMPSON. The expenses of the inspector are those paid to the inspector of penitentiaries who goes from Ottawa to make the inspection, and they have no relation to the expenses of the prison itself. The reason why they are so much larger for Manitoba as compared with British Columbia, is that the New Westminster penitentiary is so far away that it is very rarely visited from Ottawa, I think only once within three or four years. The hon. gentleman

knows better than I do the exposed situation of Manitoba penitentiary and the difficulty experienced in heating it. The building is, I think, very ill-designed for the prairies. Under the old system by which allowances were made to wardens and other officials, these have all been discontinued since last July.

Mr. TROW. I should imagine that the cost of living in Manitoba would be much cheaper than that of any other penitentiary in the Dominion, for the simple reason that they have an almost unlimited extent of land. The institution raises its own root crops, onions, beets, potatoes and so forth, and it must have at least ten acres under cultivation, this being land of inexhaustible fertility which is cultivated by prison labor. The expense, consequently, should not be so large as in other penitentiaries where there are not such advantages.

Mr. THOMPSON. We pay two cents per pound more for beef for the Manitoba penitentiary than for any other.

Mr. WATSON. What do you pay?

Mr. THOMPSON. 8 cents per pound.

Mr. WELSH. I find that 85 prisoners in Manitoba penitentiary cost about the same amount as 143 in Dorchester penitentiary.

Mr. THOMPSON. Because the prices are so much higher.

Mr. COOK. There are two barrels of apples for Manitoba at \$11, which is a pretty high price. Had the duty anything to do with the price? There is one item that I do not think is sufficiently high, and it is that for bibles and books; I am afraid the Government are neglecting the convicts in that respect. They should pay a little more attention to church matters there and give the convicts a little less beef, and their morals will be improved thereby.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the \$400 for extra cost of living for the warden in Manitoba penitentiary? Mr. Bedson receives \$2,000 a year, and last year he received \$400 for extra living.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no allowance for extra living granted to any prison official. The salary is fixed by law; the minimum salary of the warden is \$2,000 and he goes by increases to \$2,400. The extra allowance to which the hon. gentleman refers was made in this connection: when the large influx of prisoners incurred in consequence of the rebellion the warden was required to vacate his quarters and remove his family to Winnipeg. One member of his family was very seriously ill and the illness resulted in death, and an allowance was made in consequence of his extra expenses. In order to save expense the inspector was ordered to go on one or two occasions to the Regina and Prince Albert jails.

Mr. WATSON. Has he any consideration for that outside his salary.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not except travelling expenses.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like the Minister to explain the item of sugar. I find there are 5,551 pounds, costing nearly 7 cents a pound. I also find there are 100 pounds of "Paris lump." Would he explain why this "Paris lump" was used.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot explain that just now. I find the contract is 10 cents a pound for sugar and the estimate for the coming year is 2,500 pounds.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). That would be only about half the amount that is down here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not 10 cents a pound an extraordinary high price to be paid for sugar to be supplied to a prison?

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON. I can only explain what the hon. gentleman asks about this sugar by saying that under the former system on which those accounts are based, rations were allowed to the warden and deputy warden. I suppose the supply was for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman if he says that sugar of a sufficiently good quality for penitentiaries cannot be obtained in Winnipeg less than 10 cents a pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs can tell us something about this article. It can hardly be 10 cents a pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the cost of transportation. We pay 12 cents in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That should only cause a fractional difference between the price in Winnipeg and the price in Toronto and Montreal. The cost of transportation even on the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot be so material as to involve such a considerable difference in price.

Mr. WATSON. We can buy granulated sugar in Winnipeg for 8½ cents per pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would be very happy to give a contract at that price.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). You bought the Paris lump sugar at 10 cents per pound.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the brown sugar we are estimating for now.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the Manitoba penitentiary I think there is evidence that its expenses requires the careful attention of the Minister. I have no desire in the world to find unnecessary fault, but I have made a calculation which shows that there is something wrong with the Manitoba penitentiary. In Kingston there are 572 inmates at a cost of \$187.10 each for all expenses during the year; in Dorchester there are 143 at a cost of \$298.90 for all expenses, and in Manitoba there are 85 at a cost *per capita*, for officers and all expenses of \$558.80, or very nearly \$600 an inmate. In British Columbia there are 95 and they cost only \$368.14 each. Now we find that for the feeding alone of those inmates, in Dorchester they cost \$66.80 each; in Manitoba \$111.25 each, and in British Columbia, where I think certainly food should be quite as dear as Manitoba, they only cost \$108.30 each. In the central prison in Toronto they only cost 55 cents per head, per day, while in Manitoba they cost \$1.53, and in Dorchester 81 cents, in which the inmates are equal in number to the Guelph central prison. When you come to Manitoba the charges there are enormous, and I think the Minister should have a full investigation of all items of expenditure in connection with that penitentiary and see that they are reduced to something within reasonable limits.

Mr. COOK. I suppose they keep horses there. I see one charge for a buggy at \$200. Is it for the purchase of a buggy?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. COOK. I see items for livery and horse feed, \$243, and horse hire \$24. If they have horses what is the necessity for hiring horses?

Mr. THOMPSON. The livery was for the surgeon.

Mr. COOK. There is a very large item of \$321.60 for telegrams.

Mr. THOMPSON. Telegraphing is expensive there.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think you will find there are separate items in reference to the surgeon's livery, and it appears in the officers department there is another charge for livery and feed. It must have been for some of the other officers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Probably for both, I will enquire about that.

British Columbia penitentiary,.....\$43,827 85

Mr. THOMPSON. There is an increase of \$1,530 in the salaries. The increase is to give the warden the minimum salary provided by the statute, which is \$2,000. There is an increase also in the salary of deputy warden on account of the special duties that he has to perform. In addition to his duties as deputy warden and chief keeper, which of course may well be discharged by the deputy there, he has qualifications as a farmer. He has been successful in bringing a large area under cultivation, and he attends to the duties of the farm, thus saving the expense we have to incur elsewhere for the employment of a farmer. He does it very successfully indeed, and we thought under those circumstances he should get an increase of \$100. The warden has asked to have a carpenter instructor and a baker appointed, and that has been recommended by the inspector. I need not tell the committee that it is very useful to have a carpenter instructor where so many convicts are employed either at practising or learning the trade; and it has been recommended as decidedly in the interest of economy that a baker should be employed instead of having the bread furnished by contract, as at present. The other increases are only statutory increases. In the maintenance there is a decrease of \$3,323.40, on account of a smaller estimated prison population than last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. The fact is that we have had for two or three years past an abnormally large number of convicts, principally in consequence of the kind of population that was left stranded in the country after the completion of the railway works; but the influx of prisoners to the penitentiary has since been much less. There is a small decrease in the working expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see that there is much ground of complaint there; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's report of 1886-87, he will see that the complaints which have been made regarding the Manitoba penitentiary are amply justified. If you take the item of meat, you will find that in Manitoba, including the guards, there will be about the same number of persons as in the British Columbia penitentiary, and yet they consume four times the quantity of meat that was consumed in British Columbia. It does look as if that required a considerable overhauling.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no doubt that that ought to have careful enquiry. I may say that a very diligent accountant has been appointed in the Manitoba penitentiary; he was formerly employed in the Dorehester penitentiary, and I have every confidence in any accounts that pass under his hands. He was appointed about two years ago.

Regina Jail.....\$13,000

Mr. THOMPSON. We have at present merely organised the staff in anticipation of the wants of the prison. I estimate that we shall require two more guards when, as we expect about the 1st July, we shall take the prisoners who are confined in the police barracks throughout the North-West and transfer them, as far as we can accommodate them, to the Regina jail. We have not had any prisoners there heretofore.

42-1888-4

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind of an arrangement is likely to be made with respect to all the jails throughout the North-West? The Dominion will have to support the penitentiaries, but does the hon. gentleman contemplate the establishment of several ordinary jails throughout the new North-West Territory, because it will be a tolerably expensive business.

Mr. THOMPSON. We must do so, because we have to look after the administration of justice there, which devolves on the Provincial Governments elsewhere, and I have asked the hon. Minister of Public Works to provide on an economical scale for several jails and lockups in the North-West. The fact is, we make an allowance to the Mounted Police for keeping prisoners in the guardrooms and cells in their barracks, which are in most cases unsuitable places for keeping convicts. At present the only prisons erected are at Regina and Prince Albert, and this is the only one yet occupied.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand that you are making provision to keep lunatics at this jail permanently?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, the lunatics are confined in the asylum at Selkirk, and an allowance is made by the Provincial Government for their support. The Selkirk asylum is full, and at present, I am sorry to say, there are lunatics confined in the police barracks of necessity; but I made arrangements with my late colleague, the Minister of the Interior, a month or two ago, for the removal of all those to the Manitoba penitentiary, where they can be better cared for.

Salaries, House of Commons\$66,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a considerable increase.

Mr. SPEAKER. The increase \$2,100 under this head is made up as follows: Thirty clerks are entitled to the annual statutory increase of \$50, making \$1,500. For years past it has been found necessary to have one of the messengers attached to the stationery office to attend to the supplying of stationery to the members, and holding copy in proof-reading, which is done in that department. The person so employed became necessary to the office, and therefore, instead of having his time divided between the messengers' room, and the stationery office, it was deemed advisable to attach him to the stationery office as a junior clerk. The change has been found to work well, as attending at the counter and proof-reading can be proceeded with at the same time. His salary is \$600, being only \$10 more than he had before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This item embraces sessional clerks. How many are there?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am quite sure we will not exceed the usual vote for that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a great curiosity on the part of many young members like myself to know what the duties of those sessional clerks are.

Mr. SPEAKER. Their duties are varied. Of course, they cannot always be employed, but sometimes they have all the work they can do. The custom has been followed by many members employing them on their own account when they are not working for the House. They employ them as private secretaries, and I think that on the whole they are useful to the House and very often to the members. When asked to copy something, they are always ready.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If hon. members employ them, it is at their own expense.

Mr. SPEAKER. They can employ them on public business, for instance copying electoral lists. They are also employed in some of the departments when required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then a member of the House can have any official work of that kind done by one of these clerks?

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly; the moment the application is made to the Clerk of the House, these clerks are supplied to do any work that can be called public business.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Do I understand the Speaker to say that he does not know the number?

Mr. SPEAKER. The number is not greater than in other Sessions.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). In 1886 you had about 37.

Mr. SPEAKER. To-day I should say we have not more than 20 or 28.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As Mr. Speaker has kindly imparted to us this information, it might be interesting to know how he distributes these clerks when wanted by various gentlemen in the House. If available, they should be available in due proportion. We should have them appointed in the same fashion as we appoint commissioners. A certain section should be attached to the service of hon. gentlemen on your right, and a certain section on your left. I am a pretty old member, having been in office a good many years, and I have never obtained any advantage or assistance from the gentlemen of the sessional clerk department. If Mr. Speaker will see that the division be made proportionately, I suppose my hon. friends will not say much about it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I had pretty nearly forgotten there is one right side and one left side. I do not attend to these details, but I understand from the clerk of the House that any member who applies to him for the assistance of a sessional clerk for doing his work, when that work may be called public business, a clerk is always supplied to him. I am quite sure that if the hon. gentleman would see his friend, Mr. Bourinot, he would have any number of clerks he wanted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is information to every hon. gentleman on this side. There are 30 or 40 of those clerks now. At one time there were 110.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In 1878.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be a great convenience to have these clerks; but if we are to have gentlemen waiting, we should have the privilege of appointing those who are to serve us. Sometimes those public documents are of a confidential nature, and there would be an advantage in having clerks in whom one might have perfect confidence when giving them such documents to copy. It has so happened, so far in the distribution of those clerks, that, although we do a very fair proportion of public business on this side, not one of these blessings has ever fallen to us.

Mr. SPEAKER. You did not care much for them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker has never given us an opportunity of letting him know how much we would appreciate advantages of this sort.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Just try it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am inclined to think that if we were to make the trial, we would find they are always engaged to the full extent of their powers by hon. gentlemen opposite. A few years ago, I know we had a number of these gentlemen, and they sat in the galleries, and were correspondent of newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. There were a few not exactly of that class. I think Mr. King Dodds was one who was

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

appointed an extra sessional clerk one Friday, and on the following Monday he left, but his appointment was antedated forty days, he drew \$160, and he was allowed to return home in order to engage in an election canvass. That is the way in which he performed his duties. Then, another gentleman made a representation to a member for the city of Ottawa, but his services were not required immediately, for the reason, I believe, that they could not find a room to put him in, so that he might be out of the way; but the member representing this city received a letter from him at the end of the Session thanking him for the appointment and stating that he had received his money all right, though he had not been required to come to the House at all. I hope Mr. Speaker has not any of that class at this time. I hope the present clerks are all actively and earnestly engaged in discharging those duties which the hon. gentlemen on the other side find so extremely convenient and so necessary in the public interest; but it does so happen that not one of those sessional clerks has ever been placed at the service of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I must say that I never supposed it was any part of their duty to write the addresses on parliamentary literature which hon. gentlemen were sending to their constituents. On this side of the House, when hon. gentlemen have had anything of that kind to do, I believe they have been obliged to pay for it out of their own pockets; but, on that side of the House, thanks to the generosity of the Ministry and to the large sums in the public treasury, hon. gentlemen are not put to any inconvenience of that sort, and those gentlemen find that it is highly convenient to have these clerks engaged as their private secretaries—for that is what it amounts to—and paid out of the public treasury. The Minister of Finance has for some time been engaged, I think, in trying to cut down the public expenses. The hon. gentleman will see that here is an opportunity. Every little counts in this matter, and, as the hon. gentleman is, as we on this side are, a friend of unrestricted reciprocity with the neighboring Republic and anxious to extend our trade relations with that country, and is desirous to economize in order to bring this about, it is highly proper that he should see that this element of public waste comes to an end. It seems to me, if we are to accept the statement of Mr. Speaker, if he is not mistaken—and I apprehend he is not mistaken, as to what these men are engaged in doing—we have been paying out of the public treasury the salaries of parties who are simply the private secretaries of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it can be properly inferred from what I have stated that these clerks are only employed in assisting the members on this side of the House. I said we were obliged to keep a larger staff than we otherwise would because at times business is so pressing and there is so much work for them to do that we have to keep a large number of them so that the work on hand can be done at once. When they have leisure, I do not see why these sessional clerks should not be employed profitably in the public interest by members who might want them, but, if they are so employed, it might be considered as a favor. The clerk of the House has always allowed that. I do not think he has done it only for members on this side of the House, but I think he has done it equally for members sitting on the other side. Still, it is only when these men are at leisure, when they are not employed in the work of the House, that they are disposed of in that way, and I think the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not fair in this sense, that it does not prove that it is not a necessity to have these sessional clerks on hand when they are required. Hon. members might say the same thing in regard to a great many of the employés of this House. Most of them are only employed for three

or four months, for the time of the Session. Is that a reason why their services should be dispensed with, because the whole work might be done in the twelve months of the year by a smaller staff? The work has to be done during the Session, and, if these officers have leisure after the Session, that is no reason for dismissing them. The same reasoning applies to the sessional clerks, and, when they have nothing else to do, we have to utilise them in some way, and we have to keep them on hand because they may be required at any moment in order that the work of the House may be done with expedition and with celerity, so that the work of the House may not be impeded. I do not think it would be fair that we should infer from what I have said that these sessional clerks are paid uselessly or that their time is wasted.

Mr. HESSON. I must entirely repudiate the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are utilising the services of the sessional clerks. I have been a member of this House for seven years, and I have never asked any sessional clerk for five minutes of his time. I think there are many on this side of the House who can say the same as I do. Can hon. gentlemen on the other side say as much? I know that there is one gentleman who has had 7,000 pamphlets or speeches sent out in a very short period, and I do not think that he addressed all the envelopes himself. If sessional clerks were at his disposal, if he asked the Clerk of the House to allow him to obtain their services, no doubt if they had leisure he would have obtained their services.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. HESSON. I utterly repudiate—

An hon. MEMBER. Name the man who sent out 7,000 speeches.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman have patience? I repudiate the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it is customary for members on this side of the House—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my statement; it is the Speaker's statement.

Mr. HESSON. The Speaker did not make that statement, that these clerks were only at the disposal of members on this side of the House. He stated the contrary. He said that, if hon. gentlemen asked for their services, the Clerk would give them to hon. gentlemen opposite. I have nothing more to say on this subject, but I do not want to have the accusation hurled at me that we use the services of these gentlemen. Probably we have more work to do than hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I know that I have a great deal of work to do, and I am willing to do it, and I do not ask for any favor from the Government or from any Government employés. I believe it is necessary, as a great deal of work has to be done sometimes in this House, to have men employed to do that work; and, when they have too much leisure, it is well that they should be employed in other ways. I do not think it is fair to assume that they are only available for the services of gentlemen on this side of the House, when hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware of the fact that if they want the services of these men they can have them. For myself, I have never had one of them employed for five minutes, and I presume there are other gentlemen on this side of the House who can say the same thing.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member who has just sat down says that the Speaker did not say that these gentlemen were employed only for the service of members on that side of the House. I did not understand the Speaker to say that, but the Speaker did say that these gentlemen were at

the services of members on both sides of the House. As a matter of fact we know that in the past members on this side of the House not only have not employed, but were not even aware that they could employ these clerks, and as a matter of fact, members on this side have not employed them. In the past, hon. members opposite have had the full advantage of the services of these gentlemen; but in the future, I suppose that hon. gentlemen on this side will avail themselves of the services of these employés. But there is another point to which I wish to allude. How are these men paid?

Mr. SPEAKER. By the day.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask whether, when they are absent from the city of Ottawa, their pay goes on, or whether their time is docked whenever they are absent from the city? I have known some of these gentlemen who are most of the Session away from Ottawa, but I have understood that they collected their full pay for every day of the Session. I do not know whether all the employés of the House are in the same position and are paid in the same way; but I have, myself, within the past three days, seen an employé of this House down at Bedford in the county of Missisquoi who was present on a platform at the nomination of candidates in a local election, and that gentleman was not present in Ottawa doing his duty as an employé of this House from Friday of one week until Monday evening of the next week. An hon. gentleman near me asks me whether he was working for the Tory candidate. I did not speak to him, but I know he was there, and I would like to know from the Speaker whether this gentleman is allowed to draw his pay at so much per day, even though he may be absent from his duty and away in the country, apparently doing work in an election campaign.

Mr. MADILL. I would suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite appoint our Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that permission has been given to any sessional clerk to do this: such a thing is not allowed. He is not entitled to his pay if he has been absent during a working day, and if he is absent without leave, he ought to be reported.

Mr. FISHER. What are working days?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the days on which the House sits. On Saturday after one o'clock I suppose every clerk is at liberty to go away, like all other civil servants.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask Mr. Speaker what he calls working days?

Mr. SPEAKER. Every day of the week, except Saturday afternoon.

Mr. FISHER. I understand, then, that these men's services extend during the ordinary hours that civil servants work, or during the session of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. Sessional clerks must be on hand during the sittings of the House. When we adjourn at two or three o'clock, sometimes, they have to remain here until four or five in order to get everything ready for the members next morning. It depends entirely upon the kind of work they have to do.

Mr. FISHER. Then I understand that if these gentlemen are away for a part of the time during which the House is sitting, and during which they are supposed to be here, they ought to be docked their pay for that time.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, if they were absent half a day, I suppose they would not be docked half a day's pay.

Mr. LAURIER. There is more than that in the question of my hon. friend. If an employé of this House goes and takes part in an election, even while the House is not sitting, surely the Speaker will not permit that, and he

would see that such an employé was called to a better sense of his duty. This has been a common practice in the past, but in the future I hope it will not be tolerated. No one, I am sure, can countenance any officer of this House going to take part in an election such as the officer which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has just mentioned.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. member says, I do not think we ought to countenance clerks or other employés of this House taking an active part in elections. Of course they have their right to vote, but I should say at once that they have no right to take such a part in elections as to make themselves obnoxious in any way, either to the public or to members of the House. That rule should be followed strictly. I suppose the election to which the hon. member has referred is a provincial election.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not decided what should be done in that case, but I should say that if a clerk was on the hustings where a member of this House was present, and if he did not conduct himself like a gentleman towards a member of the House, of which he is a servant, he should be dismissed at once. But I do not think that we can go so far as to say that officers of this House cannot mingle in provincial elections, or in municipal elections. They have their rights, and they can enjoy them as well as any other citizen, but they should not engage actively in elections. But as I said before, I have not decided the point. No complaint has been made to me yet in reference to officers of this House taking part in provincial elections.

Mr. LAURIER. I would not like to make a complaint that would involve the dismissal of an officer of this House, but I call the attention of the Speaker to a fact that has come under my notice, not with a view of procuring the dismissal of the offender, but with the view of preventing a practice which seems to me most objectionable. Mr. Speaker says that he is not disposed to say at present whether an officer of this House should be allowed to take part in a local election. I have no hesitation in saying that he should not be allowed to do such a thing. It is my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of the majority of this House, that no officer should be allowed to leave his business at Ottawa while he is a servant of the House, and go and take part in any election whatever. If there is a municipal election here in Ottawa, or a provincial election, or a federal election, let him go and register his vote; but that he should leave the city here, leave his work, and go and engage in any electoral campaign whatever, ought not to be allowed. But this has taken place recently, I will not even mention the name; I do not want the officer to be dismissed; but I mention the fact in order to prevent a vicious practice which has been growing up.

Mr. FISHER. I would go a little further and say that if an employé of this House has a vote in any constituency where an election is going on, it would be perfectly competent for him to ask permission to leave his work here and go and cast his vote. I would not object to that at all, provided he were a voter in the constituency, and provided he obtained his leave of absence, and ceased drawing his pay while he was away. I do object most emphatically to employés going away apparently without the knowledge of their chiefs and taking part in elections in which they have no interest beyond their party interest, because I may state for the information of Mr. Speaker that this gentleman has no vote in Missisquoi and does not live there. I am not going to give his name, because I do not wish him to be dismissed on this charge or to be reprimanded, but I desire that such conduct should be put an end to in the future. I am told, although I cannot state it from personal knowledge, that this gentleman

Mr. LAURIER.

made remarks against the integrity of the hon. gentleman who sits in front of me, remarks most objectionable to that gentleman and his followers who heard those remarks. At the same time I do not wish to make any charge or to have him dismissed in consequence of his action. I do not think this is desirable, because the Government have not chosen to issue an order that employés should not do that work, but I hold that an order should be issued by Mr. Speaker directing that employés shall not meddle in political matters during the time they are employed by this House and paid by it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule of the House with regard to extra sessional clerks is that no one is entitled to receive pay except for the period of time he is here. The only thing that justifies Mr. Speaker in appointing an extra sessional clerk is the urgency of public business. If as a sessional clerk he is employed in order to perform certain work he is supposed to be here; he has no right to leave here for any purpose whatever, and I think it would be extremely improper for such a clerk to obtain leave for the purpose of voting in any particular constituency. We know what the result would be. There would be such a paucity of public business he would not be required here, if he were on the right side of politics; but if he happened to be on the other side public urgency would prevent his being absent. Then the practical way is that if he wishes to exercise his franchise he ought not to engage in the public service, but if he is engaged here as an extra sessional clerk then he should remain here to discharge his duties. When my hon. friend says he will not give the name of the party lest that might lead to his dismissal, I do not think there is the slightest danger. I dare say hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches may have sent this party into Missisquoi to engage in the canvass.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman cannot suppose such a thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The innocents are not abroad, the innocents are at home.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I see them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Only the other parties are sent abroad. Mr. O'Donohue, a clerk in one of the departments, is away canvassing. Several hon. gentlemen have met him in Russell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope they have made his acquaintance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has made his acquaintance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know him very well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Sometimes he has enjoyed the confidence of the hon. gentleman, and at other times there seems to be a serious misunderstanding between Mr. O'Donohue and his distinguished friend who leads the House. The hon. gentleman knows that the high estimation in which he holds Mr. O'Donohue, is not always reciprocated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, but he has found out differently.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is wonderful what influence money from the public treasury has on even a man with such a cynical disposition as Mr. O'Donohue. If he had broad and generous views he would not suspect anything but the most lofty and pure sentiments on the part of the First Minister. But Mr. O'Donohue has entertained different views in regard to the right hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps even the hon. gentleman has thought the same way of me, but he has changed his mind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not always express my thoughts; but if I were to make a frank confession to the right hon. gentleman I would say that I have not the utmost confidence in him even at this moment. I am inclined to think, notwithstanding all the good intentions and good resolutions the right hon. gentleman has made, after all his efforts to start in a new path, it has become so much a matter of habit with him that notwithstanding these good intentions the hon. gentleman when he would do good evil is present. But it is not the hon. gentleman who does it but the sin that dwelleth in him. No doubt the hon. gentleman has a large number of these people engaged outside. The truth is that the public interest suffers by it either by the appointment of a larger number than is necessary in order that there may be individuals detailed from the service, or it suffers by a large number of those officers being away from their post of duty. I think Mr. Speaker has enunciated sound principles with regard to this matter, and I hope he will act on them, and that he will see that the extra sessional clerks absent from duty and engaged in political canvassing will not be paid out of the public treasury. It is all very well to come down handsomely in election contests.

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." Hon. gentlemen opposite always do come down handsomely in election contests; but, unfortunately, they come down by putting their hands into the public treasury instead of putting their hands into their own pockets. That is the difficulty. Hon. gentlemen know there are some gentlemen on the Treasury benches who have got into difficulty from not distinguishing between what belongs to the public and what does not. I say that because they may have gone wrong occasionally, that is no reason why every clerk should be trained to go wrong in precisely the same way. Hon. gentlemen who say "hear, hear," know pretty well that they have themselves been, perhaps, rather generously aided in election contests in this way, and it may have been all very well in the past, but we hope—we are a progressive people and the hon. gentleman claims to represent a progressive party—they will initiate a better state of things which will be entered upon at an early period. If they do that we shall have less ground for complaint, and we shall not have these clerks employed by Mr. Speaker and the House, and paid out of the public treasury, sent out to canvass for and aid Tory candidates in the county of Russell or elsewhere instead of being here at the post of duty.

Mr. LABELLE. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has made an assertion that one of the extra clerks has been on the hustings and has made disparaging remarks respecting the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). I hope he will give the clerk's name, because he richly deserves to be put out of his employment if he has done so. The hon. gentleman knows the attitude I have taken in the Tremblay case, and, if the hon. gentleman makes the charge, that clerk does not deserve to be an employé of the House. I hope the hon. gentleman will make a complaint if not in the House at least to Mr. Speaker, and I shall be one of the first to sustain Mr. Speaker in dismissing him from his employment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Whilst the hon. gentlemen opposite are making such serious charges against the Administration for employing the servants of this House in connection with the election campaigns it would be perhaps well for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to spare a little of that advice and to offer it to Mr. Mowatt, the purist of the Province of Ontario. I may say to the hon. gentleman that in the campaign I had the honor to wage against their candidate—in the election for Haldimand—I have met the officials of the Ontario Government in various

portions of the riding engaged in working for the Reform candidate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you had Her Majesty's assistants.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt the argument of Her Majesty would have little effect on the mind of the hon. gentleman. For fear he would not rely on my word solely in making those charges against the servants of the Ontario Government, I hold the print of a letter written by Mr. Thomas Paxton, M.P.P., in 1872.

An hon. MEMBER. He is dead now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, it is no crime for him to be dead. There are various others who might be dead to the greater benefit of the country. This letter is to Mr. A. P. Cockburn and reads in this way:

"Mr. D. M. Card is authorised to do some work for the Ontario Government in your part, wishing to make your acquaintance and get your advice. * * * * Mr. Card is a first-class man in an election contest. Of course I am aware he must be cautious what he was doing under the circumstances."

The public accounts of the next year show that Mr. Card was paid \$3,504.28 out of the public funds of the Province of Ontario. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said something with regard to the expenditure of public money, and though it may not be very relevant to the subject under discussion, yet as that discussion has taken rather a wide range I desire to call his attention for a moment to a matter circulated in the county of Kent at the present time, presumably in the interest of Mr. Campbell, the Reform candidate in that constituency. I saw it published in the papers to night and that is my authority for making the statement, but hon. gentlemen opposite know as to the fact, and if that circular is not now being circulated they will deny it. It is an extract from a paper and it says:

"GOOD NEWS FOR RALEIGH.

"THE ONTARIO GOVERNMENT RELIEVES THE TOWNSHIP OF \$17,000 INDEBTEDNESS.

"On Thursday, the reeve, first deputy and Messrs. Morrison and Dolsen, a deputation appointed by the council of Raleigh, waited upon the Hon. C. F. Fraser, Commissioner of Public Works, at Toronto, to urge the remission of a portion of the indebtedness due the Government of Ontario on the Government drains, in order to enable the township to provide a sufficient outlet by deepening Jennet's creek, without increasing the burdens on the ratepayers. After a full discussion of the case, Mr. Fraser, on behalf of the Government, offered to throw off the last five payments, and reduce the interest on the debenture indebtedness of the township to four per cent. which reductions of principal and interest relieve the township of an indebtedness of at least \$17,000. This grant reduces the cost of the drains from \$64,000 to \$48,000, leaving only some \$9,000 to pay instead of \$26,575—the amount heretofore due the Government. This generous act on the part of the Reform Government of Ontario will be appreciated by the ratepayers of Raleigh, who will thereby be enabled to improve the entire drainage system and provide a sufficient outlet for all the waters of the township without adding to their taxes. The electors of Raleigh know that the promises of a Reform Government are sincere and will be carried out to the very letter, and that a promise of the above nature is worth a thousand of the election promises of Henry Smyth and his friends. Mr. Smyth's insincere and absurd proposal to dredge Jennet's creek has often been used to assist him in entrapping innocent voters always doomed to disappointment. The promises of Mr. Campbell and his friends are not so numerous but they are always fulfilled."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is extremely desirable no doubt, that great economy should be exercised in all matters of the public service, and I notice in connection with the county which the hon. gentleman represents for the time being and perhaps not for very long a most remarkable instance of economy which he can compare with the liberality to which he has alluded as about to be exercised by the Ontario Government. I notice, Sir, that in that county there is a little town called Cayuga, with a population at last census of 790 people. I notice they had a net post office revenue after paying all expenses of \$450, and I observe that a liberal and wise minded government

have lately put in the estimates a sum of about \$8,000 odd, to provide a post office for the town, which has a population of 790 souls and a net receipt for post office purposes of between \$400 and \$500. So, Sir, they will be able to pay the interest on the amount of expenditure for this post office, and have probably about \$80 clear out of the annual income received from the post office in Cayuga. As the hon. gentleman is desirous of promoting economy here is an instance which must commend itself to this House. There are about 300 towns—I am not sure if there are not more—containing a population of 800 souls in the Province of Ontario and if the hon. gentlemen are desirous of promoting economy—they have only a deficit this year of \$850,000 in the management of the post office this year—where there are such deserving citizens as the hon. member for Haldimand, there is a most admirable illustration of how you can save public money and promote economy. I have no doubt the Minister of Finance will expound to us, to-morrow evening I hope, the scrupulous care with which the finances of this Government are managed, and this I submit as one of the nice little illustrations of the mode in which—we will not say votes are influenced in the county of Haldimand—but one of the modes in which a deficit of nearly a million a year is made good in the Post Office Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say, Sir, in connection with that grant, that it is the first the county of Haldimand ever got from the public treasury. I have to say further, that when I was engaged in that contest my opponents were the strongest advocates for the erection of that public building. They claimed it was a necessity and a justice to the county, and the only argument they produced against me was that the Government would never build it. If it was not a correct expenditure why did the hon. gentleman allow it to pass last year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I had not the majority to stop it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, but because he was afraid to influence the minds of the people against his candidate, and now when the hon. gentleman knows that Haldimand has gone from their grasp and that they never can redeem it, he is willing to vote against it. So far as his insinuation that I shall only be here for a short time is concerned, I may say that my hold on my people is not so flimsy, not so small nor not so slight as the hold of the hon. gentleman on the various constituencies which I shall not tax my mind to remember to-night. I have come here to represent the electors of Haldimand and I believe I have come here to stay as long, or longer, than the hon. gentleman did in his constituencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So long as the hon. gentleman is supplied with returning officers of the kind that elected him, and a sufficient number of ex-convicts, so long as he may find his way here and no longer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So far as the returning officer is concerned against whom he is desirous to use the tongue of slander, so far as his present conduct is concerned, he is just as honorable a member of the community in Haldimand, as the hon. gentleman himself is in Kingston.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt whatever that he is a very fit associate for the hon. gentleman—not the slightest doubt at all, and also for the men who appointed a returning officer who would appoint such convicts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say a few words on this before it is carried. Hon. gentleman need not think that any of their insinuations or utterances will stop me from saying what I am going to say. If they attempt anything of that kind they will get enough of it before the Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

is over. I notice in the Auditor General's report that there are 16 officials who got an extra allowance of \$50 each last year. I do not understand why 16 messengers were allowed a gratuity of \$50 extra. I notice that one man, a sessional clerk, got \$50 for clothing. I would like to know under what circumstances he got that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Some of the messengers got that gratuity on this ground: They are only paid like the other messengers, but some of them, for instance the doorkeeper of the Chamber, have to be provided with uniform, and being not better paid than the others, the hon. gentleman will understand that it would be unfair to them, and they would be really less paid than the others if they did not receive that gratuity at the end of the Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if uniforms have been supplied to those at the outer doors, or only to one.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are five or six who are required to have special uniform, not more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say that there has been a complaint made that the French messengers got this allowance last year, and the others did not. I would like to know if there is any truth in the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not aware that there is any truth in the statement, and I am astounded that there is a complaint made that I would give anything to the French messengers that I would not give to the English messengers. In fact, I do not know their nationalities, and I would add that not more than one-fourth of the employés of this House belong to the French nationality.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say that the complaint was made in my hearing by a messenger; and I am glad that the Speaker has been able to deny that there is any truth in it. I did not think myself that possibly there was, but when a complaint is made, it is just as well to know whether there is any partiality of that kind or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say it is not my fault if Mr. Turgeon, who is chief messenger here, has received a gratuity. I do not know Mr. Hogg, whether he is English or French. Mr. Samson, who is at the door, was not placed here by me. There is old Mr. Laflamme, who has been employed in my department, I think, for forty years, and I think it would be pretty hard for me to dismiss him now because he is a Frenchman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just make another remark about a remark which was dropped by the hon. member for North Perth. He said there was one member of this side who sent out 7,000 pamphlets, and who employed the clerks to send them out, and I heard North Wellington mentioned. I would say that no sessional clerk has ever performed an hour's work for me without my paying for it, and they always professed to do what they did for me after hours. I noticed on several occasions that they were doing nothing, and fancying that they would be willing to earn a dollar, I, on one or two occasions, engaged them to address matters for me; but every single item they did for me I paid for out of my own pocket.

Mr. HESSON. I did not use the hon. gentleman's name in connection with that, but if the cap fits him, I presume he felt it more applicable to him than to anybody else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You were asked the name.

Mr. HESSON. I am aware that I was asked the question, but I was not bound to give the name.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may just say that I have not sent out 2,000, let alone 7,000, and if the hon. gentleman had any reference to me, he is quite mistaken.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman got 7,000 envelopes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not true.

Salaries of officers of the Library..... \$16,630 00

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether that includes the salary of the librarian at the Supreme Court.

Mr. HESSON. No, the librarian at the Supreme Court is a messenger of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He is an intelligent man, and I think his pay is a very small amount for one occupying that position.

Purchase of works on America for library..... \$1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What special works on America is this money devoted to?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A general collection of works on America.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have this devoted to certain special lines so that it will not be all frittered away. It would be more valuable if directed to procure a certain class of works than if spent in an indiscriminate fashion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand from the Librarian that this is to complete all our works, historical, geographical, and otherwise relating to the continent of America. Of course, we have a great many books on that subject, but there is a number wanting.

Preparing and reprinting the catalogue of the library of American history..... \$2,500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has been recommended for two years by the Library Committee, and their report was adopted last year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this to be a yearly expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is only for this year.

Printing paper and book binding..... \$80,000

Mr. MITCHELL. What does this include, and are tenders called for it?

Mr. BOWELL. The printing is done after public tender is had. The printing paper is furnished after tenders have been advertised for and specifications sent to the different manufacturers. My impression is that the lowest tenders were those of two manufacturers in Montreal for the two classes of paper. Mr. Rolland was one; I forget the name of the other.

The Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What business will be done to-morrow?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect to proceed with the financial statement immediately after the House meets at 3 o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Finance then be able to lay upon the Table the Supplementary Estimates for the ensuing year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I regret to say that I will not be able to lay on the Table the Supplementary Estimates for the ensuing year.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Friday, April 27, 1888.

No. 43.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until Wednesday, the 9th May next.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the York Farmers' Colonization Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. McCulla)

Bill (No. 114) amending the different Acts relative to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto (from the Senate).—(Mr. Small)

THE HARBOR OF MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide:

(a) That the Government of the Dominion of Canada may release and discharge the Corporation of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal from all liability to repay to the said Government the whole or any part of the advances made to the said Corporation to enable them to widen and deepen the channel in Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence, from Montreal to Quebec, or any interest thereon, beyond the amount of interest already paid by them to the Government (it being understood that no portion of the amount heretofore paid for interest is to be refunded);

(b) That the Government may pay to the said Corporation of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal a sum not exceeding the sum of \$37,405, which they represent as being the excess of their expenditure (apart from the expenditure on capital account), over their net revenue during the calendar year 1887;

(c) That the Government may, in addition to the said payment last mentioned, expend, through the medium of the said Corporation or otherwise, in the work of completing the said channel, the amount now remaining unexpended of the sums authorized by any Act heretofore passed to be advanced to the said Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of completing the said channel;

(d) That no tonnage dues shall be hereafter levied on, or collected from, any sailing vessel or steamer at the port of Montreal;

(e) That the dredging plant and appliances heretofore used by the said Harbor Commissioners, in connection with the said channel works, shall hereafter belong to the Government of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

43—1888—1

THE HARBOR OF QUEBEC.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House, on Monday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide:

(a) That the Graving Dock built at Lévis, opposite Quebec, shall become a public work of the Dominion of Canada, under the control of the Minister of Public Works of Canada, and administered by him, and the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall cease to have any control over it, and all powers, privileges and authorities in them vested shall cease and the same shall thenceforward be vested in the Government of the Dominion of Canada.

(b) That the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall be released and discharged from any obligation to repay to the Government of Canada the whole or any part of the advances made to them by the said Government for the purpose of constructing the said Graving Dock, and from any obligation to pay to the said Government any sums of money to provide for the payment of interest thereon, or for the formation of a sinking fund in connection therewith.

(c) That out of the bonds of the Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners now held by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to cover advances made to the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners by the Government of Canada to meet payments on account of improvements in the Harbor of Quebec and in connection with the wet or tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles, there shall be returned to the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners such amount of bonds as shall be equal in par value to the amount which has been paid out of capital by the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the said Government for interest and sinking fund on the bonds so deposited as aforesaid with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, and the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners shall thenceforth be released from any obligation in connection with the bonds so to be returned as aforesaid and the advances represented thereby.

(d) That from and after the first day of January, 1888, the rate of interest to be paid on all the bonds so deposited as aforesaid, and on all bonds thereafter deposited to cover further advances for the same purpose, shall be 4 per cent. per annum without sinking fund, and that all of the said bonds remaining in the hands of the Receiver General, after deducting the amount to be returned as above provided, shall be replaced with bonds of the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the same par value, in such form as he may approve, bearing interest at 4 per cent. per annum without sinking fund: Provided always, that all amounts actually paid to the Government by the said Corporation of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on their said bonds shall be the property of the Government of Canada and form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that you do now leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee of Ways and Means, I must again ask the indulgence of the House from the fact that, owing to the circumstances connected with the administration of the affairs of the country, I have been under the necessity of being absent from Ottawa for a considerable period since the last Session. Although my department has been watched over during my absence, first in London and afterwards in Washington, by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Customs, with his usual ability, yet this House will expect from me, as Finance Minister, the usual statement as to the financial condition of the country. With this brief preface, I will pass at once to the consideration of our condition in that respect. I will first give explanations as to the variations in the financial

statements made in May last respecting the year expired 30th June, 1887, and then review the condition of affairs of the current fiscal year, and finally indicate to the House the position that the Government expect will transpire during the next financial year. Taking first the financial affairs for the year ended 30th June last, we estimated that the revenue received from all sources would amount to \$35,300,600. In May last, when making the annual statement, I endeavored to deal with our expectations in as careful a manner as I could, and not to overestimate to any extent the probable revenue likely to be received. It is with pleasure that I remind the House that the total revenues for the year were \$35,754,993, or an increase over the estimate of \$454,993. The yield from Customs which we estimated would amount to \$22,000,000 actually amounted to \$22,378,800. This increase was no doubt mainly caused by the revenue of the following year being anticipated, owing to the changes made in the tariff. Before passing from this branch of the subject, I think it will be interesting to point out to the hon. members some of the features which might be termed the curiosities of Customs revenue. In the year ended 30th June, 1886, the amount of duty collected on coal and coke was \$1,012,332. The revenue on these articles for the year 1887 amounted to \$1,178,964, or an increase of over \$100,000 over the preceding year, although 150,000 tons of anthracite coal were admitted free of duty in this latter year, a striking indication of the progress which Canada made during that year in manufactures. In the matter of luxuries such as fancy goods, there was an increase from \$332,246 in 1886 to \$608,776 in 1887. In silks and manufactures of silks there was an increase from \$702,465 in 1886, to \$860,335 in 1887; and whilst on these luxuries the revenue has increased it will no doubt be gratifying to the members of the House to find that in the year 1887, 1,207,284 gallons only of spirits and wine were imported against an importation of 1,400,690 gallons of the same commodity in the year before, and that the revenue therefrom in 1886 amounted to \$1,941,601, whereas in 1887 the yield was only \$1,700,076, showing conclusively that the temperate habits of the people are gaining ground. Let me add that this conclusion is borne out by the report of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. In 1887 the quantity of spirits taken for consumption was 2,864,935 gallons as against an average of 3,376,410 gallons for the two years preceding. I take the average of the two previous years, inasmuch as the quantity taken for consumption in the year 1885 was abnormally large owing to an anticipated increase of duty, and the figures for 1886 are smaller in consequence. The average of the two years is fair and just for comparison. The revenue from sugar of all kinds shows an increase in 1887 of over \$800,000, the amount of duty collected thereon in 1886 being \$2,303,397, and in 1887, \$3,167,528; on wool the duties increased from \$2,499,246 in 1886 to \$3,176,741 in 1887. Coming to matters of Excise we estimated that the yield from this source would be about \$6,000,000. As a matter of fact the yield was \$6,308,201. This increase is accounted for by the fact that an exceptionally large quantity of spirits was entered prior to 1st July, 1887, when the provision of the Inland Revenue Act came into operation respecting the enforced warehousing of spirits for two years prior to sale.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that \$6,300,000 include simply the spirit and beer and tobacco duties under the head of Excise?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It includes all the excise duties, and the increase is due to the change that was made in the Excise Act, which requires spirits to be aged for two years before going into consumption, and which induced a very large amount to be taken out of excise previous to the end of the year. In miscellaneous items there was a slight decrease, but the Post Office showed an increased

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

revenue of over \$100,000, and in Public Works, including Railways, there is an increase of about \$200,000. We estimated that the expenditure for the year would be \$35,600,000, leaving an estimated deficit of \$300,000. The actual expenditure for the year was very close to the estimate, being only an excess of \$57,860, and the estimated deficit of \$300,000 has been turned into a surplus of \$97,313. In view of the statements made last year the Government cannot, I think, be accused of laying an over-sanguine statement before the House when we compare the estimate with the final realizations. I now come to the probable result of the year 1887-88. Having explained to the House the result of the operations of the last fiscal year, I have now to ask their attention to the probable expectation of the present year. It will be recollected that in the last budget speech I stated that the total revenues expected to be realized for the fiscal year 1887-88, \$36,400,000, made up as follows: Customs, \$22,500,000; Excise, \$6,400,000; Miscellaneous, \$7,500,000. Taking first the Customs revenue, I may state to the House that during the year we have experienced a series of ups and down. It might have been thought likely about last Christmas that the revenue from Customs would not realise what was anticipated, and this might have been justified from the fact that, as has been before mentioned, the revenue from that source exceeded expectations in 1886-87 by about \$300,000, no doubt to a great extent owing, as before stated, to duties having been paid in advance of the alterations made in the tariff last Session. But after Christmas the revenue from Customs began to recover itself, and on the 10th March the amount received exceeded the amount received in the corresponding period of the previous fiscal year by \$100,000. Since 10th March the revenue from this source has again dropped, and I regret to inform the House that up to the latest returns, those to the 20th April, the yield from Customs, as compared with last year, has fallen off \$227,000. As the total revenue from this source in 1886-87 was \$22,378,000, I do not think it would be right to calculate on a greater revenue than \$22,000,000, although we may hope that the early spring may tend to the revival of business and that a possible increase of revenue may again be our portion during the latter part of the fiscal year. But I have mentioned before I do not think it would be advisable to calculate on a greater yield from Customs than \$22,000,000. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has informed me within the last few days that the amount that will be received from Excise revenue will be slightly in excess of the \$6,450,000, and we may estimate from this source a revenue of \$6,450,000. The estimate of Miscellaneous Revenues has been revised by the officers of the Finance Department, and it is thought that from the various sources forming that revenue the amount likely to be received will be \$7,550,000. The total estimated revenue for the current fiscal year will therefore, we believe, be in the neighborhood of \$36,000,000. Coming to the expenditure side of the account it will be seen that Parliament during the last Session granted supply which with the statutory expenditure amounted to \$35,969,981.98. As hon. members are aware we have brought down estimates in addition thereto of \$1,112,000. These two sums would amount to \$37,082,000, and taking the usual savings into account in the estimates, and these last year amounted to \$100,000, I think it is very probable the expenditure will be in round numbers \$37,000,000; and I have already mentioned that the estimated receipts will be about \$36,000,000. It is but fair, however, that the House should take into account that in the year 1886-87, as I have informed the House in the financial statement I made last year I anticipated a deficit of \$300,000. In reality this has been turned into a surplus of over \$97,000; and it is but right to estimate that this sum of \$100,000 was paid in in anticipation of 1887-88. With respect to

the probable result of this year I consider that this fact should be taken into account, and having due regard to economy in the expenditure, I trust that the accounts for the present and coming year, taken as a whole, will balance. I come now to what will probably be the results for the year 1888-89. I am inclined to think, from the general tendency of trade, that the merchants of Canada will be careful in the matter of importations, and that it is not likely that there will be any material increase in the amount of importations over those in the last and in the present fiscal year. To be within bounds I put down the Customs revenue likely to be received as \$22,500,000, being \$500,000 in excess of the estimates for the current year. I am informed by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department that, under the present condition of their revenue as compared with the last two years, they calculate that the Excise yield for 1888-89 may safely be placed at \$6,650,000. As regards Miscellaneous I have informed the House that the revenue estimated to be received from this source during the present fiscal year will be \$7,550,000. If we add to this sum the normal increase of revenue likely to be derived from the Post Office Department I think we can safely estimate that the revenue from miscellaneous sources during 1888-89 will reach \$7,750,000. I therefore put down the total revenue from all sources at \$36,900,000. Hon. members have had before them the Estimates for the Public Service for 1888-89; and as, owing to the new departure, many votes have already been taken into account and explanations given in regard thereto it will hardly be necessary to offer any very extended observations as to the variations in the estimated expenditure as compared with the Estimates asked for in supply last Session. The amount of the Estimates now laid before Parliament is \$35,421,440.22, but, as hon. members are fully aware, no sums have been placed in the Estimates for mail subsidies and steamship subventions. That question was laid aside in order that we might give more careful consideration to it than we could give before the main Estimates were brought down. There will, therefore, have to be added to the amount already brought down sums sufficient to cover these services, and further amounts will undoubtedly be asked from Parliament in the supplementary Estimates to complete the services of the year; but I believe that taking all these into account at the close of the year 1888-89, hon. members will find the statement I have made verified, that having regard to the results of the operations for the years 1887-88 and 1888-89 the balance for the two years will maintain an equilibrium. It is but right to mention some items in the expenditure likely to be incurred next year which show variations and which call for remarks. The interest on Public Debt shows an increase of \$116,000. This increase, as will be seen by reference to the Estimates, is chiefly made up by the amount \$63,000 required for the Savings Banks in consequence of the increased balances held by the depositors on the 31st December, 1887, and by the probable amount required to meet further indebtedness, \$250,000, less interest on loans maturing, in round numbers, \$200,000. We have also asked for an increase of \$68,000 in the investments for Sinking Funds, that amount being required to meet additional dividends requiring to be invested. The votes for Civil Government have already passed the House, and explanations have been already given of the increase of \$32,000 therein, and also of the increase of \$14,000 in the Administration of Justice. In Pensions and Superannuations there is an increase of \$21,000, largely made up of pensions to officers who have been retired owing to abolition of their offices, and to a great extent this increase is offset by savings in other branches in the service. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence will explain the increase in his services, mainly in the cavalry and infantry schools. In railways and canals (income) there is an increase

of \$78,000, of which \$45,000 is for overhauling the foundation of the St. Ours lock and the balance is made up chiefly for expenditure on the Welland canal and the Trent River navigation. The Lighthouse service requires an additional expenditure of \$10,000; \$6,000 of this amount being for maintenance and repairs to lights and \$4,000 in the salaries and allowances of the lighthouse keepers. In Miscellaneous there is an increase of \$55,000 made up by the increased cost required for the government of the North-West Territories, the expenditures at the Banff Park, and the plant required for the Government printing office and bindery, explanations of which will be supplied in due course. The other large increase is \$290,000 in the service for Railways and Canals. This amount is made up by the \$300,000 required in the increased cost of repairs and working expenses of the Intercolonial railway. On the other hand the Immigration vote has been reduced by \$100,000, being the estimated saving in the general immigration expenses owing to the abolition of assisted passages and other causes. The £20,000 sterling (\$97,000), the contribution of Canada to the Imperial Institute having been paid, is of course dropped. The Public Works in the vote asked for shows a decrease of \$735,000, but I am afraid this vote will be supplemented to a certain extent. Generally, however, the Estimates have been framed with the full desire to add as little as possible to the expenditures of the country, and the Government have endeavored to ask for nothing more than sufficient to keep the Public Service in a state of efficiency consistent with economy. Having thus explained to the House to the best of my ability the probable outcome for the coming financial year, I will now, with the permission of the House, direct its attention for a few minutes to the Debt Account. By the monthly statements published in the *Canada Gazette*, which show fully the financial position of the country, it will be noticed that at the present moment we are in debt in England for temporary accommodation to the extent of £1,000,000. Since May last the country has experienced a certain amount of financial stringency, and one of the results has been that three banks have ceased to transact business. The past summer was one of unusual heat and drought in the Province of Ontario, and the harvest was not up to the average. The same cause has operated against the extensive lumber industry, and on account of the lowness of the water, timber which had been cut and which lay in the streams, could not be made marketable. This has caused a certain drain on the resources of the banks in order that the legitimate requirements of those engaged in the industry should be provided for. But against this we have occasion to be gratified by the splendid harvest in Manitoba and in the North-West. Still it must be borne in mind that we were going ahead rather too quickly. In our cities, and especially in Toronto, there has been a certain amount of speculation in real estate. In the end, I believe it will be found that the short crop in Ontario and these other attendant circumstances, will prove a blessing in disguise by the curtailment of importations. However, by the exercise of economy and prudence, Canada will soon recover from the present stringency; her trade is, I am satisfied, sound at the core, and will soon return to its normal condition. At the commencement of the fiscal year the Government, chiefly in deference to the banking community, lowered the limit of deposits in the Savings Banks, and fixed the amount to be received from any depositor to be \$300 in any one year, and \$1,000 in all. Originally, the Savings Bank deposits were unlimited; a reduction was then made to \$10,000, and afterwards this was again brought down to \$3,000; now the limit is, as I have said, \$1,000. The effect, however, on the Government Savings Bank deposits, has been that some of the larger deposits held by the Government have been withdrawn, and have gone to swell the general business of the country by

transfers to the banks where enhanced rates of interest were offered. The deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks show an increase, and if we set one side against the other, the Savings Bank balances, since the 1st July last, are nearly stationary, that is to say, the deposits equaling the withdrawals. Still, the country is to be congratulated that the deposits have increased in a marked manner from the poorer classes, showing that labor is fully employed and adequately paid. To illustrate this I may state that the number of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank on the 31st March last, were over 100,000, an increase of over 10,000 since the 30th June last, and the number of depositors in the other savings banks under the control of the Finance Department, increased from 56,000 to 57,000 in the same period. The stationary character of the Savings Bank balances is not to be put down to any withdrawal of capital from the country; these moneys have undoubtedly, for the reasons before stated, gone to the banks, and have been placed in other investments. The Government are of opinion that, by lowering the limit of deposit in the Savings Bank, the funds thus set loose, eased the strain on the banks throughout the country, and had the effect of mitigating the stringency. As a result, however, of the stationary character of these balances, the capital expenditure of the country, to a large extent, has had to be met out of the ordinary revenue, and the Government have been obliged to have recourse to the English market, and have borrowed to the extent already named. The million pounds sterling, which I have already stated, was borrowed in England, represented the amount that we anticipated to receive from our own depositors. It therefore became necessary, to complete the capital expenditure, as shown in the Estimates submitted to Parliament, and to pay the several subsidies to the various railways, as detailed in the Public Accounts, that further borrowing powers should be authorized, and a Loan Bill will be introduced hereafter, when it can be definitely ascertained how much the Government will have to place on the market. But I am glad to inform the House and the country that the Government have determined, for the present, with unimportant exceptions, to stop any further outlay on Capital Account beyond that to which the country is now committed. Having so far dwelt on the financial aspect of Canada, I would venture to detain the House by showing, to the best of my ability, how far the tariff changes of 1887 have affected the Canadian iron industry. It is well known to the House that at the outset much hostile criticism was provoked in England. No doubt this was because our position at that time was not clearly understood. But owing to the explanations made, and owing to a fuller consideration of the Canadian fiscal policy adopted since 1879, hostile criticism has been greatly modified, and generally speaking, that portion of the British press which deals with financial interests, now view in a friendly spirit our efforts to develop, on Canadian soil, the stores of mineral wealth within our borders. Of course, although much has been done, yet sufficient time has so far not elapsed to demonstrate fully the effects of the new tariff, the Act having virtually come into operation at the beginning of the present fiscal year, as the special provision for the admission of goods at the old rate of duty up to the 30th of June, was fully taken advantage of, and in many respects the requirements were to some extent, anticipated. It may be further mentioned that the amount of capital required for the production of iron from the ore, is so large, that great developments cannot be expected in a short space of time. As hon. members know, time is the essence of a bargain, and capital is cautious and very slow to move in new fields of enterprise. Confidence in the permanency of our fiscal policy is a further requisite before capital can be invested in the development of the large works required to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

build up the iron industries. And here I may state, to show how fully our neighbors are alive to the necessity of a permanent policy, that in the Mills Bill, now before Congress—that is, the Bill introduced into the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and which embodies the policy of the Administration, and of the great Democratic party in that country—the iron and steel duties are touched with a sparing hand. And the same thing is to be observed with regard to the measure introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Randall, whereby no material reduction in the duties on iron and steel is proposed. The course pursued in the revision of the tariff shows a fixed determination, on the part of our neighbors to the south, to continue an efficient measure of protection to that great industry. In the production of iron and steel the United States lead every country in the world, having obtained this position after 26 years of uninterrupted protection. The changes under either of the proposed Bills leave the iron and steel duties largely in excess of the present Canadian rates. Mr. Mills, under his Bill, estimates the reduction of duties on iron and steel at \$1,000,000, exclusive of \$5,706,433 duties received last year on tin plate, proposed to be transferred to the free list. Of this reduction of \$1,000,000, nearly \$350,000 is on steel rails, leaving \$700,000 for other articles. Separating tin plate and steel rails from the other iron imports, we find the imports of “iron and steel and their manufactures” into the United States for the year ended 30th June last as follows: Value, \$32,736,976; duty, \$14,165,133; showing an average rate of duty of $43\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Deducting \$700,000 from this duty, as proposed, the average rate is 41 per cent. From this it would appear that apart from tin plate and steel rails the reduction in duties on iron and steel and their manufactures is only from $43\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as formerly, to 41 per cent., as now proposed. Taking the whole importations of iron and steel and their manufactures into the United States and entered for home consumption for the year ended 30th June last, the average rate of Customs duty was 41 per cent. *ad valorem*, and allowing \$1,000,000 for the reduction of duty proposed under the Mills Bill, the average rate of Customs duty on the same importation would be 39 per cent. *ad valorem*. On the other hand, the average rate of Customs duty on iron and steel and their manufactures imported into Canada for home consumption for the year ended 30th June last was $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and for the nine months ending 31st March, 1888, under the amended tariff, the average rate of duty on these articles has been $23\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. *ad valorem*. Comparing the United States Customs tariff on all goods imported for home consumption with the Canadian tariff on similar imports, the Trade Returns show this result for the year ended 30th June, 1887:

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Average rate on United States imports..... | $31\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. | <i>ad valorem</i> . |
| Average rate on Canadian imports..... | $21\frac{1}{2}$ “ | “ “ |

Comparing dutiable articles under the United States Customs tariff with the same articles under the Canadian tariff, the Trade Returns for 1886-87 show the average duty on United States imports for home consumption to be 47 per cent. *ad valorem* against an average of $28\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. *ad valorem* on Canadian imports for the same period. Under the Mills Bills the average Customs rates on dutiable articles, based on United States imports for home consumption for 1886-87, is estimated to be $43\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. *ad valorem*, whilst under the amended Canadian tariff for the nine months ended 31st March, 1888, the average Customs rates on dutiable articles entered for home consumption has been $31\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. *ad valorem*. I might also remark, before going into details, respecting the iron duties, that in addition to requiring time and in addition to the necessity of having a permanent policy we have to overcome the opposition of those interested in the handling and manufacture of the

foreign product. But Sir, the people of Canada have faith in the advantages which local industries confer on the country, and our people of every shade of politics have shown unmistakably the importance they attach to the operation of active home industry by the readiness with which free sites, exemption from taxes and cash bonuses are offered to start new enterprises to provide industrial employment in the several localities. With these introductory remarks, I may say, as I shall show in the details which I shall lay before the House, that the action taken last year is endorsed by the representatives of the principal plate and bar rolling mills, who express their satisfaction with the present tariff as a whole, and with its working. It is my intention to give an account of the effect on the market prices, caused by the changes made last year in the tariff, and it may surprise hon. members to be told that the effect of the tariff on market prices of iron has been to make a small increase, but not to the full extent of the increased duty. I propose to take, by way of illustration, the value of warrants in Glasgow, that being the best gauge of the general level of the iron market, and as at Glasgow prices were pretty even during February and December, 1887, I will take these months for comparison. Taking pig iron, the price in Canada was only from \$1 to \$1.25 per gross ton higher in December than in February, 1887, while the additional duty, which took effect 1st July, was \$2.24 per gross ton, indicating that the foreign maker, carriers and importers, &c., had made a concession of about \$1 to \$1.25 per ton to retain the trade. In other words, the consumer paid fully one half the amount of duty contributed to the revenue. As to bar iron, the price was as follows:—In February, 1887, \$1.60 to \$1.65 per 100 lbs.; in December, 1887, \$1.85 to \$1.90 per 100 lbs., showing an advance of only 25 cents per 100 lbs., while the extra duty was 45 cents per 100 lbs. As to cast-iron water pipes, the contract prices for the Corporation of Montreal averaged as follows:—

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| For 1885 | \$18 50 per gross ton. |
| " 1886 | 26.21 " " |
| " 1887 | 33 14 " " |
| " 1888 only | 32.10 " " |

although the increase in duty has been \$3 per ton. The Montreal corporation water pipes for 1888, above referred to, have been contracted for and are to be made in Canada from Canadian ore. The increase of price over the average for 1885 and 1886 is thus about half the increase in duty. I now come to the effect of the tariff in the explorations made as to new fields for the development of this industry, and I am glad to be able to state that very extensive and valuable deposits of iron ore have been discovered in the vicinity of Port Arthur, Ontario, and on Hunter's Island near the boundary line. When the Thunder Bay Colonization Railway reaches these points the opening up of these deposits will be facilitated. South of the Canadian Pacific Railway crossing of the Seine River, about 100 miles west of Fort William, an immense deposit of high grade Bessemer iron ore has been discovered. It is said to be the largest and purest body of ore ever found in America. The ore is a black magnetic oxide and analyses from 64 to 70 per cent. of metallic iron. Having briefly noticed the effect of the changes in the tariff as shewn in the new discoveries, I will now trouble the House for a few moments to point out what has been done in the Dominion towards the organisation of new iron works. The Bristol Mine in the county of Pontiac, Quebec, which had been closed for a time, has been recently acquired by a company who have been employing about 300 men around the mine. Roasting kilns have been erected for calcining the ore, but operations have been interrupted pending the completion of needed railway facilities. The various individual interests in the iron mines along the line of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway have been consolidated into one company with sufficient capital to

operate them. Some of the ore shipped from this district to Chicago has been pronounced by experts to be the purest ore ever received there, the percentage of phosphorous being extremely low. I am informed that preliminaries have been arranged for the erection of a blast furnace at Trenton, and in the iron districts of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia a good deal of exploratory work has been done. The Pietou field has attracted marked attention, having been visited by a member of one of the leading firms of English ironmasters and by representatives of other capitalists, for the purpose of examining and reporting on the ores. The situation for the manufacture of iron and the quality of the ores have made a favorable impression, and negotiations now in progress, it is stated, point to an early arrangement for the erection of large iron works in that locality. Having thus briefly referred to the new discoveries and to the works that have been organised, it becomes also my pleasant duty to show to the House how the industries in existence prior to the change in the tariff have been expanded, and of this expansion and progress there is already substantial evidence. The foundries, machine shops, bridge works and kindred factories throughout the Dominion have been fully employed last year and have shared in the general prosperity. There can be no question but the general effect of the new iron duties has been to stimulate home industries and will cause the great bulk of our iron to be produced in the country, at the not distant future. At Londonderry the works of the Steel Company of Canada, which have been in liquidation for some years, were acquired at the end of February last by a new company of English and Canadian capitalist, who propose running them to their full capacity and extending their operations. One of the smelting furnaces which suddenly gave out in January is undergoing repairs, and the other furnace which has been silent since 1884, is being rekindled. These furnaces have a capacity for turning out 25,000 tons each of pig iron per annum. Puddled iron bars in considerable quantities were manufactured last year by the company. The employment for labor afforded in December, 1887, at the works shows an increase of more than 50 per cent. over the corresponding month in the previous year, as will appear by the following statement:—

| | Dec. 1886. | Dec. 1887. |
|---|------------|------------|
| Number men employed..... | 300 | 500 |
| Disbursements for fuel, flax, other materials and freight, representing labor indirectly employed | \$16,000 | \$25,700 |
| Value of product | 29,300 | 47,500 |

Product and operations at the iron works, Londonderry, 1887:

| Particulars. | 1st half year, 1887. Tons. | 2nd half year, 1887. Tons. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ore mined | 22,205 | 26,358 |
| Limestone used | 7,112 | 8,748 |
| Coal (including coke) used | 30,423 | 47,014 |
| Pig iron made | 9,613 | 9,886 |
| Puddled bars | | 2,128 |
| Bar iron, N. plate axles, etc | | 1,470 |
| Scrap bar | | 445 |
| Castings | 54 | 80 |

Disbursements.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Wages paid to employés..... | \$70,000 | \$100,700 |
| Paid for fuel | 29,500 | 52,000 |
| " lime | 6,815 | 8,007 |
| " sundries | 5,000 | 8,000 |
| " railway freight | 46,686 | 66,941 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Total | \$158,001 | \$235,651 |
| Wages to employés from March, 1888 | | \$21,000 |
| The number of operatives on Londonderry pay-roll, March, 1887. 343 | | |
| " " " " 1888. 630 | | |

Increase..... 317

At New Glasgow the recent tariff changes have had the effect of largely increasing the sales of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, as the following statement shows:—

| Time. | Shipm't Tons. | Shipm't Value | Coal Consumed. | Wages Paid. | Railway Freight. |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| July 1st to Dec. 31st, 1886. | 1 728 | \$ 69,465 | \$ 5,647 | \$ 28,300 | \$ 13,123 |
| July 1st to Dec. 31st, 1887. | 2,712 | 133,400 | 10,465 | 34,900 | 17,332 |
| Increase in 1887..... | 62 pr. ct. | 92 pr. ct. | 85 pr. ct. | 33 pr. ct. | 32 pr. ct. |

The orders now in hand are greater than the entire shipments for the last six months of 1886. The company has been consolidated with the Nova Scotia Forge Company, and arrangements made for the addition of a new smelting furnace, which will double the output of the Steel Works and will mean a disbursement of nearly \$250,000 a year for wages, fuel and railway freight. At St. John, N.B., reports from the Cold Brook Rolling Mills are to this effect. I quote from a letter received from the President of the Company:

"By the operations of the tariff, the imports of iron now are less, consequently our output now is proportionately greater and the benefit to the manufacturer rests on a large turnover on small margins. We are able to sell our goods to the merchants at lower figures than they could be imported for previous to 1886."

There were, it appears, 50 per cent more men employed in the Rolling Mills in 1887 than in any of the years 1884, 1885 or 1886. At Montreal, Pillow, Hersey & Co. have converted themselves into a joint stock company with a capital of \$800,000, and the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplate the erection during the present season of a shop for passenger car work, and when this is completed all of their rolling stock of every description will be made in the country. The company built 24 locomotives in 1886 and 24 in 1887. And they have not purchased any locomotives outside of Canada since October, 1884, excepting two special ones for the mountain grade. All of their freight cars for several years back have been built in Canada, and practically all of their passenger cars are now built in Canada, excepting some of the sleeping and dining cars. The Montreal Rolling Mills Company have added to the capacity of their bar and plate mills by running night and day. 1887 was the first year during which the bar mill was run at night, and last year they worked 10,000 tons of iron of all sorts and used about 10,000 tons of fuel. They have recently put in an extensive wrought iron pipe embodying the latest improvements, which can turn out 6,000,000 feet of piping per annum, using up 4,000 tons of material to do so. The new pipe mill is running day and night. A German firm from Dusseldorf have decided, as I am informed, to erect extensive works for the manufacture of wrought-iron pipe and boiler tubes, which will be a new manufacture in this country. At Kingston, important changes have taken place in the locomotive works. Messrs. Dubbs & Co., of Glasgow, one of the largest manufacturers of locomotives in Great Britain, have invested in the Kingston locomotive works. They now manage and control them and have in view their operation on a larger scale. At Hamilton, as one effect of the recent tariff changes, an establishment has been erected capable of giving employment to 400 hands in the manufacture of wood screws, carriage bolts and the like. In cast-iron pipe manufacture at Hamilton the immediate result of the tariff has been that the Canada Pipe Foundry has been steadily employed during the past season, and will soon necessitate its increase to double the present capacity. The Hamilton Bridge Company report:

"We use iron of local manufacture very largely, and find it of at least equal quality to that imported, and the price, as far as our experience goes, is reasonable and not so high as the full tariff increase

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

would warrant. We also have the great advantage of ordering and obtaining this material when wanted, and without having to lay in our stocks."

Burrow, Stewart & Milne, of Hamilton, say:

"We are using half of all the iron that we run of Canadian make, and find the quality first-rate, A1."

The Ontario Rolling Mill Company report with regard to the new tariff:

"We are now beginning to feel the beneficial effects and expect we shall be called on by spring to make far more iron than ever before. We shall be able to turn out by spring nearly double the tonnage we ever made here. We are also arranging to start up the mill we have in London either there or elsewhere, so that by May we can, if necessary, make in that mill about 35 tons per day."

The Hamilton Iron Forging Company say:

"In our own business we have felt the good effects of the wise and judicious policy of the Government, notably during the last four months, having largely increased our output by running our force full time both night and day, and within the past few days have started another furnace in our establishment with all the necessary equipment capable of turning out one car load more of finished bar iron per day; this will give active employment to 12 skilled men besides day laborers; we have also increased the capital stock of our company for the purpose of further developing the business, and in the near future we propose placing in position another mill plant with a capacity of 6,000 tons per year."

"In conclusion we have much pleasure in stating we never heard a consumer of iron complain of the tariff changes; moreover, we desire to place on record the general feeling and satisfaction expressed by them in having their wants supplied promptly at home without having, as in the past, to purchase abroad and carry large stocks and pay cash for them. They can now secure iron within a reasonable time that at once goes into legitimate consumption, thereby giving a healthy and vigorous tone to business."

"The continuation of an iron policy wise in its inception and having for its object the development of the mineral resources of this country covering the whole Dominion of Canada, meets with our hearty approval, and must eventually lay a foundation broad and enduring that will be materially helpful to every class of men living between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans."

As closely connected with the development of manufactories and as an evidence of the steady progress of the country, it may be mentioned that, in addition to the expansion of the iron industry, the changes in the tariff had a beneficial effect in the output of coal from the mines. In the Nova Scotia and Cape Breton coal mines the following is a close estimate of the output—I give the totals of Cumberland county, Pictou county and Cape Breton:—

| | 1886. | 1887. |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Cumberland County Mines, tons..... | 416,000 | 469,242 |
| Pictou County Mines, " | 369,000 | 338,050 |
| Cape Breton Mines, " | 588,000 | 717,000 |
| Totals | 1,373,000 | 1,524,292 |

In 1879 the coal raised at Spring Hill was 92,000 tons; in 1887, the output had increased to 442,000 tons. At this mine 1,400 men and boys are employed, the largest force at any mine in Canada. Having thus, I trust, shown to the satisfaction of the House the effects of the tariff changes on the iron industry, I propose to show what has been done towards the development, and extension of the West India trade. The West India trade for the past year has been on the whole profitable. The present prices of fish in the West Indies during the past year would have been considered good. The price has advanced so much that our fishermen have greatly benefitted thereby; and I have no doubt that part of the benefit, though not so much as went to the fishermen, accrued to the merchant shipper. It must be borne in mind that an important factor in the West India trade is the return cargo of sugar. It is gratifying to see that the recent change in the sugar duties, putting the same duty upon all sugars for refining purposes according to their polariscopic test, has had the effect of encouraging the importation of sugar from the West Indies, especially into Nova Scotia. The importation of West India sugar into Canada (including British Guiana sugar) amounted for the following years, viz.:—

| | Lbs. |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Year ended 30th June, 1886 | 59,854,645 |
| " " 1887..... | 51,021,331 |

| | Lbs. |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Year ending 30th June, 1886..... | 19,830.723 |
| “ “ 1887..... | 21,398.201 |

| | 1878. | 1887. |
|---|-----------------|-------------|
| Flour..... | Bbls. 637,778 | 753,480 |
| Grain..... | Bushels 331,170 | 1,016,334 |
| Live stock..... | No. 46,498 | 80,732 |
| Lumber..... | Feet 56,600,000 | 161,100,000 |
| Manufactures..... | Tons 140,858 | 820,000 |
| Other articles (not including fire wood)..... | “ 230,741 | |
| Total freight..... | “ 522,710 | 1,131,334 |
| Passengers..... | No. 618,957 | 940,144 |

| Year ended December. | Tons. |
|-------------------------|---------|
| 1879 | 570 |
| 1880 | 10,246 |
| 1881 | 30,629 |
| 1882 | 35,039 |
| 1883 | 54,891 |
| 1884 | 112,898 |
| 1885 | 165,791 |
| 1886 | 175,512 |

| | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| From Halifax..... | 88,996 |
| " Moncton | 56,992 |
| Total | 145,988 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| To Montreal..... | 3,143 barrels. |
| " Other Stations on Grand Trunk Railway..... | 33 " |
| " Quebec..... | 3,081 " |
| Total..... | 6,267 " |

| | |
|------------|---------------|
| 1887 | 197,774 tons. |
| 1880 | 47,142 " |

The New Brunswick Cotton Mills report an increase in sales of \$52,437 in 1887 over 1886, and total sales of \$599,147 during the past three years to the upper Provinces. The Moncton Cotton Mills report an increase of \$12,495 in 1887 over 1886, and total sales of \$366,622 in three years to the Upper Provinces. The Halifax Cotton Mills report total sales to the upper Provinces in four years of \$528,-

400. The Windsor Cotton Mills report total sales in four years to the upper Provinces of \$437,522. The Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company report total sales of their product to the upper Provinces during the past four years of \$850,478. It is gratifying to note that in every instance the returns show a steady increase. Thus the shipments by railway of the products of the Steel and Forge Company in 1887 were 155 per cent. more in value than those of 1884, notwithstanding the decrease in price of 45 cents per ton in 1887 as compared with the average price of 1884. In addition to coal, the Intercolonial carried in 1887 over 6,000 tons of stone, nearly 20,000 barrels of plaster, over 45,000,000 lbs. of iron, 13,300 barrels of pickled fish, over 3,000,000 of fresh fish, 4,250,000 lbs. of dried fish, 750,000 lbs. of canned fish, and 16,000 barrels of oysters, all for the upper Provinces. Besides these, numerous other articles of commerce, as well as railway plant and the like, have found their way to the upper Provinces from the maritime section.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman a comparative statement of the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway for the periods included in the statements he has just given?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be able to furnish my hon. friend with that. I thought the question of inter-provincial trade was transcendent in importance, and that it would not be necessary to go into the question of receipts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it does go into it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be very glad, in discussing the items in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, to furnish the information the hon. gentleman has suggested. It does, no doubt, go into it; but, after all, I must be excused for saying that I think it is a matter of secondary importance to the great one of building up a large interprovincial trade between one section of our country and another. We must also bear in mind that there is a very large water-borne trade, as indicated by the shipping employed in coasting. The tonnage employed in the coasting trade between Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in 1887 aggregated 9,358,735 tons, against 5,321,726 tons in 1887, an increase of nearly 76 per cent. Taking the three Maritime Provinces, in 1877 I find that the various ports of the section saw 12,268 arrivals of vessels, and as many departures. That seemed a good business, but so vast has been the change that in 1887 these ports witnessed 23,611 arrivals and as many departures of coasting vessels. In 1877 there were 21,323 arrivals and as many departures of coasters in the whole Gulf and Atlantic coast, and in 1887 the arrivals had risen to 33,330, with as many departures. Moving all along the coast and river line, as far up as Montreal, these coasting vessels have found in inter-provincial trade a development they never would have found confined in the limits of their respective Provinces. The increase in the number of arrivals and departures marks the development of trade and intercourse that has taken place between the Provinces by the sea and those on the St. Lawrence River. This development is the more marked because it has taken place during the very years that the Intercolonial Railway has been in operation. That railway is a continuous coasting vessel day and night conveying the goods of one part to the other parts of the Dominion, from the Maritime Provinces to the upper Provinces, and *vice versa*. So great has been the increase of interprovincial and of provincial trade, general internal commerce, that the demand for coasting vessels has gone on increasing until now there are nearly 60 per cent. more trips made in the year by the coasting marine of the country on the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Atlantic coast than ten years ago, and the tonnage employed has increased 76 per cent., showing the employment of a supe-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

rior class of vessels. In the United States, as hon. gentlemen who have looked into this subject at all are, no doubt, aware, the completion of the railway has resulted in diminishing the enrolled and licensed tonnage employed in the Atlantic coasting trade. In Canada there has been found increasing employment for the railway and for the coasting vessel, the first showing an increase of freight carried of 116 per cent. in ten years, and the latter, judging from increased tonnage, of 76 per cent. As a single illustration of the growth of the trade between the upper and the Maritime Provinces, I may state that the tonnage of vessels arrived at the port of Quebec from the Maritime Provinces during 1887 was 193,000 tons, being an increase of 33 per cent. over the preceding year, and an increase of 47 per cent. over 1885. Hon. members will be interested to learn, as a further evidence of inter-provincial trade, that the coasting trade of the whole Dominion has been steadily increasing, judging from the tonnage employed, until now it is double what it was ten years ago, as the following figures show:—

| | Tonnage. |
|-----------|------------|
| 1877..... | 8,968,862 |
| 1878..... | 11,047,661 |
| 1879..... | 12,066,633 |
| 1880..... | 14,053,013 |
| 1881..... | 15,116,766 |
| 1882..... | 14,791,064 |
| 1883..... | 15,683,566 |
| 1884..... | 15,473,707 |
| 1885..... | 16,944,421 |
| 1886..... | 16,368,274 |
| 1887..... | 17,513,677 |

If hon. members will allow me, I will here state to the House that the chief results of the Canadian trade in 1886-87 were pretty much as follows:—The total exports exceeded those of the previous fiscal year by \$4,250,000, being 8 per cent. in advance of the average of the 20 years of Confederation. The export of the fisheries show an increase of 15 per cent. over the average of the preceding twenty years, the total amount being \$32,000 more than in 1885-86. The export from the mines of Canada show an increase of 13 per cent. over the average of twenty years, but a decrease of \$150,000 compared with the previous year. The forest export shows a decrease of 7 per cent. compared with the twenty years' average and a decrease of \$500,000 compared with 1886. I referred before to the fact that the great drought and the want of means to get the lumber and the material for its manufacture down the rivers, had a serious effect in checking our trade in lumber. The export of agricultural products, show an increase of 80 per cent. over the twenty years, average and an increase of \$1,200,000 over the year 1886. The export of animals and animal products show an increase of 50 per cent. over the twenty years' average and of \$2,200,000 over the export of 1886. The imports for home consumption were 8 per cent. more than the average for twenty years and \$6,000,000 more than in 1886. The total imports were \$8,400,000 more than in the previous year. The imports of woollen manufactures were 28 per cent. more than the twenty years' average and \$2,500,000 more than in 1886. The imports of cotton were 54 per cent. less than the twenty years' average and \$300,000 less than in 1886. The total tonnage of shipping employed in external trade was 14,000,000, being 130,000 tons more than in 1886 and 16 per cent. more than the twenty years' average, and as I have said before, the total tonnage employed in the coasting trade was 17,500,000 tons, being 1,200,000 tons more than in 1886 and 21 per cent. more than the twenty years' average. The tons of freight brought into and carried out of Halifax by shipping increased 73 per cent. in 1887 as compared with 1878. The shipping carrying cargoes into and from Halifax in 1887 was 125 per cent. more than in 1868. Halifax increased during the past ten years in the tonnage of cargo carried

in, and out more than any other port, Montreal having increased 67 per cent. while Halifax increased 73 per cent. Having detained the House at some length with these statistics, which are always very dry, but which I think are not uninteresting, considering the great importance we all attach especially to interprovincial trade, and to the fact that Confederation has become more than a name, that instead of its being a Confederation on paper, a mere union by which these Provinces are brought under one central Government, it is found that, notwithstanding some geographical difficulties from the great length and the comparatively narrow breadth of our country, a very rapidly increasing and a very large trade is growing up, showing the intimate commercial relations which are being established between one portion of our country and the other,—I do not intend to detain the House by going over at any length the statistics which bear upon the year's progress, to which I alluded a year ago, when making the financial statement. I have had prepared by Mr. Johnson a series of diagrams in the same form, though I believe somewhat improved, as those which were presented to the House last year, and I have had these placed in the hands of every hon. member, so that he may ascertain the exact position we are in and the progress we are making.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are some new tables in this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, there are some additional tables which I thought would be of interest to the House as illustrating the subject with which I am dealing, and that is, endeavoring to put before the House something which will give information as to the position which the country occupies, not only in regard to a large number of financial questions, but also in reference to the trade and commerce and development of the country, and I have had them put in such a form as to attract the attention, not only of the members of this House and the people of the country generally, but of any persons who may be desirous to take an increased interest in this country.

CANADA Federal Gross Debt with Assets, for Years ended 30th June :—

| | Gross Debt. | Assets. |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1867 (Confederation created)..... | \$ 93,046,051 | \$ 17,317,410 |
| 1869..... | 96,896,666 | 21,139,631 |
| 1869 (Better terms to Nova Scotia)..... | 112,361,998 | 36,502,679 |
| 1870 (Manitoba created a Province, debt \$172,090)..... | 115,993,706 | 37,783,964 |
| 1871 (British Columbia admitted, debt \$1,666,200)..... | 115,492,682 | 37,786,165 |
| 1872..... | 122,400,179 | 40,213,107 |
| 1873 (Prince Edward Island admitted, debt \$1,927,060)..... | 129,743,432 | 29,691,970 |
| 1874..... | 141,163,551 | 52,838,586 |
| 1875..... | 151,663,401 | 35,655,023 |
| 1876 (Intercolonial Railway opened)..... | 161,204,687 | 36,653,173 |
| 1877..... | 174,675,834 | 41,440,525 |
| 1878..... | 174,957,268 | 34,595,199 |
| 1879..... | 179,483,871 | 36,493,683 |
| 1880 (Intercolonial Railway finished)..... | 191,634,440 | 41,182,852 |
| 1881 (C.P.R. begun)..... | 199,861,537 | 41,465,757 |
| 1882..... | 205,365,251 | 51,703,601 |
| 1883..... | 202,159,104 | 43,692,389 |
| 1884 (Provincial Debts assumed, \$7,172,297)..... | 242,482,416 | 60,320,505 |
| 1885 (C. P. R. finished last spike 7th Nov.)..... | 264,703,607 | 68,295,915 |
| 1886 (Temporary loan to C. P. R. of 20 millions. Manitoba debt assumed, \$3,317,226)..... | 273,164,341 | 50,005,234 |
| 1887 (\$10,189,521 added to debt being purchase money of 6,793,014 acres of land from C. P. R.)..... | 273,187,626 | 45,873,611 |

CANADA Taxation, being Customs and Excise Duties collected, during Years ended 30th June :—

| | Excise. | Customs |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| 1868..... | \$ 3,002,588 | \$ 8,578,380 |
| 1869..... | 2,710,028 | 8,272,880 |
| 1870..... | 3,619,612 | 9,334,213 |
| 1871..... | 4,295,945 | 11,841,104 |
| 1872..... | 4,735,652 | 12,787,984 |
| 1873..... | 4,460,682 | 12,954,164 |
| 1874..... | 5,594,904 | 14,325,193 |
| 1875..... | 5,069,687 | 15,351,011 |

| | Excise. | Customs. |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 1876..... | 5,563,487 | 12,823,838 |
| 1877..... | 4,911,898 | 12,546,988 |
| 1878..... | 4,858,672 | 12,782,824 |
| 1879..... | 5,390,763 | 12,900,659 |
| 1880..... | 4,232,427 | 14,071,343 |
| 1881..... | 5,343,022 | 18,406,092 |
| 1882..... | 5,884,860 | 21,581,570 |
| 1883..... | 6,260,116 | 23,009,582 |
| 1884..... | 5,459,309 | 20,023,890 |
| 1885..... | 6,449,102 | 18,935,428 |
| 1886..... | 5,852,905 | 19,373,562 |
| 1887..... | 6,308,201 | 22,378,801 |

TOTAL Exports of Canada for Years ended 30th June :—

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 1868..... | \$ 57,567,888 |
| 1869..... | 60,474,781 |
| 1870..... | 73,573,490 |
| 1871 (Manitoba created a Province, 15th July, 1870)..... | 74,173,618 |
| 1872 (British Columbia admitted, 20th July, 1871)..... | 82,629,663 |
| 1873..... | 89,789,992 |
| 1874 (Prince Edward Island admitted, 1st July, 1873)..... | 89,351,928 |
| 1875 (Revenue Tariff)..... | 77,886,979 |
| 1876 do..... | 80,966,435 |
| 1877 do..... | 75,875,393 |
| 1878 do..... | 79,323,667 |
| 1879 do..... | 71,491,255 |
| 1880 (Protective Tariff)..... | 87,911,468 |
| 1881 do..... | 98,290,823 |
| 1882 do..... | 102,137,203 |
| 1883 do..... | 98,085,804 |
| 1884 do..... | 91,406,496 |
| 1885 do..... | 89,238,361 |
| 1886 do..... | 85,251,314 |
| 1887 do..... | 89,515,811 |

RELATIVE VALUE of 10 principal Exports (home production) from Dominion of Canada, Fiscal Year 1887 :—

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Wood and manufactures..... | \$21,166,530 |
| Grains, barley, peas and flour..... | 16,001,897 |
| Animals..... | 10,461,442 |
| Cheese..... | 7,108,978 |
| Fish..... | 6,875,810 |
| Furs and hides..... | 2,323,908 |
| Eggs..... | 1,825,559 |
| Coal..... | 1,522,272 |
| Meats..... | 1,091,076 |
| Gold..... | 1,017,401 |

TOTAL Imports into Canada, for Years ended 30th June :—

| | Dutiable. | Free. |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1868..... | \$ 73,459,644 | \$ 71,985,305 |
| 1869..... | 70,415,165 | 67,402,170 |
| 1870 (Manitoba created a Province)..... | 74,814,839 | 71,237,603 |
| 1871 (British Columbia admitted)..... | 96,092,971 | 86,947,482 |
| 1872..... | 111,430,527 | 107,769,116 |
| 1873 (Prince Edward Island admitted)..... | 128,011,281 | 127,514,594 |
| 1874..... | 128,213,582 | 127,404,169 |
| 1875..... | 123,070,283 | 119,618,657 |
| 1876..... | 93,210,346 | 94,733,218 |
| 1877..... | 99,329,962 | 96,300,483 |
| 1878..... | 93,081,787 | 91,199,577 |
| 1879..... | 81,964,427 | 80,341,608 |
| 1880..... | 86,489,747 | 71,782,349 |
| 1881..... | 105,330,840 | 91,611,604 |
| 1882..... | 119,419,500 | 112,648,927 |
| 1883..... | 132,254,022 | 123,137,019 |
| 1884..... | 116,397,043 | 108,180,644 |
| 1885..... | 108,941,486 | 102,710,019 |
| 1886..... | 104,424,561 | 99,602,694 |
| 1887..... | 112,892,236 | 105,639,428 |

CANADA Imports for Home Consumption, divided into Free and Dutiable, during Years ended 30th June :—

| | Dutiable. | Free. |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| 1868..... | \$ 43,655,696 | \$ 28,329,610 |
| 1869..... | 41,069,342 | 26,332,928 |
| 1870..... | 45,127,422 | 26,110,181 |
| 1871..... | 60,094,362 | 26,853,130 |
| 1872..... | 68,545,718 | 39,163,398 |
| 1873..... | 71,409,196 | 56,105,398 |
| 1874..... | 76,235,853 | 51,168,316 |
| 1875..... | 78,141,432 | 41,477,229 |
| 1876..... | 60,243,346 | 34,489,872 |
| 1877..... | 60,919,960 | 36,380,523 |
| 1878..... | 59,776,589 | 31,422,988 |
| 1879..... | 55,430,012 | 24,911,596 |
| 1880..... | 54,182,967 | 17,599,382 |
| 1881..... | 71,620,725 | 19,990,879 |
| 1882..... | 85,757,433 | 26,891,494 |
| 1883..... | 91,688,339 | 31,548,680 |
| 1884..... | 80,010,498 | 28,170,146 |
| 1885..... | 73,269,618 | 29,440,401 |
| 1886..... | 70,658,819 | 28,943,875 |
| 1887..... | 78,120,679 | 27,518,749 |

IMPORTS of Iron and Steel, and Manufactures thereof, into the Dominion for Home Consumption, for years :—

| | | | |
|------|--------------|------|--------------|
| 1868 | \$ 6,885,365 | 1878 | \$ 9,398,306 |
| 1869 | 7,385,780 | 1879 | 7,962,295 |
| 1870 | 7,760,867 | 1880 | 10,128,660 |
| 1871 | 10,808,645 | 1881 | 12,955,855 |
| 1872 | 15,913,179 | 1882 | 17,499,488 |
| 1873 | 25,435,020 | 1883 | 20,080,274 |
| 1874 | 20,700,387 | 1884 | 14,790,727 |
| 1875 | 18,199,198 | 1885 | 11,415,713 |
| 1876 | 12,965,117 | 1886 | 11,053,365 |
| 1877 | 11,082,321 | 1887 | 13,595,046 |

DISCOUNTS given by the Chartered Banks of Canada, June 30th :—

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 1868 | \$ 50,500,316 |
| 1869 | 53,573,307 |
| 1870 (Manitoba created a Province, 15th July) | 62,252,569 |
| 1871 (British Columbia admitted, 20th July) | 83,939,756 |
| 1872 | 107,354,115 |
| 1873 (Prince Edward Island admitted, 1st July) | 117,646,219 |
| 1874 | 133,731,260 |
| 1875 | 123,786,038 |
| 1876 | 128,645,238 |
| 1877 | 126,169,577 |
| 1878 | 124,888,552 |
| 1879 | 122,502,537 |
| 1880 | 118,916,970 |
| 1881 | 144,139,875 |
| 1882 | 177,521,800 |
| 1883 | 177,222,569 |
| 1884 | 160,459,183 |
| 1885 | 158,209,174 |
| 1886 | 165,044,608 |
| 1887 | 169,357,325 |

CANADA, Overdue Notes and Debts in Chartered Banks, proportion being to total amount borrowed from Banks for Years ended 31st October :—

| | | | |
|------|---------|------|---------|
| 1873 | \$ 2 07 | 1881 | \$ 2 68 |
| 1874 | 2 02 | 1882 | 1 97 |
| 1875 | 4 73 | 1883 | 2 45 |
| 1876 | 4 30 | 1884 | 3 57 |
| 1877 | 4 45 | 1885 | 2 45 |
| 1878 | 4 56 | 1886 | 1 63 |
| 1879 | 4 90 | 1887 | 1 61 |
| 1880 | 4 24 | | |

BUSINESS Failures in Canada, years :—

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1873 | \$12,334,000 |
| 1874 | 7,696,000 |
| 1875 (Revenue Tariff) | 28,843,000 |
| 1876 do | 25,517,000 |
| 1877 do | 25,523,000 |
| 1878 do | 23,908,000 |
| 1879 do | 29,347,000 |
| 1880 (Protective Tariff) | 7,988,000 |
| 1881 do | 5,751,000 |
| 1882 do | 8,587,000 |
| 1883 do | 15,872,000 |
| 1884 do | 18,939,000 |
| 1885 do | 8,743,000 |
| 1886 do | 10,387,000 |
| 1887 do | 16,311,745 |

CANADA Bank Notes in circulation during years ended June 30th :—

| | Bank Notes. | Dominion Notes. |
|------|--------------|-----------------|
| 1868 | \$ 8,307,079 | \$ 3,795,000 |
| 1869 | 8,063,198 | 4,794,000 |
| 1870 | 14,167,948 | 7,294,103 |
| 1871 | 18,339,893 | 7,244,341 |
| 1872 | 25,040,077 | 10,813,548 |
| 1873 | 29,516,046 | 11,314,256 |
| 1874 | 26,583,130 | 12,175,579 |
| 1875 | 20,902,991 | 10,780,324 |
| 1876 | 20,288,158 | 11,534,731 |
| 1877 | 18,265,356 | 10,680,493 |
| 1878 | 19,351,109 | 10,435,696 |
| 1879 | 18,090,814 | 10,790,510 |
| 1880 | 20,186,176 | 13,665,959 |
| 1881 | 26,102,368 | 14,539,795 |
| 1882 | 32,229,937 | 15,786,538 |
| 1883 | 32,211,915 | 16,005,243 |
| 1884 | 29,654,511 | 15,344,474 |
| 1885 | 29,692,803 | 15,423,229 |
| 1886 | 29,200,627 | 16,269,452 |
| 1887 | 30,438,152 | 15,064,835 |

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

DEPOSITS by the People in the Chartered Banks of Canada, 30th June :—

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 1868 | \$ 32,808,104 |
| 1869 | 35,823,333 |
| 1870 | 50,767,100 |
| 1871 (Manitoba created a Province, 15th July) | 55,763,067 |
| 1872 | 53,986,818 |
| 1873 | 55,547,607 |
| 1874 (Revenue Tariff) | 65,991,047 |
| 1875 do | 58,367,942 |
| 1876 do | 63,320,858 |
| 1877 do | 63,241,128 |
| 1878 do | 68,603,757 |
| 1879 do | 63,635,952 |
| 1880 (Protective Tariff) | 77,891,498 |
| 1881 do | 86,507,571 |
| 1882 do | 99,100,729 |
| 1883 do | 99,364,750 |
| 1884 do | 92,413,313 |
| 1885 do | 99,383,673 |
| 1886 do | 103,583,950 |
| 1887 do | 107,154,483 |

CANADA, Deposits by the People in Savings Branches, Building Societies and Loan Companies, for Years ended 30th December :—

| | | | |
|------|------------|------|--------------|
| 1868 | \$ 959,054 | 1878 | \$ 8,269,295 |
| 1869 | 1,485,014 | 1879 | 9,426,148 |
| 1870 | 1,942,575 | 1880 | 11,713,633 |
| 1871 | 2,399,136 | 1881 | 13,460,268 |
| 1872 | 2,590,778 | 1882 | 14,241,783 |
| 1873 | 2,869,382 | 1883 | 13,954,461 |
| 1874 | 4,614,813 | 1884 | 13,876,516 |
| 1875 | 5,020,607 | 1885 | 15,435,084 |
| 1876 | 6,126,378 | 1886 | 17,712,885 |
| 1877 | 7,102,186 | | |

DEPOSITS in Savings Banks of Canada, 30th June :—

| | | | |
|------|--------------|------|---------------|
| 1868 | \$ 4,360,692 | 1878 | \$ 14,222,074 |
| 1869 | 5,723,567 | 1879 | 14,702,715 |
| 1870 | 7,591,978 | 1880 | 18,237,496 |
| 1871 | 9,367,941 | 1881 | 24,331,202 |
| 1872 | 10,526,376 | 1882 | 31,093,718 |
| 1873 | 12,933,894 | 1883 | 35,189,426 |
| 1874 | 15,101,195 | 1884 | 38,003,116 |
| 1875 | 14,125,477 | 1885 | 41,990,776 |
| 1876 | 13,838,201 | 1886 | 45,072,886 |
| 1877 | 13,391,014 | 1887 | 50,944,785 |

CANADA, operations of the Money Order System for years ended 30th June :—

| | Orders issued. | No. of orders issued. |
|------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | Amount. | |
| 1868 | \$ 3,352,881 | 90,163 |
| 1869 | 3,563,645 | 96,629 |
| 1870 | 3,910,250 | 110,021 |
| 1871 | 4,546,434 | 120,521 |
| 1872 | 5,154,120 | 136,422 |
| 1873 | 6,239,506 | 161,096 |
| 1874 | 6,757,427 | 179,851 |
| 1875 | 6,711,539 | 181,091 |
| 1876 | 6,866,618 | 238,668 |
| 1877 | 6,856,821 | 253,962 |
| 1878 | 7,130,895 | 269,417 |
| 1879 | 6,788,723 | 281,725 |
| 1880 | 7,207,337 | 306,088 |
| 1881 | 7,725,212 | 338,238 |
| 1882 | 8,354,193 | 372,248 |
| 1883 | 9,490,900 | 419,613 |
| 1884 | 10,067,834 | 463,502 |
| 1885 | 10,384,211 | 499,243 |
| 1886 | 10,231,189 | 529,458 |
| 1887 | 10,328,984 | 574,899 |

CANADA POST OFFICES.

Number of Post Offices :—

| | | | |
|------|-------|------|-------|
| 1868 | 3,638 | 1878 | 5,378 |
| 1869 | 3,756 | 1879 | 5,606 |
| 1870 | 3,820 | 1880 | 5,773 |
| 1871 | 3,943 | 1881 | 5,935 |
| 1872 | 4,135 | 1882 | 6,171 |
| 1873 | 4,618 | 1883 | 6,395 |
| 1874 | 4,706 | 1884 | 6,837 |
| 1875 | 4,892 | 1885 | 7,084 |
| 1876 | 5,015 | 1886 | 7,295 |
| 1877 | 5,161 | 1887 | 7,534 |

Distribution of Post Offices :—

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Ontario | 1 to every | 64 square miles. |
| Quebec | do | 142 do |
| Nova Scotia | do | 16 do |
| New Brunswick | do | 26 do |
| Prince Edward Island | do | 7 do |
| British Columbia | do | 3,250 do |
| Manitoba and North-West | do | 225 do |

Letters and Postal Cards posted :—

| | | | |
|------|---------|------|--------|
| 1868 | 18,100* | 1878 | 50,455 |
| 1869 | 21,920 | 1879 | 50,840 |
| 1870 | 24,500 | 1880 | 53,600 |
| 1871 | 27,050 | 1881 | 57,810 |
| 1872 | 30,600 | 1882 | 67,500 |
| 1873 | 34,579 | 1883 | 75,740 |
| 1874 | 39,358 | 1884 | 79,680 |
| 1875 | 42,000 | 1885 | 82,200 |
| 1876 | 46,446 | 1886 | 86,110 |
| 1877 | 46,960 | 1887 | 90,656 |

* 000 omitted.

Newspapers carried by Postal Department :—

| | | | |
|------|---------|------|--------|
| 1868 | 18,860* | 1878 | 39,936 |
| 1869 | 18,700 | 1879 | 42,380 |
| 1870 | 20,150 | 1880 | 45,120 |
| 1871 | 22,250 | 1881 | 48,690 |
| 1872 | 24,400 | 1882 | 50,846 |
| 1873 | 25,480 | 1883 | 53,140 |
| 1874 | 29,000 | 1884 | 55,990 |
| 1875 | 31,300 | 1885 | 58,381 |
| 1876 | 33,550 | 1886 | 60,064 |
| 1877 | 39,000 | 1887 | |

* 000 omitted.

Postal Revenue :—

| | | | |
|------|-------------|------|-----------|
| 1868 | \$1,024,710 | 1878 | 1,620,022 |
| 1869 | 973,056 | 1879 | 1,534,363 |
| 1870 | 1,010,707 | 1880 | 1,648,017 |
| 1871 | 1,079,767 | 1881 | 1,767,953 |
| 1872 | 1,193,062 | 1882 | 2,022,098 |
| 1873 | 1,406,964 | 1883 | 2,364,384 |
| 1874 | 1,476,207 | 1884 | 2,330,741 |
| 1875 | 1,536,509 | 1885 | 2,400,062 |
| 1876 | 1,484,886 | 1886 | 2,469,379 |
| 1877 | 1,501,134 | 1887 | 2,603,256 |

Postal Expenditure :—

| | | | |
|------|-------------|------|-------------|
| 1868 | \$1,053,570 | 1878 | \$2,110,365 |
| 1869 | 1,079,828 | 1879 | 2,167,266 |
| 1870 | 1,155,261 | 1880 | 2,286,611 |
| 1871 | 1,271,096 | 1881 | 2,333,189 |
| 1872 | 1,369,163 | 1882 | 2,459,356 |
| 1873 | 1,553,604 | 1883 | 2,687,394 |
| 1874 | 1,695,480 | 1884 | 2,931,387 |
| 1875 | 1,873,241 | 1885 | 3,097,882 |
| 1876 | 1,959,758 | 1886 | 3,380,411 |
| 1877 | 2,075,618 | 1887 | 3,458,101 |

RAILWAYS in Canada, 30th June :—

| | Miles. | | Miles. |
|------|--------|------|--------|
| 1868 | 2,522 | 1878 | 6,143 |
| 1869 | 2,580 | 1879 | 6,255 |
| 1870 | 2,679 | 1880 | 6,891 |
| 1871 | 2,950 | 1881 | 7,260 |
| 1872 | 3,018 | 1882 | 7,530 |
| 1873 | 3,609 | 1883 | 8,726 |
| 1874 | 4,022 | 1884 | 9,575 |
| 1875 | 4,826 | 1885 | 10,773 |
| 1876 | 5,157 | 1886 | 11,523 |
| 1877 | 5,574 | 1887 | 12,292 |

| | Cost per mile. | Population per mile. |
|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Great Britain | \$ 206,500 | 1,930 |
| Germany | 103,000 | 2,065 |
| France | 134,000 | 2,110 |
| Italy | 94,700 | 5,000 |
| Belgium | 123,400 | 2,102 |
| Holland | 95,200 | 3,400 |
| Russia | 97,200 | 5,965 |
| United States | 61,000 | 417 |
| Canada | 61,000 | 491 |

CANADIAN Railways, Passengers carried, for years ended 30th June :—

| | No. of passengers carried to each inhabitant. |
|------|---|
| 1868 | No returns |
| 1869 | " |
| 1870 | " |
| 1871 | " |
| 1872 | " |
| 1873 | " |
| 1874 | " |
| 1875 | 5,190,416 1.33 |
| 1876 | 5,544,814 1.30 |
| 1877 | 6,073,233 1.50 |
| 1878 | 6,443,924 1.57 |
| 1879 | 6,523,816 1.57 |
| 1880 | 6,462,948 1.50 |
| 1881 | 6,943,671 1.57 |
| 1882 | 9,358,325 2.01 |
| 1883 | 9,579,948 2.12 |
| 1884 | 9,981,358 2.16 |
| 1885 | 9,672,599 2.08 |
| 1886 | 9,861,024 2.08 |
| 1887 | 10,685,508 2.20 |

RAILWAYS of Canada, Tons Carried :—

| | Carried tons per inhabitant. | Tons. |
|------|------------------------------|--------------|
| 1876 | 160 | \$ 6,331,757 |
| 1877 | 170 | 6,859,796 |
| 1878 | 193 | 7,883,472 |
| 1879 | 200 | 8,348,810 |
| 1880 | 235 | 9,938,858 |
| 1881 | 277 | 12,065,323 |
| 1882 | 306 | 13,575,787 |
| 1883 | 293 | 13,263,255 |
| 1884 | 299 | 13,712,269 |
| 1885 | 312 | 14,659,271 |
| 1886 | 325 | 15,670,460 |
| 1887 | 335 | 16,367,987 |

SEA-GOING and Inland Lakes : Shipping employed, not including Coasting Vessels :—

| | Tonnage. | Sea-going Departed. | Tonnage Arrived. |
|------|------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1868 | 12,982,825 | 2,215,312 | 2,104,009 |
| 1869 | 10,461,044 | 2,537,482 | 2,459,083 |
| 1870 | 11,415,870 | 2,476,354 | 2,608,519 |
| 1871 | 13,126,028 | 2,594,460 | 2,521,573 |
| 1872 | 12,808,160 | 2,956,911 | 2,988,793 |
| 1873 | 11,748,997 | 3,032,789 | 3,032,746 |
| 1874 | 11,399,857 | 2,973,374 | 3,077,987 |
| 1875 | 9,527,155 | 2,708,074 | 2,521,134 |
| 1876 | 9,911,199 | 2,938,305 | 2,972,459 |
| 1877 | 11,091,244 | 3,348,835 | 3,295,887 |
| 1878 | 12,054,890 | 3,342,919 | 3,341,465 |
| 1879 | 11,646,812 | 3,039,029 | 3,049,521 |
| 1880 | 13,577,845 | 3,298,979 | 3,487,735 |
| 1881 | 13,802,432 | 4,071,391 | 4,032,946 |
| 1882 | 13,379,882 | 4,003,410 | 3,933,152 |
| 1883 | 13,770,735 | 3,968,420 | 4,004,357 |
| 1884 | 14,359,026 | 4,233,636 | 4,250,665 |
| 1885 | 14,084,712 | 3,843,951 | 3,800,664 |
| 1886 | 13,969,232 | 4,018,156 | 4,026,415 |
| 1887 | 14,317,099 | 4,125,671 | 4,236,767 |

CANADA sea-going Shipping (arrived and departed) by nationalities :—

| | Registered Tonnage. |
|------|-------------------------|
| 1876 | 1,896,663 |
| | Canadian 1,634,333 |
| | United States 1,597,828 |
| | Foreign 782,389 |
| 1877 | 2,216,516 |
| | Canadian 1,897,094 |
| | United States 1,716,800 |
| | Foreign 814,412 |
| 1878 | 2,294,688 |
| | Canadian 1,928,531 |
| | United States 1,670,057 |
| | Foreign 791,078 |
| 1879 | 2,155,444 |
| | Canadian 1,786,310 |
| | United States 1,534,016 |
| | Foreign 662,780 |
| 1880 | 2,642,935 |
| | Canadian 1,794,210 |
| | United States 1,594,333 |
| | Foreign 755,236 |

| | Registered Tonnage. |
|------|------------------------------|
| 1881 | British..... 3,526,005 |
| | Canadian..... 1,865,612 |
| | United States..... 1,793,206 |
| | Foreign..... 919,514 |
| 1882 | British..... 3,164,839 |
| | Canadian..... 1,892,290 |
| | United States..... 1,884,654 |
| | Foreign..... 994,779 |
| 1883 | British..... 3,001,071 |
| | Canadian..... 1,886,166 |
| | United States..... 2,096,148 |
| | Foreign..... 989,392 |
| 1884 | British..... 3,257,219 |
| | Canadian..... 1,880,993 |
| | United States..... 2,239,576 |
| | Foreign..... 1,106,513 |
| 1885 | British..... 3,007,314 |
| | Canadian..... 1,598,894 |
| | United States..... 2,118,767 |
| | Foreign..... 919,640 |
| 1886 | British..... 3,101,289 |
| | Canadian..... 1,783,623 |
| | United States..... 2,190,700 |
| | Foreign..... 969,963 |
| 1887 | British..... 2,657,619 |
| | Canadian..... 2,314,109 |
| | United States..... 2,288,067 |
| | Foreign..... 1,102,641 |

CANADA Coasting Trade, Tonnage employed :—

| | Registered Tons. | Registered Tons. |
|------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 1868 | No returns. | 1878..... \$ 11,047,661 |
| 1869 | " | 1879..... 12,066,633 |
| 1870 | " | 1880..... 14,053,013 |
| 1871 | " | 1881..... 15,116,766 |
| 1872 | " | 1882..... 14,791,064 |
| 1873 | " | 1883..... 15,683,666 |
| 1874 | " | 1884..... 15,473,707 |
| 1875 | " | 1885..... 15,944,421 |
| 1876 | \$ 10,300,939 | 1886..... 16,368,274 |
| 1877 | 8,968,862 | 1887..... 17,513,677 |

TOTAL Production of Coal in the Dominion, Net Tons of 2,000 Pounds :—

| | Tons. | Tons. |
|------|-----------|---------------------|
| 1868 | 623,392 | 1878..... 1,109,595 |
| 1869 | 687,527 | 1879..... 1,152,783 |
| 1870 | 734,285 | 1880..... 1,456,795 |
| 1871 | 804,431 | 1881..... 1,514,642 |
| 1872 | 1,018,349 | 1882..... 1,845,548 |
| 1873 | 1,228,852 | 1883..... 1,831,819 |
| 1874 | 1,068,166 | 1884..... 1,997,368 |
| 1875 | 993,104 | 1885..... 1,973,987 |
| 1876 | 950,483 | 1886..... 2,104,170 |
| 1877 | 1,020,875 | 1887..... 2,387,875 |

NOVA SCOTIA coal Sales, (in Tons).

| Year. | Total Sales | Sales to Neighboring Provinces. | Sales to other Countries. | Sales for Home consumption. |
|-------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1868 | 453,624 | 102,814 | 233,179 | 117,631 |
| 1869 | 511,795 | 129,148 | 266,210 | 116,427 |
| 1870 | 568,277 | 172,978 | 265,147 | 130,152 |
| 1871 | 593,419 | 164,578 | 278,209 | 149,632 |
| 1872 | 785,914 | 280,553 | 300,055 | 205,306 |
| 1873 | 881,106 | 337,977 | 327,834 | 215,295 |
| 1874 | 749,127 | 338,754 | 195,408 | 114,965 |
| 1875 | 706,795 | 381,711 | 112,454 | 212,630 |
| 1876 | 634,207 | 317,843 | 90,706 | 225,658 |
| 1877 | 687,065 | 291,447 | 136,828 | 255,790 |
| 1878 | 693,511 | 303,728 | 109,661 | 279,172 |
| 1879 | 688,624 | 341,391 | 69,113 | 278,120 |
| 1880 | 954,659 | 453,301 | 148,445 | 322,913 |
| 1881 | 1,035,014 | 503,611 | 148,950 | 382,413 |
| 1882 | 1,450,179 | 666,476 | 124,751 | 458,952 |
| 1883 | 1,297,523 | 688,111 | 138,085 | 471,327 |
| 1884 | 1,261,650 | 691,817 | 76,783 | 493,050 |
| 1885 | 1,254,510 | 769,643 | 40,215 | 454,652 |
| 1886 | 1,373,666 | 835,324 | 78,105 | 460,237 |
| 1887 | 1,519,684 | 970,037 | 80,183 | 469,464 |

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

| Year. | Analysis of sales to neighboring Provinces. | | | |
|-------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | Sales to Quebec. | Sales to New Brunswick. | Sales to P.E. Island. | Sales to New-foundland. |
| 1868 | 187,059 | 68,217 | 26,840 | 55,861 |
| 1869 | 162,269 | 78,841 | 41,948 | 55,696 |
| 1870 | 189,754 | 85,968 | 43,641 | 62,348 |
| 1871 | 117,303 | 101,890 | 46,908 | 51,742 |
| 1872 | 95,118 | 104,818 | 45,169 | 49,342 |
| 1873 | 83,710 | 115,245 | 43,412 | 61,361 |
| 1874 | 154,118 | 84,731 | 44,891 | 57,651 |
| 1875 | 239,091 | 97,817 | 46,767 | 69,626 |
| 1876 | 268,628 | 123,526 | 49,313 | 62,174 |
| 1877 | 383,031 | 153,617 | 50,096 | 79,732 |
| 1878 | 410,605 | 167,740 | 48,088 | 61,678 |
| 1879 | 396,782 | 158,420 | 50,399 | 86,216 |
| 1880 | 493,917 | 148,634 | 52,770 | 74,322 |
| 1881 | 538,762 | 175,918 | 49,168 | 71,476 |
| 1882 | 650,858 | 186,511 | 50,615 | 82,053 |

TOTAL Consumption of coal in the Dominion, net tons of 2,000 pounds :—

| | Tons. | Tons. |
|------|-----------|-----------|
| 1868 | 714,893 | 1,665,814 |
| 1869 | 636,704 | 1,748,164 |
| 1870 | 859,630 | 2,094,844 |
| 1871 | 852,217 | 2,260,680 |
| 1872 | 1,227,653 | 2,708,654 |
| 1873 | 1,398,403 | 3,085,689 |
| 1874 | 1,454,636 | 3,566,873 |
| 1875 | 1,362,363 | 3,439,745 |
| 1876 | 1,466,531 | 3,515,769 |
| 1877 | 1,761,031 | 4,110,778 |

FIRE Insurance in Canada. Amount at risk Dec. 31st :—

| | \$ | \$ |
|------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 1869 | \$188,359,809 | 1879..... \$407,357,985 |
| 1870 | 191,594,586 | 1880..... 411,563,271 |
| 1871 | 228,453,784 | 1881..... 462,210,968 |
| 1872 | 251,722,940 | 1882..... 526,856,478 |
| 1873 | 278,854,835 | 1883..... 572,264,041 |
| 1874 | 306,848,219 | 1884..... 605,507,789 |
| 1875 | 384,421,029 | 1885..... 611,794,479 |
| 1876 | 454,608,180 | 1886..... 586,738,022 |
| 1877 | 420,342,681 | 1887..... 633,523,697 |
| 1878 | 409,899,701 | |

LIFE Insurance in Canada. Net Amount in force :—

| | \$ |
|------|---------------|
| 1869 | \$ 35,680,082 |
| 1870 | 42,694,712 |
| 1871 | 45,825,935 |
| 1872 | 67,234,684 |
| 1873 | 77,500,896 |
| 1874 | 85,716,325 |
| 1875 | 84,660,752 |
| 1876 | 84,344,916 |
| 1877 | 85,687,903 |
| 1878 | 84,751,937 |
| 1879 | 86,273,702 |
| 1880 | 90,289,293 |
| 1881 | 103,290,932 |
| 1882 | 115,044,048 |
| 1883 | 124,106,875 |
| 1884 | 135,453,726 |
| 1885 | 149,962,146 |
| 1886 | 171,315,696 |
| 1887 | 191,566,168 |

CANADIAN Bank Stocks, Highest and Lowest Quotations in Montreal during years ended Dec. 31st :—

| | No. of Banks. | Quotations. |
|------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1868 | 13 | Highest 111 1-10 Lowest 104 2-10 |
| 1869 | 13 | Highest 120 Lowest 209 8-10 |
| 1870 | 13 | Highest 134 7-10 Lowest 108 7-10 |
| 1871 | 14 | Highest 143 7-10 Lowest 120 |
| 1872 | 16 | Highest 132 Lowest 113 |

| | No. of Banks. | Quotations. |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1873..... | 16 | Highest 120 8-10 Lowest 111 6-10 |
| 1874..... | 17 | Highest 122 8-10 Lowest 113 2-10 |
| 1875..... | 20 | Highest 121 1-10 Lowest 100 4-10 |
| 1876..... | 20 | Highest 112 3-10 Lowest 102 9-10 |
| 1877..... | 20 | Highest 106 2-10 Lowest 93 |
| 1878..... | 20 | Highest 100 5-10 Lowest 83 |
| 1879..... | 17 | Highest 93 4-10 Lowest 74 5-10 |
| 1880..... | 18 | Highest 115 7-10 Lowest 89 1-10 |
| 1881..... | 19 | Highest 126 8-10 Lowest 103 8-10 |
| 1882..... | 19 | Highest 133 Lowest 118 8-10 |
| 1883..... | 20 | Highest 132 6-10 Lowest 111 6-10 |
| 1884..... | 20 | Highest 120 3-10 Lowest 99 6-10 |
| 1885..... | 21 | Highest 114 6-10 Lowest 100 6-10 |
| 1886..... | 21 | Highest 129 3-10 Lowest 113 1-10 |
| 1887..... | 19 | Highest 137 2-10 Lowest 122 6-10 |

PRICES of Canadian Securities in London, in month of March :—

| Loan of | Amount. | Nature. | Ave. Rate Interest. | Average rate at which taken. |
|---------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 1869 | £ 3,000,000* | { $\frac{3}{4}$ Guaranteed | 4 p. c. } | Premium £ s. d. |
| 1873 | 1,800,000* | { $\frac{1}{2}$ Unguaranteed... | 5 p. c. } | " 4 7 8 |
| 1874 | 4,000,000* | { Guaranteed | 4 per cent. | " 9 19 3 |
| 1875 | 2,500,000* | { $\frac{1}{2}$ Unguaranteed... | 4 p. c. } | " 18 4 |
| 1876 | 3,500,000* | { Unguaranteed.. | 4 per cent. | " 9 0 0 |
| 1878 | 3,000,000† | { $\frac{3}{4}$ Guaranteed | 4 p. c. } | " 3 8 3 |
| 1879 | 3,000,000† | { $\frac{1}{2}$ Unguaranteed.. | 4 per cent. | " 4 18 1½ |
| 1884 | 5,000,000† | { Unguaranteed.. | 3½ " } | " 9 0 0 |
| 1885 | 4,000,000† | { Unguaranteed.. | 4 " } | Premium 1 1 8½ |

* Sinking fund of 1 per cent.

† " " " " for unguaranteed.

‡ No sinking fund.

TOTAL debt payable in London, July 1st, 1887 :—

| Rate of Interest. | Amount. |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 3½ per cent | \$ 24,333,333 |
| 4 " | 140,856,599 |
| 5 " | 2,433,333 |
| 6 " | 4,052,473 |

Total.....\$171,675,736

Interest paid.....\$6,850,745

Average rate of interest:—1867, 5·55 per cent.; 1874, 5·35; 1877, 4·74; 1882, 4·39; 1887, 3·99.

I do not propose to detain the House very much longer, but, before sitting down, there are two or three questions to which the House will no doubt expect me to allude. When making the financial statement a year ago, I was obliged to state to the House that there was one cloud on the horizon. I think I would hardly be wrong in saying that there was a cloud both on the political and the commercial horizon; and that cloud was the very unpleasant relations which at that time threatened to arise between us and our great neighbors to the south of us, between the United States of America and Canada. I am happy to be able to congratulate the House on the present occasion, upon that cloud having been entirely swept away; and I am glad to be able to give to the House the most conclusive evidence that, I think, could be required on that point, by reading brief extracts from very high authorities, and which, I think, the

House will regard as entirely conclusive upon that question. I will first read an extract from the Message sent by President Cleveland to the United States Senate, in submitting the treaty that was recently arranged at Washington between Great Britain and the United States of America, in which that gentleman used the following language:

"The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantage and convenience are the only permanent foundation of peace and friendship between States, and that with the adoption of the Treaty now placed before the Senate, a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established, so as to secure perpetual peace and harmony."

Mr. Bayard, in a letter which I had occasion to quote, and which was made public in the United States, and which he addressed to parties who had invited him to go to New England to make a speech, said:

"Conciliation and mutual neighborly concessions have together done their honorable and honest work in this treaty, and paved the way for the relations of amity and mutual advantage."

I think, Sir, with that evidence, I am justified in congratulating the House that the only cloud that we could see upon the horizon has entirely passed away. The House of Commons of Canada have ratified that treaty by their action, and I have no doubt that the other branch of the Legislature, the Senate of Canada, will ratify that treaty; and I am still sanguine that that treaty will not be rejected by the Senate of the United States of America. But, as I said before, come what may, we have the fact placed on record from the very highest sources connected with the administration of that great republic, that the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada have been prepared, by mutual concession, to ratify a treaty which would dispose of any question that was causing so much unpleasantness between the two countries; and whatever may be the action of the Senate of the United States upon this question, I think I am not too sanguine in expressing the conviction that nothing will occur to disturb that continued harmonious intercourse between the two countries, that friendly reciprocity of good neighborhood, that will not only dispel any cause of anxiety in regard to our relations with the great republic, but will lead us to anticipate a larger and freer commercial intercourse than has hitherto taken place. I do not intend to ask the House, in going into Committee of Ways and Means, to make any alteration in the tariff. As I said before, nothing is more important in regard to the trade and business of a country, than confidence on the part of commercial men in the permanence of existing arrangements; and I feel that we can scarcely do a greater service to the country and to the development of our best interests, than by showing that it is not necessary continually to change our tariff arrangements. I am satisfied that no gentleman who has ever held the high position that I now occupy as Finance Minister, has been less troubled than I have been with applications for a change of tariff. I am quite certain that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he held that position, had a hundred applications for a change of tariff during every year that he administered the duty of Finance Minister, for every single application that I have had during the present Session. I may be told that a hint which we gave to the country, rather discouraged applications; but at the same time I believe that it has, to a large extent, arisen from the fact of a general satisfaction upon the part of the country with the tariff which we now have upon the Statute-book, and a disposition not unnecessarily to disturb it, but to allow it to have an opportunity of being fairly tried and fairly tested. A year ago it became my duty to submit a very startling proposition to this House in regard to the iron industry of the country; it became my duty to make a very radical change in the tariff in regard to that industry. I think, considering

the difficulties to which I have adverted, that capital is extremely cautious, that the capital required for the establishment of new iron industries is so enormously large, still we have every reason to be satisfied with the indication we see that there will be no want of capital in a short time, and that at no distant day we shall be able to manufacture, on Canadian soil, and with Canadian ore, all the iron—and a very enormous consumption *per capita* it is—that is used in our country. It has been a source of great gratification to me to be able to read to the House, as I have done, the evidences that we have on all sides from parties connected with the development, not only of the iron industry, but parties who are engaged in the various manufactures of iron, of uniform satisfaction; and I am safe in saying that I have not received from any source, from either a company or any important and prominent individual desiring to invest money in the iron industry, a single remonstrance against the very great change that was made a year ago. I have been pressed, and strongly pressed, to take another step in that direction, for the purpose of having steel rails manufactured in our country. I mentioned to the House a year ago that Canada was the only country in the world possessing 12,000 miles of railway within its borders, that did not manufacture its own steel rails, and I had the evidence presented to me that, by giving proper protection, such protection as we gave the other branches of the iron industry, we might succeed in establishing rolling mills for steel rails. But we had to take into consideration the fact of the enormous importance of the railway development of a country like Canada, and under those circumstances we have, although we considered it a subject worthy of attention, whenever it can be properly taken up—but considering the great and vital importance of railway extension to the prosperity of this country, we felt that we must postpone, at all events, for this year, making such a change as would lead to the establishment of rolling mills in this country for the manufacture of our own rails. I am glad, as I say, to be able to state to the House the uniform satisfaction that seems to be expressed all over this country in regard to the present tariff. I will not say more upon the subject than refer to the Bill that I propose to introduce in connection with the resolutions that are on the Table, when we go into Committee on Ways and Means. And that is to a large extent to meet the changes in the Act proposed, what I have termed the Mills' Bill. I need not remind this House of what I said a few days ago, that both parties in this House, whether in power or out of power, had been exceedingly anxious to obtain a return to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, or such reciprocal trade relations as were enjoyed between Canada and the United States under that treaty. I am bound to say, I am quite certain every hon. gentleman who has looked into the subject with the care and attention I have,—and no doubt, considering its importance, a great many hon. gentlemen have done so,—I am bound to say that I believe this country would be greatly disappointed if the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 were re-enacted. While that treaty gave the most undoubted stimulus to the trade and business of Canada, while that treaty, advantageous as it was to Canada, was still more beneficial to the United States than it was to us, I cannot forget that a great change has taken place in this country and in the United States in a great many very important points that would bear upon the operation of that treaty if it were re-enacted to-morrow. But the House is perfectly aware that all the efforts, and they have been great and continuous, made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when in power to obtain a return to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, have proved abortive. It would, perhaps, be a waste of time to go into the causes that have resulted in that; suffice it to know that all our efforts in that direction have ended in

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

failure. The House is aware, from my statements on a former occasion, that we not only endeavored to obtain a re-enactment of the reciprocity treaty as a question of treaty, but that we also endeavored to promote a freer intercourse of trade, freer commercial relations between Canada and the United States, by the placing upon our Statute-book for a very long period of what was held to be a statutory invitation to the United States to meet us half-way in reference to certain articles. Those articles did not cover all the articles that were in the reciprocity treaty, but as long ago as 1849, Canada, before Confederation adopted that clause, and it has been re-enacted in every re-enactment of the Tariff Act, I believe, from that time down to the present period. The object of that was to direct the attention of our American neighbors to the fact that we were anxious to promote freer commercial intercourse between the two countries. It appears that certain articles that were named in that statutory clause were made free two or three years ago in the United States. Attention was not drawn to it, I believe it escaped the attention of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House, and the attention of the Government was not drawn to it until a very recent period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Excuse me for mentioning it, but attention was drawn to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We had an hour's discussion on it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1886.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I must say, in justification of myself, that I do not think I was here in 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think you were not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At all events I do not remember, and I am not as a rule deficient in memory, the subject having been brought under the notice of the House, and although I have been a tolerably close observer, whether here or abroad, of what has transpired in this House, I do not remember to have seen any reference to the subject. If, as the hon. gentleman says, and I must of course, accept his statement, attention was drawn to it, I regret my own attention has not been drawn to it. However, the question when presented from that standpoint, and I may here mention that no communication down to this hour has been had with Her Majesty's Government on the question that certain articles contained in that statutory invitation had been made free in the United States, and I make this statement as I wish to correct an improper impression that has gone abroad that we had been in communication with Her Majesty's Government on this subject—when at a very critical period in the relations between the United States and Canada our attention was drawn to the question, we felt that under all the circumstances the wisest course to pursue was to meet the proposal that had been made and to put on the free list the articles that were contained in that clause and which had been made free by the action of Congress. I see a very erroneous impression is abroad in many quarters as to the effect of these resolutions which are placed upon the Table with a view to the amendment of that clause, or rather to its repeal and the substitution of a somewhat different clause, and that is that the effect of that action will be to destroy the effect of the proclamation which put the articles named on the free list. That is an entire misapprehension. Parliament clothed the Governor General in Council with power to put certain articles under certain conditions, upon the free list, and, that power having been exercised, those articles are on the free list of Canada and duties can only be imposed on those articles on the re-enactment of a new tariff placing duties upon them. I mention this because it has been stated

in the press, and I do not consider it is an attempt to misrepresent the position, but it is a statement likely to create a very erroneous impression on that point. I have drawn the attention of the House to the fact that those difficulties having been removed, this cause of irritation, commercial and political, between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain and between the Governments of Great Britain and Canada, at a very early period we found a Bill introduced by Mr. Mills, Chairman of the Commission on Ways and Means, placing a number of articles in which we are very much interested in Canada, upon the free list. And I will say this, that it is one thing to make a treaty and another thing to make a statutory arrangement, to make a legislative reciprocity. You may be induced to put a large number of articles into a treaty that you do not desire to be made free, that if you had your choice you would not put on the free list, but you agree to it for the purpose of getting other articles there which you very much desire to be there; consequently a treaty is made a matter of mutual arrangement, of mutual concession, and it has the advantage that being a treaty it cannot be affected during its continuance by any legislative action on the part of one country or another. But under legislative reciprocity the whole thing is entirely changed, as the House will see, and we cannot imagine for a single moment that the policy of that great country is going to be materially influenced by any reference to Canada. When we take the proposal to put lumber on the free list, as it is proposed in the Mills' Bill, a Bill regarding which I still entertain a very sanguine hope, it will become law during the present session of Congress. I say when we find that to be the case, we know at once that it is not for the purpose of furthering Canadian interests. It is done simply because, in carrying out the policy of the Democratic party of the United States, they desire to make that article free in the interests of their own country, and in the interests of their own people. So in regard to a large number of other articles. But, as I have said, that proposal in the Mills' Bill is coupled with the statement that lumber will only be free to countries that have no export duty on logs. The consequence was that I introduced this Bill of which I have given notice in the resolutions, by which the export duty can be taken off logs by an Order of the Governor General in Council. If the Mills' Bill, a month hence, become law, and lumber of the other countries be free, our lumber would be met in the United States by the same duty as before the passage of that Act. Consequently it became necessary, as every gentleman in the House will see, that in order to give Canada the advantage of having this large industry relieved from the heavy duty which is imposed upon its products in the United States of America, it became absolutely necessary to arm the Governor General in Council with power, when that Bill became law, to repeal the export duty on logs, in order that we might enjoy the advantage that is thus given under that Act. But, Sir, we must not forget that although lumber may be made free, although a large number of other articles in which we are greatly interested may be made free under that Bill, that it is only an Act of legislation. It is not a treaty, it is not a matter of arrangement for ten or twelve years, as on former occasions of reciprocal action between the two countries which was arranged by treaty. We have the disadvantage of knowing that there is not that fixity in legislative arrangements that there would be under a treaty, but counterbalancing this we are left in Canada as free as the statesmen of the United States are left, in altering or modifying their legislation, and under a reciprocity of tariffs each country remains perfectly free from Session to Session, to make just such changes in extending the free list or in curtailing it and imposing duty upon articles that have previously been made free, as they had before. There is no obligation resting or binding

upon either country, and, under those circumstances, I felt that it was right for the protection of Canadian interests that we should modify this clause and only embrace in it such articles as we were all quite satisfied it would be in the interest of Canada to make free, whenever they were made free in the United States of America. Salt stands in the same way. In the Mills Bill it is provided that salt shall be made free, but only that coming from such countries as do not charge duty upon salt going into that country out of the United States. So in the same way as in reference to lumber, in order to get the advantage of that Bill, if it were to pass to-morrow or a month hence, it was absolutely necessary the Governor General in Council should have power to deal with that subject so as to put salt on the free list, and give—as I have no doubt that action would give—a very great impetus to that very large and important industry in the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, I do not think it will be necessary for me to say more in reference to that, but I want to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to a subject of very considerable importance. When I was standing here a year ago I congratulated the House, and I congratulate the country upon the fact, that the anxiety that parties wishing and desiring to invest their capital in the manufacturing industries of this country and in the development of our industries, had, in consequence of the doctrines held previously by the Liberal party, disappeared on account of the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I congratulated the House, and I congratulated the country, upon the fact that the great leader of the party opposite—I refer to the Hon. Mr. Blake—who was then and who so long led with so much ability in this House the party opposed to the Government—I congratulate the House that in the most formal and authentic manner, that hon. gentleman, on a most important occasion, on the eve and in the very throes of a general election, had declared to the people of this country that the antagonism of the Liberal party to the policy of protecting Canadian industries had ceased, and the hon. gentleman not only spoke with the high authority which attached to his name, and which attached to his position, but feeling that it was desirable on an occasion of that kind that there should be no misunderstanding; that everybody in this country should understand that we were as one upon this great question which had been so long a subject of such fierce controversy; referred especially to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and undertook to state to the country that he was expressing that hon. gentleman's views and expressing the views of the great party of which he was the leader still, when he made that important announcement. I do not hesitate to say that as a party man, as one who believes very earnestly that the best interest of Canada is intimately bound up with the success of the great Liberal Conservative party in this country, I read that announcement of Mr. Blake's with a good deal of dismay. Looking at it from a party standpoint I felt that he had made a great stride on the march to the Treasury benches. I always felt secure that so long as that hon. gentleman kept his party in battle array against giving such fostering protection to the industries of Canada, as had been found necessary to vitalise them and bring them into existence, that we were safe. But I felt that, however much we were in danger by the fact that the hon. gentleman had stepped upon a higher plane and placed himself before the people of this country in a position that took away one of the strongest arguments we could present to the country to induce them to keep hon. gentlemen opposite discharging the important functions of a loyal and constitutional Opposition—I say, Sir, although I felt this, I felt also that the loss to the party was more than counterbalanced by the gain to the country, in the assurance to the capitalists of the world and the telling to them: You need not fear, you are no longer in

danger, there is no party with free trade colors nailed to the mast, you need not fear that if we get into power we will destroy your capital. It reassured not only the capitalists, Sir, but that body which is of more vital and greater importance than the capitalists, the laboring class of this country. In informing the laboring man who had been lifted by this policy of fostering our industries from the condition of helpless poverty into one of comfort, the laboring man would no longer tremble at the thought of hon. gentlemen opposite obtaining a position on this side of the House, and discharging the administrative functions of the Government of the country, because they were told that all these fears might be at once and forever thrown aside, and that the party had shown that it was possible that they could learn something. They had shown that it was possible for them at last when face to face with the great throbbing pulse of the public sentiment of this country, to ascertain what the people of this country had deliberately resolved upon, a policy that the people had deliberately and again and again affirmed was the true policy to be pursued in this country. Still, Sir, I need not tell you with what regret I learned that all these congratulations that I had offered to hon. gentlemen opposite, all these congratulations I had offered to this House, all these congratulations I had offered to this country, had to be re-called. I need not tell you, Sir, the regret with which I learned of this—not again as a party man, because, looking at it from a party standpoint, I felt that hon. gentlemen opposite could do us no greater service as a party than to fall back from the high position they had taken, and to take back this deliberate announcement made in the most formal way to the people of all Canada as to what the future trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite would be. Well, Sir, what was proposed? Why, Sir, when that great and distinguished leader of the party was obliged, by causes which we all deplore, to deprive the Parliament of Canada of the great advantage of his presence, we know that very soon, notwithstanding the amiable qualities of the gentleman who has so worthily succeeded him, notwithstanding that he is a gentleman whom we all respect, we found that the Liberal ship was drifting without a rudder. Instead of the firm hand of the captain on the tiller, we found a vacillating hand. The hon. gentleman with his conservative instincts—so conservative that I have always wondered, ever since I have had the honor of meeting him in this House, that he was not on our side instead of where he is—I say the hon. gentleman, with his conservative instincts, when it was proposed to go back on the policy propounded by his leader and accepted by his party, and deliberately sanctioned by the people who sent them to this House—when it was proposed to the hon. gentleman to go back on all that, he hesitated long; and when it was propounded to him further that we should take so radical a step as to virtually change the constitution of our country, the hon. gentleman showed more than a disinclination to be led into that course. But, Sir, we found the Liberal ship, having lost its rudder, in the hands of the hon. gentleman opposite, scarcely apparently knowing in what direction to attempt to move. We found it drifting upon the rock of commercial union. Sir, I am glad to believe that the hon. gentleman did not commit himself to that policy; I hope, for his own sake, and for the sake of the record that will remain of him as a public man after we all pass away, that he did not commit himself to that policy; but it cannot be forgotten, Sir, that hon. gentlemen holding high and commanding positions in the party, were ready to adopt commercial union as the policy of the Liberal party. We know, Sir, that commercial union was developed by Mr. Wiman, a gentleman of great ability, a gentleman of immense pecuniary resources, and I think I would not be doing him a particle of injustice if I were to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

add—for it is no disgrace to him—a gentleman of unbounded ambition, living in the city of New York and a resident of the United States for many years, and who left his country greatly to his own advantage undoubtedly; and I congratulate him on his success most heartily. If we do lose a man, if a Canadian goes to the United States, I care not in what capacity, I want to see him occupy the highest and most important position a man can occupy. But, Sir, what did we see? We found that gentleman prepared to place himself at the head of the great Liberal party of Canada. We found that gentleman, not only with the ambition, but the vanity, notwithstanding the great names and the great abilities possessed by a large number of gentlemen in that party, to aspire to place himself at their head, and dictate to the Liberal party of Canada what should be their policy with respect to the most vital and important and momentous issues in this country. Well, Sir, it is a great advantage for a movement to have a man of unlimited pecuniary resources associated with it. Everybody knows that in these days it is no detriment to a cause to have men in it who have not only the will, but the means to put their hands in their pockets to advance its interest.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Like Sir Hugh Allan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Wiman had those other advantages, and I do not hesitate to say he had the still greater advantage of being a man of marked ability. Well, Sir, what was the result? Why, Sir, he soon—whether by some human device or not, we are not able to fathom—secured the services of two leading journals of Canada, the *Globe* newspaper and the *Mail* newspaper, to advocate the cause of commercial union. But, Sir, we found not only these two leading journals committing themselves to the policy of commercial union, but we found one after another of the great lights of the Liberal party giving more than countenance to that policy. Where is it now, Sir? Why, Sir, a discovery was made, and I feel that a meed of praise is owing to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in this regard. I believe he is the man who held out the beacon light to keep the great party with which he is connected from drifting on the rock which he had the sagacity to see, would have consigned it to political perdition. We not only found that hon. gentleman becoming alive and awake to the dangerous direction in which his party was drifting, but we very soon found that he had influence enough to rescue the organ of the Liberal party from a policy that would have undoubtedly ended at an early day in the utter destruction of the party. And what is the result? The result is that Mr. Wiman, with all his money, with all his ability, with all his ambition, stands to-day alone on the policy of commercial union, without a follower, without a supporter, in the whole of Canada. That, Sir, is the position. He found himself face to face with the loyal British sentiment that is too deeply rooted in the hearts of Canadians to allow them for one moment to adopt a policy which every man with a particle of sagacity must see would result in Canada either occupying the most deplorable and contemptible position that any free country could ever occupy, that of having its tariff and taxes imposed by a Government with which it had no connection, or taking the next and inevitable step, of becoming a part of that great country. Brought face to face with that sentiment, which fills the breasts of Canadians to an extent as great as it does those of the people of any portion of Her Majesty's Empire, the ship was steered away, and, Sir, what for? Only to escape destruction on the rock of commercial union, to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. There it lies to-day, Sir, a great party, a party possessing men of the highest order of talent, a party embracing a great body of the independent yeomanry of this country, who give it an enthusiastic support, a party

possessing every quality necessary to lead it to power except fixed principles, in accord with the sentiments of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope my hon. friend will allow me to take that back, if he supposes me to use the expression in the sense of unprincipled. Not at all. What I say is this, and I say it in no invidious sense—I say that the seeking of power, the desire to obtain power for the sole purpose of governing a country, is, in my judgment, the most unworthy one that could ever stimulate a party. I say that the object of obtaining office must be, if it is to be useful to the country, inspired by the conviction that the attainment of power will be the means of enabling the party to carry out such a policy and such principles as will promote the progress and prosperity of the country. When I speak of the want of principle, I speak of it in that sense; I speak of the want of any fixed principle that will commend itself to the judgment of the independent yeomanry of Canada as inspiring the party which seeks their suffrages.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Something like the standing offer that you refer to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not occupy the time of the House much longer, but I want to draw the attention of the House for a single moment to the supreme folly of any Canadian statesman talking about unrestricted reciprocity. I put aside as a minor matter the question that in order to get unrestricted reciprocity you must bring the people face to face with the consequence of direct taxation. That I take to be admitted by the gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If they do not, they ought to admit it, for it is plainly to be seen. No man who has yet undertaken to give during this long debate, to which I was sorry not to have the pleasure of listening but which I read, a single statement asking this country to commit itself to what I conceive to be the mad folly of unrestricted reciprocity, has ventured to put before this House or formulate any system by which it could be carried out if we got it to-morrow. If they say they are going to let the United States supply Canada with everything without a farthing of tariff being imposed on it, where is the revenue to come from? The United States are perfectly able to supply this country with everything we require, and I want to know in that case where is your revenue to come from? But, I am not going to waste the time of the House in discussing the wildest chimera that was ever put before a sensible people. I put aside the question of the enormous direct taxation that would crush the people of this country. I put aside the question of imperilling the industry, the capital, the labor of this country, as they would be imperilled. I put aside the fact which everybody knows, and which my hon. friend admitted, when he stood here battling with heavy deficits and struggling to make the revenue of this country meet the very moderate necessities of this country, the hon. gentleman then was impelled to pursue a very economical and moderate course in reference to public expenditure. I say, when he was face to face with deficits, when he, as Finance Minister of Canada, told the people of this country that he could not add a small percentage to the duties on imports, that he could not increase the revenue to even a small extent unless he did it by direct taxation —

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend says he did not say that, I will say that his memory and mine are not together on that question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

43-1888-3

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And he knows better perhaps than I do; but I understood the hon. gentleman to say, when he was admitting a serious and formidable deficit, that he would be glad to provide for it, but that he did not know of any means of further increasing the revenue except by direct taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says I misunderstood him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I suppose I have misunderstood him. But independently of that, what is the fact? Why, he knows that Canada was then the slaughter market of the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He knows that every interest in Canada was paralysed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that every interest in Canada—that is my opinion—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all right, but you said I knew.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That Canada was made a slaughter market for the United States. Does the hon. gentleman want to take Canada back to 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1877?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. She was in a great deal better position then than she is in to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does he want to allow the enormous capital, the great skill, which has made the United States to-day one of the foremost manufacturing countries of the world, to sweep our younger industries, with their smaller capital, out of existence, and to compel the labor of this country, which, after all, it is our most vital and important consideration to keep in our midst, to go, as it had to go in those dark years of Canada, down to Boston and New York, to do in another country the work required to be done in Canada, and which a subsequent Canadian Government found that Canadians could do on Canadian soil? I have used a strong term; I have said this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity is a folly, a mad folly; and I say so for this reason, that if every man in this House was of opinion that Canada should commit suicide, as it would have to do by adopting unrestricted reciprocity—I say if that was the position of every man of both sides of the House, we would have no more chance of obtaining unrestricted reciprocity with the United States than we would have of dictating to the Imperial Parliament who should advise Her Majesty's Ministers. Not a bit more. I can scarcely find any simile or language that would show the helplessness and the utter futility of adopting such a policy. This subject has been discussed now for many months, it has been put forth in the most captivating form by the ablest men on the opposite side of the House, both in this House and abroad through the country, and they have found papers so wanting in information and so blindly subservient to party influences as to advocate their scheme—and what has been the result? Why, point me to a paper in the United States, Republican or Democratic, mugwump or anything else—show me a single paper possessing the slightest influence in that country that would ever give support to a scheme which would take away the barriers between the trade of Canada and the trade of the United States, and leave Canada free to admit the products of England.—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.—and the other parts of the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what you call unrestricted reciprocity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say you will search in vain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will find no man in Congress who will support such a scheme. Mr. Butterworth, in his Bill, provides that nothing shall be done until there is an arrangement by which all this is to be managed. In these vague terms, he seeks to get over the difficulty, but he knows that neither in the Senate, nor in the House of Representatives, nor in the press, nor among the public men or statesmen of that great country, could you find a man occupying influence or position who would dare to stand up in that country and propound the policy that Canada should have free trade with the United States, and make as low a tariff as she pleased at the same time with England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the reason why, in my judgment, I am not using too strong a term, when I say that a madder act of folly for a party to commit itself to could not be discovered, if they offered a premium to any person to discover it. Yesterday these hon. gentlemen stood face to face with the people of Canada with a policy that everybody understood. Yesterday they stood face to face with the people of Canada declaring that they had learnt something by their long term in Opposition, and were prepared, if entrusted with power, to protect the labor and the capital and the industry of the country. To-day they have escaped sudden destruction on the rock of commercial union only to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You were very near there yourself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says I was very near there myself. I am puzzled to know what sort of a mental organisation a man must possess who cannot discover the distinction between an unrestricted offer and unrestricted reciprocity. When as a negotiator, when as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, it became my duty to ascertain whether the United States were prepared to meet us half way or to do anything to remove the obstructions to the freer commercial intercourse which we all desire, when I was in that position, I put an unrestricted offer before them certainly, but did I say anything about unrestricted reciprocity? What was that offer? Did it commit me to anything except that I was prepared to negotiate in regard to the question of freer commercial intercourse? The hon gentleman said, you made an unrestricted offer. I said I did, and I did so deliberately, because if the statesmen of the United States were prepared to offer us unrestricted reciprocity, I wanted to know it, but I was not committed to it. I said that I was prepared to negotiate the settlement of the fisheries, difficulty on the basis of freer commercial intercourse, but I ask any hon. gentleman on the other side if I would not have had a perfect answer to any proposition, either that the proposal did not go far enough or that it went too far.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You made an offer, but you did not mean it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that I made an offer which I did not mean. That would be a very mean thing to do. I think my hon. friend cannot mean that. I made an offer in a broad, comprehensive and statesmanlike form, meaning exactly what I said, that I was prepared or that the British plenipotentiaries, who

authorised me to make the offer, were prepared to negotiate the settlement of the fisheries question upon the basis of greater freedom of intercourse between the United States and Canada; but did that commit me? I was asking for what every public man in this country, every man on both sides of this House, has endeavored to obtain and has asked for over and over again.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If they accepted your offer, would not that have committed you?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it would not have committed me to this. I tell my hon. friend, as I have already explained, that, if they had accepted the offer and had said, Yes, we will settle this question on terms of greater freedom of commercial intercourse, and had then said: We are prepared to negotiate in regard to those terms, and had asked: What greater freedom do you wish? I would have formulated the greater freedom which we desire and would have put a distinct statement before them. Then I would have been bound to formulate my policy and to say how far I was prepared to go or how far I required them to go in order to negotiate the question on that basis. If I had to take up more time to teach hon. gentlemen the difference between an unrestricted reciprocity, I should despair, and I will save my breath for something more important. When we took up this question of fostering our native industries, many parties in England attacked me in reference to it, and asked, what do you mean by turning your back upon the English free trade policy and taking up the United States protective policy? I said: If you were placed in our position, with a population of five millions alongside of a country with sixty millions of people, and with only an invisible line dividing the two countries, you would understand. I said to them, as I have stated in this House, that no Canadian statesmen can formulate a fiscal policy for this country without having regard to these policy of the nation to the south of us; and I said further that it was of the greatest interest to Canada to have the freest intercourse possible with them, consistent with safeguarding the best and highest interests of the people of Canada. Now, what do you find? You find the Republican party of the United States standing firm by a protective policy, you find them standing by a policy of high protection for American industries. That is their policy. Do you find any free trade party in that country? If you think there is any such party, read Mr. Mills' Bill, and that is the exposition of the views of the administration of the United States and of the great Democratic party. Do you find any free trade in that Bill? I have shown that he proposes the enormous reduction on all the iron industries of the United States from 43½ per cent. to 41½ per cent. That is the free trade proposed under Mr. Mills' Bill. He proposes, it is true, what is also our policy, to make raw materials and natural products free, but that is also a protective policy. Everything that makes the living of the artisan cheaper and furnishes the raw material to the manufacturer cheaper, enables you to raise the same revenue and at the same time to protect the article. There you have the great statesmen of that country, who have been able to excite the admiration of the civilised world by the great condition of prosperity and progress into which they have brought their country; you have Republican and Democrat united in demanding and maintaining a system of protection for the capital, for the industries, and for the labor of the people of the United States. This is their position, and it is ours. I do not intend to weary the House with any further remarks, except to say that, although I have had the unpleasant duty to perform—and I hope my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will not press me too hard on that ground—of showing that we have had a little check on our onward progress, he must not forget that the policy which was adopted

of fostering the industries of this country so as strengthened the hands of the Government and of Parliament, so filled the treasury of the country, as to enable us to construct public works of the most gigantic extent, and of the most undoubted importance to every section of this country; he must not forget that Canada has built these great public works—and not only one side but both sides of the House have been concerned in that, because hon. gentlemen opposite completed the Intercolonial Railway, as far as it can be said, I suppose, ever to be completed—from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the people of Canada have found the means to construct one of the most gigantic works that any five millions of people in any part of the world have ever been able to construct. We have found means to stimulate the various interests of the country, we have found means to promote every industry except lumber, which, I hope, in a very short time is going to have its innings, under the Bill which I am at present laying on the Table. We have a country vast in extent, illimitable in resources, whether by sea or land; we have inexhaustible riches in the seas which surround us, and it is in our own hands to develop them. We have a mercantile marine which would be the pride and admiration of any country, and which is only surpassed by that of four nations in the world. Sir, I remember the hon. gentleman opposite, on one or two occasions, endeavoring to cover me with ridicule because I made a calculation of how much wheat could be grown in the North-West by 100,000 farmers, cultivating 320 acres of land each, with a yield of 20 bushels to the acre. What does he say now? Will he repeat that to-day when we have the facts before us, that 16,000 farmers in Manitoba and the North-West of this country, have produced from 13,000,000 to 16,000,000 bushels during the past year? Sir, the abnormal difficulties that were experienced there, the inexperience of the country by the new men who went into it, and a variety of other difficulties, have disappeared, and so far as the development of that country is concerned, we are now entering upon a career of rapid advancement that I believe will, at an early day, give us much greater surprises than that which is at this moment occupying the attention of thoughtful agriculturists over the civilised world, that is, a country producing 50 and even 60 bushels to the acre, upon the average, over large farms. I do not mean to say that is the average in the country, but I mean to say that, on a number of large agricultural holdings in the North-West and I am told that when the grain was threshed out it measured from 50 to 60 bushels per acre, covering the whole crop on the farm. I hope that is true. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be as glad as I will be if that statement turns out to be true. I say, under the circumstances, what has Canada to be afraid of, if we have accomplished all this, if we have brought our country to the position which she occupies to-day? There is no member of this House who does not know that both in England and the United States Canada is beginning to attract an amount of attention that a few years ago the most of us would have believed it impossible to attain. I say, Sir, what have we to be afraid of, with a hardy, enterprising and intelligent population, with men who, man for man, are ready, in a fair field, to enter into competition with the men of any other country in the world—with a fair field, not handicapped mind you, but with a fair field—I say, what have we to be afraid of? Sir, we have the most abundant evidence that it is only necessary for us to have confidence in ourselves, and to devote ourselves unsparingly in the future to the great task of developing the inexhaustible resources of this country. Then, whenever the time comes that, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think, we shall have the management of these matters entirely in our own hands, we shall be able to enter upon even terms, into negotiations with other countries for the extension of our commercial relations. I say, Sir, that

we not only have the advantage of this great domain, with its inexhaustible resources, but we have over us the flag of the mightiest empire in the world, and under its ægis we can go forth with greater confidence than any man can possess, representing a community of only five millions of people, we can go forth knowing that in the remotest section of the world that flag is waving over our heads, that there are behind us an army, a navy, and a moral force of a great empire that will give Canada all the protection that she can desire. Sir, under these circumstances, to throw away our birthright for a mess of pottage, to go looking for commercial reciprocity with a foreign country—even if we could obtain it, I say a policy of that kind would be, in my opinion, to make us forget what Canadians never will forget, the gratitude they owe to the great empire of which we form a part, and the duty of building up on this northern portion of the continent of America, a power to which every Canadian will feel proud to belong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Call it 6 o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it would be as well, but I wish to say one or two words to the hon. gentleman. I regret extremely, for his own sake, that he was not present during the reciprocity debate. It would have interested us all to have heard what he had to say then. Had he been present then, he never would have talked the intolerable rubbish he has done to-night about unrestricted reciprocity. But I agree with him that it is not possible just now to enter into a discussion of that subject, and so, as the hon. Minister has suggested, I will call it 6 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 30) to authorise the town of Kincardine, in the county of Bruce, to impose and collect certain Tolls at the Harbor in the said Town.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance may be said to be properly divided into three parts. The first version was a candid and businesslike statement of the affairs of the country, carefully prepared and carefully read; a departure no doubt from our ordinary custom but one under which the circumstances I do not think anybody ought to object to, inasmuch as it is extremely desirable that a Minister of Finance in making such a statement should guard against any incautious or ill-considered words, which might per- adventure, be afterwards used, or misunderstood, to his detriment. I have my doubts, Sir, if the hon. the Minister of Finance quite clearly saw the full import of all the statements which he made in the early part of his speech. I have my doubts whether he entirely comprehended their bearing on certain proposals to which he alluded, and very gingerly indeed, in the course of the discussion, but of which we will hear more I do not doubt, before this debate is closed and assuredly before this House is prorogued. The second part of his speech was mainly devoted to an advertisement, or, perhaps, I might more properly describe it

a prospectus, lacking nothing in fulness of accuracy and detail of the Londonderry steel works and all that pertains thereto, saving and excepting a list of the shareholders past, present and to come, but possibly this may be in the documents the hon. gentleman handed to the reporters. But in the third part of his speech, the old Adam asserts itself, and we hear once more those thundering tones impassionately declaimed, with which the hon. gentleman was wont to tickle the ears of the groundlings on that side of the House when he had the honor of sitting here and when we had the honor of sitting on the opposite benches. There was the same glorious inconsequence, there was the same magnificent audacity, and the same superb self-confidence which has so often led the hon. gentleman to wrestle with facts, and so often resulted in facts getting the worst of it. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to say what we are to admire the most, and I use the word admire rather in the American sense than in the English in this matter, whether it was the tender solicitude for the welfare of the Liberal party displayed by the hon. gentleman—and the hon. gentleman knows how sincere it was—lest we had made a mistake and thereby put off indefinitely our chance of returning to office which the hon. gentleman no doubt most sincerely declared or implied, that he desired in the interests of the country, if only we would alter our position in one little matter, or whether the House should most admire the hon. gentleman's grand and magnificent explanation of the devotion to fixed principles, which has so uniformly distinguished not only the hon. gentleman but all the hon. gentleman's colleagues in all the many years he has been acquainted with them. It does infinite credit to the hon. gentleman's command of face, when we recall the events of the last few months and recollect that the apostle to-night of fixed principle is the same Minister of Finance, who was a member of the self-same Cabinet about a year ago, when they explained to the British Government and to this House, that the concessions demanded by the Americans could not possibly be made to them without treason to their country and without utterly destroying the entire value of our fisheries, and who twelve days ago came down with propositions to this House enforced with all the hon. gentleman's eloquence and energy, in which he proved to us most conclusively that his late colleagues (or his present colleagues I should say) had not quite fully understood the situation, that they had gone a little too far, and that he in his wisdom had come to see the necessity of a totally different conclusion and to make them see it too. Sir, is this adherent, this apostle as I said, of fixed principles the self-same hon. gentleman, a member of the self-same Cabinet who twelve months ago compelled this House by an enormous majority to declare that disallowance must be rigorously practised in Manitoba at the peril of the most tremendous consequences to the people of this country who had invested so many million dollars in developing that country, who about three months ago, as the papers laid on the Table of the House show, addressed a formal communication of the greatest weight to the English Government, in which he pointed out that the greatest interests of Canada would be imperilled if these pernicious Manitobans were permitted to construct a railway of 60 miles to the American frontier; and who are at this present moment in the act and instant—not of free grace or free will, but on compulsion, applied directly to them by these same despised Manitobans—of proposing to us to add to the enormous burdens of the people of this country in order to compensate a well-paid corporation for giving up a monopoly which those men of fixed principles told us could not be given up without the greatest peril to this country? Are they the self-same parties who a few weeks ago declared—although there the hon. gentleman was not inconsistent—that it was in the highest degree treasonable and traitorous to this country to ask that certain goods which the Ameri-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

cans had put on their free list, should also be placed on ours, and who, about a week thereafter, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, who had the good sense to see where their senseless obstinacy was leading them, issued a proclamation to do that which they declared, only a week before, could not be attempted without treason to this country? Sir, one is almost tempted to ask, are there, if I may be permitted to use the phrase, two Tupperts or one Tupper in the field? We know that the hon. gentleman can show two distinct faces rather irreconcilable to the situation. But are there two wholly different gentlemen, one of whom was present twelve months ago, and one of whom is present to-day? I rather think not; I rather think that when nature made the mould in which the hon. gentleman is cast, she broke it forthwith; and perhaps it was just as well. Sir, here we have this same hon. gentleman, who is so touchingly afraid lest the Opposition should become inconsistent, declaring in one breath—and there I agree with him—that Canadians in a fair field are able to hold their own in any country under heaven, and in the next breath deprecating competition by these same Canadians with the people of the United States. We have had these gentlemen boasting of what Manitoba has done in spite of a high and vile tariff, in spite of a viler land policy, and in spite of a vilest railway monopoly; and we hear this same hon. gentleman, who is responsible for the tariff and the land policy, and more than any other man in Canada responsible for the railway monopoly, absolutely congratulating us on the progress which is likely to ensue in Manitoba when these disabilities, and most of all, this last disability, are removed. Sir, we had the hon. gentleman declaring, in one breath, that unrestricted reciprocity was a folly, and in the next admitting that he had offered that same thing, just to see what the Americans would say about it. Sir, the hon. gentleman told us—and there again I rather agree with him—that it did not commit him to anything. What, Mr. Speaker, in the name of wonder, could commit this Government or any member of it to anything, I should like to know? He asked us why it was that the Liberal party never reminded the Government of the statutory offer of the United States—as if it was our business to acquaint them with what passed in the United States. I have the *Hansard* of 1886 under my hand, showing that for an hour I, myself, my hon. friend from Bothwell, and others of my hon. friends here, pleaded with the hon. gentleman, who sits behind him, not to impose those enormous and exorbitant duties on green fruits and other things coming into the country, because the Americans had made them free, and because, as I told him, we were bound, by our statutory offer likewise, to put them on the free list. The hon. gentleman declared, and perhaps declared truly, that I had a hundred applications to add to the burdens of the people in the shape of new taxes for one which was made to him. Sir, that may be true. What, I should like to know, have the hon. gentleman and his colleagues left untaxed? Look over the free list from end to end, and can he or any of his friends point out to me one single article which enters into the general consumption of the people of Canada that is left untaxed, save only the articles of tea, and one particular species of coal? The hon. gentleman desires to know if we should go back to 1874. Sir, there is no such luck for the people of Canada. I would to heaven that we could go back to 1874. I would to heaven that we could undo the villainous mischief, the era of folly and extravagance which have disgraced the history of Canada during the last ten years. But, Sir, unhappily no such thing is possible, and we must recognise the changed situation. The hon. gentleman declared—and upon my word, audacious as he is, I wondered to hear any man in his position, or any position, make such a statement—that the effect of putting additional duties on iron was to pro-

duce new discoveries of iron ore in the neighborhood of Port Arthur and elsewhere; and he also declared, on the authority of a gentleman who had been greatly enriched by his iron taxation, that he never heard of a consumer who complained of those duties. Sir, the hon. gentleman must have been deaf in both ears. If there is one subject more than another on which complaints have been rung into my ears from the day the hon. gentleman put on his duties to the present time, it is the oppressive incidence of those iron taxes on vast classes of our population. And then, Sir, the hon. gentleman wound up by declaring that no man in the United States, no party in the United States, and not one single journal of repute in the United States, would go in for unrestricted reciprocity, but he did not add, as defined by a high commissioner and plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper. Sir, I agree with the hon. gentleman in this, that if our proposition had been such as he defined it to be, if it had been one for annulling and repealing the whole system of trade of the United States, and for turning Canada into a vast smuggling depot from which people at pleasure might import goods into any part of the United States, it was the maddest folly to propound any such proposition. But, Sir, when did any man in this House, when did any journal of the Liberal party, or any other party, ever profess to expect that the Americans would entertain any proposition for unrestricted reciprocity which at the same time meant free trade with England? If the hon. gentleman had done me the honor to read the speech I delivered on the question, he would have seen that several pages were devoted to pointing out that it was of the essence and necessity of any proposition made by Canada for unrestricted reciprocity, that we must discriminate in certain lines of goods against England and all other countries; and I defy the hon. gentleman to say that he can name any journal or any man of note in the United States, who, if that had been explained to them, who, if the proposition had been placed before them as I have placed it in document before this House, would have declared that they would refuse to consider it. If the hon. gentleman will look at the language of Secretary Bayard, if he will look at the language which President Cleveland, time and again, has addressed to the Congress of the United States, if he will look at the language used by Mr. Mr. Butterworth in his Bill, he will see that he is wholly mistaken in supposing that such a proposition as the one we advanced has been refused or criticised in an unfriendly fashion by the distinguished gentleman to whom I have referred, or, for that matter, by any other public men of note in the United States. But it is interesting to note—and I call on my hon. friends to take special note of it, I call on the press to take special note of it, I call on the people of Canada to take special note of it—that the hon. gentleman by his own words admits that he and his party are utterly unable to solve or to grapple with this problem. I well believe it. There is no doubt whatever that to grapple successfully with the great enterprise to which we have set our hands, requires the greatest prudence, and the greatest economy. There is no doubt it requires a knowledge of the first principles on which honest taxation should be based, it requires the greatest wisdom for the welfare of Canada and not for retaining place by grants to combines and trusts and monopolies; it requires the greatest statesmanship and patriotism—a statesmanship and patriotism not of the order which, in two periods amounting together to fifteen years, has trebled the debt and the taxes of the people of Canada; not of the order of statesmanship and patriotism which has succeeded in those periods in driving away something like two millions of people from our shores; not of the order of statesmanship and patriotism which succeeded in provoking two rebellions in the North-West and would have provoked the third, had these hon. gentlemen not cooled down in time and surrendered to force

and threats what they would not give to justice and reason. For the rest, I have to tell the hon. gentleman what he, as a medical man of renown must know, that it is not our business to prescribe until we are called in. If he and his friends cannot solve this problem, I can tell him that we can, and are prepared to do it in case of need. But I am not going to commit the *gaucherie* of drawing up a budget, out of which he may take such plums as he pleases, and hold me responsible.

Mr. HICKEY. Very sour plums.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was inclined to smile at the tribute which the hon. gentleman paid to my worthy friend, Mr. Blake. I have no hesitation in saying that in the language he used with respect to that eminent statesman, he spoke the simple and literal truth; but it is most noteworthy that these worthies on the other side never discover the purity of statesmanship and the worth of any Liberal leader until that Liberal leader is out of their way. They belong to the tribe, they are the true spiritual descendants of that people whose fathers stoned the prophets and whose descendants built their tombs. So long as Mr. Blake was here, using his great power to unmask the schemes of those hon. gentlemen, how few compliments were paid to him from these benches. So long as my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie was able to lift his voice, as he was wont to do, in defence of the right and truth, so long was his reputation not particularly respected by these hon. gentlemen, but when these two gentlemen have been stricken by the hands of disease, we find all of a sudden hon. gentlemen opposite are awaking to their great virtue and patriotism, particularly if they think any word of theirs can, by any possibility, be twisted to the detriment of the Liberals who survive. I would not wonder that if anything should happen to me and I were compelled to absent myself from political life, I might be canonised in my turn. My patriotism, my loyalty, my statesmanship, and all the rest of it might be flaunted in the faces of my hon. friends on this side, if any good opportunity presented itself, by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I am on the whole content to be where I am; I am not anxious for premature exaltation in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even at the price?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even at the price. I must, however, on behalf of my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, take serious exception to the very gross misconstruction which was placed on his words by the hon. the Minister of Finance. What did Mr. Blake say? I know what he said. I know what Mr. Blake meant, and I have to tell the hon. gentleman this: Let him take my hon. friend's speech from end to end, and you will not find one syllable in it in favor of protection, or in approval of the National Policy. What my hon. friend did was to point out, in very express and particular language, the monstrous injustice of the present tariff, more particularly as it affected the poorer classes of the community and the agricultural classes. What he did was to point out how very grievously the interests of consumers at large had been set at naught in the framing of that tariff, and it is noteworthy that in that very speech, in the speech—because they will not quote the speech, they quote merely fragments from it which suit their purpose—but even in that little fragment quoted my hon. friend expressly declared, in so many words, that relief from these difficulties was to be sought in freer trade relations with the United States. What he did say was this, and hon. gentlemen opposite are welcome to make the most of it: He did state that the folly and extravagance of which those gentlemen and their friends have been guilty for the past ten years had most grievously complicated the whole question, that it would take time and consideration to work our way through it, and, furthermore, that the parties whose inter-

ests were affected had the right to be heard. That is what my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, said, and that was a proper and statesmanlike utterance. I agree with that. I say undoubtedly these gentlemen have complicated the case; I say that time and consideration are required to deal with it, and I say, also, that the parties concerned have a right to and should be heard. But that was all. And I may tell hon. gentlemen this: I made not quite as many speeches as did my hon. friend, Mr. Blake, but I addressed, in all human probability, about 100,000 voters in various parts of Ontario, preliminary to the last elections, and in not one single, solitary speech that I made did I fail to point out to the audience I addressed that the position was so seriously complicated by the extravagance and folly of the Government that I saw no chance of great permanent relief except in much freer trade relations with the United States, and if the hon. the Minister of Finance wished it, I could bring witnesses, not by the score or by the hundred, but by the tens of thousands, to testify that on every possible occasion I indicated freer trade relations with the United States, as the one avenue of relief which was opened to the people of Canada. We can judge perhaps better of the extraordinary accuracy of the hon. gentleman in regard to Mr. Blake's speech, by remembering what he said but a few hours ago with respect to Mr. Mill's new tariff Bill. I have here the speech dated 20th April, in which Mr. Mills introduced that Bill to the Congress of the United States, and I will call the attention of the House to the language which Mr. Mills used with respect to that Bill, as to which the hon. gentleman gave us to understand it is practically a protective measure. What says Mr. Mills?

"The policy which is being pursued now, may for a while suit the demands of the capitalists who have money invested in the various factories and enterprises of that kind in the country. They may be able by the aid of these pools, trusts and combines, which seem to be springing out of the earth all around us, to secure for a time the capital invested. But what, I ask you, is to become, in the meantime, of the poor laborer when they shut off their fires, when they turn him into the streets and determine that they will limit the product of their establishments in order to keep up prices so as to save the profits on their investments? And yet they call this the American policy. I repel it, Sir, it is not American. It is the reverse of American. That policy is American which clings most closely to the fundamental idea that underlies our institutions and upon which the whole superstructure of our Government is erected, and that idea is freedom—freedom secured by the guarantees of Government; freedom to think, to speak, to write; freedom to go where we please, select our own occupations; freedom to labor when we please and where we please; freedom to receive and enjoy all the results of our labor; freedom to sell our products, and freedom to buy the products of others, and freedom to markets for the products of our labor, without which the freedom of labor is restricted and denied. Freedom from restraints in working and marketing the products of our toil, except such as may be necessary in the interest of the Government. Freedom from all unnecessary burdens; freedom from all exactions upon the citizen except such as may be necessary to support an honest, efficient, and economical administration of the Government that guarantees to him protection to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' Freedom from all taxation except that which is levied for the support of the Government; freedom from taxation levied for the purpose of enriching favored classes by the spoliation and plunder of the people; freedom from all systems of taxation that do not fall with 'equal and exact justice upon all'—that do not raise the revenues of Government in the way that is least burdensome to the people and with the least disturbance to their business."

I think that, when having access to that document, which was as free to him as to me, the hon. gentleman should have so thoroughly misconceived the spirit of Mr. Mills' resolutions, he can hardly be held to be a very good or a very accurate guide as to the meaning of a particular passage in Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern. I feel that, to a certain extent, this debate has been discounted. A good deal that might properly come in the course of the Budget debate has been anticipated in our debate on unrestricted reciprocity, and I must add that, while I was disappointed that the hon. gentleman was not present during the other debate, I was also somewhat disappointed in the line which he has taken to-day. I had thought, and I had some reason to think, that the hon. Minister had recognised in a great

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

measure the difficulties of our situation. If he has, and I am not certain that he has not, realised these difficulties, at any rate to a great degree, then the statement we have heard is only another proof of the extreme difficulty, even in the case of a capable and resolute man, as I admit the hon. Minister to be, in retracting his steps and getting out of the difficult position into which the country has been plunged. I thought he had seen the signs of the times, and I think that to some extent he still does see them, and that he saw the changes which are imminent in the United States and how they would inevitably affect us, but the hon. gentleman perhaps is indifferent, perhaps he has made up his mind to leave us, and under those circumstances it may be that the hon. gentleman does not care needlessly to embroil himself with his colleagues further than he has already done. Still, it is to be regretted, because the hon. gentleman had at this moment the opportunity, if he so saw fit, of bringing about, I think, a great and wholesome alteration in the policy of this country; and, as I have said on another occasion, I am inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman really and truly desired to do so, although circumstances were too strong for him, and he was obliged to leave the work he had begun unfinished. I noticed that, in his preliminary remarks, the hon. gentleman called our attention to the fact that he had expected a deficit of \$300,000 on the transactions of the year 1887, and that, by some remarkable exercise of skill and ingenuity, that deficit had been avoided. I proceed to point out to the House how it was that the misfortune of having to declare a deficit has been avoided. I find that the first expedient which suggested itself to the hon. gentleman was a simple one, to be sure. The hon. gentleman stated as you will observe, that, whereas he had expected a deficit of \$300,000, he found himself unexpectedly in possession of a surplus of \$97,313, and this is the way in which that pleasant result was brought about: For the last four or five years, after discussion, after special agreement on the part of his leader, it has been arranged and agreed that receipts for Dominion lands sold in the North-West shall go to capital account, as shall also the expenditure for surveys and purposes of that nature go to capital account. That has been done ever since 1880, as these public accounts show. What does the hon. gentleman? All of a sudden he reverses the policy formally enunciated by the Prime Minister, and charges the expenditure to capital account, but credits the amount of \$191,781 for receipts on account of sales of Dominion lands to income; and so, unexpectedly as he says, he converts a deficit of at least \$300,000 into a surplus of over \$97,000. But the hon. gentleman was not then at the end of his resources. In former years, under his predecessor for two successive years, the cost of suppressing the rebellion in the North-West was properly charged to consolidated revenue, inasmuch as we had nothing but gunpowder smoke to show for that expenditure; but it was not convenient to do that on the present occasion, and so the hon. gentleman opens a new account which he calls a territorial account, and he credits to that \$293,917 on account of this North-West Rebellion expenditure, instead of charging it in the ordinary way. Thus, by getting rid of items which his predecessors had charged to consolidated revenue for years and years, to the amount of \$456,000, he forces a balance of \$97,313. The hon. gentleman's original statement, it turns out, was perfectly correct, because the actual deficit was \$348,996; but it was not convenient to have a deficit reported when he was leaving the Finance Department, and, so, by a species of legerdemain, this deficit has been turned into a surplus. It is very ingenious, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman, for the sake of producing a wholly fictitious balance, should have allowed himself to be a party to what is purely and simply a case of cooking accounts. If you take the Public Accounts for 1887, you will see that,

from 1881 to 1886, not one farthing of the receipts for Dominion lands was credited to the consolidated fund, and you will also see that the Postmaster General, during his time, most properly and correctly charged to ordinary expenditure the very large sums which were expended in 1885-86 for the purpose of putting down the rebellion in the North-West and defraying the losses thereby. Now, in that respect I am bound to say that the Postmaster General set the Minister of Finance an excellent example, and it is very much to be regretted that he departed from it, more particularly after the special agreement which was entered into on that subject between myself and the First Minister, and to which, for fear of accident, I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance, because I really think the item ought to be reversed. This matter came up as far back as 28th April, 1880, and after some discussion between myself and the present Premier, after I had pointed out the necessity of having the account arranged in this way, if he chose to charge the expenditure for service to capital account, he replied:

"A special land account can be kept for this, for which credit will be given for all moneys received, and in which all charges for surveys, &c., will be charged."

That was repeated the year after, and an account was opened, as I have shown, for four or five successive years by the hon. gentleman's predecessor. Now, Sir, I will not detain the House at present by pointing out, as I have often done before, the fact that it is a very dubious policy indeed to allow expenditure for ordinary rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway to be charged to capital account. I think the good sense of the House is with me in thinking that such matters as rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway should certainly come under current account; otherwise we will never be able to know where we stand as regards the expenditure upon that railway. I have my doubts whether it is altogether in consonance with sound book-keeping to go on keeping a perpetually open account for every building that he chooses to add to the enormous pile of buildings which we have already erected here for parliamentary purposes. I think it is time, also, that that account should be closed. However, I am not going to insist on that. The points I have alluded to, I think, admit of no dispute, and they show only too clearly that on the present occasion the public accounts of Canada have been cooked, and cooked to the extent of \$456,000, so as to convert a real deficit of \$350,000 into a nominal surplus of \$97,000. Sir, in reviewing the estimate which the hon. gentleman has brought down, and as to which he correctly stated that he believed a large addition would have to be made on the public works and mail subsidies, I find that he proposed to spend \$35,421,000. Now, the hon. gentleman gave us no hint whatever as to what amount would be required for mail subsidies, but I am strongly inclined to believe that we will be fortunate if we escape, under existing circumstances, with less than about \$500,000 on that account. I fear, also, that, looking at the experience of previous years, which is the only guide we have, that the Indians and Mounted Police together are likely to absorb a couple of hundred thousand more than the hon. gentleman has estimated for. There is no doubt whatever that he will have to ask for at least \$500,000 additional for public works. It is probable that railways and canals, judging from the statements which the hon. gentleman himself brought down, and for which I am indebted to him, in which I observe a charge of \$477,000 in addition to the large sum already asked for on railway expenditure—it is only too probable, I say, that we may add at least \$200,000 more to the amount estimated for railways and canals. For interest, as I understood himself to admit, something like \$200,000 is likely to be charged; and there remains if we are to have an Election Act at all the necessity of providing for the registration of voters, which on the plan laid down by the hon. gentleman, cannot

be done for less than \$250,000. Now, Sir, the total result is this, that we have arrived, and this is substantially in accord with the statement of the hon. gentleman, to an annual expenditure of \$37,000,000 a year, and if we have a Franchise Bill, of thirty-seven millions and a quarter, not to speak of other matters which I shall presently allude to. Sir, the hon. gentleman admitted candidly and frankly, it is to his credit, that, so far as he could not see, things had come to such a pass that our probable income would hardly exceed \$36,000,000 and our expenditure would be about \$37,000,000. So that we are not only confronted with a past deficit as I said of \$300,000 or \$400,000 and I fear a possible deficit for this year, but an almost certain deficit on the hon. gentleman's own showing of \$1,000,000 for 1889. Now, I say that is rather a serious state of affairs and more particularly as the hon. gentleman made no proposition whatever for the purpose of grappling with that deficit. He trusts to the chapter of accidents, he leaves it to his successor. Sir, the time was when I recollect that the hon. gentleman used to denounce such a policy in a most ferocious language and he could find hardly any words sufficiently severe to stigmatise my colleague when under very peculiar circumstances he thought it was the lesser of two evils to save the people from excessive taxation and to face a possible deficit of \$1,000,000 a year. Now, it is important that we should be accurate here, because although the hon. gentleman treated the matter very lightly indeed there can be no doubt that there are very heavy liabilities looming up before the people of Canada. The House will remember that I took occasion to warn and caution the hon. gentleman last year of the inevitable result which would ensue from the grant which he proposed to make to Prince Edward Island. I pointed out to him that if he gave half a million to that island on any pretext whatever, he must lay his account to be confronted with an equal demand from all the other Provinces in the Confederation. I pointed out to him, also, that this pernicious system of railway subsidies, which he is now apparently desirous of stopping, involved consequences which could not be stopped, that he had opened the door wide and he could not shut it. He had laid down a principle which involved the necessity, if the case was fairly and honorably dealt with, of dealing with it on a large and generous scale, and of compensating those localities which were not provided with railroads, or had spent their own money in providing themselves with railroads. I pointed all that out, and if the hon. gentleman had any doubts as to the correctness of my foresight on that occasion, I think that the resolutions passed at the Interprovincial Conference which took place a few months ago, must have roused him from his dream and dissipated his delusion. There, Sir, he finds that the Premiers and the Ministers of the various Provinces united in council, took the ground, and took it, so far as I can see, incontrovertibly, that the present Government, by their conduct in violating the Federal Act, by their conduct in making these grants without reason, or any special cause, to particular localities and particular Provinces, had utterly destroyed the whole financial basis of this Confederation. As the hon. gentleman well knows, they proceeded to formulate their demands, involving, if these demands are acceded to—and the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have rendered it exceedingly difficult to find any just ground for refusing them involving in addition to the public burthen of about a million and a half a year, if capitalised, an addition to our total indebtedness of something like 40,000,000. Then, Sir—and a remarkable omission it was from beginning to end—I did not hear one word used by the hon. gentleman to point out to us the fact that there is now on the journals of the House a proposition by himself and his Government, involving a charge of \$525,000 a year for 50 years

to come in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not one word respecting that very heavy liability did the hon. gentleman say. Sir, the hon. gentleman might have, with propriety perhaps, deferred the discussion of this until these resolutions were before the House; but in a financial statement the hon. gentleman, I think, was bound to call the attention of the country to the fact that engagements had been entered into by the Government of which he was a member with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company involving a charge for more than the lifetime of every man I now address of \$525,000 a year. I am not going to discuss that in detail, I will merely say at the present moment that seems to me to be trebly objectionable. It seems to be objectionable, in the first place, because the hon. gentleman does not propose apparently to give us any data by which we can estimate the real value of the rights we are called upon to purchase; nor do I think it would be possible for him to give it. In the next place, it is quite clear that the concession will involve other very large concessions to various other portions of the Dominion, that we will not be allowed to guarantee this half million to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, without making concessions to other parts of the Dominion that will involve a loss of many millions to our assets and practically an addition of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to our public burden. I might add that it appears to me, likewise, that the hon. gentleman and his friends were guilty of very gross negligence in this, that when they were making concessions in times past to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when that company was suing them for aid, which it was necessary for it to receive, although cautioned and warned by us of the necessity of arming themselves with power to deal with this very monopoly, they obstinately refused to do so. They had the power then to have got control of the monopoly question into their own hands, and if they had thought it was in the public interest they could have maintained it, but under those circumstances, we would have been free agents in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I need not comment on the utter violation of pledges made time without number by hon. gentlemen to this House and to the people of this country. Here is another final, final, final bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, every man knows, and none better than the First Minister and none better than the Finance Minister, that the moment the ink is dry on this contract new propositions will be made, new demands will be made; the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is certain to have some other proposition to make, and it will seek to rescind its bargain when convenient that it should be rescinded. Nor did the hon. gentleman, although he has formally announced, or his colleagues have formally announced to this House that there were negotiations now going on with the Island of Newfoundland for its admission into the Union. Did he say one word to us of those negotiations, or did he ever allude in the slightest way to the responsibilities we might be called on to assume, and the additional burdens that might be imposed on the people of this country if we entered into any arrangement with that island? I warn those hon. gentlemen that they have no right to entangle this country further at the present time. That is a matter to be gravely considered. There might be situations, there might be occasions on which it might be reasonably prudent for us to undertake the question of the acquisition of Newfoundland; but I say, and I will prove it before I sit down, that of all conceivable times and periods this is the most inopportune to add largely to the burdens of the people of Canada. We have past experience to warn us. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that it was a most unwise and ill-judged step on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite to precipitate as they did the union of British Columbia with us, although Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

there was a great deal more to be said for that step than can be said for the present negotiations with Newfoundland. It did no good to British Columbia, and it very seriously hampered and embarrassed our whole future, and I am afraid the union was one of the greatest blots and the greatest mistake in point of statesmanship that was ever conceived; it was at least ten years too soon, and it would have been infinitely better for the people of British Columbia had they attained their autonomy for that space of time. Sir, I fear again we see Imperial interference. I am afraid the British Government, finding Newfoundland a troublesome colony to deal with, are egging on hon. gentlemen opposite, without much regard to the interests of the people of Canada or the people of Newfoundland in order to rid themselves of the trouble; and I call the attention of the House again to this, that in dealing with Newfoundland there is a series of unsettled and troublesome questions which have bothered and perplexed the British Government for many a long year past. Why, it is well known that one of the most thorny questions in diplomacy are the rights which the people of France still assert over a large part of the Newfoundland coast; and does the hon. gentleman suppose, does this House suppose, after the experience we have had of our fate in dealing with our own possessions in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, that if we get possession of Newfoundland with all these questions involved, Imperial necessities would not compel us to play second fiddle to the people of France just as they have compelled us to play second fiddle to the people of the United States on the fishery question. Sir, I have no time to speak of all the other propositions alleged to be in the air, although the hon. gentleman has declared that, with certain exceptions, which he was too wise to specify in detail, he and the Government want to stop all expenditures on public works and all expenditures of capital account. Who does not know that there are demands for canals, for railways, for bridges across our great rivers, who does not know that all these different proposals are being pressed on hon. gentlemen opposite, and that under certain political exigencies these demands will be conceded? I should like the House to consider what the sum would amount to if these projects or demands for which the hon. gentleman has opened the door so wide be carried out? I venture to say we will not escape from our settlement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, including sums we will have to pay to other parties to get their support to the bargain, for one penny less than \$25,000,000. I venture to say that if we allow ourselves to be entangled in negotiations for the acquisition of Newfoundland, it will mean a charge of about \$1,000,000 to the annual expenditure of this country in one way and another over and above all we can obtain from that colony. I venture to say that sooner and later, and probably sooner than later, hon. gentlemen opposite will find they will have cut the ground completely from under their feet by their past actions as regards the demands of the several Provinces, and they will have to concede to them a sum which, if capitalised will amount to \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 more. There is a sum of one hundred millions of dollars of added debt, if those sums were capitalised, staring us in the face, largely in consequence of the unexampled imprudence and folly with which hon. gentlemen opposite have conducted the affairs of this country. Sir, I say this has arisen to a very great degree from one fundamental error, I might add from one fundamental crime, because from first to last hon. gentlemen opposite have deliberately disregarded the very essence of our federal constitution. From first to last they have grasped at more than they could manage, they have insisted on taking the second step before they have taken the first, and now we see the consequences of that folly. Some weeks ago I showed, and I will not repeat what I said, where this had landed us. The Finance Minister might possibly have made a better defence of the conduct

of the Government than his colleagues made had he been here, but up to the present time the facts I then advanced has had no refutation, and have hardly met with a contradiction. We had the flimsiest apology for the deplorable condition into which the hon. gentleman's party has brought Canada. Now, Sir, it is perfectly notorious that from the first, the present leader of this Government never liked the federal system, never approved of it and never believed in it. I will not say that he has maliciously and of set purpose applied himself to destroy the federal constitution, but I will say this, that the worst foe of the federal constitution would have acted precisely as that hon. gentleman has done. I say that from first to last, in every possible shape and way, the hon. gentleman has set himself to destroy and undermine the leading principles of our constitution. And at what a cost in men and money to Canada has that been done? Why, Sir, from 1867 to this present year of 1888, our own records, our own census returns, our own statistics show that the conduct of the hon. gentleman has cost us about one million of native-born Canadians and about three-quarters of a million of immigrants who sought our shores intending to stay here. In that same space of time, if I am to include the possible indebtedness which the hon. gentleman is now prepared to add, he has added something like \$200,000,000 to our national debt. In that same space of time, if you regard, not the nominal sum which goes into the treasury, but the real addition to the taxes of the people, the hon. gentleman has added about \$30,000,000 a year to the annual taxation—the real genuine taxation which comes out of the people's pockets. That, Sir, is a record of which very few other men indeed, in this or any other country, can boast, and there is no doubt, Sir, that the hon. gentleman for once, at any rate, in his life, spoke the exact and simple truth, when at Quebec some months ago, he declared that one thing his friends might be certain of, and that was: If the wretched Grits succeeded him they would find no surplus to dissipate. Never, Sir, was there a prophet who so thoroughly believed and who is more determined to keep his word than the hon. the First Minister. Now, Sir, I am going to address myself to-night to show two or three matters of most practical moment to the people of this country. And first of all, I shall point out the relative expenditure of Canada as compared with the expenditure in England and the United States, in those matters which are not fixed charges and which are under the control of Government and of Parliament. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we were told that no economy could be practised; no substantial economy could be practised in the affairs of Canada. We were told, Sir, that with such skill, and with such excellence were our affairs managed that it would be practically impossible for me, or for anybody else to affect any material reduction. Sir, I am content to point to my past record. We found a controllable expenditure of some \$9,000,000 a year and we cut it down to something like six and a-half million dollars, and, Sir, what we did before we can do again. But what I want to call your attention more particularly to is the actual present controllable expenditure of Canada and the United States. I have here, Sir, the Treasury returns of the United States and I call the attention of this House to them for a few moments. It is a very curious thing that the actual expenditure of the United States for the past year amounted to \$267,000,000 all told. Of that \$75,000,000 were for war pensions, \$47,000,000 for interest on debt, and some one hundred odd millions were for army, and navy, and such purposes as these. The total expenditure, less the army and navy charges and war pensions and items such as we head under "collection of revenue," the total expenditure of the United States for the purposes such as we call controllable expenditure, with the solitary exception of the expenditure on our militia amounted to \$54,732,000, the rest was for army and navy

43-1888-4

and interest and pensions and customs and inland revenue charges, and here are the details in my hand. The United States, Sir, with 60,000,000 of people require \$54,000,000 for all ordinary purposes of expenditure, that is to say they carried on their controllable expenditure for just 90 cents per head and about the same amount I notice is estimated for the year 1888-89. What is our expenditure? I will not go over it in minute details but I will imitate the hon. gentleman and give the details to the reporter here. Canada for present purposes has similar items:

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Civil Government..... | \$ 1,300,000 |
| Legislation..... | 700,000 |
| Superannuation and Judges' Pensions.... | 290,000 |
| Public Works..... | 2,250,000 |
| Indians..... | 1,200,000 |
| Mounted Police..... | 800,000 |
| Fisheries..... | 400,000 |
| Penitentiaries..... | 360,000 |
| Justice..... | 700,000 |
| Emigration Account..... | 350,000 |
| Franchise Bill..... | 300,000 |
| Miscellaneous..... | 500,000 |
| Light-houses..... | 600,000 |
| Minor items..... | 300,000 |
| Mail Subsidies and Ocean Service..... | 700,000 |
| Deficits Post Office and Public Works..... | 2,000,000 |
| Total..... | \$12,950,000 |

I will say comparatively that beginning with civil government, \$1,300,000 go for legislation and superannuation and public works and including—as it is included here—the deficits of post office and public works, our expenditure amounted to \$12,950,000. Assuming our population to be 4,500,000 whites or 4,600,000, if hon. gentlemen opposite like, our controllable expenditure for the same purposes is \$3 per head nearly for the people of Canada as against 90 cents per head for the people of the United States. This is a fact that may well make hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House ponder, and if they want the details I shall be happy to supply them to the Minister of Finance or any of his friends. More than that, Sir, those hon. gentlemen perhaps will object to the United States as being a Republican country, and they are too proud spirited to take a lesson in needed economy from republican countries. I have looked to the expenditure in England and I find in England a similar state of things to the United States. England be it remembered is a country having a legislative form of Government and a comparison, therefore, is not fair to England. It is too much in our favor, unless I were to include our subsidies which I do not propose to do. I find in England, excluding services of education and similar services and their legal expenditure, I find their civil list amounts to £1,000,000 sterling; their public works £1,708,000; their civil departments £2,468,000, with which we have nothing to compare; their foreign and colonial services, £617,000, of which we have nothing to compare either. Such of their non-effective and controllable services as may be fairly put in comparison is £500,000; miscellaneous, £48,000. So that, Sir, in England they contrive to discharge substantially the same services that we discharge for \$12,950,000 (or deducting our charges for justice \$12,200,000,) they in England discharge those for £6,321,000 sterling or about \$31,000,000 a year with a population of 36,000,000 of people, or nearly the self-same amount that the people of the United States require. You get, Sir, this rather remarkable result, that we in Canada, a young nation and by no means as wealthy a nation as England or the United States, for those controllable services which are under the special charge of the Government and Parliament and in which economy can be exercised, we require to-day per head about three times as much as is needed in England or the United States. What makes this matter very much worse in my judgment is this: This huge expenditure, for huge it is, either in comparison with our resources, or in comparison with the expenditure of

England and the United States has raised up a system of taxation of which I say that it would be hard to find in any other country a system more oppressive to the great mass of the people. Now, Sir, that is denied by Ministers. When I made this statement in the course of a recent debate the late Minister of the Interior took occasion to say that under the present system the poor men could get on practically without any taxation at all. Sir, I take issue in the strongest possible terms with any such assertion. I say in the first place that no system of indirect taxation can spare the poor man if it is an oppressive system of indirect taxation and not supplemented by heavy direct taxation. I say, in the second place, that our system is especially a bad one. Our system taxes the poor man's food, or many portion of it; it taxes his tools, it taxes his medicine, it taxes his clothes, it taxes his furniture, it taxes his crockery, and everything that he has, except possibly the one article of tea. All other things, with the exception of certain descriptions of food, are heavily taxed under our tariff. He was followed by the hon. Minister of Marine, who declared, like the hon. Minister of the Interior, that the tariff does not press on the poor man; and challenged us to name any article the duty on which pressed on the poor man. Sir, I reverse the challenge. I challenge him, I challenge the hon. Minister of Finance, I challenge any and all of those gentlemen, to name one single article which enters into the consumption of the poor man which we import which is not taxed, except the one article of tea. You can get old masters free, you can get rough diamonds free, you can get raw cottons and other articles for the benefit of the manufacturers free; but you will not find on our free list one single thing that enters into the consumption of every man that comes in free except the one article of tea. Then the hon. gentleman undertook to dilate on the case of the farmer, declaring that every article that goes into the food of the farmer's family escapes taxation. What about sugar, I should like to ask him? Does it not go into the food of the farmer's family, and does it escape taxation? What about dried fruits, rice and a host of minor articles? The hon. gentleman is virtuous, no doubt, but he would surely admit that there would be more cakes if he would cut off the ale, which some people deem a necessary article of consumption. Now, Sir, the truth is this: Our system of taxation, among its many other evils, is especially hard on the thrifty workingman and artisan. I have the details of the average expenses of an ordinary family, of which the head possesses an income of \$400 a year; I have had several estimates given me, and have made a sort of rough average of the amount of taxation paid in Canada by an ordinary mechanic receiving that income, and having a wife and three or four children. I find that such a family will consume 2 lbs. of sugar a day, on which the taxes, although not necessarily going into the treasury, amount to at least \$5 a year; it would consume of dried fruits, rice, and similar articles about \$10 worth a year, on which the taxes would amount to \$3; its clothing—and it is a low estimate—amounts to about \$85, on which the taxes amount to about \$30 a year; and when you take into account the increased cost of their outfit of tools, furniture, bedding, crockeryware, &c., there is not the slightest doubt that their annual taxes on these items amount to not less than \$10 a year. In other words, an ordinary artisan or mechanic receiving \$400 a year, is taxed under your tariff, though the taxes do not necessarily go into the treasury, but are for the benefit of some trust or combination, to the tune of \$48 a year on the average. And, Sir, where in some cases, as in the city of St. John, you may fairly make an addition in consequence of the taxes on flour and meal, the taxes of such a mechanic would be increased some \$8 or \$10 more. Now, Sir, I turn to England. Hon. gentlemen are always quoting England. I

SIR, RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

wish they would pay her the compliment of an enlightened adoption of her system. An Englishman, with an income of 30 shillings a week, which is almost equivalent to \$400 a year, only pays necessary taxes—I am not speaking of excise taxes, which are voluntary—at the outside on 20 lbs. of tea, amounting to \$2.50, and on an equal quantity of dried fruits, amounting to about \$1 per annum. So that the English artisan, or operative, or mechanic, with \$400 a year escapes with a taxation of \$3.50 a year, while his Canadian brother has to pay \$48 a year under this beneficent tariff, which the Ministers of State tell us does not practically add one farthing to the expenditure of the poor man. Why, Sir, the very organ which hon. gentlemen opposite have lately established in the city of Toronto, had a calculation the other day which I was rather amused to see, in which it pointed out that a man with an income of \$500 a year was apt to run behind under existing circumstances to the tune of \$60 or \$70 a year; and it stated rightly that that was a very unfortunate condition for thrifty, industrious mechanics to find themselves in. Now, Sir, I will point out further that this is exceedingly aggravated by the incidence of the specific duties which hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed. Sir, I need hardly waste many words on this subject, because it must be obvious to everybody who gives the subject one moment's reflection, that when you raise a large portion of your revenue from specific duties, they must necessarily press very heavily and unjustly on the poor man, and give an undue advantage to the wealthy consumer. Now, I find that in such articles as coarse tweeds, for instance, which are worth about a shilling a yard, there is an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. and a specific duty of 7½ cents per pound; so that the man who uses such tweeds has to pay from 44 to 46 per cent., while the rich man using tweeds costing 7 or 8 shillings a yard only pays 20 or 25 per cent. The same is the case with such articles as blankets, on the cheaper kinds of which the duty amounts sometimes to 70, 80, 90 or a 100 per cent., as compared with a duty of 20 or 25 per cent. on the richer and superior article. I am quite aware that it is one of the misfortunes of a heavy tariff that when you have heavy duties they constantly provoke fraud, and it is very much easier to detect frauds on richer goods, by imposing specific duties, than it is by imposing *ad valorem* duties; but there is also this effect, that a specific duty conceals from the people the weight of the taxes and the extreme injustice of those taxes to the poor man in favor of the rich. The hon. gentleman was good enough to devote a large part of his speech to a eulogy of the beneficial results of those enormous taxes on iron which he imposed last year, and he had recourse to a very old and very stale artifice. Instead of pointing out to us what was the amount of the duties imposed on those kinds of iron which went into consumption, he masses his duties together and says that the average is only so much. Now, I have here a statement from a gentleman in the trade, in which he points out that the hon. gentleman's charges are now as follows:—On pig iron, which at present—or when this estimate was made out—was worth about \$12 a ton, the hon. gentleman places a duty of \$4, amounting to 33 per cent.; on puddled bars, which were worth at the time of this estimate, \$16 a ton, the hon. gentleman charges a duty of \$9, or 60 per cent.; on ordinary bars, which were worth \$22 a ton, he places a duty of \$13, amounting to about 60 per cent. also. These are not, by any means, the worst of these duties. There are some duties which range up to 75 per cent. or 80 per cent., and I will call the attention of the House to the way in which those duties affect an ordinary farmer, in order that we may see what right the agricultural classes have to consider that their interests are protected under the present tariff. Some time ago, I caused to be made by an exceedingly competent party an estimate of the

amount of iron which would be used in a very ordinary dwelling house if erected by a farmer. I find it would require some \$86 worth of iron, on which the duty ranges from \$24 to \$36 in the articles required. I find that stoves and cutlery, of one kind or another, would cost about \$40, on which the duty would amount to \$12 or \$15; I find that in building his barn, the farmer would require iron to the value of \$64, on which the duty would be \$20 or \$25. Such ordinary tools as he must have would cost \$20 and a duty of \$5. If, as very frequently is the case now in Canada, owing to scarcity of wood, and is universally the case in the North-West, he found it necessary to use wire fencing on his farm, he would probably require for an ordinary farm about 30 cwt. on which he would have to pay some \$45. That is a mere illustration of the incidents of this taxation on iron, as regards certain necessary expenditures on an ordinary farm. But if you want to see how mischievously, how grievously the whole future of the country is compromised—and the words are not too strong—by this suicidal policy of taxing what has now become a prime necessity in farming operations, because no man requires cheap and good iron more than the farmer, I must refer you to the case of a farmer going to Manitoba with the intent of occupying a considerable quantity of land and hoping to bring it into cultivation in a short space of time. In the case of the four first articles I have named, the dwelling, stoves, barns and tools, the estimate is pretty much the same. On the first four items, the Manitoba settler would be mulcted in about from \$61 to \$75. Of wire fencing he would probably require a considerable amount, because there is no wood at all in most parts of Manitoba, he would probably require about 50 cwt., on which he would have to pay a tax of \$75; and in order to farm properly in Manitoba, the farmer must have a large quantity of agricultural implements, not less, as I am informed, in order to start fairly and properly, than \$600 or \$700 worth. Well, on those implements our beneficent Government, for the purpose of encouraging settlement in Manitoba, has placed a duty of 35 per cent., and has, at one blow, in that article alone, added \$200 to \$250 to their cost. When you add to that the enormous taxation on clothing, bedding, lumber, furniture, even the tarred paper used in his shanty, and on every article the settler needs, you must allow for at least \$120 or \$140 more. And it is absolutely demonstrable that this policy of high taxation practically inflicts a fine of \$400 or \$500 on every settler who goes from Ontario to Manitoba and desires to farm any considerable quantity of land and possesses means enough to supply himself with the proper outfit. This may be said to be in some cases a little mitigated by the exemption on settlers' effects, and that, perhaps, applies with more force to persons who come from the older countries as regards the latter line of articles, but it is of no use to settlers coming from the other Provinces of the Dominion, and those are the most valuable settlers. I might add further that the effect of these huge taxes on iron is inevitably to add to the cost of working and constructing railroads, and in that respect hits the farmer both ways. You tax him on everything he requires for his outfit, and you likewise tax the railroads which convey his produce to market, and thereby rob him still further of the proceeds of his toil. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman tell us, with all our experience in these matters, that really, after all, although he had put on this enormous taxation, manufacturers are so kind and so good to us that they do not take full advantage of the taxation; and that although he has put on a tax of \$2 a ton on some articles, he found by experience the manufacturers only take \$1.25 out of us. We should have some explanation of this benevolent feeling on their part. They do not want, perhaps, to pinch the people too suddenly, or, what is the most probable explanation, they have probably not had time enough to form a

combine or trust, and so we have escaped with a charge of only \$1.25 instead of \$2. But the hon. gentleman knows well that this enormous taxation which he has put on, in addition to all the other evils I have described, tends most seriously to interfere with the proper sanitary condition of our cities. It is a direct impediment to the putting down of gas works and the construction of water works. It is preposterous nonsense to talk of these things being given to us by these manufacturers as cheaply as if there were no extra duty. What does the hon. gentleman take us for? Does he not know we have a committee of this House investigating at this moment the various arts, and modes, and ways in which these manufacturers, after brief competition, combine together to put prices up to the highest point that the taxation imposed by the Government will allow. That is the most preposterous argument I have ever heard advanced. If these gentlemen can manufacture as cheaply as we can buy in other countries, what need have they of a protective tariff at all? Sir, I say that this whole policy is both foolish and wicked, and I warn hon. gentlemen and I warn the House, and, as far as I can, I warn the country that we are only beginning to feel the results of this foolish policy. Why, consider for one moment what the tax of \$40 or \$50 a year on frugal, industrious mechanics, factory operatives, artisans, and people of that kind, means. It means nothing more or less than depriving them of the means of making provision for themselves and families in their old age. The tax you take out of them for the purpose of furnishing them with manufacturing associations, wisely used, would supply these men, if they chose to put the money away, with the means of effecting an insurance to the large amount of \$2,000 or \$2,500, to be paid them when they obtain the age of sixty years, or to be paid their families or their agents. It would enable every man to provide himself with a home and a reasonable plot of ground attached. More than that, let the hon. gentleman consider what a terrible disadvantage all this is likely to put us to in entering into competition with our neighbors. No doubt, we are on the eve of seeing great changes in the American tariff policy, and if we go on loading down our farmers and artisans with this heavy taxation at the same moment when the people of the United States are reducing theirs, all I can tell the hon. gentleman is that he will find that we will be exposed to a very much more intense competition with them than we have hitherto experienced. Now, there are a few fallacies and there are a few errors which are constantly cropping up, some of which I noticed in the hon. gentleman's remarks, and in regard to which I would like to say a word or two. In regard to this alleged cheapness which he told us we would obtain from the promotion of home manufactures, in the first place, it is a most dubious question whether there is any increased cheapness at all. I believe that, in a great many cases, it will be found that our manufacturers, when they say they are giving us cheaper articles, are really deteriorating the quality, as has been done in other cases and in other places; but, supposing this is true, if these men can manufacture as cheaply at home as goods can be manufactured elsewhere, what need is there of hedging them round with an artificial protection? Are they not perfectly able to compete in the open market with other people? So far as there has been any reduction in the price of goods, it has arisen from worldwide causes, from causes largely affecting the cheapness of the raw material which enters into the manufactures, and in no way or shape or form is it due to the increased taxation which we have heaped upon ourselves. Then, I would like to say a word or two as to the fears of our manufacturers. As I conceive, the real danger to the manufacturers of Canada will begin the moment the United States reduce their present heavy tariff. Then, as Mr. Chamberlain pointed out, American manufac-

turers will become very formidable rivals not only to English manufacturers but also to Canadian manufacturers; then there will be a slaughter market in earnest, and your present tariff will be inadequate to keep them out, and the manufacturers, not being able to send their products to the United States, will suffer ten times more than they did in the old time of the so-called slaughter market. I am quite aware that the manufacturers are now in some respects in a difficult position. They need, and they know that they need, a much larger market than they now have; and the better class of our manufacturers are in favor of obtaining admission to a larger and freer market. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that, in the case of a great many manufacturers, the cost of production has been increased by the operation of this tariff. Their workmen require more wages in order to live in comfort under the increased cost of articles under the tariff, and, more than that, the necessary effect of a high tariff is to utterly destroy the export trade, as we have had proof advanced time and again by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), and as is shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns. Then, we find in the last place, that the artificial and foolish stimulus which is given to placing capital in certain particularly favored lines ends in producing a home competition which is much more formidable than the foreign competition, or results, as we have seen, in inducing the manufacturers to combine together for their own profit, but to the great injury of the consuming public. Then, there is another fallacy which is constantly advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think the Minister of Finance mentioned it to-night, but it is often brought before the attention of the House. That is the fallacy that it costs nothing to the people of this country to assume provincial debts, that, though a Province is managed as foolishly or as extravagantly as you will, it costs nothing if the Dominion steps in and relieves the Province from the results of its extravagance. I deny that altogether. I say that is contrary to the fundamental principles on which our federal constitution is based. I say it is at once a wrong to the Dominion and to the Province, and I have regarded from the first with the greatest possible apprehension the consequences of the policy which the hon. gentlemen have introduced, and which having now been adopted, renders it almost imperative that we should revise the constitutional basis of Confederation, if it be possible to adopt some system or some scheme by which we can put an end once and for all, to the incessant forays which are made on the Federal Treasury. I think we have shown that a most radical reform is necessary. We have indicated to the hon. gentlemen how that might best be obtained. We have pointed that out, and, as the hon. gentleman was not here at the time, I will briefly point out the uncontradicted and uncontrovertible reasons which have led us to this conclusion. We have pointed out how formidable has been the movement of population as against us. We have pointed out that in 20 or 25 years we have lost 2,000,000 of our people or of those who came here in order to settle in Canada. We have pointed out that in that space of time there has been an enormous reduction in the volume of trade, measured *per capita*, so that in 15 years, the total volume of trade *per capita* is 50 per cent. less than it was long before this policy was introduced. We have pointed out that the hon. gentlemen have contrived in that time to treble our debt and to treble our taxes. We have pointed out—and it is one of the very few points that the hon. gentleman attempted to contravene to-day—that there was, after all, a complete failure to create an interprovincial trade of any magnitude. We did not deny that there had been some intercourse, but we pointed out that so weak and feeble was the current of trade that, after all the enormous expenditure to which we had gone for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. gentlemen were unable to make that

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

railway pay its own working expenses by many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and there can be no better proof than that of the total failure of their efforts to create an interprovincial trade. If that interprovincial trade could be properly obtained, it would not be necessary to convey goods from one part of the country to the other at less than the cost of transport, and that is what has constantly been done on that railway, and that is the real cause of the constant deficit which has already been pointed out in regard to that road. The hon. gentleman has been compelled to admit that this augmentation of trade of which he boasts has been obtained absolutely and entirely by conveying goods on that road below the cost of transport, and there can be no greater condemnation than the policy which he has adopted. As for his allegation touching the large increase in the coasting trade, it may be as well to remind him of the explanation which was given a short time ago by one of my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, who pointed out with great force that the nominal increase of trade was almost entirely due to the fact that the customs regulations were more strictly enforced, that there were not any more ships or any more real business, but that more reports were made of vessels which went from one port to another, and that there was hardly any increase in the coasting trade, if there was any. We have pointed out the lamentable failure which had attended the efforts of the hon. gentlemen to settle the North-West in spite of the enormous expenditure of money which has been made there. We have pointed out their failure to make their other public works pay. We have pointed out that practically there were but two customers for Canada to deal with, the people of England and the people of the United States, and we have shown very good reasons for believing that, were we able to obtain free trade with the United States, our commerce would spring up by leaps and bounds, that it would vastly increase, and that it would become not less than one hundred fold in excess of what we are ever likely to obtain by all the steamship subsidies, all the delegations, all the arrangements which the hon. gentleman can make with the antipodes, or with South America, or with all the ends of the earth, to which he proposes to send his trusted friends. And we pointed out also the fact, bearing very heavily on us at present, that we had completely reversed our position towards the United States, that whereas we started on our career with a debt one-third that of the United States, with taxation only one-third that of the United States, our debt to-day was two and a-half times as great as that of the United States, and our necessary taxation was at least 50 per cent. greater than the necessary taxation of the United States. Well, what answer was made to all that? Why, Sir, practically the very facts I stated were admitted. I do not believe a single fact of importance was challenged; I know that not a single fact which I advanced was overthrown. There were two feeble attempts made to reply, and two only; one was as to the value of lands in the Province of Ontario, and another was as to the egress of population from 1873 to 1879. Now, I will say a word or two on that subject. My statement was, and I repeat it here, that there has been, within the last few years, a decided and heavy fall in the actual selling value of property throughout the Province of Ontario. What was the reply of the hon. gentlemen? They did not dispute my assertion that there had been a fall in the actual selling value, but they said: Look at Mr. Blue's statistics, and you will find that Mr. Blue reports a small increase in the value of farm lands in 1887 as compared with the average value of farm lands for several years back. Well, I looked at Mr. Blue's statistics, and I found this very important fact: I found that Mr. Blue gave the value of land in the Province of Ontario as follows:—In 1883 the number of acres in occupation was 21,458,067; the value of

land, \$654,793,000. In 1887 Mr. Blue gives the total quantity of land at 21,799,017 acres, that is, 340,950 acres more; and he gives the value of land, not the selling but the estimated value, at \$636,883,000, being just \$17,909,000 less than in 1883, and, Sir, that was the case, although 340,000 acres of new land had been added, and 560,000 acres more had been cleared. There, Sir, according to the authority that these hon. gentlemen quoted, the value of land in Ontario was less in 1887 than it was in 1883 by 28,000,000, after allowing for the additional acreage brought in. Sir, it so happened that on the very day and hour that I was speaking a gentleman well acquainted with this subject addressed a letter to me of which I will read a short extract to the House, and I beg the House to note that this letter is dated on the 12th of March, 1888, two days before I had made this statement in the House of Commons. This communication is as follows:—

"In my almost daily communication with the farming community as inspector for a loan company here, on knowing something of the strain put upon the country at the present time, I have been led to study the situation seriously, and I am convinced that the country never was in a more plight, financially, than it is at present. Lands that could have been readily sold in Western Ontario five and six years ago at \$30 to \$80 per acre, cannot find a market now at \$10 to \$50, and in any township there are dozens of farms for sale and no buyers, and it is very difficult to say what the end of such a state of things will be, except we get relief from some quarter.

"No doubt you will have the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries thrown in your face in contradiction of the statement as to depreciation in value of farm land and while I am free to admit that they are computed honestly, probably from the best data obtainable still as to the value of farm lands, they are terribly misleading. The number of acres sown in wheat, oats, barley, &c., price of cleared and wild per acre, &c., are probably returned complete, and from the average of this return the tables are computed. A farmer can tell exactly how many horses, cattle and sheep he has, also how many acres he has in wheat, oats or barley, but if he gives the price of his land he invariably puts it down at the highest price he has ever been offered, or bases his figures on some price generally that has been paid in his neighborhood adding for improvements he has made in the meantime at cost, hence the misleading character of that portion of the statistics. I have gone over these sheets carefully in townships where I knew the parties and the farms well, and found that it was generally the best, most independent and enterprising farmers who made returns and while they gave the other statistics correctly, they invariably place their land at a great deal more than it is worth and we find the same thing occur in applications for loans."

I shall not trouble the House with the remainder of this letter, which is in the same strain, as it is somewhat longer than I care to read through at the present moment. Now, here is a communication volunteered to me by a man whom I know to be exceedingly well acquainted with the value of land in Ontario. I, myself, have had large experience for many years in dealing with farm lands in various parts of this country, and I know for a positive fact that you cannot obtain to-day, in many parts of the country, within 20 or 25 per cent. of the price which was freely and readily paid for farms but a few years ago. But I have a challenge to give to the hon. gentlemen, if they dispute my assertion, if they think that the actual selling value of land has maintained itself. There is no use in appealing to statistics as to estimated values, but it would be in their power, as the Government of Canada, to apply to those men who are practically conversant with the selling value, to apply to the sheriffs, the registrars, the county attorneys and county judges, all of whom, in various ways, are continually made acquainted with the actual selling value of land. If they dare to dispute my assertion, let them apply to these authorities, and I venture to say that they will find that I am only too well justified in the statement I make, that there has been a large and formidable reduction in the selling value of land throughout a great part of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on many occasions have dared to talk to us about the egress of the population from Canada, they have dared imply that there was as great an exodus from Canada while Mr. Mackenzie controlled the affairs of this country, as under their régime. Sir, I have the same statistics before me to which they appealed, and I call the atten-

tion of the House to the absolute increase which took place in Ontario in two periods of seven years, one period from 1872 to 1879, covering the whole period during which Mr. Mackenzie held the reins of power; the other period from 1879 to 1886, covering seven years while hon. gentlemen were in power. Sir, we find that in Ontario the total population increased in seven years from 1872 to 1879 by 250,782 souls; in other words, the natural increase was maintained within a very small fraction. The rural population of Ontario increased from 1872 to 1873 by 80,958 souls. We turn to the period from 1879 to 1886, and we find that under hon. gentlemen opposite the total population of Ontario in a similar period increased just 145,000 souls as against 250,000 under the régime of my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie. We also find that the rural population increased 15,631 souls from 1879 to 1886 as against 80,958 in Mr. Mackenzie's time. So, Sir, the actual increase of the Province of Ontario was very nearly double in the seven years for which Mr. Mackenzie was mainly responsible to what it was under hon. gentlemen opposite, and the increase of the rural population, the farming population, the true backbone and sinew of the country, was six times as great under Mr. Mackenzie as it was under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that, be it remembered, in spite of a very large immigration which came in during the latter seven years as against a very small immigration which came into this country in the first years to which I have alluded. As to the allegation that the poor pay no taxes I will say no more; I think I have dealt sufficiently with that particular misstatement. But I have this to say, that our position now is such that it requires the most serious consideration at our hands. What is it in brief? In brief it is this: We have contracted a huge debt, huge in proportion to our population and in proportion to our resources, a debt almost as great per head as that with which the Americans emerged from their civil war. For that debt we have nothing whatever to show except a set of assets so unprofitable that they involve an annual charge on the people of this country of not far short of one million dollars a year in order to make up the difference between the working expenses and the receipts we obtain from that source. We are on the eve of risking an enormous increase, as if our position was not already sufficiently serious. We have been, I say, most scandalously extravagant in every particular of our controllable expenditure. Why, I turn to the United States' accounts, which after all afford the best ground for comparison, because they have a federal constitution on which our own was very closely modeled; and I call attention again, as I have called attention before, to this very remarkable fact, that forty years ago, in 1845, the United States, having an army and navy to maintain, having considerable pensions to pay, were able with twenty millions of people to conduct their whole expenditure for \$22,919,000 a year, while Canada with 4,500,000 or 4,600,000 souls requires, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, \$37,000,000 to discharge the expenditures which the United States, with an army and navy to boot, discharged for \$23,000,000 in 1845. I have pointed out that our controllable outlay is so great that to-day, for about the same services, we charge the people of Canada three times as much as the people of England or the people of the United States are charged. I have pointed out likewise that our system of taxation is most injurious to the workingman, that the thrifty workingman who denies himself for the sake of his family all luxuries, whether tobacco, spirits, beer or wine, is obliged to pay for the necessaries of life for himself and his family one thousand per cent more than a workingman in the same position in life has to pay in England. I have pointed out that this is aggravated by specific duties so constructed as to compel the poor man, who under our indirect system of taxation is already taxed out of all proportion to

his means and income, to pay fifty per cent. while his rich fellow citizens pay twenty-two or twenty-three per cent. I have pointed out that taxes appear to be so designed and levied as to be specially injurious to the farming population above all other portions of our population, and that has been aggravated in a high degree by these identical iron duties, for the imposition of which the Finance Minister takes so much credit, and that they are specially calculated to impede the settlement of the North-West and Manitoba, on the rapid progress of which so much of the future of this country depends. One thing must be admitted. If the design of hon. gentlemen was to keep back the farmers and impede settlement they have been remarkably successful for they seem to have succeeded, according to the statistics I have quoted, in bringing the rural population of Ontario to a perfect and complete standstill, and in the case of Manitoba where we ought to have had to-day four hundred thousand or five hundred thousand people, they have been so successful in impeding settlement that in the same period of time during which Dakota has acquired three hundred thousand or four hundred thousand people, composed largely of Canadians, we have only added thirty thousand people to the population of Manitoba. I think it is desirable we should put our views on record. I think that there is good reason we should do so, because it appears to me that the danger is always looming nearer. It appears to me that my hon. friends would do well in future discussions to emphasise the fact that a very great change is imminent in the United States and that great change is likely to affect the people of Canada very seriously. The hon. gentleman cannot be ignorant of the very remarkable ground taken by President Cleveland in his recent Message to Congress. He knows what that foreshadows, that the great party in the United States have inscribed "reduction of taxation" on their banners, and that there is every reason to believe that those banners will lead them to victory at the next Presidential election, and I would call the hon. gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the language in which the highest authority in the United States spoke of that system of protection to which the hon. gentleman would have us believe the people of the United States are fondly wed. Says President Cleveland:

"But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchased for use those imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid duty."

The Finance Minister will note that President Cleveland agrees precisely with the doctrine which I have laid down, and which has been constantly laid down by this side of the House, as to the effect of those vicious, inequitable and illogical tariff laws. President Cleveland goes on to say:

"So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefore nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon in the public treasury, but the great majority of our citizens who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people. Nor can the workers in manufactures fail to understand that while a high tariff is claimed to be necessary to allow the payment of remunerative wages, it certainly results in a very large increase in the prices of nearly all sorts of manufactures which in almost countless forms he needs for the use of him-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

self and family. He receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and, perhaps, before he reaches home, is obliged, in a purchase for family use, of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase in price, which the tariff permits, the hard earned compensation of many days of toil."

And he goes on to point out at great length and with great force how unfavorable this vicious and inequitable taxation hampers the farmer and prevents him competing on fair terms with the inhabitants of every country in the world, and how greatly for the interest of the American farmer it is that those taxes should be swept away. So the Ways and Means Committee, have likewise pointed out at very considerable length to their fellow-countrymen, what is the assured and inevitable result of that vaunted home competition of which we have heard so much and which was said to be so certain and so likely to produce cheapness and to reduce prices to the people of this country if they would only consent to go on for a little raising their tariff higher and higher and excluding foreign goods from importation. Here, Sir, is the report of the Ways and Means Committee which I commend to the special attention of that hon. gentleman:

"There is a persistent pressure by manufacturers for the specific duty, because it conceals from the people the amount of taxes they are compelled to pay to the manufacturer. The specific duty always discriminates in favor of the costly article and against the cheaper one, and therefore it imposes a heavier burden as it goes down from the highest priced articles to the lowest. This discrimination is peculiarly oppressive in woolen and cotton goods, which are necessities of life to all classes of people."

Then it proceeds to point out that the inevitable result of excluding foreign goods, first of all, to produce an intense home competition, and next, and very speedily, to bring together "combines" and "trusts" all the manufacturers of a particular article who will make rules to close as many manufactories as are necessary to keep the highest price of the goods they produce up to the highest possible figure. President Cleveland's message, and the statements of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Bill which has been recently brought into the United States are undoubtedly glad tidings for all honest toilers in the United States. But they are also this: They are a warning for the people of Canada and to the Government of Canada, to set their house in order, and the hon. the Minister of Finance is too able and capable a man not to know what the consequences are likely to be to us if we refuse to accept that warning. The hon. gentleman knows right well that if the American taxes are largely reduced, as most probably they will be, that we may prepare ourselves for a most intense competition with American producers in all walks of life, and that that competition will assail not merely our farmers but our manufacturers in every possible shape and way, and that, Sir, if our position is further injured with further heavy taxes of the sort which he has been imposing, we may also look to see a redoubled exodus of our people, of far greater proportions than we have already had to deplore in this country. Now, Sir, I shall not dwell further on that unpleasant theme. I will say this, that one thing is certain: Every million of fresh debt which we add to the encumbrances of this country, every dollar of yearly expenditure which we incur, every new liability we assume, are all and each of them a fresh nail in the coffin of the commercial and political independence of Canada. Every one and all of them mean, Sir, an additional millstone around our necks, an additional fetter on our hands and a fresh disadvantage in coming to fair and full trade relations with the people of the United States, in which, as I have said, the best and truest safety of the people of this country lies. Within the last 20 years it appears to me that there have been two possible policies, either of which might have resulted in great advantage to the people of this country. One of those policies was the policy developed by my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie in his time. That was a policy of prudence, a policy of economy,

a policy which meant to solidify the ground as we went on. That hon. gentleman, with his native sagacity, saw that there was great danger to us if we persisted in heaping up debt and taxes in the reckless way which had been done for some years before he succeeded to power. He saw the danger, and his policy would have gone far to prevent it if it had been adhered to. I think my hon. friends will do well to note, and to call the attention of their constituents, and the people of Canada, to the results which most assuredly would have followed if Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been adhered to. First of all, there would have been a vastly reduced taxation. In the next place, there is no doubt whatever the people would not have been driven out of Manitoba and the North-West. We would have to-day something of the same state of things as on the other side of the line in Dakota. We would have had a population of 500,000 at least of the best settlers in the world, and we would have had an extra volume of trade backwards and forwards of \$100,000,000 to-day. We would have had a taxation of \$20,000,000, instead of a nominal taxation of \$30,000,000, or a real taxation of \$40,000,000 or \$45,000,000. Our position with respect to the United States would have been infinitely better than our position is to-day. We would have been in 10,000 times a better position to make a good bargain than that which we can possibly hope to make under the present condition of things; and, Sir, in every way it would have been to the great advantage of Canada, if they persevered in that policy which had been inaugurated under unusual disadvantages by my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie. There is a second policy which might lead to equally good results and that was the policy which was lately propounded from this side of the House; a policy which recognised the altered situation, a policy which proposed an effective remedy for all those evils which I have pointed out, and which not one of the Ministers nor any of their colleagues have been able to contradict. The hon. gentlemen may rest assured of this one thing; they may rest assured that the Liberal party is not drifting without a policy or without a rudder either. They may rest assured that we will fight it out on the lines we have commenced, they may rest assured that our policy will be fought out on every hustings, in every farm yard, by every fireside from one end of the Dominion to the other. It is a very false theory to suppose that we are going to quail before any adverse vote, or a hundred adverse votes such as those that were recorded here the other evening. It is an error of our form of representative institutions to suppose that a nominal majority in this House should by any chance represent the real strength of parties in the country, and that applies, no doubt, to hon. gentlemen opposite whilst they were in Opposition as well as to our position when we are in Opposition. But, Sir, least of all does it apply to a question like this, which has not been brought before the people at the last general election. I will give the House a very few figures which may convince some of those hon. gentlemen—if anything can convince them—of the sort of majority on which they are depending as evidence that the people of Canada are determined to maintain their present policy and maintain that in the future. I find that at the last general election there were cast in this Dominion 659,452 votes. Of these there were cast for the Government candidates 332,485; there were cast for the Opposition, 326,967. The difference in favor of hon. gentlemen was about 5,500, and that, too, it will be remembered, in Ontario, at least, by gerrymander, which had the practical effect of disfranchising at least 4,000 or 5,000 Reform votes. In Ontario the Government carried 173,821 votes against 170,150 cast for Opposition candidates. And, Sir, in my own riding, in the riding of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and in the riding of

my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville), there were Reform majorities left unpolled, because we did not want them, which would have wiped out that majority in Ontario altogether, obtained by fraud; aye, by fraud, by villainous fraud, the people of Canada, or at any rate the people of Ontario, were deprived of the right of electing those men whom they would have elected. The fact is that a change of one-third of one per cent would have placed my hon. friend on that side of the House, and those hon. gentlemen on this side in as great a minority as they are in a majority to-day; and I tell hon. gentlemen this. They talk of the will of the people being shown by the majority of the Government in this House. I say there are other assemblies which represent the will of the people fully as much as this House does which are nearer to the people, which are elected under a much honester system, under a system in which there are no returning officers or deputy returning officers to frustrate the will of the people; and to-day I have reason to believe that resolutions in favor of unrestricted reciprocity would be carried in every legislative assembly from one end of this Dominion to the other by just as large majorities as that cast against us here the other night. Now, Sir, I warn the Government of this. I cannot hope to influence the hon. Minister of Finance, because I understand that he is not going to give us the light of his countenance much longer, which for certain good reasons I regret. But I warn the Government that it is in their power to obstruct and delay for a short time what they well know is the true current of the proper will on this subject; but if they do that, they do it at their peril. You may dam it up, you may divert it and delay it; but the consequence will be that the pent-up waters will rise higher and higher until they sweep away you and perhaps much else that you would not like to be swept away. Now, I think it well that our views on this matter should be put on formal record, and therefore in amendment to the motion that you leave the Chair, I move that all the words after the word "That" be left out, in order to add the following:—

"The net debt of the Dominion of Canada was \$140,362,069 on the 30th June, 1878;

"That the net debt of the said Dominion was \$228,235,786 on the 31st March, 1888;

"That the total annual expenditure of the Dominion was \$23,503,158 for the year ending 30th June, 1878, and \$35,658,161 for the year ending 30th June, 1887;

"That the estimated expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1889, is \$35,421,440, wholly apart from divers known unprovided expenditures which will raise the total amount likely to be expended to at least \$37,000,000, being an increase of the net debt to the amount of \$88,000,000, and of the total annual expenditure of \$13,500,000, in the space of 11 years;

"That the said debt and expenditure have increased in a ratio very far in excess of the increase of the wealth and population of the country during the said interval;

"That the said expenditure is provided for by a system of taxation so adjusted as to press with extreme and unjust severity upon the thrifty and industrious producer, and especially upon all farmers, day laborers, mechanics, artisans, and factory operatives, who are at present subject to a Customs taxation on articles necessary to life and comfort amounting to nearly one thousand per cent. more than that levied upon members of the corresponding classes in Great Britain and Ireland;

"That the mischiefs caused by the present system are further aggravated by the very general substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duties whereby the injustice of the existing mode of taxation and the unfair preference shown to rich consumers over the less wealthy is at one and the same time increased and concealed, and that it is expedient that the said injustice should be remedied and that the wealthy classes should be compelled to bear their fair proportionate share of the burden of taxation;

"That this House views with alarm the extremely rapid increase of the debt and taxation of the Dominion, especially in view of the fact that there has been contemporaneously a very great reduction in the debt and amount required for necessary taxation by the United States, and that this House is of opinion that any considerable addition to the debt or taxation of the people of Canada will work very great hardship to the great bulk of the population and will tend powerfully to place them in a position of great disadvantage as regards the people of the United States, besides seriously prejudicing their chances of securing improved commercial relations with the people of that country."

Mr. McLELAN. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. The resolution which the hon. gentleman has offered is so long that it is impossible for us to grasp the different points at once, and the House is so thin that I think the debate had better be adjourned.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have listened with so much attention to the speeches made on both sides to-night that I think we shall require a little time to digest them. Therefore, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Monday, April 30, 1888.

No. 44.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose, with the consent of the House, to make a motion without notice. We are getting on very late in the Session, and, as the House knows, to the general regret of the Parliament of Canada, His Excellency the Governor General will leave here at the end of May. It will, I am quite sure, be a matter of great gratification to him to be enabled to wind up his administration by proroguing the present Parliament, and I would invite the assistance of the House, in the purpose of expediting business so that that object might be accomplished. I am quite sure that the moment I mention this it will receive the general assent of the House if the public interest and the state of public business will allow it; of course, not otherwise. On looking over public Bills and Orders, I do not see that there are very many matters of such paramount importance that we could not facilitate business by giving more time to the measures in the hands of the Government; and if the House will permit, I will move that after answering questions, Government measures should, on Wednesdays, as well as on the other days which are now appropriated to Government measures, take precedence.

Mr. LAURIER. I am quite sure that on this side of the House we will do everything in our power to assist the hon. gentleman in bringing the business of the Session to a close, consistent with public exigencies. I do not think we would have any objection on this side to allow the Government to take next Wednesday and the other Wednesdays following, but I would suggest that the two Bills on the Temperance Act be first on the Orders of the Day for next Wednesday and take Government business afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the Prohibition Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. No, only the Bills to amend the Scott Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is a very good arrangement.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be considered a little invidious to other members who have charge of Bills, not to allow the whole of Wednesday for public Bills and Orders, instead of giving preference to these two Temperance Bills?

44-1888-1

I do not think it would make much difference if the whole of next Wednesday were given to public Bills and Orders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is just the next Wednesday that will make it of importance.

Mr. LAURIER. I made the suggestion because the hon. gentleman some time ago said full opportunity would be given to have those Bills expedited.

Mr. LANDRY. I do not wish to say a word in objection to the motion proposed; but in justice to a Bill I introduced, seven or eight days after the opening of the Session, and which is of considerable importance to the district I have the honor to represent, I must say a word in its behalf. I introduced this Bill at an early day in order that I might have an opportunity of testing the feeling of the House on its second reading, and I have watched it ever since, but it has not been reached, and it is evident, if this suggestion be agreed to, that it will not reach its second reading this Session. It does appear to me that if in the early part of the Session the hon. gentleman would not propose the adjournments at the early hours he generally does, private members would have a better opportunity of having their Bills put through.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The time for members not connected with the Government to press their measures is early in the Session. If an hon. member is in charge of a measure and desires to carry it through, he must see that it is translated, printed in French and English, and put on the paper early. Then he can best ensure its being taken up by the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would be well for the Government to do the same thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the early portion of the Session, there seems to be a general reluctance on the part of the members to put through their measures.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Especially the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is giving us a confession so far as his Government was concerned. We will not confess the same thing. The only chance private members have, in our short Sessions, is to have their measures printed and put on the paper early.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not propose to make any objection to the arrangement arrived with regard to the Temperance Bill, but the hon. the First Minister had better understand that the discussion on the Bill in the hands of the hon. member for Lanark will certainly exhaust Wednesday. He need not expect to have any of Wednesday if that Bill is to remain first in the order. The second order, an Act in relation to railway employees, gets the go by according to this arrangement, unless the hon. the Minister of Finance will say that the Government propose to go on with their railway legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then that Bill can be dealt with at the same time.

Mr. LANDRY. I would not want the observations of the leader of the House to go to my constituents, and to

be interpreted by them in such a way as to imply that I had neglected to proceed with my Bill. What I said was that I presumed these Bills were printed and translated in their regular order, and that was the way in which I understood the proceedings of the House. I do not think there was any neglect on my part in reference to this Bill, and when the leader of the House proposes the adjournment of the House at an early part of the Session, it is difficult for a private member to oppose it. At this stage of the Session, I do not suppose there is any possibility of reaching the Bill, but I certainly wish that the Government should state at the early part of the Session that there will be no possibility of reaching a Bill instead of reserving the statement till a time when it is too late to proceed with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I am here next Session, I shall do so.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the leader of the Government intends to leave Monday to private members?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Monday is a day on which notices of motion come first, and the hon. gentleman is taking the only day on which Public Bills can be reached. Several of the Notices of Motion are of very much less importance than some of the Public Bills; and I would suggest that, instead of taking Wednesday, the hon. gentleman should take Monday. That will give him the same number of days, and will leave the half of a day for Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. McQARTHY. Or take Wednesday's business for Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to that, but, in the first place, I may say that some of the Notices of Motion are really more important than the Public Bills. The list of Public Bills and Orders is not very important, as a rule. Then, on Monday, for whatever reason it may be, there is always a thin House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the Government can get on faster.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are so confident in the merit of our measures that we like to have the House full in order to have the meed of approbation which we receive from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it would be only reasonable, if only one day is left to private members, that it should be a day on which all kinds of business introduced by private members might have a chance of being taken up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection that for the rest of the Session the routine for Monday shall be that laid down for Wednesday. In giving that, we will take the whole of the Wednesday, as we may take the Temperance Bills on Monday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there is any reason to believe that we cannot reach Public Bills and Orders to-day. Unless there is a debate which we cannot foresee upon some Notice of Motion, we may reach Public Bills to-day. At any rate, we make a sacrifice at the end of every Session, and in every Session a number of Bills must be slaughtered at the end.

Mr. CHARLTON. There was no proposition made to interfere with the proceedings to-day, but simply to take Wednesdays after to-day for the Government and to allow the proceedings of Wednesdays to be applied to Mondays after to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like very much to take the whole of next Wednesday, with the view of
Mr. LANDRY.

expediting business, and we will give next Monday the same routine as Wednesday would have. We are certain in that way to get these two Bills upon Monday, and it will not throw them back at all.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentlemen intend to proceed with the Bill which was promised in relation to the North-West, or has that been abandoned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It stands for the second reading. It has been kept back by the difficulty of settling the boundaries of the constituencies, and I think we have that settled now, and the Bill is in the hands of the printers.

Mr. LAURIER. That leaves two heavy Bills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, this is not a heavy Bill. It is only to allow them to elect an Assembly, according to the Bill of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with as few alterations as possible, leaving the new body, altogether elected, to lay their views as to the future before Parliament at our next Session.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman follows the suggestions of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Mills), I am sure it will be a good Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it intended that they should have an executive or an administrative body?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is the Governor to get on?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have copied the Bill of the hon. gentleman *verbatim et literatim*, so that he can easily show how this system will go on without an executive.

Motion agreed to, as follows:—

That Government measures have precedence on Wednesday for the remainder of the Session after Questions to be put by Members, and that the order of business for Mondays hereafter be the order of business for Wednesday, under Rule 19.

FRATERNAL AND BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

Mr. DICKINSON, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) respecting Fraternal and Benevolent Societies. He said: It is well known to members of this House that societies of a fraternal and benevolent nature exist throughout this Dominion, and the membership of such societies is already large. I am informed that they number over 200,000 throughout the Dominion, and this Act is intended to protect the beneficiary in such societies, but it applies more especially to societies which grant privileges of pecuniary benefit to their members or to those who partake of the nature of insurance, as well as other societies which grant those benefits. The Bill provides for a Government inspection and audit of such societies, and also that such societies shall have the privilege of depositing with the Government such sums as may be made necessary by the regulations of the Treasury Board. The Act will not apply to societies doing business within the bounds of only one Province; it only applies to societies doing business in more than one Province, or throughout the Dominion. The Act is promoted more especially by the Independent Order of Foresters, which has been in existence some six years, and has now a membership of nearly 9,000, with a surplus on hand of over \$90,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Civil Service Act, chap. 17 of the

Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: In presenting this measure, I may say that it deals only with matters of detail of minor importance, with the exception, perhaps, of one provision made in order to prevent the personating of candidates at examination, and copying and procuring copies of answers, or procuring papers for examination. There is also a provision that the entrance, promotion and qualifying examinations shall be held at only one sitting. The other details of the Bill will be more fully explained on the second reading.

— Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 117) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, chap. 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: I may state, in introducing this measure, that it is limited to three dispositions, though the length of the Bill might suggest that it contains more important provisions than it really does. The three provisions are these: First, transferring from the Election Act the penalty imposed on a person disqualified for bribery or other corrupt practices; second, to provide means for printing all the electoral lists at the Government printing office, thus reducing the cost of printing by a very large figure; third, to provide that no revision of the lists should be made this year. It has been found impossible to make a revision this year, as it is desired that the lists should be printed at the Government printing offices, which are not yet ready. A saving will be effected in the printing, as will be seen in the report of the Secretary of State, for the first revision, of the difference between \$180,000 and \$7,000 or \$8,000.

Mr. LAURIER. I may say at once that my hon. friend's provision for having the printing so far from the different electoral districts, will, I fear, involve endless confusion. As to the last provision of the Bill, suspending the Act once more, if it were coupled with a provision to have the electoral franchise in the meantime carried out in the different Provinces, I would approve of it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We shall save that amount this year, and I hope to be able to satisfy my hon. friend in respect to the other provisions of the Bill when it comes up for its second reading. I know the prejudices and the wrong impressions that have been created in the public mind, but I hope that all these will vanish when explanations are given to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman made just as confident a promise as did his leader when the Franchise Bill was under consideration. We predicted, on this side of the House, that it would cost at least a quarter of a million dollars to prepare the voters' lists. Our estimate was largely exceeded, and \$410,000 is the charge against the Treasury for preparing the voters' lists for a single year. Now we have in the Province of Ontario a voters' list prepared, a non-political list, made by representatives of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I want to know whether county councils are not non-political bodies? I want to know whether the people have not the same opportunity of electing their party friends on county or township councils as they have in electing members of this House? I want to know whether, in the preparation of these voters' lists, municipal bodies do not act fairly as between the respective parties, and whether the county judges, who are appointments of the Government here, are not the ultimate arbitrators in deciding whether these lists are not properly prepared? Now we can use those lists without their costing us anything, and without requiring

personal supervision, because they are prepared by those who live on the spot, who know the parties. I want to know whether the Government are not prepared now to adopt the lists prepared by the municipal bodies? The hon. gentleman can amend his Bill without difficulty; he can relieve the country of this extraordinary burden that has been imposed upon it; he can restore to the people the representation which has in many cases been taken away from them. The hon. gentlemen dared not put his Bill in operation last year, he dare not put his Bill in operation this year. An hon. friend informs me that he can name a county in which there are more than a thousand electors left off, who, if an election was to occur to-morrow, would be disfranchised. Yet hon. gentlemen persist in imposing this extraordinary and unnecessary burden upon the people in order that the voters' lists may be manipulated by them and their friends.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that Canada, in respect to this Franchise Act, occupies a unique position among the Angle-Saxon commonwealths of the world. We have upon the Statute-book an Act which is confessedly, in a measure, unworkable, and too expensive to be put into operation every year—confessedly so from the fact that the Government have twice suspended the operation of that Act. Now, the practical knowledge we have derived from the carrying out of that Act fairly bears out the observations made by the Opposition when the Bill was under discussion in this House. It was asserted that its operation would be very expensive; and the expense of its operation has proved to be fully as great as was asserted by the Opposition. It was asserted that the operation of the Act would entail very great public inconvenience, and that proved to be the case upon the division taking place when the voters' list was revised for the only time under that Act. It was asserted that the fact that there would exist in each Province two separate sets of voters' lists would create great difficulty and contention; and that has proved to be the case. In the preparation of our voters' list we follow a course different from that pursued in any British community. In England the voters' lists are prepared by the overseers of the poor, and those gentlemen are municipal officers elected by the people. The division of the voters' list in England is a judicial act, performed by a revising barrister, who is appointed, not by the Government, but by the courts. In British colonies, so far as my investigation goes, the voters' lists are formed in the same manner—it is a municipal Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every colony has a separate law.

Mr. CHARLTON. But there is no British colony where the Government assumes this power. It is conceded to be a popular right for the people to exercise in all the colonies, except in this country. If we look to the United States we find that in every one of the thirty-eight States of the Union the preparation of the voters' lists is a municipal act, and the revision is a municipal act in every State except in Oregon, where the list is revised by county court judges. We have a cumbersome, unworkable, tyrannical Act in existence, which has been shown to be such by the experience of the people. Experience bears out every charge made against the Act when it was under discussion in this House, and the Government could not do better than return to the old common sense principle of adopting the Provincial franchise in each Province. That principle was adopted in the American Union when the constitution was adopted. After full discussion, and after four different plans had been thoroughly discussed, the members of the constitutional convention of the United States deliberately adopted the plan of having the qualification of a voter in every State the qualification that would be required for voting for a member of the most numerous branch of the Legis-

lature in each State. That system has worked well for more than a hundred years, and no one would dream of the possibility of adopting such an absurd regulation as to give Congress control of the voters' lists, and have two sets of voters' lists, one for state and another for national purposes. We shall be obliged to abandon the present system, and the sooner we abandon it the better. The sooner hon. gentlemen opposite accept the inevitable in this matter the better it will be for their credit, and for the interests of this country. The common sense principle is to decide that the qualification for a voter for a member of the Dominion House shall be the qualification required in each Province for a voter for a member of the Legislature of that Province. It is a simple, inexpensive, common sense system, which would work no injury, and would enable us to dispense with all the costly machinery connected with the present system, together with the inconvenience caused to the public, and with the confusion which results from having two lists, by which one-half of the voters do not know whether they are on one list or the other, or whether they have a vote at all. I counsel the hon. gentlemen opposite to amend the Bill by adopting the Provincial franchise and return to a common sense system again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Any one who has a practical acquaintance with the printing of the lists will know that the scheme proposed by the Secretary of State will never work. When the lists are printed in the various places there are always a great many errors, both in the christian and sur-names and also in the post office addresses. The county court judge being on the spot goes over them and revises them, after which they are reprinted and accuracy as far as possible is secured. If the work is done here I can see no system by which these errors will be corrected, but the evil existing in the present system will be intensified. I wish the leader of the Government would once for all adopt the proposal made on this side of the House sometime ago and simplify this matter. He has provided a large number of franchises, being driven onward by the force behind him. In this democratic country where wealth is, perhaps, more general than in other countries and where the people, man for man, are better educated politically than in other countries, there is only one logical course to pursue, and that is to provide residential manhood suffrage. That is a proposition which would meet with great favor throughout the country. It is a proposition which we urged some years ago, it is a proposition which the logic of events will compel the Government to accept, and it would be a graceful act on the part of the Government if they were to repeal all the other clauses of the Bill and enact one clause giving residential manhood suffrage.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The Secretary of State thinks that when he made this explanation it would be a perfectly satisfactory one to this side of the House. The hon. gentleman must have been very much mistaken indeed if he thought he could satisfy this House or members on this side of the House with the Bill in its present shape. He has a very easy way of stating, not only to this side of the House, but to his own side of the House and the country as well, that the Bill would be a satisfactory one, at the same time forgetting that the Government have not ventured to carry out this Act for the last two years. They have suspended the operation of their Act for one of two reasons; either, because they were afraid of the outlay involved, especially in view of the statement the Minister of Finance expressed the other day that the Government sought to exercise prudence and economy; or it was because the Act is as distasteful to their own supporters as it is to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Look at what is going on in the country to-day. We have had elections going on almost every week since the House met, and yet to-day in different counties—for example, in Russell where there is an election

Mr. CHARLTON.

now going on—there must be a large number of electors who possess ample qualifications but are unable to vote. It is an arbitrary and a cowardly act, to take away from the people the right to express their opinions at the polls. In Russell, Kent, or in any county where an election is in progress, there are many people who are in a position to be voters, but who, at the will of the Government, are disfranchised. This is an arbitrary Act, and it shows clearly that the Government do not carry out the provisions of the measure both on account of the expense involved and because they know that it is just as distasteful to their own people as it is to hon. members on this side of the House. Does the hon. Secretary of State propose to carry on that Act from year to year until the general election? The hon. gentleman shakes his head. Why not put the Act in force to-day? Why not bring in an amendment that it shall be revised in cases where elections are to be held? If the hon. gentleman will bring in an amendment to his proposal that revision will take place wherever an election is to be held before the House meets next year, it would not be so objectionable, but to defer this from year to year and to disfranchise a large number of voters—not voters, I will correct myself again, but people who are qualified to vote and who would be voters if they had the opportunity—is a very bad principle, and the hon. gentleman brings in a Bill here to-day to prevent their being put on the list. I repeat, Sir, that it is an arbitrary Act and it will be viewed, I believe, by hon. members on both sides and by the country generally, as an attempt to interfere with the liberty of the people in the proper choice and election of members to represent them in this House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is in a warlike mood to-day. He opened the sitting of this House by defending in a soldierly manner those premises against some invasion. He now appears to defend the country against any injury which does not exist.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes, it does.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is true it is well to say "Never say die." The gentlemen on the opposite side were very badly defeated when the principle of this Bill which I desire to amend was before the House, but not being satisfied with the defeat they met there, they went to the polls, and they spoke of our predictions that the principle of the Bill would not cost much to carry out. Nobody on this side of the House made such a statement. We all knew it would cost a great deal of money, and that the introduction of a completely new system necessarily involved a large sum of money. But what was the result of the predictions on the other side? My friends, when the discussion comes up, will be astonished to read or to hear how unfounded were their predictions. They told us that it would cost not less than three-quarters of a million of dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so, and I will prove to my hon. friends that they made that prediction. I have made a little collection of those terrible predictions that have gone into smoke, as most of their predictions have.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It costs too much anyway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with my hon. friend, it costs too much, but the Government are anxious now that it should cost very little. I will satisfy my hon. friend here, if it is possible to satisfy him, as well as the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, perhaps not all but I have the majority of them at least on this point, which is the main part of this Bill, that we will reduce the expenditure to its minimum. It is useless to go on with the discussion now on the introduction of the Bill. It is always better to speak in time, and it is always a great

deal of saving of words and of valuable time when we speak only when the time comes. My hon. friends have now been fighting a Bill which is not yet before the House, and of which they do not know one of the provisions at the present moment. It has been said to us that we have protracted the introduction of this measure for two Sessions. I will give a reason for that at once. The first reason was that we could not introduce the amendments and the modifications which we proposed in this Bill before the House passed the Printing Bill. Last year after the Printing Bill was introduced we thought we could print those voters' lists at the Government Bureau, but it may startle members of this House to know that forty printers working all the working hours of the day would take ten months to print the 6,150 pages of those lists. Those lists will be ready in due time and they will all be prepared for next revision. We have not been able to do it this year because it was physically impossible to do it. My hon. friend has made a complaint that we have not made a provision for any election imposed on the House by the death of members. Death has been busy amongst us this Session, but I hope we will be spared from any further calamities. We have death enough amongst us and I hope we will not have any more new elections from such a cause. It is not right to prevent a county from being represented in Parliament because of delaying the revision of the lists, when revision would take three or four months and when members of the House ask that a writ should be issued immediately. It is but right that those who have run the race on the political ground of their county and when the court has decided the race was not fair, that they should begin on the same ground again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand the objection. My friends say that new-comers should have a right to ask that their vote should be put on the new list, but I do not see that there is any harm done to one side or the other, if the new election takes place with the same list. It may be that a few electors would ask for the privilege of voting when a new election comes around, but that is not a very great loss to the country if they do not vote. In the olden times, lists have been left for three, four and five years without any revision at all in many constituencies. It was not perhaps right, but it was not sufficient to place the interests of the country in danger. I think I will be able to show my friends, when moving for the introduction of the Bill, that the provisions will be acceptable to them, and that it will reduce the expenditure to such a degree that they will find the system quite workable and not very expensive.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The argument of the hon. the Secretary of State shows how important it is that the revision should take place. He admits that the cost has been too much, and that was the point which this side of the House made in our arguments against the Franchise Act. The amounts may have varied but there is one thing clear, as the hon. gentleman admits, that the expenses are too great.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that for the first time it was too large.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The reason given by my hon. friend for not printing the list implies that the expense for the second time would be nearly as great except that he hopes to reduce it in the manner that he points out. The members on this side of the House stated that it would be a great expense to the country, and that prediction has been verified. The Secretary of State is endeavoring to reduce that expense by printing all the lists throughout this Dominion, from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, at Ottawa. Those lists have got to be divided, and it seems to

me that so far as this plan is concerned if it does not increase the expense, it will increase the inefficiency of the list to a very large extent. It was bad enough as it stood on the first revision, but it will probably be worse now, and where any difficulty took place on the first revision it was supposed that the inaccuracy might have been corrected in the second revision. It is my experience, and I think it is the experience of every member of this House that names were left off the list of elector, who had a right to be put on. It might not have been any harm, as the Secretary of State says, but if one man is deprived of his rights of franchise it is a wrong done to them and through him to the entire people. I know a gentleman in the county represented by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), a gentleman who is the local member for that constituency, and a gentleman of wealth, and to-day he is not entitled to vote for a member for the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Was it because of a mistake of the printer?

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Whether in the printing or not his name has been left out. I can give several instances of this kind where names have been omitted last year and where the people thought the mistake would be rectified this year. By this delay now proposed, the people will be again deprived of their franchise. It seems to me that we had better go back to the original principle. So far as the Province from which I come is concerned we have a cheap mode of registering the voters which commends itself to the people, and which is controlled by the people through their revisers—revisers appointed by the municipal authorities and not responsible to the Local Government. It is a cheap and inexpensive mode, and every man who has a right to the franchise can have his vote.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I quite sympathise with the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) in the instance he has given to the House. He refers to Mr. Killam as not being on the list, and I sympathise very strongly with Mr. Killam, because he left the county of Westmoreland where he would have voted against my hon. friend who represents that county, and who could afford to have one adverse vote, and came to Albert to vote against me there.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to point out that the remarks made by the hon. the Secretary of State were the most powerful arguments that have been adduced against the operation of this measure. The hon. Secretary of State tells us that in the preparation and printing of these lists at Ottawa the time of thirty or forty men will be employed for at least ten months. Now, Sir, contrast that with the fact that the lists under the Provincial franchises are prepared without expense and speedily, and when prepared, are more suitable for the purposes for which they are designed than the lists my hon. friend is to expend ten months in preparing here. This fact illustrates more forcibly than almost anything that has been said in this discussion, the cumbersome and unreliable character of this huge, inoperative piece of mechanism.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has rather trespassed on the rules of the House in making a second speech on the introduction of a Bill, and before we have the Bill before us. The discussion has almost entirely gone off on the question of whether the Franchise Act which was passed some two years ago should be repealed or not. Well, that is a fair question for discussion. But that was a reform Bill, which was deliberately adopted by Parliament; it is the law of the land, and like any other reform of a constitutional nature, it is a portion of the constitution of the country, and if it is to be altered it should be altered with due consideration, and after full discussion of the merits of the Bill itself. But this measure of my hon. friend

has nothing to do with that Franchise Bill. It simply relates to the printing of the voters' lists; you ought not to mix the two subjects together. One is a reform Bill. If we should adopt the suggestions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and return to the old system of adopting the franchises as they exist in the different Provinces, we should have to have a new election. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not quite agreed as to what the reform is to be. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says, let us return to the old system, and let the voters' lists as prepared in each Province be the governing franchise. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), says we must come to manhood suffrage.

Mr. DAVIES. I say that is the alternative if you do not take the Provincial lists.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a different proposition. One says, let us have manhood suffrage; the other says, no, we will let each Province state what the franchise is to be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So your constitution provided.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We would fall between two stools if we took the contrary advice of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We would be satisfied no matter what way you fell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If hon. gentlemen state what they want, we will consider it.

Mr. LAURIER. You heard for six weeks, three years ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen did not agree then. They discussed the franchise for six months, I think, but they did not agree.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We did agree.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And if they had brought the force of their united intellects and power to bear upon the question, perhaps the Government would have been forced to succumb. But we escaped defeat. On the contrary, we gained a great victory, so far as numbers constitute a victory, in the carrying of that measure. Now, we are not proposing such a measure as we discussed then; this little Bill of my hon. friend is simply a measure, as he says—and when hon. gentlemen opposite see it they will probably agree with him—which will greatly economise the expense of preparing the voters' lists. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says it is a unique system, which exists in no country in the world, that the Government should regulate the voters' list. The Government do not pretend to regulate or interfere with the voters' lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes, you do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are prepared under the Act by a revising officer in each county, who is in most cases a judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in most cases a judge; and I have not heard any statement that these revising officers have behaved partially. The Government have nothing to do with the preparation of the voters' lists, but, when the voters' lists are made up by the revising officers, the simple proposition of the Government is that they shall be printed in an economical manner; and to that proposition we expect to get the assent of both sides of the House when they see the measure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman let me ask him a question? I understood the hon. Secretary of State to say that it would take ten months to print these lists. The hon. gentleman knows that, as the law now

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

stands, the printing goes on simultaneously all over the country in each electoral district. Now, under this proposition ten months will be occupied in the printing of the lists, and twelve months will pass by before a list can be revised—at all events before some of them can be—so that lists will be in operation in some counties a year before they are in others. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how he proposes to get over that difficulty? because he must see that it is a serious one. Our experience shows that ten per cent. of the old voters go off, and ten per cent. of new voters come on every year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Not five per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A good deal more than ten per cent. in some cases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am speaking of the average.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking of the average too. I would ask the hon. gentleman how he proposes to overcome that difficulty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The system is understood. The lists are settled by the revising officers. The printing of the lists will take considerable time, no doubt. I rather think my hon. friend has exaggerated the time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said it would take about thirty men ten months to do the work, but it will be done in a shorter time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can easily get the necessary number of men to print the lists. When they are once printed they are stereotyped, so that when a list has to be revised, the names to be taken off are picked out, and the names to be added are put in the form; and that will take hardly any time. An enormous saving will be effected by having the lists stereotyped, and having them altered from year to year when the revising officers make their returns.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may perhaps be allowed to make a suggestion, which if accepted may greatly shorten the debate on this Bill when it comes to be considered. I would invite those hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, who would wish to see practically the simple manner in which these lists are going to be printed, as well as the cheapness and regularity of the system, to go to the printing office, where the Superintendent of Printing told me he would be ready not only to give explanations of the system, but to show hon. members, especially those connected with printing establishments, its practical operation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says it will take thirty or forty men ten months to prepare the lists, so that at any rate one-half of the voters' lists used in a general election would be those of a prior year, and all the Government would have to do to carry an election would be to find whether a particular list was favorable, or unfavorable, and to get the lists changed in the order to suit them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend does not understand one thing. When the lists are all prepared, let us say that there is about ten per cent. to be added in the revision. That would be ten per cent. of ten months; and it would take one month when ready, as they will be in three or four months from now to make the corrections. At every revision, not more than one month would be required to make the corrections. My hon. friend will say it is not right to have that delay, but as every district will not be prepared at the same time, the Superintendent of Printing stakes his reputation that not a single constituency will have to wait a single day for its lists, unless the revising officers delay them on purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said it would take ten months to make 215 lists.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those are the lists we are now making, but when printed the type will remain standing. Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York, to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Corby.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the York Farmers' Colonisation Company.—(Mr. McCulla.)

Bill (No. 114) To amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto.—(Mr. Small.)

RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Government that Mr. J. A. Martin, Collector of Customs at the port of Rimouski, is a trader, carrying on business at the present time? If so, whether it intends to take any action in the matter?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government has lately been informed that Mr. Martin, the Collector of Customs at the port of Rimouski has been carrying on a trading business. That will be investigated, and if it is correct, he will be called upon to give up business or to resign his position.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY CONTRACTORS.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the Government intends to adopt means to compel the sureties of Sims & Slater, contractors on the Eastern Section of the Cape Breton Railway, to pay laborers and others who were employed by the said Sims & Slater on the construction of that section of railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Any legal means the Government may have to get these matters settled, of course the Government will take.

TRAVAUX PUBLICS DANS LE COMTÉ DE RIMOUSKI.

M. Fiset: Le gouvernement a-t-il dépensé dans le cours de l'été dernier, les montants votés à la dernière session et mentionnés à la page 55 du budget pour l'année finissant le 30 juin 1888, savoir: Matane—achèvement du brise-lame, \$500,00; jetée du Bic—achèvement, \$780,00; Rivière-Blanche—réparations, \$2,000,00; Rivière-Rimouski, \$1,000,00? Si non, quelles sont les raisons qui ont empêché le gouvernement d'employer les montants ainsi votés pour les réparations et améliorations ci-dessus énoncées?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: L'honorable député a fait erreur dans la colonne des items qui ont été votés pour l'année 1888. S'il réfère de nouveau aux estimés de l'an dernier, il verra que les items qu'il mentionne ont été votés pour l'année précédente, et qu'ils ont été dépensés durant l'année précédente.

QUAI DE MATANE ET DE LA RIVIÈRE BLANCHE.

M. Fiset: Le gouvernement se propose-t-il de mettre dans les estimations supplémentaires les montants nécessaires pour la réparation du quai de Matane et de la rivière Blanche, de même que pour l'achèvement de la jetée du Bic et l'amélioration de la rivière Rimouski?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: Je ne suis pas capable de répondre à l'honorable député dans le moment. Les estimés supplémentaires, aussitôt qu'ils seront devant la Chambre lui donneront la réponse à cette question.

CONTRACT OF MESSRS. ISBESTER AND REID.

Mr. CAMERON asked, Whether the Government have reasonable ground to believe that Messrs. Isbester & Reid will have their contract finished before the expiration of the time limited by their contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that we hope these contractors will finish their work before the time fixed by their contract.

PILOTAGE AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Have the pilotage authorities for the port of North Sydney, Cape Breton, made the yearly returns required of them by the Pilotage Act of 1873? Has the Government taken any, and what steps, to ascertain if the superannuation fund has been, and is now being properly administered by the said pilotage authorities? Has any security been taken from such pilotage authorities, or any of their officials, for the proper distribution of such fund?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no pilotage authority for North Sydney. That is included in the general pilotage authority of Sydney. I do not know that any superannuation fund has been established, but I think there is a fund for the widows of pilots, as I find some items in the accounts for that purpose. No security has been taken for the distribution of such fund; it does not appear to be required. I will further look into the matter.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGEVIER (Quebec Centre) moved for:

Copies of all notices calling for tenders, and of all tenders received, for an improved postal service across the Atlantic; and, also, for copies of all correspondence or documents respecting the said service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw this motion, because it would not be in the interest of the public service that these papers should be laid before the House at present.

Mr. LANGEVIER (Quebec Centre). Am I to understand that the Government propose to take some action in the matter during the coming summer, or is it proposed to leave the service as it is? The object of my motion was to obtain some information in which the public at large and people of Quebec in particular, are greatly interested, that is to say, when we can expect to get an improved postal service on the Atlantic. Sometime ago rumors were published in the newspapers that the Government were to enter into a contract with a certain company for an improved mail service; while not more than a week or two ago, the papers published rumors that the Government did not intend to do anything this year, that they intended to leave matters as they are. This matter has been pending for a long time; it is within the recollection of those who have been members of this House since 1885, that there has ever since been a question of having such improved mail service. The Government proposed to give a new contract to the Allan Steamship Company. The members on this side of the House opposed the renewal of the contract. We all agreed that it

would be better to pay a little more, and get an additional service than to pay even a comparatively small sum and get no service at all. This is a very pressing matter indeed, and a deputation came from Quebec to Ottawa to interview the Government regarding it a short time before the Session. At the present time we are paying for a mail service to Europe, and our own people do not avail themselves of the mail steamers which are subsidised by the Government. I consider that it is an injustice to other steamship lines which ply between Quebec or Montreal and Europe, that one particular company should be singled out and favored by getting a subsidy for doing a service which is considered so inferior to the lines plying between New York and Europe, that even our own merchants scarcely use the line from Quebec at all. Every winter I see our merchants leaving Quebec to go to New York, and taking the Inman or Cunard steamers, or even the French steamers, to go to Europe. This is very much to be regretted, and I consider it is a waste of money to this country to be subsidising any line unless it is sufficiently well equipped to take our own people to Europe, and even people from the United States. I regret very much that the Government do not intend to give this information to the House, not even to say when they will be able to give that service. I do think there could be no objection to laying before the House the tenders that have been sent in. I understand there are only two or three; some of these tenders seem to be what we call in French a *secret de polichinelle*, that is a secret that every one knows. It is known that one or two tenders have been sent in, and also, almost the exact amount, and the terms of each tender, are known generally by those who are engaged in that business. It is very desirable that the Government should be in a position to give us more precise information on the subject, a subject of the greatest interest to the public at large. In the meantime, while we do not get that improved service, we are going on wasting money that is being paid to an insufficient service, to the detriment of other lines which get no subsidy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated just now why we could not bring these papers before the House. I will ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to renew his question and his remarks when the Supplementary Estimates are discussed, on the item relative to mail service on the Atlantic. That will give him an opportunity of bringing up the subject again, and then the Minister who has special charge of that matter will be here, and will be able to give him all the information that the House can desire.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGEVIER (Quebec Centre) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, reports, papers and documents touching the seizure made on F. O. Vallerand, at Quebec.

He said: I should like these papers to be brought down as soon as possible. I know the facts regarding the case of Mr. Vallerand very well, but I desire to know the facts relating to the seizure connected with Mr. Levi, which was a more important one. In the one case that of Mr. Levi, the goods seized were returned; in the other case, that of Mr. Vallerand, they were not returned. The case of Mr. Vallerand was that of goods seized on account of an error committed by a clerk and done in good faith. In the case of Mr. Levi it was a seizure of diamonds and precious stones. After some time the goods were returned, and I do not know whether he was compelled to pay a fine. I should like to see the papers in these cases, not only for myself, but for the information of a great many people of Quebec, especially in order to see what particular ground existed for returning the goods in the case of Mr. Levi, and not returning them in the case of Mr. Vallerand. Mr. Vallerand is a most respectable merchant in the city of Quebec, and I understand the whole trouble arose owing to a mistake, and a very inexcusable mistake, made by a clerk. On the other hand, Mr. Levi was a stranger who came into the country having a large quantity of precious stones, I am told, of the value of \$10,000 or \$12,000, in his trunk. They were seized, but were returned after a short time. Why they were returned, it is impossible to judge, but I should like to see the papers in order to see the reasons assigned.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the papers in connection with both seizures being laid before the House. In the case of Mr. Vallerand the seizure arose from the fact of there having been an enclosure in a package not mentioned in the invoice, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to the law he will find that in such a case the goods are absolutely forfeited and there is no discretion left to the department. Mr. Vallerand was treated in precisely the same manner as all other importers, quite as respectable as he is, are treated. I have no doubt as to the respectability of that gentleman; but in all cases of that kind where the law is positive the importers are treated alike. As to the seizure of diamonds from Mr. Levi, I think, when the papers are laid before the House, the hon. gentleman will see that where the Minister of the department has some discretion in dealing with the case, the decision was of an equitable character. He not only had to pay the duty, but penalties were imposed in addition. I do not desire to go into the facts, because the hon. gentleman will be much better satisfied when he reads all the papers and the decision of the department which contains the reasons for the conclusion arrived at.

Mr. LANGEVIER (Quebec Centre). I do not dispute that the law is as stated by the Minister of Customs; but, if the law is such, it is a very bad law and should be amended as soon as possible. Here we have the cases of two men; in one a seizure occurred from a package, and a very unimportant package, being enclosed in another package and omitted from an invoice, all of which was done in good faith; in the other case it was that of a man who had no invoice, but who concealed goods in his trunk, which goods proved to be of very large value, I am informed not less than \$10,000 or \$12,000 at least. Those precious stones were seized but returned. He was a stranger, and visited Quebec with those stones in his trunk evidently for the purpose of selling them to the trade. I repeat that I do not say the interpretation of the laws laid down by the Minister is incorrect, but I say that it is evidently a very bad law and should be altered.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not admit that the clause is a bad one. It is more moderate now than it was when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, and when they consolidated the law. I did modify it once. I do not think, in the interests of trade, it should be modified again; but it would have been just as well if the hon. gentleman had waited until he had obtained the papers before he expressed the opinion he has given in regard to the diamonds, because one would be led to the conclusion from his remarks that the two cases were analagous. The diamonds were not brought in as the hon. gentleman has said. I will not discuss the question, but will simply say that the information he has received is not strictly accurate.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES.

Mr. MARSHALL moved:

That the establishment of mutually favorable trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies would benefit the agricultural, mining, lumbering and other industries of the latter and would strengthen the Empire by building up its dependencies, and that the Government

should ask the other Colonial Governments to join in approaching the Imperial Government with a view to obtaining such an agreement.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in moving a resolution for the first time in this House, and having taken part in none of the debates or proceedings heretofore, I do not intend to occupy your time for more than a few minutes on this occasion, as I should like to hear hon. members on both sides of this House express their views on this, what I consider a very important question. My object in moving this resolution at this Session is, because I think the time has come when the attention of this House should be drawn to the advisability of extending our trade relations between Great Britain and Canada, whereby the natural products of our country should have the preference in the British market to that of foreign nations or other countries other than her colonies. During the recent debate on unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States in this House, it was admitted on all sides that we should seek the British market for our natural products, and that fact has already been established, because there has not been an hon. member on the opposite side of the House, or on this side either, who has not forcibly laid that principle before the House, and spoken in support of it. They have all admitted that the British market is the market which rules the prices of our surplus products not only of our own country but also of the United States, and all the world. Sir, I have been asked by hon. members since making this notice of motion when I intended bringing my Imperial Federation resolution forward. Now, Sir, I want to say for the information of hon. members that I do not belong to the Imperial Federation League myself, nor neither does my resolution. This subject has been prominently in my mind for some time past, long before I had the honor of occupying a seat in this House, and perhaps more naturally so because being intimately and practically connected with the class of people who would be more directly benefited by such resolutions than any other class of people in Canada, and upon whom I consider, and I think this House considers, by the voices in the past, that upon them depends the welfare and prosperity of this country of ours, and that is the farming and agricultural classes, and it is in their interests that I have been prompted to move in the matter, for when they are benefitted or prosperous the country naturally must be also. But, Sir, as a Canadian, I do not propose to go to the mother country hat-in-hand, as the saying is, to ask a favor off her specially for Canada. I hope while in this House or out of it I will always in my humble way uphold the dignity of Canada. I do not propose to ask England to do anything that would be an injury to herself or her people. What I ask for is a policy of trade relations by which mutual advantages would be secured in the exchange of our natural and manufactured products, as I do not propose, of course, to seek any advantages from England without giving her something in return. The object of the resolution is that we shall have more extended trade relations between Canada and Great Britain, whereby some mutual agreement may be arrived at beneficial to both countries, and extended trade relations with our sister colonies. When I propose that Great Britain and Canada, as well as all the colonies, should be more closely connected, I do not expect that Great Britain will concede specially favorably to us, nor do I ask it. But I do think that if the mother country makes a concession on behalf of the colonies that they will give her something in return, when we remember that such a policy in the Empire will give our people a market with a population of over 320,000,000 instead of having a market of 60,000,000, as proposed by unrestricted reciprocity with the United States—the people with whom we have to principally compete in the British market. It may be said in answer to this proposition that it is all very well

to make a suggestion of this kind, but that England, after adopting her free trade policy for the benefit of her people, will not go back to her old barbarism, or as some people say, of protection, or adopt a protective policy in favor of her colonies. That may be the case, but England's relations with her colonies have been very much changed since free trade was first agitated and adopted as the policy of Great Britain. The free trade policy was first agitated in 1838, or about fifty years ago, and let me ask hon. gentlemen what the position of the North American colonies at that time was and what it is now? Take, for instance, our own country. At that time it was almost unknown to England except as a country of forest and snow, and we are in a position to-day that if our great wheat fields of the North-West and Manitoba were under cultivation they would supply the British markets with wheat by themselves. I should like very much that the Government of the country should take whatever steps may be necessary to bring about such a trade policy, as I do not intend to let this matter rest until some such result has been arrived at.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before you declare the motion carried I desire to say a few words in support of it. The motion is very similar in purpose to the one I had the honor of placing upon the Order paper and which I am afraid there will be no opportunity of moving during the present Session. I have given notice that I would move:

"That it would be in the best interests of the Dominion that such changes should be sought for in the trade relations between the United Kingdom and Canada as would give to Canada advantages in the markets of the Mother Country not allowed to Foreign States, Canada being willing for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favor of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had to the policy adopted in 1879 for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, and to the financial necessities of the Dominion."

The motion which my hon. friend has just proposed is one upon somewhat the same lines. At all events it cannot be said that the motion which I have just read is not germane to the general purpose of that resolution. I undertook, Sir, at a public meeting that was held in the city of Toronto, to bring this subject before the House this Session, and I am very glad that I have this opportunity of doing so. Not that I at all assume that the House is prepared to come to any decision on it this Session, but it is proper, I think, that the matter should be considered, and the arguments—as I believe, the irresistible arguments—in favor of this policy should be known, should be weighed, should be considered. I do not—I may as well disclaim at the outset—I do not at all admit that what we know as the National Policy has been a failure. I do not at all desire to join the band—which is sufficiently large in my view, and perhaps a little too large, on the other side—of those who are always proclaiming, and seem to take a delight in doing so, that the people of this country are in a worse condition than the people of other lands. On the contrary, Sir, I believe that on investigation, the condition of our people will compare favorably with that of any other people who are known to us, or any other people we are brought in contact with; and I think, Sir, it will be found that the policy which we adopted here, and which the country has twice since ratified by a very large vote, has been on the whole beneficial, and that whatever we may be now said to be laboring under is not at all attributable to the policy of protection, or the policy known as the National Policy, but to causes over which we in this Parliament have no more control than the people of Great Britain or the people of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Flies on the wheel.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman reminds us of remark of the financial critic of the Opposition. I do not know that it is particularly apposite to the point I am making, but, at all events, it is always well to remember

that that was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Whether they have forgotten or would like to forget that policy, and adopt more active measures for the promotion of the interests of the country, it is for them and not for me to say. Now, let me deal with one large class of people in this country—the largest class—the farmers and the farming community. We hear a good deal about the manufacturing industries of the country, and I think we do not, perhaps, think any more of them than the great importance of those industries demands. I think we all, or the most of us, at all events, are of opinion that if Canada is ever to attain to that position in the councils of the world that we believe she is entitled to, it cannot be by the promotion and fostering of one industry alone, but that the best results are to be obtained by the promotion and fostering of various industries, and the affording of opportunities to the sons of toil and the people in different branches of life. Therefore I do not at all desire to say that the manufacturing industries of this country, and those engaged in them, are not entitled to every consideration. But we cannot and ought not to lose sight of the fact that the largest proportion of the laboring classes and the toiling millions in this country are engaged in tilling the soil; and those people are entitled to have at the hands of this Parliament full consideration of their wants and aspirations, and all that this Parliament can do to afford them the best market for their produce. It is because I think, Sir, that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is exactly in the wrong direction—because I believe the policy which has been announced here on the other side of the House, and so persistently fought for during a large portion of the Session, would not be giving to the farmers of this country that which they demand, a better market, that I ventured to put the notice on the paper to which I have referred, and that I venture here to make some observations in support of that notice. When we are asked to throw open the market of sixty or sixty-five millions of people, and when we are told in general terms that that would be a great boon to the four or five million people in this country, we ought naturally to enquire—and we should be unworthy of our position here if we did not carry our investigation at least that far—what is the market for our farmers which is sought to be obtained by that policy? Why, Sir, we are competitors in the great market of the world. Our surplus products go to the English market, as do the surplus products, to a very much larger extent, of the people on the other side of the line. They are producers of corn as we are producers of corn; they are producers of cattle as we are; and if we look to the trade returns, of which we have ample store, and which are opened to us all, we shall find that the great market for both countries, as for the whole of this continent, is the British market; and if by any means we can obtain in the British market a more favorable return for our products than is permitted to other countries, that certainly would be a wiser policy than, as has several times been said, to send our coals to Newcastle, to send our products to mix with the mass of the products of the United States, where we could not expect to get a better price. Now, let us see whether these few observations, which are merely introductory to what I intend further on to draw the attention of the House to, are not borne out by the statistics which are open to us. Is the Canadian farmer, according to the knowledge we have—and unfortunately that knowledge is confined mainly, if not entirely, to the statistics in the Province of Ontario—any better off to-day than the farmer of the United States? Whether you look at the quantity he produces or at the price he realises, I venture to say that no hon. gentleman can consult the statistics of the United States without being perfectly and clearly satisfied that the farmer of Ontario at all events—and I do not know why the same remark should not apply to other parts of the Dominion—is better

Mr. MCCARTHY.

off, both as to the quantity he produces and the price he realises, than is the farmer in the United States. Now, Sir, I desire to prove—and I have the statistics here which I think will enable me to prove to the satisfaction of all who desire to realise the true position—that that is the position of the farmers of Canada at this moment. Whether you take, Sir, wheat, or barley, or oats, or rye, or corn even, or hay, or potatoes—taking each and all of these articles, I find that the following may be said to be the net results: In the great article of production in the Province from which I come, an article which in the near future we all hope is to be produced in the great North-West in still greater and ever increasing quantities, it will be found that the average production per acre, as well as the price realised, are in favor of the Ontario farmer, and I believe to the same extent in favor of the farmers in those portions of the Dominion in which those cereals are grown. Now, I have taken the returns of fall wheat for two years; but an examination for a series of years will lead to the same result and perhaps one more favorable to the Canadian farmer. Take fall wheat for the years 1885 and 1886, and I find the net result has been as follows: The average price has been 77½ cents per bushel in the Province of Ontario, and the average product has been 22¼ bushels per acre. During the same period in the United States, the average price was 72 instead of 77 cents, and the product 11¼ as compared with 22¼. The net return, therefore, so far as that part of that product is concerned, shows that the yield per acre in the Province of Ontario has been 9¼ in favor of the Canadian as compared with the American farmer. That result alone, if it is borne out by reference to the other figures which I propose to give, ought not to dishearten us, but ought to rather encourage us, and to show that we are not, as my hon. friends opposite so often preach we are going to ruin. Take barley, the price of barley during these two years in Ontario averaged—hon. gentlemen will understand that the average includes the barley not quite sufficiently good for export or for use by our brewers and also that which is fit for export and fit for use by our domestic manufacturers—53 2 cents and the average product 27¼. On the other side of the line the average price was 56 cents, but the average product was only 22; and the difference, again in favor of the Ontario farmer, is \$2.11 per acre. So in oats, the difference is \$3.70 per acre, the quantity grown in Ontario being an average of 36 bushels per acre compared with 26 bushels on the other side of the line, and the price in Ontario being 31¼ as against 29¼ on the other side of the line. Therefore, both in quantity and in price, the average is in favor of the home farmer. In rye, the product is not very large in either country; but such as it is, the quantity with us is 16¼ bushels per acre as compared with 12 on the other side, or 25 per cent. more in our favor, and the price with us is 53 cents while that on the other side is but 52 cents, showing upon the whole a result favorable to us to the extent of \$1.20 per acre compared with the other side. I cannot make any comparison with regard to peas, because they do not appear to be grown to any considerable extent on the other side. I do not find them in the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture, but the result appears to be reasonably satisfactory, so far as our farmers are concerned, \$28.20 per acre. Take in corn, of course our product is not very large. It is confined, so far as I know, to that part of Ontario which is in the neighborhood of the Detroit river, but our product is 26½ bushels per acre to 24 on the other side, and the price 27 cents on our side against 24 on the other side, the result being favorable to our farmers to the extent of \$10 per acre. Now, hay is grown on both sides; and although the Americans import hay from us and pay the duty, their importation is but for local purposes. Taking the general result, I find that the price

during these two years in Ontario averaged \$9.77 a ton and on the other side averaged \$8.11 a ton, showing a difference in favor of the Canadians of \$1.66 per ton; and the product was \$1.39 in Canada compared with \$1.22 on the other side, the net result being \$3.13 in favor of the Canadian side. Take potatoes, this is the original home of the potatoes.

Mr. CASEY. No, that is in Ireland.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, that is a mistake of my hon. friend. The home of the potato is here, and it shows this result: The price during the two years was 43 cents in Ontario, and on the other side, 44.7 per bushel. And the average product here 123 bushels to the acre compared with 77 bushels on the other side, the difference in value in our favor being the enormous sum per acre of \$24.40. So, whatever article you take that we grow and compare it with a similar article on the other side of the line, the conclusion is inevitable that a value of the farmer of his labor is greater on this side than it is on the other. It may well be said that I am comparing one particular province, perhaps the richest part of the Dominion, with the whole of the United States, and that the comparison in that respect is not fair. I understand perfectly well that my argument is open to that objection, and the objection is so obvious that it has occurred to my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) as well as the others. Surely those hon. gentlemen will not say it is an unfair comparison to compare Ontario with Michigan or with the State of New York. I invite a comparison between these two neighboring States and Ontario, and I maintain it will be found, although not so largely in our favor as the total result by the figures I have already given would indicate, that the result is in favor of the Canadian farmer. Take, for instance, wheat, the value in Ontario as I have already said per acre is \$20. In Michigan it is \$16.17, and in the State of New York \$14.76. Rye, \$8.96 in Ontario, \$6.67 in Michigan, \$7.37 in New York. Oats \$11.27 in Ontario, \$7.71 in Michigan, \$10.05 in New York. Barley \$15.27 in Ontario, \$13.98 in Michigan, \$15.00 in New York. Potatoes \$54.27 in Ontario, \$29.58 in Michigan, \$25.00 in New York. Hay \$14.12 in Ontario, \$12.85 in Michigan, \$13.39 in New York. Corn \$17.86 in Ontario, \$11.00 in Michigan, \$17.00 in New York. In fact, there is not a single article for the year 1885, of which the value to the farmer was not greater in the Province of Ontario than it was in the neighboring States, according to the returns of Michigan and New York. I think that this is a satisfactory reason why I should not stand here representing an agricultural constituency, and pretend to think or to urge that our farmers are going to ruin as compared with those who occupy the same position on the other side of the line. I think it is also a reason why I should not accept the policy which has been enunciated on the other side of the House, and in regard to which we are told that they have nailed their colors to the mast, which they are prepared to stand and fall by; and that affords an argument why I shall be found voting, as I trust I ever shall be found voting, against that policy. But I admit, while that is so, that if this House by any policy can improve the condition of the farmer, it is the bounden duty of this House to do so. I think, therefore, that, while I am not opposed in any sense or form to the policy that I have hitherto supported, while I am prepared to accept that policy with all its consequences, at the same time if it can be shown to us that we have yet another means which is quite consistent with that policy which we have adopted, and consistent with the protection which we have given to our infant manufactures, by which we can benefit our farmers, we are bound to adopt that means; we owe everything to the great producing people of this country, and we are bound to give effect to such a policy. Therefore it is that I

have ventured to propound the policy which I have mentioned, and which is expounded very largely, if not more widely, in the resolution which is now before the Chair. Undoubtedly, while the comparison, so far, is in favor of the Canadian farmer with the American farmer, while it is still more largely in his favor as compared with the English farmer, who, according to statistics, is on the high road to ruin, still we cannot forget or ignore the fact that the price of the cereals, which are suitable articles of export from this country, has been for some years past, and appears still to be, getting lower and lower, so that the farmer does not get now for his product, although he gets more than his neighbor, as much as he did obtain some years ago, and particularly in the product of wheat. On the contrary, that article has been falling in the market so enormously that I will just mention one set of figures as showing the result of that falling off, which must strike us as being of great signification. The export from the United States of wheat and wheat flour alone in 1887, as compared with what it was five years before, has increased to an enormous extent, I think to the extent of over £15,000,000. The cost to the English consumer is no less than £5,000,000 sterling more than it was five years ago. They have purchased from the American farmer wheat and wheat flour to the extent of £15,000,000 more than they did at the period which I have mentioned. Nothing can more illustrate the down grade which this great article of production on this continent has been taken in late years than that. Therefore it behoves us to take into consideration the question whether we might not restore to the farmer the market he has lost in consequence of the enormous competition on the other side of the line.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before entering on the next branch of the subject, I desire to disclaim all hostility to the great American Republic. The motion which I have mentioned, and the views I propose to state, are not grounded at all upon any desire to create feelings of hostility between this country and the neighboring Republic; but I believe that we ought to do here what they appear always to have done there, to make our trade relations with reference to our interests and the interests of the people we represent, without regard to the interests of that neighboring nation. I think we will best fulfil our duty if we endeavor, no matter what the subject may be in connection with trade, to put it in the best possible shape for the people of Canada, without having too much regard to the Acts, the policy, the possibilities, the expectations which we may have from a conciliatory policy on the part of the people on the other side of the line. Perhaps in the past we have all been looking too much to Washington. Certainly we have been expecting more than we have ever obtained from them, and I think we are strong enough and able enough, and I think we will do better, to deal with that great trade question solely in regard to the wishes and wants of our own people, without regard to the policy which is pursued on the other side of the line. Now, we cannot, of course, discuss this question without making some reference to the alternative proposition which has been made this session, and although I have no right, and I do not propose at all to transgress the rule, to make any reference in particular to the discussion which took place on that subject, nevertheless, the two policies are virtually antagonistic. Unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which it is admitted, involves the rearrangement of our tariff, not to suit our own wants, not to suit our own interest, but in order to prevent goods being imported through Canada, and thereby reaching the neighboring Republic. That seems to be practically and

honestly conceded. Then it appears to me that after all, call it what you will, unrestricted reciprocity is but commercial union thinly veiled; because, whether we are to make, by a joint arrangement, our tariff, which, in point of fact, would be having our tariff made for us by the people on the other side; or whether we are to make our tariff according to their wishes, and to bind ourselves to retain that tariff for a certain definite number of years, as in the reciprocity treaty; whether we are to collate our revenue into one bulk and distribute it *per capita*, or in any other way that may be agreed upon, or to collect the revenue coming into this country and to allow them to collect their revenue—all these, in the long run, amount to one and the same thing; and, as I say, I believe it is commercial union thinly veiled. Now that involves, Sir, as an immediate consequence, the disruption of the trade relations which exist between this and the mother country. It would cause us to say to the people of Great Britain: True it is, you have given us an open market; we have for years sent you our goods on free and equal terms, but the country to the south of us, which has denied us an open market, which has imposed a high rate of tariff upon our goods, which has done all that tariff regulations could do in order to impede our trade and to build themselves up at our expense,—because of that very policy, we are now prepared to take them to our bosom and to turn our backs upon the old mother land. Now, not merely is that so, but it is a fact that cannot be denied, that the great bulk of our trade has been, and is, and is still more largely likely to be with Great Britain, than with the United States,—I speak more particularly of that portion of our products which the farmers have to export, the export of agriculture in the broadest sense of that term. Let me just go over, very briefly, a few figures upon that subject. For the last five years I find that our exports to Great Britain—I do not take five years because it brings out any special result; I believe the same result will be found for any other period that may be selected—but I will take the five years from 1883 to 1887, and I find the amount of our agricultural products exported to the mother country amounted to \$114,000,000 odd, or an average of nearly \$23,000,000 for the five years. During the same period our exports of the same products to the United States amounted to the sum of \$28,000,000 or an average of something over \$15,500,000. I do not wish to trouble the House with the exact figures; the general result is quite sufficient for the purpose of my argument. Now, then, the total of these exports of agricultural products for that period came to the large sum of \$192,000,000; or in the ratio of 23 to Great Britain, and 15½ to the United States. When we examine, for that period, the proportions we must be more convinced that our trade is growing with one country while it is falling off with the other—if not falling off, it is certainly not increasing. In 1883, the ratio was 22½ to 1½; in 1884, 20 to 18½; in 1885, 24 to 15; in 1886, 22½ to 15½; in the last year of which we have returns, 27·7 to 15·2, the largest export of any year, and the largest proportion to Great Britain. Now, it would be a policy of madness, as it appears to me, if we, at this stage, should say to the people of Great Britain, who are the great purchasers of our goods, we propose to increase our tariff in such a way that not only can goods come in here intended for the United States, but that the large imports which we are now taking from you, must be very greatly diminished, because the result of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, would be that, to a large extent, these goods would be purchased from the neighboring Republic. That course, I say, is not unattended with danger in a commercial sense; that course would be followed, I believe, very promptly, by scheduling Canada, and preventing us from doing that which we have hitherto done, when we have been enabled to export cattle alive to

Mr. McCARTHY.

the mother country. No greater blow could be struck at the prosperity of the farmer, in my humble judgment, if that growing industry—because it is a growing industry, one which has attained enormous proportions within recent years—nothing could give us so fatal a stab as that the English people should place Canada upon the schedule, and put us in the same position, in that regard, as the United States. We all know the trouble that our High Commissioner, the present Minister of Finance, had in England not many years ago, to prevent that untoward result. We all know the jealousy of the hard-run English and Irish farmer against importations of cattle from a colony like Canada, that does not give any advantages whatever to Britain in our markets; but if we were to raise our tariff, no one can pretend with any show of reason that the English people would not be perfectly justified in scheduling us, and treating us, in that sense, as a hostile people, so far as tariff relations were concerned. Not only would that be so, but if we do not deal with them, if we do not purchase from them, we cannot ship our goods to them with advantage. The very ships that now go there to carry our wheat, come back laden with their goods. But destroy our trade with them, and we would see repeated the complaint made in respect to Maritime Province vessels that go to Boston without any return cargo. That itself would tend to drive our grain and our produce away from the ports of Montreal and Halifax, where we have been spending money and doing all we can, with the highest patriotic efforts, in order to build up those ports and these sea-ways, for it would be driving our goods away towards the ports of the United States. So, whatever way it is looked at, it appears to me it is a policy that must be attended with the greatest disadvantages to this country. Now, what is our position in the English market? It is said we have got all we can possibly get there; we have got absolute free trade, right to take our goods in there. We get that just as all other countries in the world get it, not because we are a colony, not because we are a British possession, but because it is the policy of that country to receive goods on those terms from all parts of the world, so that they may buy in the cheapest market, even although they may be compelled, possibly, to sell in the dearest, and if that is true, if that be the unalterable policy of that country, then there might be some justification for the argument used on the other side of the House; although, Sir, it does appear to me that if nations are to deal in the same way that people deal with one another, it is a strange way of showing our gratitude for all that has been done for this country in the past, by the open market that has been given to us, to take the first opportunity of building up a country to the south of us which has denied us that market in every possible way. Why, Sir, to me it is most astonishing that the free traders in this House, those who have preached free trade so long in this country, should have this as the culmination of their policy, that the country which has denied us free trade, which has built itself up by protection, is to reap a reward from this country, which my hon. friends opposite have all along contended should have adopted free trade. I fancy that gentlemen on the other side of the line, the great statesmen who inaugurated the policy of protection, would if they lived to see this day have reason indeed to be proud of their policy and of its results. They would be able to say: Here is part of the British Empire, a part of that great country which has nailed its colors to the mast so far as free trade is concerned, and we are a country which has adopted the opposite policy of protection. That policy of protection of building up our own manufactures, making and creating a market for our home industry, has been attended with such marvellous results that Canada is knocking at our door, desirous of obtaining the great advantages of the protective country, and is willing to give equal terms to

the United States that she gives to Great Britain. I do not think it is possible in any event that so disastrous a policy as that is likely to prevail. But I am prepared to establish that we have a market in England for everything we produce, that no matter what may happen that market is open to us, and I think I shall be able to satisfy this House that there is good ground to believe and strong ground to hope that there is a party in England which favors the giving of advantages in the English market to the colonies, and that this opinion will before very long prevail. Hon. gentlemen may say that it is an impossibility. Hon. gentlemen may say: What evidence have you of such a result? In the first place, let me point out what the result would be. I have given the figures of our exports of farm produce to England for the past five years. I ask this House, is there any member in it prepared to vote against the proposition that will give to us a preference in the English market of 10 per cent. or any other percentage, no matter how small, upon the agricultural products of this country? Is any person prepared to say that that would not be a policy advantageous to the people of Canada? I see my hon. friend who is distinguished of course as a free trader, Mr. Mills (Bothwell) laughs at the very notion that the English people would do such a suicidal act, in his judgment; but, if he will pardon me, I will come back to that point afterwards, and I will simply say now that there is a strong probability, I will venture to say there is more than a strong probability, that as regards bread-stuffs Great Britain will be obliged to come to that point. I am at present dealing with the question whether it would be advantageous for us, if there is such a party there, if there is a party in England prepared to offer to the colonies, and this is England's greatest colony, advantages in her market which they would not afford to foreigners, a percentage obtained by placing a duty against foreign products, thereby giving a substantial advantage in her markets to Canada as well as to other parts of the Empire. I want to know if there is any person prepared to say that that policy would not be an advantage to the people of this country? Why, take these very \$25,000,000. Ten per cent. on that would be an advantage to our farmers of \$2,500,000 more in addition to \$25,000,000 already received. It would mean a very considerable sum per bushel to every farmer who produces any portion of the produce exported from this country; and whatever may be said about the other part of the question, I do not think any hon. gentleman will deny that that at all events would be an advantage which we ought to be prepared to accept.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) What about the manufacturers?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman, although I propose to deal with that branch of the question a little later. I admit, and my resolution suggests it, and it is a point that has not been lost sight of by gentlemen who favor the policy, that manufacturers must be to a certain extent protected, and to a certain extent they must surrender in favor of the great farming population the extreme protection they possess at this moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will deal with that point in a few moments when I come to discuss that branch of the subject. We need not doubt that there is a market in England for all our products. When I say so I am aware that hon. members know perfectly well that England to-day is importing from the United States 60 per cent. of her bread-stuffs, 15 per cent. coming from India and but a very small proportion indeed from the remaining part of the Empire. There is no question but that there is an ample field for all we can raise or hope to raise in this country for the next thirty years in the English market. The same remark applies

to horned cattle, to cheese, to everything we have to export, even to barley, which we send to the other side of the line; there is not an article that our farmers have to export and which the country has to dispose of for which there is not an ample market in England, and that market can be obtained by excluding, in the differential manner I have mentioned, the exports of foreign countries. Who is in favor of this policy on the other side? I have been at some pains to follow the discussion and the thought in this particular and most interesting branch of politics to Canadians, because whatever else may be said of it I think we all must agree that if there is any large party in England willing to adopt that policy we should stretch out the right hand of fellowship to that party and do all that is possible to support and strengthen it. In 1879 the subject of fair trade, as it was known, was first broached, and the first discussion took place in the press and on platforms, and in 1881 an organisation was formed. I will read the principles, or what we would call the platform of that organisation, showing as it does that from the earliest time the fair traders were in favor of giving advantages to Canada and the other colonies of the Empire in the markets of Great Britain. The first article of the platform was with respect to the formation of commercial treaties. It was suggested and urged at that time, and perhaps not improperly so, that some of the commercial treaties Great Britain had made would prevent her giving terms to her own dependencies than she was prepared to give to other countries with which she had made commercial treaties. The first article of the platform was in opposition to that policy, and for the discontinuance of it in the future. The second article of the platform was this:

"Imports of raw materials for home industries free from every quarter in order that we may compete successfully in the sales of our manufactures."

The third article was that import duties should be placed upon the manufacturers of foreign states refusing to receive our manufactures into their markets free or on a fair exchange, and article four, the one with which we were more immediately concerned, was as follows:—

"A moderate duty to be levied on articles of food from foreign countries, the same being admitted free from all parts of our Empire, in order:

"1. To develop the resources of our own Empire, and to determine the flow of British capital, skill, and industry, henceforth into our own dominions, instead of into protective foreign states where it becomes a force commercially hostile to us.

"2. Thus to transfer the great fruit growing industries which we employ from protective foreign nations where tariff restrictions contract our export trade and diminish its value, to our own colonies and dependencies; where, even now, without such preferential treatment, our labor products are in increasing demand, and are taken per head of the populations, in far greater proportion than those foreign states to which our food custom is now chiefly given."

That was the policy laid down by an organisation known as the Fair Trade League. That league is still in existence, and before I am done I shall be able to show hon. gentlemen that the principles of the league have been adopted by the party that now rules in Great Britain. But there are some words to which, with the consent of the House, I venture to draw attention, written by one of the distinguished members of that league—a gentleman who occupied so high a position that he was afterwards appointed one of the Royal Commission on the depression of trade—Mr. Farrar Ecroyd of Bradford. He wrote on this subject and his letters were afterwards circulated in pamphlet form and to those letters I appeal for a full statement of the case. So full and so convincing is the statement that I venture to say no man can read them without feeling satisfied that the day of the triumph of the policy which he is in favor cannot be very long delayed. He divided the position of England into three periods and he said:

"1. A period of almost unbounded prosperity, during which the nations from whom we purchased our supplies of food and raw materials, not having the means as yet of manufacturing for themselves, must, of necessity, take our productions in exchange. During this period, any protective duties they might levy would not affect us, and would only enhance the cost for themselves.

"2. Transition. During which these nations, gradually increasing their own manufactures under the shelter of protective duties, should become more and more independent of ours; yet during which the increased prosperity of our home trade and the growth of markets in semi-civilised lands should suffice to maintain our prosperity.

"3. A period of contradiction and difficulty, when—being obliged to import half the food of a dense and delicately organised population—we should find the nations excluding by hostile tariffs those products of our industry which are all we have to offer in exchange in the long run."

Now, look at the trade returns, and see if this gentleman's statement of the position is not accurate? How has the course of trade been in England? Why, Sir, the imports from 1871 to 1885 from foreign countries, mainly although not altogether protective countries, have increased from £135,000,000 to £171,000,000. The exports from England to the United States, notwithstanding the enormous increase of the population of that great country, have decreased from £34,000,000 in 1871 to £21,000,000, or nearly £22,000,000 in 1885. The exports to Germany during the same period have decreased from £27,000,000 to £16,000,000. The writer pointedly asks, and the argument is irresistible and I venture to say it is unanswerable: If such is the result of protection in those countries, and I could have added France to the number, that we cannot trade with them, that they built up by their protective policy industries in their own land, so that they ceased to buy from us, what will happen in England if Japan, China, Turkey and other countries, where there is no protective policy should adopt the same system and establish the same industries in their midst? That is the view that is presented by this gentleman, who is not merely a free trader but who is also a manufacturer. It is impossible to have regard for what we know is going on in the world without seeing that the United States with its 65,000,000 of people is now practically doing nearly all its own manufacturing.

Mr. MULOCK. How much did they export last year from Great Britain?

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not give last year, but in 1885 it was twenty odd millions.

Mr. MULOCK. Pounds sterling?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Compare that with £34,000,000 in 1871 and compare the population in 1871 with the population in 1885 and see how enormous the decrease *per capita* has been. Now that is not all. That is not the only force that is at work. The agricultural industry in England is absolutely in a state of bankruptcy, and I do not think that language is too strong to describe it; I do not think it is too much to say that, when I point out the enormous loss the agriculturists have been sustaining, and I take the authority of Sir James Caird. In that gentleman's evidence before the Commission on the depression of Trade, he puts the annual loss of the farming community at no less than the enormous sum of forty-two millions and odd pounds sterling. Then look at the enormous quantity of land in England that yearly passes out of cultivation. Take grain growing as an illustration of that, and let me give you the figures. From 1870 to 1886, in 16 years, the difference in the quantity of land in Great Britain which formerly was used for the cultivation of grain had fallen from 11,803,000 acres to 9,51,000 acres, or nearly 2,000,000 acres and a decrease of 16 per cent. It is shown by statistics also that although the population is largely increasing the number of people engaged in agricultural pursuits—somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000,000—is very largely diminishing. Those people either emigrate or go to the

Mr. McCARTHY.

towns and what is the result? Let us take the manufacturer. He is denied his home market to the farmer, who was his largest customer, and the former purchaser who is in beggary instead of being in affluence can buy no more. The agricultural laborers are driven from the country to compete with the artisan and the mechanic in the town and so the manufacturer and artisan and the mechanic have this two-fold reason for supporting the policy which I am speaking of. First, the increase of his home and local market, and secondly, a desire that the competition from the countryman should be withdrawn to his more natural pursuits of agriculture. Those economic forces appear to me, must before very long prevail. But I am not driven merely to rely upon that argument, although I think very large importance is to be attached to it. Whatever politicians may hold, we know they pass away, but the arguments and reasons which induced great changes of public opinion remain, and I say these causes inevitably tend to England doing something in order to get a market for herself, instead of importing enormously from protective countries which every year take less and less from England in exchange. Now, let me draw attention to the report—the minority report it is true, but still a report of very able men; upon this subject on the Commission of enquiry into the depression of trade, and the reasons they give and the remedies they propose for it. The gentlemen whose minority report I propose to read an extract or two from, are Lord Dunraven, Mr. Farrar Eeroyd, Mr. P. Albert Mintz and Mr. Neville Hubbock, men of distinction in the various walks of life. Let us see what they recommend. They say:

"For though we may be unable to alter the protectionist policy of other nations, we can do much to free ourselves from its injurious effects. The more we can draw our supplies of imported food from countries which will largely and under moderate tariff rates, accept the products of our industries in exchange, the fuller and the steadier will be the employment of our population.

"Our command of the fiscal arrangements of India has saved the industry of Lancashire from the calamity which must have overwhelmed it, had the great empire come under the control of a commercial policy like that of Russia and the United States. And the growth of our colonies, with their very large consumption per head of British manufactures, has helped on our industries to endure with less suffering the stifling pressure of foreign tariffs.

"But these aids, though welcome, are insufficient. It is a striking fact that during the past twenty years 67 per cent. of our emigrants have gone to the United States and only 27½ per cent. to our own colonies. The more extreme protectionist policy of the United States, so far from repelling the emigrants has operated as an effectual bribe to both capital and labor, by holding out the inducements of higher prices and higher wages.

"It would be an act of suicidal folly on our part to attempt to counterwork these influences by a like system of enormous import duties, designed to raise the price of commodities for the advantage of home producers. We have a far better and more effectual remedy at command. A slightly preferential treatment of the food products of India and the colonies over these of foreign nations, would if adopted as a permanent system, gradually but certainly direct the flow of food-growing capital and labor more towards our own dependencies and less towards the United States than heretofore."

Mr. CASEY. What is the book you are reading from?

Mr. McCARTHY. The report of the Commission on the depression of trade.

"When it is noted that in the year 1884 the Australian colonies, with only 3,100,000 inhabitants, purchased £23,895,858 worth of our manufactures, whilst the United States with about 55,000,000 inhabitants, purchased only £24,424,638 worth, it will be apparent how great would be the effect of a policy which should lead to the more rapid peopling of the Australian colonies in giving fuller employment to our working classes at home, and thus increasing the healthful activity of the home trade, as well as the import of raw materials for our various industries to operate upon.

"We believe that specific duties, equal to about 10 per cent. on a low range of values, imposed upon the import from foreign countries of those articles of food which India and the colonies are well able to produce, would sufficiently effect this purpose. Their adoption would, of course, involve the abolition of the heavy duties on tea, coffee, cocoa and dried fruits which are now levied on Indian and colonial equally with foreign produce. It would widen the basis of our revenue, and render us less dependent upon the sustained productiveness of the income tax and the duties upon intoxicating liquors. And, what is even more important, it

could not fail to draw closer all portions of the Empire in the bond of mutual interests, and thus pave the way towards a more effective union for great common objects."

Here in this formal document is the proposition to put 10 per cent. duty on all breadstuffs imported from foreign countries; and, Sir, it is the recognised policy, the clear and well-understood policy of the party of which these gentlemen were the representatives that that duty or some equivalent duty should be placed on breadstuffs in order to attain the ends which they seek to accomplish, and of the means they themselves propose. Now, Sir, let us understand what that would be to us. Let us take it in a simple form and work it out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman say what party has declared that as its policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will tell him before I take my seat, but I thought the hon. gentleman having such a wide knowledge of financial matters would not require to come to me for information on that subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I know that it has been disavowed by the leaders of both parties in England.

Mr. McCARTHY. However, I will give the hon. gentleman the information, and add to his stock of knowledge. Let us see what the effect of that policy would be on the consumer, because I am reasoning the question from his standpoint. It needs no argument to show that it would be of advantage to us; what I want to show is, that it is a policy which must recommend itself in the near future to the English people, and what I want this House to do, if not to-night, at some near day, is to let the party who are advocating it know that we are in accord with them, and ready to do whatever we can to induce the Canadian people to join hands with them. Now, I have worked out, as an illustration, the effect of this policy on the food supply of England, which is, perhaps, after all the most unpopular way in which it can be presented to a British audience. Much has been heard there in days gone by of the large loaf and the small loaf; but when we know that during the years of England's greatest prosperity the price of wheat was 50s. a quarter, and that to-day—or on February 8, by the last returns I could obtain—it was 30s. 4d. a quarter, I think hon. gentlemen must see that a small specific or *ad valorem* duty on wheat would not press heavily on the resources of the working classes of Great Britain. If they could prosper with wheat at 50s. a quarter, I fail to know in what way their circumstances have changed so as to prevent them paying 36s. or 38s., which, perhaps, a small duty on wheat would compel them to pay, but would be more than returned to them in the increased prosperity of their own farmers, the revival of their industries, and the enlarged commerce of their colonies. England's consumption of breadstuffs amounts to 231,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour. Of that quantity Great Britain herself produced something in the neighborhood of 79,000,000 bushels, while from the British possessions 36,000,000 bushels were imported; in other words, Great Britain and her colonies produce about 50 per cent. of her food supply. Now, put upon that, if you please, a specific duty of a shilling a bushel, and what is the immediate result? That would bring in a revenue from foreign wheat of nearly £1,000,000. The revenue obtained from foreign wheat would supply the place of the revenue now obtained from the duties on tea, coffee chicory and the like, and dried fruits. They would be merely receiving that revenue from one article of food that largely enters into the consumption of the people, while they could relieve the people of the duty on the article of tea, which I suppose also enters very largely into general consumption. But, Sir,

that is not all that it would do. It would raise the price for us of the wheat we send, and would also raise the price to the English farmer of the wheat he grows. How much it would do that is not perhaps a matter on which we shall be able to agree; but I put it—and I do not suppose it will be deemed too much—at 9d. a bushel, three-fourths of the duty. Suppose it would be a shilling, my argument would still be sound; but call it 9d., and what is the result? The result is that you would have an increased cost to the consumer altogether of £3,000,000, which would be the difference in the price of wheat between 30s. 4d. and 36s. 4d. a quarter, which would be still much lower than was the price in the best days of England's prosperity. To us it would mean a difference of 25 cents a bushel; to the English farmer a difference of a shilling or at least 9d. a bushel, as the case may be; to the British consumer it would mean half of that spread over the whole of the breadstuffs, because he would be relieved of the tax on tea, which he could afford to apply on the increased cost of his grain. Now, I was pleased to find that this illustration was backed up by a gentleman to whom I have already referred, Mr. Farrar Ecroyd, who puts it in this way:

"To effect our purpose it would, I think, be needful to impose specific duties on foreign food products, equal to about 10 per cent. on a low range of values, and to maintain them steadfastly until our own dependencies should be able to supply our wants; save only, that in the event of a bad harvest and high prices, the duty on corn, not being maintained for revenue purposes, could easily be suspended for a year. I will not encumber my letter with a long array of figures, but after a careful study of our average imports of food products from foreign countries, I find that a duty of 10 per cent. on them would amount to about £12,500,000. From this must be deducted £4,000,000 which would be remitted by reducing to 10 per cent. the existing duties on foreign tea, coffee, cocoa, dried fruits, &c., and by admitting these articles duty free from English dependencies. To the balance of £8,000,000, I add £1,600,000, to cover the charges and profits of distributors on the increased cost; this brings the sum to £9,600,000. We have next to consider the effect of the duties in raising the price of some of these articles which are also grown at home; this is a complicated question, because it is not easy to estimate the proportion of loss which would fall upon the foreign grower, just as Bradford mill owners and workmen too well know that they now endure a portion of the burden of these foreign tariffs which press upon their goods and render their toil and trade so unprofitable. I take the amount, however, at £7,500,000 after much research,—thus bringing the total up to £17,100,000; of which sum it is evident that £8,000,000 being new revenue, would at once enable to lighten the existing burden of taxation to an equal amount. This would leave £9,700,000 as the net additional cost to consumers; of which £7,500,000 would go to relieve our depressed and harassed agriculturists of the remaining £1,600,000 to increase the interests and profits of wholesale and retail distributors, should competition permit them to charge it to us. Now our present population is about 35,000,000, or 7,000,000 families at 5 persons each, amongst whom to divide the added cost of £9,700,000. This would give 26s. per annum, or 6d. per week as the charge on each family; surely a very moderate price to pay for benefits so great and enduring as those which have been described."

I think I have shown so far that this matter is gaining ground in England; and now I will answer the question and point out the party that has adopted, as a party, to-day the fair trade policy, which was laid down in 1881 and has been fought for ever since, and which was adopted by a large minority of the report on the depression of trade. We find at the meeting of the great Conservative party in Oxford last November, attended by representatives from all parts of England, that a resolution in favor of fair trade was adopted by the enormous figures of 1,000 to 11. The great party of England, because it is the great party of England to-day—leaving Ireland out of the question—the Conservative party, has a majority of about 90 representatives, so far as Great Britain alone is concerned. It is the great party of England, and upon this question of protection, I venture to say the Irish representatives would not be found opposed to the majority of English representatives. There is no country in the world where protection to the farming industry is more required than it is in the Green Isle; and on that policy, when the day comes for a new party, when the day comes for a new policy and for new issues, I venture to say that the Irish representatives

will be found at the back of the majority of English representatives on this great question. Here is the resolution which I beg to read for the information more especially of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I have read it a dozen times and know it is disallowed by Lord Salisbury, it is no use to read it again.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will deal with Lord Salisbury's position presently.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt you will.

Mr. McCARTHY. The resolution is as follows :

"Resolved that the continued depression in trade and agriculture renders speedy reform in the policy of the United Kingdom as regards foreign imports and the influx of indigent foreigners a matter of vital necessity to the people of Great Britain and Ireland."

That platform, only last November, was, at what we would call a convention, a convention of the whole party of England, adopted by the enormous majority of 1,000 to 11; and that policy is now the accepted policy of the Conservative party of England. I want to know whether that is not encouragement for us to adopt a corresponding resolution in this House. I want to know whether any representative here of any agricultural constituency can go back to his constituents and say: The great party in Great Britain offers to us differential terms in our market, and that party has accepted this policy as their platform, but we have refused in the Canadian House of Commons to take advantage of the offer they have made. I do not think there is one member from an agricultural constituency or from any other constituency in this House who can refuse to, at all events, hear what the results of that offer may be. Now, as to Lord Salisbury, he came down to Oxford. He was not present at the meeting, but he was received by that convention and addressed them; and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is perfectly right in saying that Lord Salisbury did not, by word, say anything in favor of this resolution. On the contrary, Lord Salisbury, with a good deal of circumlocution, gave it the go-by. He intimated that in times past his party and the Liberal Unionists had held different views. He intimated that these two parties were now united for a specific object, and that their purpose gained, their interests could again differ; but for the present—and a practical statesman was concerned for the present,—he, the leader of the Government, composed not merely of Conservatives but of Conservatives and Liberal Unionists—a government formed for the express purpose of preventing the policy of separation, as propounded by Mr. Gladstone, being adopted—had, as his first duty to his party and policy, to see that no disturbing influence or question should be allowed to interfere with that union until the great end and aim of the union between the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists was attained. Well, I can understand that. I can understand that it would have been suicidal on the part of the leader of the present Government to have introduced a bone of contention into his present policy. Remember that he has the support of Mr. John Bright in his present policy. Remember that Mr. Bright always has been a great free trader and will remain a free trader to the end of his term. Remember that Mr. Bright could not support a government, even perhaps to prevent the separation or division of the Empire, contrary to his opinion on free trade. But the men of this generation, the men who compose the party, the men who wield the strength of the party, because, after all, even the hon. gentleman, a kind of sub-leader on the other side, I venture to say, does not direct all the policy of his party, for the great body of gentlemen who sit behind him have something to say in the formation of that party and so—I believe have we—the men I say who formed the body of the great Conservative party of England have

Mr. McCARTHY.

something to say in the formation of its policy, and when these men, when the great Conservative party of England have adopted as their policy this policy of fair trade, it must in the near future prevail.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They had a vote on that in the House of Commons.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt, but that party were just as much bound to sustain the Government in their present policy as is Lord Salisbury. But the policy of fair trade has been announced and I am merely giving the course of events which have led to that conclusion and which is convincing that the policy must be successful. Either England, as a great productive country, must fall from her great estate, either England, as a great manufacturing country, must cease to hold her own in competition with foreign countries or she must adopt some policy of the kind I have intimated, of drawing her supplies of breadstuffs from her own people and creating an interprovincial trade, so to speak, by gathering in all her colonies and dependencies, just as we have gathered in all the colonies and dependencies from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Is there anything to fear from the adoption of this policy? I dare say there are amongst us gentlemen who may feel that, if we adopt any such policy as this, we will raise feelings of hostility, that is to say, that we will be embarrassed in our trade relations with the United States. For my part, I utterly disbelieve in the possibility of the United States doing more than the United States has already done to injure us in trade matters, or, in other words, to advance her own interests. Her policy has been consistent. It has been said, perhaps not correctly, that it was Mr. Seward's policy, after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, to drive us into annexation, to compel us by hostile tariffs to sue for annexation. If any such idea entered into the mind of any United States statesman, I think the results since that date must have shown the difficulties with which they had to deal. Take our products which they import. Take for instance our barley. There is a duty of 10 cents a bushel on that. If they were to make it 15 cents, does anyone suppose that we would send one bushel less to the United States?

Mr. MULOCK. Who pays the duty?

Mr. McCARTHY. The American brewer buys our barley because he must have it, because, great as that country is as an agricultural country, it cannot produce the barley which he requires in order to make his beer, and the American brewer, as he bought our barley in times gone by, so he buys it now, and pays that duty in order to obtain our barley. I throw out a hint to some of the moneyed men on the other side of the House. They could make a corner in barley if they were to buy up all our barley, and they could make the American brewer pay whatever they like to ask for it. England is a great importer of barley. She imports a large quantity of barley from Russia. Why should she not import from Canada? Will anyone say that our barley is not as good as the barley from Russia? I may be told that the barley which is produced in England is better for the production of their heavy beer than any barley which we produce here. That may be so, but does anyone suppose that the barley which they obtain from Russia is better than ours?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). She gets it cheaper.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not so cheap. Look at the trade returns, and you will see that the declared value of Russian wheat in England is 77 cents per bushel. Of course that includes freight, that is the price delivered in England, but that is not so remarkably cheap. I say that, if we had a preferential market there, if 10 per cent. were to be put on Russian barley, we would have a market there for Canadian

barley. I think I may say that the reason why we have not a market in England for our barley is that the Americans are always prepared to go one better than the English go; and, of course, when they go one better, it is to our interest to send our barley there; and everyone who knows anything about brewing knows that whether the price is 10 cents or 15 cents different is only a small matter. Then I will come to another article, that of horses. They tax our horses pretty heavily. The tax I know has been lowered, but has it been lowered to suit Canada or to protect the American farmer? What is our position? Out of \$37,000,000 of exports to the United States, about \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 went in free of duty. If the present propositions are carried out, it is expected that another \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 will go into the United States free of duty. But we are not getting that reduction because we asked for it, or because it is to please us. All parties in the United States find that they have a larger revenue, that they are absorbing a larger revenue from the country into their exchequer, than they know what to do with, and it has to be reduced; and, while one party proposes to lighten the taxes on the necessities of life, the other party proposes to reduce the taxes on whiskey and tobacco, so as to keep up the tariff wall against all the world; but, with all the care they exercise, with all their devotion to their own country and its interests, they have never suggested what, in madness, has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, to take off the protection which is given to the farmers. They may take the duty off lumber, but not off horses.

Mr. CHARLTON. What about wool?

Mr. McCARTHY. Wool is an exception. They do not take the duty off barley or cattle. They keep up this protection for the farmer, and the farmer much needs it, because there is no certainty that this tariff of theirs would introduce reciprocal relations with this side of the line, and the farmers need what protection they have, as I demonstrated by the figures which I quoted this afternoon. I do not think that any portion of the Canadian people will agree to allow any man to say that they fear that the adoption of any policy which is wise and beneficial will be hostile to the United States. They have dealt with us as they saw fit, they have raised and lowered their tariff, as they saw fit, and I do not think anyone will say that the Canadian people are not able to alter the own tariff and make advantageous relations with any country in the world without consulting the American Senate or the people of the United States. Then there is the other consideration which has been held open to us, that we would find ourselves by-and-by left out in the cold. If it is a possibility, and I am not putting it further than that—I look upon it as a certainty and not only a possibility—if it is a possibility that a Fair Trade party should come into power in England, how would they treat Canada with this tariff which we have to-day, or how would they treat us if the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to force upon the House and the country were adopted? Can we expect that, if they adopted Fair Trade they would treat us in the same way as if we had always been ready to open our markets to them and to deal with them, or would they not naturally deal with us in a manner which would under the circumstances be perfectly proper and right. I cannot put this better than in the words of the president of the Federation League, Mr. Cunliffe Lister, who says:

"In conclusion, let me point out that it is this commercial federation of the Empire which furnishes the key note of the present position, compared with the protection of old days which looked to the United Kingdom being self-contained, self-subsisting and self-supporting. This latter position is so absolutely impossible to-day that we are bound to extend our borders and to treat the Empire as one; and if it be urged that some of our possessions cannot for revenue purposes, and will not, dispense with import duties, even against British products, our reply is simple. In such case, our hands are free to establish the differential system in lieu of absolutely free imports. In such case, our Empire

would be still united in commercial bonds, and there is probably no British colony in existence that would not, in return for a preferential market on our shores only too gladly give us a preferential market on theirs. Should there be any so blind as not to be willing to do so, then such colony or possession should become *ipso facto* for tariff purposes a foreign state."

Now, there we have the alternative presented to us. On the one hand the advantages are to give us free trade with the United States, and to build up a tariff against England. You see its advantages, you know its dangers. On the other hand, we know, by that means, that not the slightest benefit can be obtained, so far as advancing the price of our agricultural products is concerned. We know, on the other hand, that there is a possibility—and I hope yet to live to see the day when my statement will be corroborated—of getting advantages in the great market of the world, where all our goods ultimately have to go. If they go to the States, we will displace there goods that go to England; if American goods are allowed into this country they merely displace so much more for the ultimate destination of all. We make the market ourselves. An invitation is offered to us, not by the Government, it is true, but by a party which is now, I venture to say, the large party. I want also to point out how much Ireland is interested in a policy of this kind. We all know, who have paid any attention to this subject, that from Ireland a large number of cattle is sold yearly to the English market; and I was surprised to learn that in the year 1886, from Ireland, were shipped to England, Scotland and Wales no less than 717,389 cattle, 734,213 sheep, and 421,285 swine. Now, compare that with our export, which we know is large. I have not the values, only the numbers. Our export of cattle was 91,000 as against 717,000; our export of sheep was 359,000 as against 734,000; we do not appear to have exported swine at all to the British market. Now, what country is more interested than Ireland? What argument compelled the Government last year to pass a measure in relief of the tenant? It was an argument demonstrated by the Commission that sat in Ireland, namely, that owing to the competition from this side of the Atlantic, the value to the Irish farmer of all that he raised, all that he had to sell, had enormously depreciated. What country, therefore, is more interested in this policy than Ireland? What country, therefore, should this fair trade policy look to for support more than from Ireland. Now, when the question is settled, the question which, no doubt, will be settled during this Parliament, which appears to be in a fair way of settlement even now, when the question is settled as to what the Irish are to have in the nature of Home Rule, or County Government, or whatever it may be, then the new issue must be this all important question, important to every man in Great Britain and Ireland, the all important question as to the position of the farmer, and not merely the farmer but the manufacturer of that country. Sir, I will close my observations by reading an extract from Mr. Chamberlain's speech. Mr. Chamberlain, of the great free trade of Birmingham, Mr. Chamberlain, of a younger generation than Cobden and Bright, and still hitherto believed to be impregnated to the fullest extent with free trade doctrine; speaking the other night—where, Sir? in the Devonshire Club, a Liberal club; in the chair, Lord Granville, a Gladstonian Liberal, surrounded by members of the Liberal party, he held out his hands in terms of kindness, in terms which one would not have expected from Mr. Chamberlain. Dealing with this question of commercial union, he said:

"The difficulty in the case of the commercial union is, no doubt, much greater. It is no use to expect that our colonies will abandon their customs duties as their chief and principle source of revenue. It is hardly to be hoped that the protected interests fostered by their system will willingly surrender the privileges which they now enjoy. All they can do is to wait until proposals are made to us to consider those proposals when they come with fairness and impartiality and to accept them if they do not involve the sacrifice of any important principle or interest vital to our population.

Coming from Mr. Chamberlain, under the auspices of Lord Granville, in the Devonshire Club, I say these are words that speak, perhaps, louder than the report of the commission with regard to the depreciation of trade, which speak, perhaps, as loudly as the voice of the great Conservative party in their meeting last November, in Oxford; and they warn us not to turn our backs, not to despise the policy which is offered to us by so great a statesman, so eminent a public man, and by so large a party in the country where our chief market must always be. Therefore it is that I have risen with great pleasure to make these observations in support of the resolution which my friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has moved, and also to some extent, and perhaps more particularly, in support of the propositions contained in my own. I would close by saying this with regard to the manufacturer: The manufacturer, as he stands to-day, has, to a great extent, successfully built up the industries of this country. I believe for my part that our manufacturers can well say that if we are to be protected against foreigners, if we are to have that market, we can well afford that England should have certain differential preferences in our market. We cannot expect that all the advantages are to be on one side; we cannot expect to discriminate against her in our market, to place England, as it were, upon the ground floor, and at the same time deny to the English manufacturer all that the English manufacturer wants, that is, the sale of his articles in our country so as to pay for the food he gets from us. We cannot refuse to say to England: We now import from the United States \$45,000,000 worth, we will do what we can to give that 45,000,000 to the English manufacturer; we will do what we can in that way, and I do not believe, Sir, that with a reduction of 5 or 7 per cent. even, upon our manufactures, upon our protection as it stands to-day, he would be not able to hold his own if the American manufacturer was excluded from his market. Therefore I say that the policy which I advocate is a fair policy. We ask, on the one hand, for preferences in the English market, and we say we are prepared to give them certain preferences in ours, we are willing to enter into commercial union. This matter has been foreseen. With many countries, their terms would be better than ours; with a country such as Australia, they would probably be entitled to all the advantages with us. As I read a moment ago from Mr. Lister's observations, there will be, perhaps, such a bargain as, under the circumstances, would not be unreasonable. That however is a matter of detail, which I need not dwell upon now. I am obliged, Sir, to the House for the patient hearing they have given to my somewhat lengthy remarks. The subject, in my humble judgment, is of the greatest importance, or else I would not have been found occupying the time of the House to this extent. I believe it is fraught with great importance to this country, and believing that, I feel it is my duty to say what I have said on this subject.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad that my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has brought this question to the attention of the House. I know that he has done so from a real desire to benefit the interest of that class to which he belongs, and to which I also claim to belong, the farmers of Canada. I have been long aware that the hon. gentleman had some such plan to bring before the House, and I am glad that he has now put it in shape, and brought up a discussion upon it. I cannot say that I stand before you as a supporter, in the fullest extent, of everything that has been advanced by himself, and especially by his seconder, in discussing this matter, but I am sufficiently of a free trader, sufficiently in favor of reciprocity with whoever is willing to be reciprocal with us, to entertain favorably any reasonable proposition for reciprocity with any country, and more especially

Mr. McCARTHY.

with that country from which we claim political descent. I have voted already this Session in favor of reciprocity with the United States. I do not think that is inconsistent with the position of being willing to enter into reciprocal trade relations with Great Britain as well. I do not accept this proposition instead of the other; in fact, I wish to be understood distinctly as saying that if it must be a choice between the two I believe Canadian interests will be most promoted by having free trade with the United States rather than any arrangement that is likely to be obtained with Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen may say "no." If they can show us any reasonable possibility of obtaining fair arrangements with England, arrangements quite as favorable as those we can reasonably expect to obtain from the United States, then they may say "no." However, I am not contrasting the two propositions or rejecting the one in favor of the other; I see no reason why we should not discuss with the Imperial Government the question of improved trade relations between Great Britain and the colonies generally. The resolution merely suggests that such arrangements would be beneficial to all interested in Canada and would strengthen the Empire by building up her colonies, and that we should discuss that question with the Home Government. So far there is very little objection to be taken to the motion, and I am glad he has brought it before the House with a view to eliciting opinion by way of discussion. I do not suppose it is intended to press the motion to a division, at least I hope not, for I do not think a vote should be taken on such an important question the first time it comes up in the House for discussion. I do not think ten members have considered the matter sufficiently to be able to vote intelligently upon it and place themselves on record. I am glad, however, that an opportunity is afforded to discuss it. This question should be discussed in a purely non-partisan spirit, I do not see why any question of party is connected with it, and for that reason I was rather sorry, not so much at any actual words used but at the general tone of the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The earlier part of his speech was evidently prepared for delivery on a former occasion, when perhaps the hon. gentleman had not an opportunity of delivering it, it was a speech intended for the reciprocity debate, and I do not think it has improved by keeping. Some things do not improve by age, and speeches are among the number. The earlier part of the speech was devoted not to advocating reciprocity with England but to showing that reciprocity with the United States was not advantageous, and it is to that part of his speech I desire to make special reference. The hon. member, no doubt, spoke some sound and stirring truths. He said that most of the people of Canada were farmers and that their interests should be considered, and that they should have the best market available, and he went on later to state that the manufacturers must give up to the farmers some of the extreme protection they now enjoy. It is because I believe that the manufacturers should give up some of the extreme protection they now enjoy that I voted in favor of reciprocity with the United States and am now willing to consider the question of reciprocity with England. For the same ostensible reason for which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) claims we should have reciprocity with England, I claim we should have reciprocity with the United States because the farming interests should prevail. We have had class legislation since 1879, nearly all favoring that portion of the population which comes under the generic name of manufacturers; but in legislating in favor of the farmers who constitute a majority of the people I hold that they should be considered more than any other class. It is their turn now, and I hope that the farmers have a sufficient bond of union, sufficient *esprit de corps*, sufficient self-restraint, a

knowledge of their own interests to see that their interests are protected. We should not have a class war, but if one class pushes their interest at the expense of the preponderating and overwhelming class, the farmers, they must expect ultimately to go to the wall. It would be unfortunate if such a war should occur, it would not be the fault of the farmers of our party, but would have been brought about by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and unless some one of these propositions is adopted and reciprocity is had with a convenient market such a result may occur, and the manufacturers must look out for themselves. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the policy of the United States in protecting the farmers and said that neither party in the States would be so mad as to talk of giving up protection to the farmers, and he went on to show that a similar condition prevailed in Canada. Did the hon. gentleman forget that his leader, the representative of Canada at Washington, clothed with all the authority of a plenipotentiary and backed by the Canadian Government, asked the American commissioners to agree to remove the duties on agricultural and natural products on both sides of the line? I do not think such a proposition was improper, but I also think it should not be confined to that line of products alone. I believe in reciprocity all around. I think the farmer has a right not only to enter the American markets with his produce, but that he should be able to buy his manufactured articles in the American market if he can obtain them cheaper. Reciprocity all round is the only motto that can be adopted. The hon. gentleman continued, with his thorough knowledge of agricultural questions to discuss the comparative profits of American and Canadian farmers, and he declared that the United States market was no use to us because they produced the same articles we did. This is an old argument used during the reciprocity debate, but it requires perhaps an answer afresh. Although the United States export a great many products, we are able to sell them many agricultural products. The hon. gentleman has proved to his own satisfaction, as a lawyer, that our farmers cannot obtain in the United States as high prices for their products as they can at home; but the fact remains that, notwithstanding the protection, our farmers send produce across the line. In New York and its vicinity there are over two millions of people forming one of the largest centres of population in the world. There is, there a large market for choice cattle, choice sheep, choice horses, and everything that is good; a market almost, if not quite as high in price, as the market of England, and a market infinitely more convenient for Canadian farmers to send their stock to. I have been myself told by traders and buyers of cattle in my own neighborhood that they would much rather deal in New York market even at a smaller price, than with the Liverpool market, for the reason that they can know from day to day how the market stood. They can buy a carload of cattle and ship them across the line, knowing about the price that they will get for them, whereas if they send them to England, there is a long delay, there is a great uncertainty whether they will get there, and a tremendous uncertainty as to what the price will be if they do get there. For that reason alone the United States markets would be a great convenience to the Ontario farmers. I say "United States" because I have an objection to using the word "American" and I shall say United States whenever I have an occasion to refer to that people, because I believe that we have the bigger if not throughout the better part of America ourselves. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the prices of products in the States and here. He said that the price of wheat was higher in Canada than in the United States and that the farmer was more prosperous because he not only raised more bushels per acre but he obtained a higher price. I have no doubt of the correctness

of one of those statements, that on an average the Ontario farmers do produce more bushels per acre than the average farmer in the United States; but I must also point out the utter unfairness of any comparison between Ontario, the best Province of old Canada—and the most fertile part of Canada too, except the very favored portions of the prairie in the North-West—being compared with the average of the United States, including the worn out lands of New England, including other lands which may not perhaps be worn out but which never were good, and including the rocky farms of the State of New York, for even in New York there are a great many rocky farms. It is absurd, utterly misleading, and unfair in discussing a question of this kind on the motion made by the hon. gentleman who seems to show such a knowledge of agricultural matters and I would almost say it was lawyer-like to make such a comparison. If he wishes to make a comparison between Canada and the United States he should have secured the statistics for all Canada, and if they are not available it is simply impossible to make any comparison between Canada and the States. He referred to the comparison between Ontario and New York, but he did not give us a comparative statement of bushels and prices as between Ontario and the State of New York or the State of Michigan.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, he did.

Mr. CASEY. No, he did not. I was here, and the hon. gentleman simply said that the total returns per acre were so much in Ontario, so much in Michigan, and so much in New York. He did not tell us how it was arrived at, and he did not tell us that 20 bushels per acre were worth considerably more in the State of New York than in the Province of Ontario. He did not tell us that they were worth more in Michigan than in the western part of Ontario. Of course I have not given so much time and attention to the matter as the hon. gentleman, nor have I gone so fully into the records. I just picked up this afternoon, since I came into the House, a copy of the *Empire*, and it gives the contrast between the prices of wheat in Ontario and the State of New York and in Michigan. I find the result to be as follows:—I find that in Toronto on Saturday, as reported in the *Empire* to day, "Red Winter" wheat of the very best kind was worth 90 cents a bushel; "No. 2 Fall," 86 cents a bushel, and the prices in the Toronto market ran all the way down to 76 cents. Let us compare that with the price in the State of New York. Let us take the price in Buffalo, which is just about as far from tide-water by way of New York as Toronto is by way of Montreal. In Buffalo "No. 1 Red Winter" was the same price as in Toronto; "No. 1 Hard" was 96½ cents a bushel, and there was no price quoted in Toronto for "No. 1 Hard," and there did not seem to be a market for it. "No. 2 Red Michigan," corresponding to "No. 2 Fall Wheat," sold in Toronto at 86 cents, was sold in Buffalo at 94½.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the hon. gentleman look and he will find that "No. 1 Hard" is quoted in the Toronto market in to-day's *Empire* at 93½ and 94.

Mr. CASEY. It is possible I overlooked that. It was 96 cents in Buffalo, that is three cents more than in Toronto and all the other grades run about the same way. "No. 2 Fall" wheat was 8 cents higher in Buffalo than in Toronto and "No. 1 Hard" on the word of my hon. friend was 3 cents higher in Buffalo, and "No. 1 White" was 3 or 4 cents higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. In London on the same day the highest quotation for wheat was 84 cents a bushel. Detroit is the nearest corresponding point to London, and in Detroit on Friday the highest quotation was 88½ cents. The highest quotation in Detroit, which is 100 miles west of London, was 4½ cents higher than the highest quotation in London. I take the quota-

tion from the London *Free Press*. I do not know exactly what kind the wheat was but that is the highest quotation that I can find for wheat in the London market. Now let us take barley. The highest price for barley in Toronto was 68 cents a bushel, and in Oswego across the lake it was 80 cents for the best Canadian barley. The same grade of barley as was selling at a low rate in Toronto was sold at 12 cents a bushel more in Oswego that is the difference between the two sides of the lake, and yet the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says it would not pay us to go into that market. If prices are lower in the States than in Canada, as they would wish to make us believe, how is it that the people of the United States do not send their wheat in here. It is perfectly absurd and nonsensical to make such a statement as that to an audience of farmers. The hon. gentleman would not say it in a country school house, because he would know that everyone who heard him was aware of the fact that grain is dearer on the other side of the line than it is here. He would not presume to make that statement to farmers, but he thinks possibly so many members of this House are not farmers that it will go down here. He will find he is greatly mistaken. Such a statement will go down neither here nor in the country, because it is absurd on the face of it. If grain was cheaper in the States than it is here they would overrun our market with grain.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quote oats.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will have his opportunity afterwards and I shall have to make this speech myself I think. The hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) dwelt a great deal on average prices. That was another misleading portion of his speech. I should like to know what he means by average prices. He says he quoted the average prices in Ontario from the report of Mr. Blue, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. I do not know how Mr. Blue arrived at an average price for a whole Province—at how many points he took the market rates; but even if you took the rates on a particular day at every market town in Ontario, you could not arrive at an average market price unless you knew the quantity of wheat sold at each of these places. As a matter of fact, the great bulk of the fall wheat of Ontario, at all events, is sold at markets west of Toronto, where the price of wheat is low, and runs, as it does at London at the present time, at from 80 to 84 cents a bushel. If you took this price and averaged it with the prices in Eastern Ontario, you would get an unfair result, because the bulk of the wheat sold in Ontario is sold at the low rates instead of at the high rates, and you must know the quantity sold at all places in the Province before you can get the average price. I do not know whether Mr. Blue made up the average price, or whether the hon. gentleman took Mr. Blue's figures and made up the average price himself; but I know that no average price can be anything but misleading. The same is true of his figures of the average price in the United States, which he says was 85 cents. We find in to-day's paper that on Saturday last wheat sold in Buffalo at 90 cents, and in Detroit at 88 cents. I do not know how the average price in the States is made up unless the prices at Chicago, Minneapolis, and other western points, where wheat is still lower in price, are taken into account. The hon. member gave us a great many statistics of our trade with Great Britain to show how important and great it was as compared with our trade with the United States. I should be as glad as the hon. gentleman to see our trade with Great Britain increase; I should be more so, I think, because the hon. gentleman has been supporting a policy which led to a decrease in our trade with Great Britain. He tried to draw on our credulity by urging that if we entered into reciprocity with the United States, it would lead to the scheduling of Canadian cattle, so that they would have to be

Mr. CASEY.

killed on landing at Liverpool as are American cattle. I admit that if we entered into reciprocity in live animals, it might possibly have that effect, not from revenge against Canada, but because our cattle would be exposed to the same risks as the American cattle. But that might be avoided by quarantine or in some other way. But suppose our cattle were scheduled, the Americans seem to make a good deal from selling their cattle in England as things are, and if we had both the English market and the American market, I do not think we should care much whether our cattle were scheduled or not. But what pleased me very much in the hon. gentleman's speech was the way in which he dilated on England's prosperity under free trade. The statistics he quoted were such as to convince almost everybody that free trade has been a good thing for England. I shall leave it to the hon. member himself to draw the conclusion which is applicable to Canada. After that, he went on to prove to his own satisfaction that although free trade had been such a success to England, the largest party in England, the Conservative party, were at the present time committed to the policy of what he calls fair trade—discrimination in favor of the colonies—because a certain Conservative meeting at Oxford had adopted that policy. The hon. member knew, and admitted that he knew that Lord Salisbury, the leader of the Conservative party and the leader of the Government, had utterly repudiated that policy, and had said that it was impossible to carry it out. I should not object to see England adopt that policy, as I think it would benefit us in this country; but it is not fair to lead us to believe that the Conservative party are in favor of that policy, when the leader of that party has repudiated it. It may come in the future, but no party in England is at present committed to it. Now, I regret, although the House will probably not regret, that the condition of my throat is such that I do not propose to continue this discussion any further. I shall conclude by repeating that I am glad that this question has been brought up by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall), and that the prospects are that there will be a very full and free discussion of the question. I hope some good will come out of it, by informing either the people of Canada or the people of England on this important question.

Mr. FISHER. Before this motion is carried, I should like to say a few words on it. Like my hon. friend who has just sat down, I am very glad that this question has been brought before this House. For some time back we have had discussions of this question in various parts of the country—discussions, however, of a more or less informal character, and carried on by those not having the full responsibility which attends a member of Parliament on the floor of this House. I am glad indeed that my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) has brought it before us to-night, so that some illusions which have been thrown around it may be cleared away, and that the people of this country may have something on which they can go in their examination into the subject. When the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was addressing the House a little while ago, in a somewhat lengthy, but not at all too lengthy speech, considering the importance of the subject and the prominent position he holds in this House and the country, I was a little surprised at some of the words he gave utterance to, and some of the ideas he put forth. In that speech the hon. gentleman announced some very good doctrines indeed, good free trade doctrine, I may call it; which I was surprised to hear coming from that hon. gentleman. Sir, we do not often hear such principles coming from the lips of leading gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Pity it is that that hon. gentleman did not years ago, in the party to which he belongs, utter the words he has uttered to-night. Pity it is

that when that party in 1878 appealed to the people of Canada on the question of protection and free trade, he did not give forth the truths which he has given forth to-night. The hon. gentleman spoke of Great Britain as our mother country, and said we would be much more right if we followed the example of that country and drew ourselves closer to her instead of trying to form a connection with the United States. But, Sir, in 1878, when the party to which that hon. gentleman belongs appealed to the people of this country, did they hold up the mother country as an example to be followed by Canada? Did they point to her policy as one that we should adopt? Nothing of the kind. They then pointed to the country to the south of us, and appealed to the people of Canada to follow the example of the United States, because we lived under the same conditions, and to adopt a protective policy as the true policy for this country. At that time, Canada made a great mistake, and threw away the chance she will never be able to regain. Had Canada then pronounced in favor of a revenue tariff, and distinctly and clearly against a protective policy, we would have to-day a prosperous condition of affairs, which words fail me to depict, instead of the deplorable condition of affairs that now exist. At that time, our neighbors to the south, by means of the injudicious policy they were pursuing in regard to their commerce on the sea, had practically destroyed their carrying trade and their shipping. If we had gone exactly in the opposite direction, instead of following their example, at a very respectful distance, as we have only been able to do; if we had announced that we would make Canada a cheap country to live in, by following on this, the best portion of the continent, the free trade policy of England, we would have attracted to our country the enormous immigration that has gone to the United States. If, at that time, instead of following the United States and doing our best to destroy our commercial marine, we had made it easy to the people of this country to build ships and to navigate those ships, we would not have gone backwards as we have, since the inauguration of the National Policy, and our commercial marine would not only be doing our own carrying trade, but be doing the whole carrying trade of this continent, and be a strong competitor with the commercial marine of the mother country in the carrying trade of the world. If instead of a high tariff we had adopted a low revenue tariff, capital would have been invited to our shores and found investment here in enterprises which it would not be necessary to foster by increased protection year after year. That capital would have been invested in manufacturing industries able to stand on their own bottom, and not continually requiring increased protection, and we would not be witnesses of that antagonism which to-day exists between those manufacturing industries and the other industries of the country. We would not have the antagonism that now exists between those who are producers of natural products and consumers of manufactured products, and our manufacturing industries. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), spoke at length this afternoon on the question of reciprocity between us and the United States, and in that connection made most contradictory and extraordinary statements. I will not detain the House by going over those statements in detail, but there are one or two points which have not been touched by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and to which I think attention should be drawn. In the first place the hon. gentleman spoke of the United States as being our competitors in natural products instead of having our market for those products. It is true that in two or three leading articles they are our rivals. They rival us in the production of beef and cheese and butter. Nevertheless it is true and perfectly reasonable to say that in the United States our farmers have a very large market for their products. The eastern portion of the United States has to bring its food from a very great

distance within the United States, and that food it could more easily import from Canada were the duties removed. Having made an investigation into this subject, and coming as I do from a locality where this Atlantic seaboard of the United States is especially valuable, I can say that the duty which the farmers of the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces have to pay on their products shipped to the United States, just counterbalance the freight which the eastern portions of the United States have to pay on the products they import from the west. If we send hay, horses, cattle, or oats, or potatoes from the Province of Quebec or the Maritime Provinces to New England, to New York, and Philadelphia, we not only have to compete with the portions of the United States which are equally distant from those markets, but we also have to compete with the whole area whose freight rates are greater than ours, but whose freight rates are less than ours and the duties combined. The result is that in the instances I have mentioned, especially horses and hay, we have to compete with the whole area of the United States all the way to the Pacific seaboard. Take a cargo of horses, the freight rate from the Province of Quebec to Boston or New York is very small indeed, but the duty is so high that, combined with the freight, it enables the Americans to purchase horses on the Pacific coast which will compete with ours. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking of the product of hay, acknowledged that local causes enabled our people to pay the duty and ship their hay to the New England markets. He thus refuted himself out of his own mouth. More than that, the hon. gentleman knows right well that we do to-day export an enormous amount of natural products to the United States. Now, if, as is contended by the hon. gentleman, our farmers get higher prices here for their products than do the farmers of the United States there, how is it that we are able to send our food products over to the United States, pay the duty, and compete with the American farmer? It would be manifestly absurd to say that we could do this, if the facts were as described by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I suppose some hon. gentlemen will say that they do not pay the duty. Well, I will refer them to the speech of the Finance Minister himself, who said that we did pay the duty. It is true that the result of that was to draw forth a vigorous protest from the Government organ in Montreal, the *Montreal Gazette*, which, while stating that the hon. gentleman had made a splendid speech in regard to every other matter, said he had made a serious mistake in saying that we paid the duty on anything that we sent into the United States. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) also said that the United States Government would not dare to take off the protection which their farmers have as against Canadian farmers in regard to food production. At the same time, he alluded to the fact that we got a higher price here for our food products than they do. What an absurd juxtaposition that is! If they can produce food more cheaply and get a less price, why do they need protection against us? He also said a few words in reference to barley, and he said that England got barley from Russia cheaper than we could send it to England. Why is that? Simply because our producers find that they can get a better price in the United States than they can get anywhere else. The other day I heard a statement on this question from a man who is an authority, a man who, I believe, is the largest dealer in barley in the Province of Ontario, and he stated that he could not afford to send barley to England because the English barley was so much cheaper than our barley could be sent over there for. The reason for all this is that the United States people are willing to pay a larger price than any English maltsters would. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Russians sold their barley in England at a cheaper rate, but the reason for that

is that the Russian people have no other market for their barley than England, they have to send it there, and they are obliged to take the price which the English maltsters would give; but in regard to our barley, we have a market at our own door. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) alluded also to what is known as the Mills Tariff in the United States, and he said that, when that was adopted, no doubt we would be enabled to send a large number of our productions into the United States free of duty or nearly so, but he brought into close juxtaposition with that the proposition to discriminate against the United States in favor of Great Britain. I think that our experience in regard to the United States of late has been that, if we were to discriminate against them in favor of any one, the mother country or anyone else, the result would be retaliatory legislation, not only against us, but probably against the British Empire altogether. I will only allude to one other fact, which is perhaps a piece of bye-play—that is, that the hon. gentleman referred to our most important export, and spoke of cereals in that connection, and said our breadstuffs were the greatest exports of Canada and the foundation of our prosperity. I think he cannot have consulted the Trade and Navigation Returns or cannot be familiar with the actual condition of affairs, or he would know that, in Ontario itself, breadstuffs play a secondary part in exports to the export of animals and their products. We, in Canada, occupy a prominent position in the world in regard to our exports of animals and their products, and I believe we have the very best means for the production of animals, and that we have shown that, especially in Ontario. We have the best appliances, and we have the best means in the world to produce the best cheese. We have been able to produce a larger proportion, in regard to our population, than any country in the world, and we stand at the head in regard to the production of animals and their products, sent from this continent to England. In this connection also, the hon. gentleman spoke of what he called our proposition to allow American animals to come into this country free, and suggested that our animals would run the great danger of being scheduled in England because of that free interchange. I was surprised that that hon. gentleman, who is known as a great legal light, should have made such a statement as that. I remember when some other hon. gentleman who, perhaps, was more rash in his statements than the hon. gentleman, made an allusion to this matter in the same sense, but I was surprised to find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) forget, apparently, that there is a statutory offer on the Statute-book of this country, an offer which has been there for a long time, an offer which hon. gentlemen opposite have boasted of, and have thrown into our teeth for years back, an offer which the leader of these hon. gentlemen proposed to withdraw; but, in his proposition to withdraw it, does he propose to take out of that list animals and their products? On the contrary, in the very first line of the resolution which the Finance Minister proposes, for which I have no doubt the hon. member for North Simcoe will vote next week, and all those hon. gentlemen will vote who have been talking about the danger that we may have our animals scheduled in England, he says:

“That section 9 of the said Act be repealed—”

That is the section which says that the Governor General in Council may by Order in Council allow these articles to come in free from the United States.

“and the following substituted therefor: Any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds.”

That is the very first thing you come to, and yet the hon. gentleman says that we have introduced a danger to the export trade of cattle to England, when he knew that the Government of which he is a supporter, ever since 1879,

Mr. FISHER,

have made the same proposition to the United States, and that to-day when they are proposing to reconstruct their offer and to make changes in reference to that proposition, they still offer what, according to the hon. gentleman amounts to ruining the Canadian export trade in cattle. This is of a piece with the other arguments of the hon. gentleman, with the changes and the difficulties which those hon. gentlemen find themselves in, when, as usual, they try to trim, to hunt with the hounds and to run with the hare. I have something more to say in regard to this question, which is perhaps more germane to the proposition before the House, because reciprocity with the United States has been dealt with, and voted upon, and the hon. gentlemen who voted against it took their lives in their hands, and many of them, when they go before the people, will find that they will have to retire into private life. There is, however, another question, and that is the question of an extension of our commercial relations with the Empire. The hon. member in introducing this resolution, —and I congratulate him on the manner in which, as a young member, he did it—stated that he did not wish England to give us a preference without giving her something in return. He did not very definitely say what he was prepared to give in return; but the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was a little more clear, although not as specific as I would like him to have been; but to a certain extent he did tell us what he was prepared to give in return. He indicated what he was willing to give by quoting from English sources, from certain people in England called Fair Traders to show what they expected us to give them in return. Now, I was a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Simcoe so completely give himself and his friends away—to use a slang expression—when he announced that the farming community in this country needed to have their condition improved, and that it ought to be improved by some means which would be consistent with the manufacturing interests. That is all right. That part of his speech was quite consistent with the action which he and his friends have hitherto taken, and quite consistent with the amendment which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries moved to the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford the other day. The hon. member for Simcoe went on a little while afterwards to say that the farming community of this country was the largest in number, that they were practically the toiling masses of this country and that they must be considered. Brave words, Mr. Speaker, and I will be glad if the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends would act upon them, and in framing legislation would remember that, as a matter of fact, the farming class are not only the foundation and basis of our community, but in numbers they are actually four-fifths of the whole population, and the capital invested in agriculture is seven and a-half or eight times as great as is the capital invested in the manufacturing industries of this country. But, Sir, he said that the manufacturer probably would have to suffer a little. I understood him to mean that the farmers would have to be carefully considered, even though it should be necessary for the manufacturers to suffer a little. Sir, that is very disloyal. These hon. gentlemen, a few weeks ago, were telling us, when we made such a proposition, that we were disloyal to the best interests of our country, that we were proposing to destroy this country, to interfere with the vested rights, as they called them, of the manufacturers, which had been built up by our protective tariff. But to-day, according to the hon. member for Simcoe, they are ready to hurt the manufacturers a little for the sake of the farmers. Sir, I am a little surprised to hear that from the hon. member for Simcoe and his friends, because a little while ago they were declaring most emphatically that not one jot of our protective tariff, so far as it relates to manu-

facturers, must be disturbed, and they declared then, and they declare now, they are quite ready to take away from the farming community of this country their protection, and to sacrifice the interests of the farming classes, in so far as the abandonment of protection will sacrifice them. I do not believe it will. Sir, I am quite prepared to believe that the farming community can exist without protection. As a matter of fact, the protection which was extended to the farming community since 1878, has been an entire delusion. Surely if the principle which hon. gentlemen opposite denounce that protection must be upheld in the interests of a class, then they ought to uphold the principle of protection to the farmers just as much as to manufacturers and other interests. But, no, they are quite ready to sacrifice all the protection they have given to farmers. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Simcoe went on to quote from English sources, to describe the great progress that the fair trade movement in England has been making. I quite agree with the hon. member that there are in England to-day a goodly number of fair traders. There are always in England a large number of individuals who are always ready to take up anything new and discuss it, hold conventions on it, form leagues and associations for the advancement of any ideas they have. We can name, perhaps, a hundred leagues which are to-day in existence for the promulgation of one principle or another. It is true, Sir, that attempts have been made by the Conservative party in England to make this a party question, but as was acknowledged by the hon. member himself, they have not so far succeeded; and the leaders of the Conservative party have again and again refused point blank to take up this question and make it a plank in their platform. Sir, they are wise in their day and generation, for they know perfectly well that those principles of free trade which Bright and Cobden taught in England some years ago, those principles upon which the great free trade campaign was conducted to a successful issue, are so well established in England that there is no possibility whatever of the electors of England being brought to reject them. The hon. member quoted some words from several fair traders, and I have here some quotations of perhaps later authorities than some he has given. Last November a great fair trade meeting was held in England, and at that meeting the platform and principles of the league were fairly announced. The great English dailies the next day had editorials on it and accepted the meeting as the exponent of the principles of the fair traders in England, and alluded to them as the official announcement of what the fair traders wanted to do. At that meeting Mr. Cunliffe Lister, who was mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe, and whom I believe to be one of the leading lights in this fair trade movement, and whose dictum upon the question is accepted as authority, said upon that occasion:

"Fair traders advocate to-day, as they did six years ago and as they have done ever since, duties on foreign manufactures, combined with duties on all foreign imports of food, but stipulating always for the free import of raw materials needed for home industry."

Now, the *Times* newspaper is generally considered to be the most perfect exponent of public opinion in England; it is a newspaper which, in all circumstances, desires to express what it believes to be the prevailing sentiments of the English people. And what does the *Times* say?

"So far as words are concerned this is clear enough. When we come to things it becomes somewhat obscure and what is more the policy, such as it is propounded by Mr. C. Lister, was expressly repudiated by one of the speakers at the conference. Mr. Dixon Hartland declared he could not be a party to taxing corn. There is thus still a rift within the lute. Fair traders are not entirely agreed as to whether they will advocate a duty on corn or not."

And here comes, I think, the most pithy statement of the question in England which I have ever heard:

"The manufacturers would like to put a duty on manufactures, but the agriculturist will not let him. The agriculturist would like to put a

duty on corn, but the manufacturer will not let him. When these two parties are agreed we shall begin to believe in the strength of the Fair Trade League."

I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the time has come for the two parties to be agreed. This was the result of that great meeting. There is a little addendum to this in an editorial in the *Times*, which the hon. gentleman might take to heart, and which expresses pretty clearly the opinion the majority of the people of England have on this movement:

"We are now told that Fair Traders are Protectionists pure and simple, with a sort of platonic predilection for what they are pleased to call 'Commercial Federation of the Empire.' 'They would' as Mr. C. Lister said yesterday, 'put a duty on everything foreign except raw material, placing, however our colonies and dependencies in the position of having free entry here if they gave us free entry in return.'"

Are hon. gentlemen ready to give English manufacturers free entry here in return?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen say "no." If hon. gentlemen are willing to discriminate against England then they may be quite sure that England will discriminate against the colonies. So long as we impose duties on British manufactures, British manufacturers will not allow us to impose a duty on the food of their laborers. Moreover, it does not follow that if we allow British manufactures to come in free, England would admit our products free and discriminate against those of other nations. I attended the British Association meetings in Montreal, which were attended by a large number of the best intellects of Britain. I attended the economic section, and a discussion arose relating to the commercial relations of the Empire, when the question of Canadian intercourse with England came up a gentleman proposed Imperial Federation or Imperial free trade, with discriminating duties against foreign countries. There were present a large number of representatives of British manufacturers, and there was one universal chorus of horror at the idea that they could be tempted under any circumstances or conditions to impose a duty on corn coming into England. The figures quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) show that the importations of foreign corn were enormous, and to-day the British colonies do not produce or at all events ship anything like to meet the surplus required by England from foreign markets. The hon. gentleman said that the duty to be imposed on foreign corn would be sufficient to give a very large return in the English markets. If so, what benefit would it be to us? It would not displace foreign corn, we would still have to compete with it. One of the two things would happen: either it would not increase our corn production and consequently would not displace foreign corn, or if it did so displace it, the duty would not give the income expected to be obtained from the duty on foreign corn. Mr. Cunliffe Lister says:

"Let us have free trade within the Empire, or as near it as may be possible, and no longer should we be dependent on the foreigner who refuses to deal with us."

The *Times* says:

"By all means we reply, but how are we to get free trade within the empire? It is not true to say the foreigner refuses to deal with us, and certainly if any foreigner does refuse to deal with us, we cannot be in any way dependent on him. But so far as it is true that foreigners refuse to deal with us, it is equally true that many of our own colonies refuse to deal with us. If fair traders really can tell us how we can better persuade the colonies to adopt free trade than by showing that we ourselves believe in free trade, they have certainly so far succeeded in keeping a very important piece of information to themselves."

Therefore, although the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is advocating commercial Imperial confederation or free trade in the Empire, it must be remembered that if there is an obstacle to free trade in the Empire it has been brought about more by hon. gentlemen opposite than by

any other individuals in the Empire, because Canada in this respect has gone beyond any other of the colonies and placed a stumbling block which it is impossible to overcome to any movement for free trade within the Empire. I will read another short extract to show what is the opinion of England on this question, and it is not going too far to say that this is a fair representation of that opinion. After discussing the old question of free trade or protection, the writer goes on to say:

"As for the other branch of their policy—namely, the commercial federation of the Empire—it seems to us to be a proposition applicable rather to Jupiter or Saturn than to the actual world in which we live."

This is a deliberate statement taken from the first editorial article in the *London Times* dealing with the question and after the full exposition of it by the leader of the fair trade movement at the meeting to which I have alluded. The same article goes on to say:

"It might be possible, if the colonies were at one with each other and with the mother country, to establish a customs union which would secure free commercial interchange between the different parts of the Empire combined with hostile tariffs against foreign nations. Whether it would be expedient or not is another question, into which at present it is quite unnecessary to enter. But the colonies are not at one with each other, nor with the mother country. Victoria and New South Wales cannot agree with each other. Canada seems at present to be moving rather in the direction of commercial union with the United States than in that of commercial union with the United Kingdom."

There is another part of the hon. gentleman's speech to which I cannot refrain from alluding very briefly. He gave a very lugubrious account of the present depression in England. I was certainly surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is rather an important person and whose words carry weight, should have followed the policy which he has so roundly condemned in hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taunted us with decrying our country and have accused us of being unpatriotic, because we have said that Canada was not so prosperous as she should be; but the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was quite ready to rise and state that the mother country is to-day suffering from commercial depression and is practically on the highway to ruin. I am not going to accuse the hon. gentleman of want of patriotism. If those are the facts relating to England we should know them, just as we should know the exact state of affairs respecting our own country. I do not attack a man's patriotism if he points out the remedy for a deplorable state of affairs, if such should exist. But if the hon. gentleman's accusation in regard to hon. members on this side of the House is true, then I must say he is as unpatriotic as we are. What are the facts? He says England to-day is depressed. I came across a report in a paper which the hon. gentleman will acknowledge to be a good protectionist organ, the *Montreal Star*, and that organ says in alluding, not to anything of its own but to a report which the hon. gentlemen will be content to accept as authority. Here is what the *Montreal Star* said about Mr. Giffen's report to the British Board of Trade. Mr. Giffen is well known all over the British Empire as a gentleman who is in no sense a partisan but who is essentially and before everything else a statistician, a man who deals with figures, examines those figures and gives the result:

"Mr. Giffen's report to the British Board of Trade shows that Great Britain maintains its relative superiority with regard to foreign trade. In the open markets of the world the old country still distances all competitors. To some countries, such as India and Australia, it sends by far the greater part of what they import from foreign countries. Great Britain sends to Egypt 47 per cent. of all that it imports, France and Germany send 14 per cent. each, and the United States 1 per cent. To the Argentine Republic, Uruguay and Chili, it sends from 28 to 39 per cent. of all they import, France sends 17 per cent., Germany from 8 to 19 per cent., and the United States 7 per cent. As much as 28 per cent. of all that China imports is sent by Great Britain, while Germany and France send next to nothing and the United States only 4 per cent. The Japanese get 43 per cent. of all their foreign goods from Great Britain, 9 per cent. from the United States, 7 per cent. from Germany and 5 per cent. from France. The preponderance of Great Britain is conspicuous in every country except Canada."

Mr. FISHER.

And mind you, Sir, that is after ten years of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite which was intended to foster a trade between us and Great Britain and to discriminate in favor of Great Britain.

"There the contiguity of the United States gives it an immense advantage. But as regards European countries, what Canada imports from the whole of them does not amount to much more than one-sixth of what she imports from the mother country alone. Germany, about who rivalry in foreign trade with Great Britain so much has been said does not, according Mr. Giffen, send to British North America more than 1.7 of its imports. Mr. Giffen's general conclusion is that 'Germany has not been gaining in common markets of late years at the expense of English trade. Its gains have been in special directions. Our predominance in the great common markets remains substantially what it was ten years ago.'"

This is only one evidence. I have here another quotation which is taken from the *Times* of last November, and in allusion to that same meeting which the Fair Trade League had held in London:

"The whole basis of their argument is the allegation that our trade is declining. The allegation is not true. 'In point of fact,' says our correspondent, 'English manufacturers and English industry in general whatever may be the case with one or two branches only are now developed to a greater degree than ever they were before, and our exports to foreign countries are also greater than they ever were before.'"

This does not look as if England were going back in the commercial race of the world. As a matter of fact to a certain extent it has apparently been slightly retrograding in consequence of the lower values of goods, but if you take the amount of goods exported, England has held her prominent position more than she ever did before. To-day she does most of the carrying trade of the world, and has a greater command of the markets open to competition, than she ever had in any period of her history before. Those things show pretty clearly that England does not need to take up this policy which is proposed to her. Her old free trade doctrine is carrying her to prosperity and keeping her in a sound condition. It shows more than that, that the efforts which have been made to deprecate this free trade success, and the efforts which have been made to point out what is called the depression in consequence of free trade are clearly inaccurate and misleading in fact. It is also a warning to us in this country. At one time it would have been better for us if we had taken the example of the mother country, and if we had followed the good advice given by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), instead of, as was unfortunately the case in 1878, following the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, who for the purpose of carrying the country at that time, chose to take the example of his neighbors to the south and chose to take that example which his followers have told him he was wrong to have done. We would have been in a far more prosperous position to-day, and we would not have been obliged to consider either the United States or the British Empire in our internal economy or our internal legislation if we had followed the policy laid down by Mr. Mackenzie. The great reason why it is necessary for Canada to regulate her commercial policy by the commercial policy of England and the States, is because our progress has been baulked in consequence of the policy of protection which the hon. gentlemen opposite have insisted on this country adopting. I do not see how it is possible that this proposition can be practically carried into effect. I read with great interest some words of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in *Toronto* a little while ago and those words I fully endorse. I thought that when the hon. gentleman uttered those words he was going to come to a different conclusion from what he did, for certainly his first conclusion does not appear to me to agree with his support of this motion. The hon. gentleman said:

"He did not think the practical Canadian people were prepared to endorse any scheme which did not hold out any hope, any prospect of being adopted on practical lines and being capable of practical solution."

He was then advocating a policy which he has not yet shown in the slightest degree, to be practical. He comes before us and he supports the motion of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) but he has not shown us the practical solution of these difficulties which he has acknowledged were to be found in the discussions at the Free Trade League meeting in England. Instead of trying to forward a policy which would be practical he has attempted what I believe to be a dream, and a dream which never can be realised. It is a fact that the Empire to-day is composed of very widely scattered portions; it is a fact that they are building up new states in far distant portions of the Empire, and I believe if there is going to be any possibility of holding that Empire together it will be by giving each portion of it the fullest latitude and jurisdiction to deal with its own affairs as it thinks best for its own welfare. Thus and thus only will you be able to keep the Empire together. If we try, by any paper plan, to bring the bonds closer and try to draw the string more tight between the outlying portions of the Empire the result will be, as it has been unfortunately in this Dominion, a rather straining of relations between the different portions of the Empire a tendency to arouse irritation between the different portions and eventually to break up the Empire into a large number of possibly antagonistic states. The efforts of the leader of this House to centralise in this Dominion have been unfortunate. His efforts to make a legislative union, though he cannot adopt a legislative union in theory, are very unfortunate. We, as Canadians, can give a warning to the whole Empire that they shall not carry out the same mistake as we did and that they shall not be lauded in the same difficulties as we have been. It is not from any lack of patriotism that I thus prefer that this resolution should not pass, or that this question be dealt with on the lines laid down by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I yield to no one in my patriotism. I hold, as everyone in this country holds, that the Queen is the head of our country and our Government, just as much as she is of the English people, the Irish people and the Australian people. But, Sir, I do not acknowledge any allegiance whatever to the Parliament of England. We in this country are a portion of the British Empire, having free institutions, ruling ourselves in a Parliament that is supreme in this country; and we believe that the more that is done and acknowledged and insisted upon, the better chance there is that we shall remain good friends with the rest of the British Empire and with the mother country herself. I trust that it will be a long time before we in this country have any other head to our Government than the Queen of England; I trust that we shall long remain a portion of the British Empire; but, Sir, I do not believe that, to occupy that ground, it is necessary that we should be subject to the Parliament of Great Britain or be ruled except by our own people, and in accordance with the views of our own people as expressed on this floor. Sir, the patriotism I glory in is the patriotism which leads me to do what I consider best in the interests of the people of Canada, and I believe I shall be doing that by favoring such measures as will tend to extend and increase the trade of our people. The hon. member for Simcoe gave utterance to some good and sound advice on this question. He said he believed we must discuss it purely from a Canadian standpoint, and I have been trying to do so; but we know that hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing the question of reciprocity with the United States, prominently brought forward what they call the interests of the Empire. I have heard and seen in the press utterances of some hon. gentlemen from which I would be led to believe that they did not care at all for the interests of Canada, but were sent here especially to look after the interests of the Empire. It will be well for men who come here from the mother country to think of those interests; but I have to look back through many generations to con-

sider any interests but those of the country in which I have been born and brought up, that is Canada. In taking that position we follow the example of the mother country. In England, have we heard one word of what would be for the advantage of Canada from Imperial federation? Not one. Have we known any man there to call on the English people to accept that doctrine for the benefit of the colonies? Not one. It has been urged on the English people by its advocates because they said it would be for the benefit of the manufacturing and agricultural classes of England; and one reason why England has been governed so well is that her statesmen have always been true to the English principle that it was their duty to look after the interests of the English people and nothing else. In the Associated Chambers of Commerce in London, in February last, a question similar to this was brought up, and I will just read to you this description in the *Daily News* of what occurred on that occasion:

"A motion in favor of such changes in the fiscal arrangements existing between Great Britain, her colonies and dependencies as would increase the trade of the British Empire, was opposed by Mr. Mundella, M.P.—"

Hon. gentlemen are all familiar enough with his name to know that he is a pretty high authority on commercial questions in England; and what did he say?

"He pointed out that the colonies could not supply us with all our needs. The United States were at the present moment the greatest market for our manufactures; and was it not possible that if we acted in the way suggested by the resolution, the United States would subject us to differential treatment? What would become of us then? We imported silks and tea from China, and were we going to put an increased duty on those articles? It would be cutting our own throats. The suggestion was especially ill-timed, when the United States were in the middle of a controversy regarding free trade. President Cleveland had undoubtedly taken a step in the direction of free trade, and if, or when, it was adopted, and America was made one of the cheapest instead of one of the dearest countries in the world, great advantage would accrue, not only to herself but to the English colonies."

What was the result of that discussion in that purely commercial body, which is representative of the whole United Kingdom? "The motion was lost by an overwhelming majority." No, Sir; the people in the mother land look on this question purely and simply from their own standpoint considering whether it is going to benefit them, and not in any sense whether it is going to benefit us. Then the question of differential duties was mooted there, Mr. Mundella did not look to Canada; he looked to the United States, and his fear was that the United States might put on retaliatory duties, and injure English trade. Hon. gentlemen know that although we are a portion of the British Empire, and although our flag is the flag of the British Empire, our trade is intimately connected with that of the United States. Sir, by looking after the true interests of Canada, we shall, I believe, best conserve our relations with England and the most outlying portions of the British Empire. I must hope that this motion be not persisted in, or at all events that it be not carried.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). As the hour is late, and we have listened to several speeches this evening on this very interesting subject, which has been so ably brought before the House, I do not propose to occupy the attention of hon. gentlemen at any great length. Indeed, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have rendered it unnecessary at this stage of the debate, for those who are in favor of the principle of the motion, and the resolution on the motion paper to which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred, to elaborate the case. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have successively taken their seat, one apparently from an avowed sympathy with the motion, and the other for reasons best known to himself, have avoided the main question before the House. The hon. gentleman who last spoke took up considerable time in discussing the question of trade relations with the United States, and alluded at considerable length

to the question of Imperial federation. Neither of these questions is before the House on the present occasion. The question before the House has nothing to do with the question of Imperial federation. It is true, many of the leagues in Canada, and Canada alone, have favored some question of this kind; but neither the league in Canada nor the league in England has subscribed to the principles in this resolution. Therefore I do not understand why, when this question is important enough, broad enough, and big enough to engage our consideration, such questions as Imperial federation and other questions which have been discussed outside of the House and are in no way connected with this important trade question should be brought before the House. I was somewhat sorry, in listening to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who poses in this House as a temperance man, and who lectures his brethren some times as to what they should do on that subject, dwell so long on the growth and export of barley in Canada. The main use for barley is for malting purposes, and surely my hon. friend has not receded from the strong position on the temperance question which he has so long occupied. My hon. friend discussed one other point only, and perhaps not the most important point, mentioned by the hon. member for North Simcoe, and that was the practicability of this resolution or of the scheme embodied in it. He took issue on that point with the hon. gentleman, who was sanguine that the day was coming when it would be practicable to go to the English Government with such a policy as this, and to endeavor to make trade arrangements for the Empire—not between Canada and the mother country, but between the mother country and all the different colonies of the Empire. I did not understand either the mover of the resolution or the hon. member for North Simcoe or the resolution itself to go so far as to ask that this Government should at once approach the Government of the mother country with this policy. I understood the hon. member for North Simcoe to take an entirely different position in the debate. I understood him to forcibly allude to the different facts occurring every day in England, in order to show that the current of public opinion there was in favor of a trade policy for the British Empire, as distinct from the policy of England with the rest of the world. In support of that position, the hon. gentleman was able to show strong reasons. He was able to point to the unmistakable utterances of a powerful party in England to-day—he was able to point to the utterances of the leaders of that party and the body of men who constitute it, when they met in solemn conclave at Oxford, in favor of that view. But the trade returns and the consular reports appertaining to the British Empire furnish far wider reasons in support of the position taken by the advocates of this resolution. These reports and returns show unmistakably that, so far from the policy of free trade in the mother country carrying out the views and the opinions of the framers of that policy, who have stood by it for so many years—so far from these gentlemen being able to convince the world that free trade is the proper policy, steadily, day by day, all the nations of the world, all the countries that are the commercial rivals of Great Britain, are going more and more to the other extreme.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. TUPPER. These gentlemen have found the colonies of the Empire forced to adopt a protective policy, and they have found that the foothold of England, once unchallenged, in the different markets of the world, foreign as well as colonial, is steadily becoming weaker.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. TUPPER. In a moment I will give the hon. gentleman my authority for making the statement. The statistics to which I have alluded, and to which the House will

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

permit me briefly to refer, fully bear it out. Comparing the position which England holds in the foreign markets to-day with that she held formerly, we find that to the colonies, in 1872, England exported \$320,500,000 worth of goods, while in 1886 she exported to them \$350,000,000 worth, showing a steady increase; and if you take her returns of exports to foreign countries, which formerly were her monopoly, you will find the proportion has decreased. In the last fifty years the imports by Great Britain from the colonies increased from \$75,000,000 to \$405,000,000, and her exports to the colonies increased to about the same extent, from \$75,000,000 to \$375,000,000. Those are important figures, and hon. gentlemen will see their force. They will see by them that this colonial question never entered the minds of English statesmen at the time they adopted their free trade policy, the value of the colonial trade then being as nothing compared with the value of the other trade. No one will seriously controvert that position, and it furnishes an important and powerful reason for the change that is coming over English public opinion. We find, for instance, Sir Robert Stout, the premier of New Zealand, in a very interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century*, written last year, citing as evidence in support of the position I took a short time ago and which hon. gentlemen opposite challenged, the important fact that in New South Wales, American contractors were able to obtain the contract for building the largest iron bridge ever built there, at a figure \$135,000 below the lowest tender from Great Britain herself. Hon. gentlemen will see from this one sample, that in her own colony and in that iron industry which, with the coal industry, at one time gave England the monopoly of the markets of the world, England can be outbid by a foreign competitor. In face of this evidence, hon. gentlemen ought to hesitate before contradicting the assertion that Great Britain has not in the foreign markets to-day the position she hitherto held. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite try to minimise the undoubtedly grand results that would follow from increased trade between the mother country and her colonies. No man from the Maritime Provinces, I venture to say, would for a moment declare that he would be in favor of frustrating a movement which has in view the increase in commerce not only between the mother country and the Maritime Provinces but between the different colonies of the British Empire and the Maritime Provinces. We have expended without demur in times past large sums of public money in the endeavor to create a trade between the West Indies and Canada, and hon. gentlemen opposite have always held that the money spent in this view was well spent, and that to open up new channels of trade was an object that should be encouraged. We find these potent facts, that, in the West Indies to-day, our competitor is not merely the mother country, but we find there, as in the English markets themselves, that the American States are our competitors. They actually buy from us about 700,000 lbs. of dried fish to send to the West Indies. Their trade relations are so complete with that portion of the British Empire that they do not only their own trade but a part of ours with them. Of course, you can encourage that trade by subsidising steamers, but it, nevertheless, is true that you can encourage and foster it in the way proposed by the resolution now before the House. Not only do the United States send our productions there, but they also send them to Africa, to the extent of \$5,000,000 annually; to Australasia, to the extent of \$10,500,000 annually; and to Great Britain and Ireland, where they meet us as gigantic competitors, they send \$447,000,000 worth of goods annually. The last gentleman who addressed the House, as a practical farmer, as one who is familiar with the trade between the mother country and the Dominion of Canada, mentioned *en passant* three articles in which we had a large trade with the mother country, cheese, butter, and I did not catch the other article

which he mentioned. Even under present circumstances, I find competing with us in the markets of the old world that country to the south of us which Mr. Gladstone referred to recently as making progress by leaps and bounds, and he predicted that it was possible that it would disturb even Great Britain in the near future. We find that, in regard to cheese, we send more to Great Britain than the United States do. But there are a host of things in regard to which they interfere with us. Looking at the trade Returns, I find—though I have not had time to look the question up as I would wish to do—and taking the consular reports of the United States and the official documents published in Washington in 1885, the following results:—

| | Great Britain Imported. | From United States. | From Canada. |
|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Cattle..... | \$16,661,210 | \$17,686,815 | \$4,650,595 |
| Sheep and lambs.... | 12,591,091 | 157,775 | 919,495 |
| Bacon and hams.... | 50,181,630 | 39,502,605 | 746,178 |
| Beef..... | 14,471,985 | 13,371,490 | 4,391 |
| Butter, &c..... | 58,869,685 | 2,811,580 | 1,423,016 |
| Cheese..... | 24,452,000 | 13,478,520 | 7,777,675 |
| Fish..... | 11,509,830 | 2,826,540 | 1,500,000 |
| Wood and timber... | 83,876,419 | { (about) } | 13,142,663 |
| | | 6,000,000 } | |

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is simply confirming what I said, that our chief export to England was animals and their products, and that we exported a larger amount in proportion to our population than the United States did.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). If I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, that is another thing, but I do not think he mentioned the article of fish or the article of lumber. At any rate, if the hon. gentleman will look through the trade returns, and I hesitate to weary the House by giving the proof of this at this hour, he will see that we send a considerable number of other articles in the same way. We are sending an appreciable quantity of manufactures, we are sending something of nearly every article, and the whole point is that you cannot judge of the trade which we could do by that which we do at present. Large as our trade has been in the past, you are not to judge what it may be in the future, or to test the merits of this resolution simply by what it has been in the past; but, if we have been able to do something, in spite of the strong and powerful competitors we have on the south, what can we do if we receive the preference in the different colonial markets? No one will dare to say that our advantages will not be great in that regard. I will not refer to the matter of canned goods and fruit which we export, which are becoming large items of our trade, and which, under any circumstances, we hope to increase year by year. But, in reference to all these matters, the slightest change in the tariff, the smallest amount that could be obtained from the British Government under an arrangement with the different colonies, would start all these industries in the most extraordinary and beneficial manner to Canada. The hon. gentleman spoke of the English merchants having no reason to fear competition in foreign markets, and said that our whole supposition was fallacious, without a careful consideration of the action which England would be sure to take in this matter. If you look over the blue-books published in England as well as those published in the United States, you will see that not only are the manufacturers of the neighboring Republic meeting the English manufacturers in colonial markets, but also the German manufacturers to an alarming extent. I could quote from the reports of English and German as well as American consuls, to show that the Germans and Americans are driving the English from the position they once held; but I may summarise these reports by one small quotation from Sir Thomas Brassey's work on "Foreign work and English wages" in which he says:

"Excluded from the principal manufacturing countries by a protectionist policy, it is to the colonies and to the half civilised countries that we must look for new openings for the expansion of our trade."

When English public opinion is looking towards the growing commercial trade, it is wise for us not to formulate any policy here, the time has not come for that, and to make any definite expression of our views now would be unwise, but we should, by an expression of the opinion of Parliament in an unmistakeable manner, show public men in the old country who may help this matter, what our sympathies are and that we hope the day will come when this will be carried out. I hope that some day the representative men of the Australasian confederation will go to London and meet the representatives of the other colonies and arrange a system which will be beneficial to all the colonies, as well as to the mother country itself. In this, there is no attack upon self-government or upon commercial autonomy. It is not necessary to invoke any sentiment in regard to this matter, but there is simply a trade proposition before the House; and I understood the mover of the resolution and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to give no uncertain voice on this question, that this is no time for action, but that it is desirable to tell the distinguished men in Great Britain, men like Mr. Chamberlain who has given the benefit of his great ability to this subject, that we are ready to meet them, and that there is nothing in the National Policy antagonistic to this matter or to the benefit of the farmers of that country. It is not proposed, as I understand it, and if it is proposed I am against it tooth and nail, to interfere with the vested interests of the country. It is proposed, on the other hand, to give them far more protection than they now have. Whatever other hon. gentlemen have to say upon the question, I for one, would not go for lowering the duties which are necessary for a fair protection of the manufacturing industries of this country, to the extent of one single farthing. But I think an arrangement can be made; I think we can raise the duties on other goods when the time comes. But certainly if there is an unanimous desire throughout the colonies and Great Britain—I mean by unanimous desire such a one as will induce political action—I am satisfied that when the time comes, an arrangement can be easily and willingly made by this country to carry out the objects which the mover of this resolution has in view. I promised the House not to deal with the position of the hon. member for Brome, as far as the question of reciprocity is concerned. It was quite natural that the hon. member for North Simcoe should explain his views as far as they affected the question of commercial union; and I quite admit that my hon. friends opposite who, a year or two ago, might consistently have joined hands with us, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) wished to do to-night, in legislating as far as we could towards a consummation of such a policy, are, to a large extent, debarred from it. They wish to throw in their fortunes with the United States, our competitors in nearly all the articles of trade between Great Britain and ourselves. We, on the other hand, who support the substance of the resolution, and the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe, desire closer trade relations with the mother country and the colonies which constitute the British Empire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does seem to me rather extraordinary that a motion of such importance as this should have been discussed the whole evening without any member of the Government giving to the House the slightest indication of what the views of the Government are upon this question. We are told by the seconder of this motion that it is one of paramount importance, that it is one effecting not merely the future well-being of Canada, but one of the utmost consequence to the whole Empire; and yet, after such declaration as that, made by a gentle-

man who occupies a very prominent place on the front benches of the Ministerial side, not a member of Government, up to this moment, has given to the House the slightest indication of what their views may be upon the subject. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever that this measure is one, if it were adopted, of a revolutionary character. If we are to believe what hon. gentlemen opposite contended on another important proposition that was under the consideration of the House at an earlier period of the Session, we should come to the conclusion that the proposition now before the House would lead to the absolute destruction of everything like self-government in this country. Sir, those hon. gentlemen informed us again and again that anything like absolute free trade between Canada and the United States must ultimately lead to the wiping out of our political institutions, and there can be no doubt whatever that if they were to abandon the policy upon which the Government entered some years ago, and adopt the views expressed in this resolution, an equally great calamity would befall this country. We would have our autonomy wiped out, and we would be absorbed into the government of the United Kingdom. Sir, if there is danger on the one hand, there would be still greater danger on the other; and if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches entertain those views which the exponents of the Government put forward upon another proposition, we can come to but one conclusion with regard to their views as to what would be the political effect of this proposition. Now, an hon. gentleman has made a proposition which would lead to a complete change in the fiscal policy of this country. Are the Government prepared to recommend to this House that change? The Government asked us again and again, what were we to do if we wiped the $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions that we now derive from the imposition of taxes upon our trade with the United States? I ask them this question: What, under this proposition, are they to do if they wipe out 10 or 12 millions of customs duties which they receive by taxes upon our trade with the United Kingdom? There can be no doubt whatever that if the proposition of the hon. gentleman who moved this motion is carried out—I lay aside the commentary that was read upon the proposition by the hon. gentleman who seconded it—there must be an abandonment of those taxes which the Government have imposed on articles produced in the United Kingdom which have hitherto been consumed in this country. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen do not suppose for one moment that the people of the United Kingdom would, if they were making such an arrangement as is proposed, permit the articles of Canada to come in absolutely free of taxes into the market of the United Kingdom, while those of the United Kingdom coming into Canada would be subject to a very heavy taxation. What do the Government propose, then? We find this proposition moved by one supporter of the Government, seconded by another, and supported in a speech by another gentleman who we are told, is looking with longing eyes, and not without hope to the Treasury benches. Sir, I think it is rather extraordinary, under these circumstances, that the Government should have, up to this moment, failed to indicate to the House what their views are upon the question. Are they in favor of abandoning their National Policy, and of accepting a policy of the federation of the Empire, for that is precisely what this proposition means. The hon. gentleman who seconded the motion told us that this was not quite so explicit as the proposition which he had submitted but that it was really a proposition with the same object and aim in view. And so the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House a proposition which we are led to believe has the support of the Government, proposing to wipe \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 of customs duty, and establish absolute free trade between Canada and the United Kingdom. Now, the First Minister is in his place, and I put to him the question: Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

If he could not see his way to carry on the Government of this country in abandoning the \$7,000,000 of taxes that we get upon trade with the United States, how is he prepared to carry on the Government of the country and to abandon the \$12,000,000 of taxes that we receive from trade with the United Kingdom? Does the First Minister propose to accept this proposition? Does he attach to it the importance that is attached to it by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who have spoken? Does he subscribe to the doctrine that fair trade is in the air, and that the policy of fair trade at this moment constitutes the policy of the Conservative party in the United Kingdom, that Lord Salisbury is a supporter of that policy in disguise, without the courage of his convictions, and that all those who support him entertain the same views? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the United Kingdom, their representatives, at all events, have rather a strange way of exhibiting their devotion to this principle. If I remember rightly, but a few weeks ago a vote was taken in the House of Commons upon the subject, and there were 4 supporters to 304 opponents. That, I think, was the way the vote stood. Those hon. gentlemen are proposing to us a proposition that, however favorably it may be received by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and those behind them, certainly has not been very favorably received by the representatives of the people of the United Kingdom. We are dealing here with questions of practical politics, and I suppose the Government are not prepared to abandon what they call the National Policy unless they see some hope of this new policy being adopted, and the action of the Parliament of the United Kingdom on the question does not indicate a very great disposition to carry it out at a very early day. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in discussing this question not long since in Toronto told us that the theory of a Federal Government was propounded by Lord Durham in 1837, and it was not until 1864 that serious steps were taken with a view to consummating the policy of union which Lord Durham in his report had indicated. And so, the hon. gentleman says, we should not be discouraged. But it is rather an extraordinary proposition to submit to this Parliament, that we should at this moment disregard our present interests and present necessities and should look to the condition of things thirty or forty years hence, and undertake to exercise a policy of self-denial and act upon lines that are only to lead to conclusion long after we have not only ceased to be members of this House but inhabitants of the world. There is a great deal of force in the observations addressed some years ago to the people by the Rev. Sydney Smith. He said: Gentlemen, so long as you are members of the congregation and occupants of the pews you have the right to decide what shall be done in the parish church, but after you have become occupants of the graveyard, after you have ceased to be here and others have taken your places, you ought to leave them the same privilege of judging what is best in their own interests as you claim for yourself when living. So long as you are masters of the ship you may say that the ship shall sail east or west, but when you have resigned your position and it is placed in charge of other persons, it is for them to say in what direction it shall sail and upon what voyage it shall enter. And so I say that those who occupy the places we now occupy thirty or forty years hence will be the best judges as to what policy shall be adopted in their day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of what ought to be adopted now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the hon. gentleman's proposition. The hon. gentleman pointed out that Lord Durham in 1837 decided in favor of a union and it was not until 1864 that serious steps were taken to carry it out; but now we have a speech in favor of the principle of federation

of the Empire at some period in the remote future, and that some one will then be in favor of giving effect to the policy at this time enunciated. I am not in favor of any such policy. I believe any step in that direction would diminish our power of self-government, it would increase our responsibilities, it would impose serious burdens from which at the present time we are relieved, and I am not disposed to sacrifice our present opportunity for practical improvement and our present lines of public policy that are in the interests of the people, in favor of some fancied scheme upon which it is necessary to consult another party which has a paramount interest in the question, especially when there is not the slightest indication of any disposition on their part to adopt the policy we are now marking out for them. The people of the United Kingdom number 37,000,000, and the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall mark out here a policy for those 37,000,000 and tell them what is the best course to adopt at this moment in order that we may convert them to our views and at some period induce them to accept what he and some other hon. gentlemen believe to be an excellent policy. The hon. gentleman also told the House that the people of Ontario were more prosperous than are the people of the United States to-day. That was a very extraordinary announcement for the hon. gentleman to make. One would suppose it was a statement of which he had been ignorant. It seems to be new to the hon. gentleman, quite as new as the calculation of an eclipse would be to an Indian. But this statement was as true ten years ago as it is to-day. There was a greater difference in 1877 between the relative prosperity of the people of the United States as a whole than to-day; and yet the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to declare that the whole country was going to ruin at that time. The present First Minister moved a resolution declaring that the people of this country were falling back, that people could not get employment and that if he was returned to power all this would come to an end. It did not come to an end. The people are leaving the country in greater numbers than before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say "Oh, yes," and statistics show it to be true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no doubt whatever of the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, every doubt of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are at least four times as many people leaving the country every year as there were in 1878. What did the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) tell us to night? The hon. gentleman said that the country is depressed, that trade is depressed, that the condition of the farmers, although better than the condition of the farmers in the United States, was far from satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, he did say so, I took down his words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, he did not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say he did, and the question will be decided by *Hansard* when the speech of the gentleman appears. The First Minister knows that the hon. gentleman went on and said what the price of wheat is to day, that it was 77½ cents a bushel. Now, the First Minister promised the people that it would never be less than a dollar. He further promised the people that the price of barley should never be less than it was in the United States.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have had better prices.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Simcoe, to-night has said that the farming population was in a depressed condition, but that it was brought about by matters over which the Government could exercise no control. I say the National Policy was intended to prevent that state of things. We were called flies on the wheel. Why did hon. gentlemen call us by that name? Hon. gentlemen when in Opposition promised to stop the emigration of the people and secure for every man good wages for a fair day's work and constant employment, and at the same time fair prices for our agricultural products. Yet what is the statement of the resolution to-night? It is that such is not the condition of things, that the agricultural population are in a depressed condition, in an unsatisfactory condition and that it is necessary to bring about a better state of things than exists. How does the hon. gentleman propose to do it? He says: Let us enter into commercial relations with the United Kingdom and other British colonies; let us enter into a compact by which there shall be absolute free trade between the various portions of the British Empire and high tariff against all the rest of the world. That is the proposition of the mover. But does the supporter of that resolution take the same ground? Oh, no; he tells us a different story. He says: That is too high a price to pay for such an arrangement as this, we would not like to have absolute free trade, we have got to consider the condition of the manufacturers to some extent, and the manufacturers have got to make concessions to the farmers. Now, take it at the present time that the manufacturer gets 60 per cent, and he must be content with 53, for the hon. gentleman says: Let us take off 6 or 7 per cent, so as to give the English manufacturer a little advantage in the Canadian market, and giving him that little advantage they will give us absolute free trade and exclude the rest of the world from trading with them. Hon. gentlemen know that this is an absurd proposition. If the English Government and the people of England can be persuaded to act on the principle of free trade, and to tax the rest of the world and establish free trade between England and Canada and the colonies, it can only be on the principle of absolute free trade between the different portions of the Empire as exists between the different Provinces of this Dominion. But the hon. gentleman will not support such a proposition, and the hon. gentleman who seconded this proposition dare not express his approval of such a proposition as that. The hon. gentleman is in favor of the federation of the Empire under which our autonomy would be sacrificed, he is in favor of a federation of the Empire that would compel us to fight the battles of England and Russia and Central Asia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentlemen think this is nonsense. I believe that such a view is nonsense, but nevertheless, it is held by quite a number of his supporters. Here is a gallant general who sits on this side of the House, who assured the people of this city the other evening that Canada absolutely was spoiling for war, in which she would feel all the consequences and mischiefs of war, and under which she would feel the necessity of relying upon the right arm of England for her support, and then from the feelings of gratitude that would be so far carried on that she would be compelled to fight the Zulus in Africa and the Russians in Afghanistan. I notice that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did not quite fairly state the commercial relations and the trade of England with the United States. He represented the trade of England as declining, that her manufacturers were losing the markets of the world, and that all this was being brought about because other countries had adopted a protective policy. He referred to the fact that the trade of England with the United States was declining. Where is the evidence of that? The hon. gentleman took a year

that happened to favor his comparison, but let him take another year. The exports of England to the United States in 1878 were £14,500,000 and in 1886 £26,824,000 sterling; nearly double what they were in 1878. Why did not the hon. gentleman take some other year in which the comparison would not be quite so favorable to his argument?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He took 1885.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And I take 1886 when the trade is nearly £6,000,000 more than in 1885. Why did the hon. gentleman take 1885 and not 1886, for I apprehend he had the statistics before him? Then, when he comes to tell us about the report of the Commission of Enquiry into the depressed state of trade in England why did he read the report of the minority? The hon. gentleman did that, and he did not tell the House that it was a report of the minority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, he did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I accept that statement. I did not hear him say so. At all events the whole drift of his speech was simply a selection of evidence that suited the line of argument which he had adopted, and carefully ignoring whatever might tend to establish a different proposition. Then, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had thought as he does that free trade with England, with protection against all the rest of the world is such an advantage, why did he support the statutory offer? The hon. gentleman who leads the Government did not take the same view. The hon. gentleman proposes to establish free trade with the United States upon certain conditions. He never made such a proposition to England and in fact he declared in 1878 that we wanted a policy of retaliation to bring the United States to terms—that we wanted freer trade relations. What did the hon. gentleman do when he succeeded to power? Did he confine his increased taxation to the punishment of the people of the United States? Why, Sir, he applied the punishment to England as well. Does the hon. gentleman think it was a great advantage to this country to buy cheaply as well as to sell dearly? Why is it that he has adopted towards England which puts no tax on our exports the same policy that he does toward the United States where he said retaliation was necessary? The hon. gentleman has not taken the same view as to the importance of free trade with England that he has with regard to free trade with the United States, and yet the hon. gentleman's supporters here to-night state that they are prepared to adopt the other policy. Is the hon. gentleman who leads the Government prepared to adopt this policy? I am satisfied that the right hon. gentleman will not venture to ask the House to support this proposition. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman will not ask the House to agree to reciprocal trade between England and Canada. I am rather inclined to think—unless the hon. gentleman's views have undergone another revolution—that he will hardly be found here to support the views of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on the subject of Imperial Federation. I think that the hon. gentleman has both in England and in this country declared himself against such a proposition; and unless he has had new light—and I have not heard that he has announced views different from those he formerly expressed—I fancy he will not support the proposition of the hon. member who moved this motion or of the hon. member who seconded it. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) told us that the English are driven out of the market of the world by the German competitors. If the hon. gentleman would undertake to read the reports of English consuls, and they are quite accessible, he will find that that is not the case, and so far as it is the case in certain localities it is due to other and different causes. The reports of the English consuls at Rio Janiero, La Plata and other parts of South America, show that the Germans have sent into the various

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

republics of South America commercial travellers who are thoroughly conversant with the Spanish and Portuguese languages and he tells the English manufacturers that unless they send out men who are good linguists they cannot expect to sell goods with the same facilities that the Germans do. What is the reason that commercial men in England are saying just now: We must establish schools and colleges for men intending to engage in commercial pursuits in all parts of the world, where the modern languages will be taught to them? What is the report of the English consul from the capital of Japan? It is that the French and German commercial men there are thoroughly acquainted with the Japanese language. And they have sent their commercial agents all over Japan, while the English have sent men there who can scarcely speak a word of Japanese, and who have to confine themselves to the capital, and he says that unless they adopt the aggressive policy of the Germans and the French they cannot make the same progress in establishing a market for their goods in that country. He says their goods are better and cheaper—there is no doubt about that; but they have not men so well qualified to act on the part of those manufacturing and commercial houses as the French and German houses have. There is not one of the English consuls—and I believe I have read the reports of every one of them throughout the world—who assigns as a reason that the English are inferior as manufacturers and are failing in the race. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that our barley was a necessity to the people of the United States, and that as long as we chose to grow the article, the Americans will have it, no matter what the duty is. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. In 1875, the Americans raised but a very few million bushels of barley. To-day they raise more than five times the quantity they raised ten years ago; and as every one acquainted with agricultural populations knows, the people in large districts become habituated to run in a certain routine; they grow certain products, and unless something occurs to induce them to change the order of rotation of crops, and to introduce some new crop, no change will take place; but when the people of the United States began largely to consume malt liquors, and a demand arose for barley, the article began to command a high price, and the Americans began to grow it largely. So that neither on the American side of the line nor on the Canadian side does barley bring as high a price as it did ten years ago, and the Government have found themselves wholly unable to seriously affect the price of that article. Now, I am not going to delay the House by entering into a discussion of this question at any length, because the Government has no more serious idea than we have of accepting the principle laid down in the gentleman's motion. They know better than to accept any such proposition, and that being the case I do not think it is necessary to discuss the subject further.

Gen. LAURIE. I desire to make a personal explanation. If I were an older member of this House, I might have been prepared for the way in which this matter was referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It appears to me that he rather took the line of drawing a red herring across the track, to carry this discussion to Imperial federation. I do not think Imperial federation is concerned. But with reference to the remark that I am stated to have made, that the people of Canada were spoiling for a war, and that they should be taken to fight the battles of England in Central Asia among the Afghans, or in Africa among the Zulus, I think that is exactly the opposite of what I stated. What I stated was that it was giving a false impression of Imperial federation to say that that was the view of its promoters; but I stated at the same time—and I am satisfied that in this I shall carry the House with me—that

there was a strong feeling in Canada in favor of taking part in England's wars when she was in danger. But I certainly pointed out to the meeting I was addressing that it was not a true idea of Imperial federation that our people should be taken against their will to fight the battles of the Empire abroad.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not stand between the House for any length of time and any hon. gentleman who may wish to address it on this subject, but I wish to make a few remarks upon it. Before doing so, however, you will permit me to correct the history of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He declared that the party of the right hon. gentleman characterised himself and his friends as flies on the wheel. Why, Sir, they never did anything of the kind. That phrase originated with the hon. member for South Oxford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; there is the original proprietor of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I am perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for South Oxford was explaining political economy, and he declared that statesmen were only flies on the wheel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is wholly wrong; I did nothing of the kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is quite right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was first used by the First Minister at Halifax. He rightly compared himself to a fly on a wheel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He used it at Halifax in 1864.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, the flies are not of so much importance; but I distinctly remember the hon. member for South Oxford making a speech, in which he did not credit the Prime Minister or anyone else with making the statement, but declared that statesmen had as much influence in promoting prosperity as flies on the wheel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Withdraw.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot withdraw, because I remember it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, all I can say is that it is a very vinous and after-dinner memory. I have told you distinctly that you are wrong.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I do not think it is at all unparliamentary to say that my memory of a matter like that is one that can be relied on; and my memory, after dinner or before dinner, is probably about as good as that of the hon. member for South Oxford. But, of course, if he is deeply hurt at the suggestion that he could describe himself and his friends as flies on the wheel, I will, out of consideration for himself and the flies, withdraw the statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member for South Oxford said so, and I heard him say so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I have no hesitation in saying that the statement just made is utterly without foundation, and if I knew any stronger expression that would not be unparliamentary, I would use it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite ready to use strong unparliamentary language, but he did state so, and if he says he did not, he says what is not true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not, and the hon. gentleman in saying that I did knows that he is stating a falsehood.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not refer to that, but I will say that I never in all my life felt confident in my memory, and found that I had cause to repent relying on it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But you have withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not withdraw. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is, I see, trying the new rôle of a humorist; he generally appears in a different rôle. I will not pay any attention to the hon. gentleman in this rôle, but will proceed to discuss the question before the House. It is greatly to be regretted that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) should have introduced Imperial federation into this question. This has nothing to do with Imperial federation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh yes, it has.

Mr. DAVIN. This is the proposal that the Government shall make certain propositions to England; and I venture to say there is not a man on either side of the House who will dare to controvert the statement that if we can get England to discriminate in our favor, it will be of the greatest advantage to us. It does not follow that we need in any way interfere with the protection we have given our manufacturers; it does not follow that our infant industries should, in any way, be imperilled, but we can make proposals to England that will be at once advantageous to England and to us, without in any imperilling the existence of these industries.

At hon. MEMBER. What are they?

Mr. DAVIN. It is of great value to have introduced this subject here and to have introduced it in England, because England has had very little interest in her colonies and in Canada up to a very recent period. It is exceedingly difficult to bring home to a large population, such as that of England, the affairs and the claims of a country separated from her by the "great floods and barriers of creation," to use the language of Edmund Burke. I can see here an illustration of how difficult it is to do that, in the difficulty we have of bringing home to members from the east the exact condition of affairs in the North-West, which is nearer to us than we are to England. But as surely as it is of the greatest importance to Canada that our eastern members and politicians should thoroughly understand the North-West, it is of the greatest importance to England and to the Empire that the people of England should thoroughly understand the claim of her colonies and the advantages that the colonies hold out to her. The other day I was reading the speech of an eminent naval man, who pointed out that England could not, apart from her colonies, defend her mercantile marine. He pointed out that, under the new conditions of naval warfare, England, deprived of her colonies, could not protect her mercantile marine; therefore, apart from any such consideration as that referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell, namely that we might have to be involved in wars and fight battles, which is a mere attempt to discredit a question on which it has no practical bearing, because nobody who takes a sensible view of this question proposes anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ask the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)?

Mr. DAVIN. If we can show the English Government that her colonies are of the greatest advantage to her, then, from our point of view, when we come to what the hon. member for Simcoe, in his closely reasoned and most instructive speech, called the great market of the world, we see what an advantage is presented by that market to

Canada. The hon. member for Bothwell talked as if this proposal was for free trade with England, and the hon. member for Elgin made a similar supposition, and said, let us have reciprocity all round. We would then have to go in for direct taxation and free trade with all the world, and the result would be that our manufacturers would despair, and the exodus, which weighs so heavily on the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite, would be swollen to an enormous extent. There is no proposition here for free trade with England.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it?

Mr. DAVIN. There is the proposition that England shall give us an advantage in consideration of our giving her an advantage, as compared with other countries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it?

Mr. DAVIN. Can we not discriminate? Can we not put up a discriminating duty against other countries in favor of England. Is not that possible? Mr. Gladstone was accustomed to say there are three customs. We may remain as we are, or we may for the benighted policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate, or we may support the suggestion of the mover of this motion and try whether we shall not get advantages in the English market, by discriminating on some articles, say on breadstuffs, in favor of Canada, while we would put a duty on manufactured articles coming from other countries to the extent of 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. over those imposed on the imports of foreign countries.

Mr. LISTER. That is a "dandy" policy.

Mr. DAVIN. I have never studied slang, and I do not know the meaning of "dandy." The only idea I have of "dandy" is as applied to the individual, and I dare say the hon. gentleman fulfils that part well.

Mr. LISTER. No, you are the man.

Mr. DAVIN. This question has been most properly brought before the House to-night, but some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to raise issues that should not have been raised. The hon. member for Bothwell complained that no member of the Government had spoken on this question. If this motion should be carried, no one can doubt that the Government shall make proposal to the other colonies and to England, and that a step will be taken towards an understanding of what may be done in this direction. At this late hour I do not propose to say anything further except this, that any one who visits England—and I visited England eight or nine months ago—will find the greatest possible change in the sentiments of the people there; he will find they have made the greatest progress in understanding the colonies and that the fetish of free trade no longer holds dominion over their minds; he will find they are beginning to understand the advantage of taking a different course from that which they took under the inspiration of Manchester and under a complete misconception of the teaching of Adam Smith. I will also give the hon. gentleman a fact that came to my

knowledge when I was travelling on the continent. I found that large quantities of ready-made clothes were being sent over to England from Belgium, sent to England where men are supposed to have such an advantage in manufacturing wearing apparel. Can anyone doubt that it would be an advantage to England to preserve that market for her own sons? Then, Sir, I know Coventry. I remember, when I was a boy, driving over to Coventry, before Mr. Gladstone's policy ruined their manufactures, and it was a thriving and a thickly populated town. After I left the university I visited it again, and I found it like a city of the dead, the manufactories closed, and the industries destroyed. By adopting a wiser policy, by adopting fair trade, as my hon. and learned friend has said to-day, and as is set forth in this resolution, England would benefit her own trade, would keep her own markets for her own sons, would practically promote her industries which are now dormant or dead, and would obtain advantages for herself and extend advantages to us.

Mr. McNEILL. As this is a very important question, a question the magnitude and importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated, and as hon. gentlemen opposite have not discussed it at all, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. It is perhaps just as well to adopt the motion of my hon. friend, as unfortunately the Government do not appear to be prepared to give an opinion on this important question this evening, and, when it comes up again, if it does come up again this Session, we may expect to have the benefit of their views on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Orders in Council, &c., connected with the resignation of Antoine Audette, Esquire, Postmaster of North Stukely, and with the appointment of his successor.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Correspondence between the Corporation of the City of Quebec, or any of its officers, and the Department of Militia, or any of the officers of the same, respecting the supplying, from the waterworks of the said city, of water to the cartridge factory and the drill hall.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, papers and documents respecting the seizure of diamonds and other precious stones effected at Quebec on one David Levi, and the cancelling of the said seizure.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Messrs. A. Pion & Co., of Quebec, in relation to a claim for goods damaged on the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Langelier, Quebec Centre.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:10 a.m. (Tuesday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Tuesday, May 1, 1888.

No. 45

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, as respects the contents of packages of salt. He said: I propose to amend the present Act by providing that every barrel of salt sold or offered for sale in Canada shall weigh 280 lbs.; the weight to be marked on the barrel. When imported in barrels such barrels should have the name of the importer marked thereon, and when packed in Canada the name of the packer shall be on the barrel. It is not proposed to interfere with salt imported in bulk or in sacks, but when small bags of salt are packed in barrels, such barrels shall have the gross weight marked on them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to call the attention of the House to a gross breach of its privilege. Last night, it will be in the recollection of the House that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a speech in which he used this phrase: "You said we were flies on the wheel." I happened to speak later on, and I said that I should like to correct the history of the hon. member for Bothwell. I said that the phrase "Flies on the wheel" was not flung across the House at those hon. gentlemen. I said that the phrase "Flies on the wheel" was —

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I must say that he cannot make a question of privilege of what passed last night in another debate in which he took part. If he wishes to make a personal explanation, and will keep himself within the limits I have on a previous occasion indicated to the House, that is another thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt that motion?

Mr. DAVIN. I said that the phrase "Flies on the wheel" had been used by the hon. member for South Ox-

ford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Thereupon the hon. member, with that courtesy which distinguishes him, said it was not so.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is still breaking one of the rules of the House. He is referring to a past debate of this Session.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understand rightly, the hon. member is bringing this up as a breach of privilege, the charge which was flung across the House to him last night, and I think he is perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. HAGGART. It was stated that the hon. member had not made a true statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. This incident could have been brought up last night as a question of order, when the veracity of the hon. member was called into question, but it cannot be taken up as a question of privilege.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If Mr. Speaker would so far kindly consent, it would please me exceedingly that the hon. gentleman should make his statement on the condition that I should have the right of reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be much better to have this dealt with when the debate is resumed, and I do not think it would further the business of the House to refer to that debate again.

Mr. DAVIN. In Manley's case, reported in the Commons Journals on the 10th November, 1620, the conduct of Manley was brought up as a matter of privilege, as I bring this matter up, and in Sheppard's case it was also brought up and was also a case of using language which it was not proper to use.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What year was that?

Mr. DAVIN. I think that was in 1622. Sheppard, for using language not nearly as strong as that of the hon. gentleman, was brought to the bar of the House on his knees. However, if you decide that I should not go on now, I will not go on at present, but I can give notice, because, in the case of Sir Robert Peel, and of Sir Edward Watkin, that course was adopted, so I will give notice in the regular way, and will bring the matter up.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. The Speaker rules that I cannot go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Speak to the motion for adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Motion for adjournment withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper: "That Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means," and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright in amendment thereto.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Speaker, in offering a few remarks to the House, I shall not follow the example of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other day; I shall not preface my remarks by stating that the observations that he made to the House were intolerable rubbish. The speech which he delivered on that occasion is before the House and before the country, and the House and the country will judge of that speech as they have judged of all the speeches which the hon. gentleman has delivered in this House before, speeches which have never yet found a response in the hearts of the people of this country, to sustain him and approve of them. Sir, he excited our sympathies for the people of this country by telling us that he had addressed a hundred thousand of the electors of Ontario. Sir, the infliction of those speeches upon the people of Ontario does excite our warmest sympathies, except in one respect, that they have resulted in giving to the Government a majority from that Province. He went down to speak to the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in 1878, and his speeches there resulted in a majority against him and the Government of which he was a member. He has spoken, he says, to one hundred thousand people. One can fancy that speech redelivered and redelivered. I was reminded, Sir, of an American statesman, Mr. Stevenson, who made a humorous speech complaining that President Hayes had not appointed him collector of New Orleans; for, he said, on behalf of the Republican party, he had made 127 speeches, or rather he had delivered one speech 127 times. So, Sir, I presume that the hon. member for South Oxford has repeated the same speech to a hundred thousand voters of Ontario. There is a similarity in all his speeches upon public questions and in all his resolutions every year. They seem to grow a little every year, but as a repetition of what we had last year, and a little added. It reminds me of the old legend of "the House that Jack built," the revelations increasing in length a little from every repetition. He has discussed almost every possible question throughout the country. Sometimes we find him dealing with a protective tariff, and the robberies committed by protection; sometimes we find him discussing political parties. In 1884 we found him at Toronto advocating the independence of Canada, and in 1887 we find him here on the floor of Parliament, and on the hustings, advocating annexation to the United States. It is true, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, in all the speeches he has made in this House, does not openly use the word annexation; but yet the arguments he has used, the assertions that he is making, are in advocacy of annexation to the United States. He startled the House this Session by informing us that he had been reading his Bible, that he had learned from Solomon that it was "In vain to spread the net in the sight of the bird." And so, Mr. Speaker, he covers up the net of annexation, and he talks about reciprocity, but the net is there all the same. He tells us that sentiment follows interest, and he declared that ever since the Loyalists settled in Canada, there has been no year in which it was not the interest of the people of this country to associate themselves and to unite themselves with the people of the United States. He tells us that we owe no debt to England except the debt of forgiveness for the wrongs she has committed against us. And so, Sir, under the guise of unrestricted reciprocity, he throws in sentences and expressions every little while to affect the minds of the people in favor of annexation, which is more dangerous than open discussion of the question, and an open declaration of his views and intentions upon the subject. Sir, he has learned from Solomon that it is in vain to spread the net in the sight of the bird, and he covers it up. The deadliest snakes are those that twine amongst the flowers, mingling and blending their coloring with the varied blossoms; their fierce eyes glittering like a sparkling dewdrop, in all

so like that which nature has most harmless and sportive, that the innocence that dreads no danger is poisoned unawares. And so the serpent twines among the flowers and blends its coloring with the blossoms, but it is there all the time. And so, Sir, he has been good enough to define his position for our benefit. He took special care to define his position for the benefit of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He declares that his position upon trade questions is to discriminate against England, to turn his back upon the mother country in all commercial transactions, and to favor the United States; and he tells the hon. Finance Minister that if the people of the United States knew that we were determined to discriminate against England, they would hold up both hands for unrestricted reciprocity with us. That he defines as his position, that is his fixed policy, the policy of himself and his party, which he is prepared, he says, to fight out upon every hustings, and in every farm yard in the country. Sir, the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that my hon. friend the Finance Minister was unable to discover a way to provide for the ordinary wants of the administration of the country. He, however, professed to have all the knowledge necessary, that it was simply a matter of commerce, that he had that political ability, that patriotism, and that wisdom which were necessary in order to solve that great problem. Mr. Speaker, it was amusing to see the way in which he directed the attention of his party and the members around him, to note the fact, and he called upon the press of the country to note the fact, that my hon. friend was unable to grapple with this problem, but that he, the hon. member for South Oxford, had the wisdom, the statesmanship and the patriotism requisite to grapple with that question. Let me read what he said:

"I call on my hon. friends to take special note of it, I call on the people of Canada to take special note of it, that the hon. gentleman, by his own words, admits that he and his party are unable to solve or grapple with this problem. I well believe it. There is no doubt whatever that to grapple successfully with the great enterprise to which we have set our hands, requires the greatest prudence and the greatest economy. There is no doubt it requires a knowledge of the first principles on which honest taxation should be based, it requires the greatest wisdom for the welfare of Canada, not for retaining place by grants to combines and trusts and monopolies; it requires the greatest statesmanship and patriotism."

And then he says: I, the member for South Oxford, possess all this wisdom and statesmanship, but I am going to button it up in my pocket and will not let the Finance Minister know anything about it for fear he will steal some of the plums. The wisdom comes to him late and it comes to him suddenly. Why, not only did he announce to us that he had been studying Solomon, but he made a pious ejaculation and wished to heaven we could go back to 1874. With this new-found statesmanship and this new wisdom that has come to him I suppose he wanted to go back to 1874, and from that date to 1879, in order to remedy the errors he had committed and to wipe from our public records the blot which he had placed upon those records by his administration of public affairs during those years. I am not surprised that he should want to go back, that he should pray to heaven that he might be permitted to go back to 1874 and exercise that wisdom and statesmanship for the want of which every industry in this country languished and died, for the want of which he declared himself, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was about to prove, to have been unable to grapple with public affairs and was but a "fly on the wheel." I understood the hon. gentleman last night denied the paternity of the fly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. McLELAN. The leader of the Government said it was a wasp. We have had proof that there have been a good many bees in the hon. gentleman's bonnet, and this Session

there has been a bee of enormous growth that wants to fly unrestricted. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman denies that, permit me to take the figure of a ship used by the Minister of Finance and to say that during that period the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) never touched the tiller, that he allowed the ship to drift helpless upon the tide wherever she might go, that during five years, for the want of that statesmanship, that wisdom and that sagacity which he now claims, he never touched a helm, he never trimmed a sail to catch a favoring breeze, but he left the ship of state drifting helpless, aimless and uncertain as the poet's ship,

"Asleep in an ocean fog."

Now, however, the hon. gentleman desires to go back to 1874 in order that he may exercise wisdom and statesmanship, that he may make a better record for his party and for his country than there remains for his administration. He claims now that he has all the statesmanship and wisdom necessary to grapple with this problem which was presented by the Minister of Finance, namely: How are you to govern the country without direct taxation? The Minister of Finance referred the hon. gentleman to his statements in 1874 during the time he was Finance Minister, to the declaration that he then made that he was unable to raise any more revenue without imposing direct taxation. The hon. gentleman then denied that he ever made such a statement. We have here his speeches for two separate years; they are nicely got up, gilt edge, but the speeches did not turn out to be of that character. What did the hon. gentleman say when he was Finance Minister, although he now denies it. He said:

"An increase of duty is inevitable, and arises from circumstances over which this Government has no control. I do not think that any greater increase of the tariff than we now suggest would be wise. I think we have gone to the limit beyond which it would be impossible to pass without resorting to direct taxation. It may be that those very expenditures may indirectly help our revenue; but I desire to say to the House that, although I think the country can bear the entire burden we have imposed upon it without any great inconvenience, I do not think that much more taxation could be safely resorted to; nor do I think we should be called upon to consider the question of raising any great amount by direct taxation."

Now the hon. member puts aside the question of direct taxation and stands before this House and declares that he is quite able to solve the problem of sweeping away the entire revenues we derive from our imports from the United States, and nearly all those from our imports from Great Britain, and carry on the administration of the country and provide a revenue without direct taxation. I should like to refer the hon. gentleman to some observations made by his late leader, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) at Malvern, when the question of the reduction of revenue was under discussion. What did his leader say?

"Now, what are our sources of taxation? Direct taxation is at this time out of the question. The reasons I need not discuss. The advantages and disadvantages I need not balance. We are dealing with practical conditions, and no one suggests direct taxation as practicable. There remain in the existing sources, the duties of customs and excise. From the liquor duties we cannot expect further relief. By common consent these are kept as high as the danger of illicit invasion will allow; some think higher. The progress of the Temperance movement will, we all hope, diminish this source of revenue, and when the advocates of total prohibition succeeds those duties will disappear; at any rate the excise will then be 'all smoke.' There remain the duties of customs on other commodities, and the conditions demonstrate the impossibility of diminishing to any large extent this fund. We have no longer a surplus to dispose of; we have a deficit to overcome; and, that done, we have a tremendous yearly charge to overtake. 'Oh, but,' say some Tories, 'you can yet do this and make a free trade or non-political tariff.' The statement is dishonest and absurd."

I want to call the hon. gentleman's special attention to this:

"The statement is dishonest and absurd."

I should like to know whether, if the hon. member for West Durham had been present, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), knowing that that hon. gentleman made the statement that it would be dishonest

and absurd, would have risen in the House and said he was quite able to solve this problem and quite able to provide revenues for the country without restoring to direct taxation. One word more upon this point. I have referred to a speech delivered last year by the hon. gentleman, and I find he took a little different course at that time to that which he is taking this Session, for he said that the charges on the revenue are so great that you must always raise a large sum from customs and excise in order to meet them. He goes over the different items: for interest and charges of management, \$10,000,000; sinking fund, at \$60,000,000; subsidies, \$1,182,000; and if you include the Indians, \$25,278,000. Now, Sir, he admits that here are the fixed charges which must be met. Allowing that from excise, or miscellaneous sources, we receive enough to meet those expenses of the country, let me tell the hon. gentleman that our entire revenue, exclusive of Great Britain and the United States, from customs, was \$5,851,000. Having free intercourse and no duty from the United States, this would without doubt drop \$5,000,000. The hon. member has told us in a previous discussion that although we had entire free trade with the United States, we ought to purchase from England as largely in proportion to our population as the United States does. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) put the amount at \$150,000,000 of purchases from Great Britain. I do not believe that we would purchase anything near so large an amount, but assuming that we did, that would be \$12,500,000 worth purchased from Great Britain, and at a percentage it would give us a revenue of two and a half million dollars, or a total of seven and a half million dollars from those sources to meet the \$25,000,000 that the hon. gentleman says are a fixed charge upon us. This would leave a large difference between our revenue and the fixed charges to be otherwise provided for. Allowing that from excise and from the general revenue of the country there would be \$2,700,000, there would still be \$17,000,000 that would have to be met, and the hon. gentleman would have a difficult task before him to make this up. I know that the hon. gentleman, if he takes time to consider this subject will come to a different conclusion, and if he gives weight to the assertion made by his late leader, that it is dishonest to say otherwise, he will admit that we must raise \$15,000,000 by direct taxation from the people of this country, if the hon. gentleman's proposed scheme is carried into operation. I have been referring to the assertion which was made by his late leader, that any attempt to convince the people of this country that it was impossible to reduce the duties of the country without direct taxation, was dishonest and absurd. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when reference was made to Mr. Blake, challenged us, or rather he referred to the contrast of the way in which we treated the member for West Durham and the member for East York now, to what we did in old times. Sir, when those hon. gentlemen were here in health, there were always men on this side to measure swords with them. But when, Sir, they became unfit, or rather when they retired from the conflict, we observed all the decencies of life, and all the decencies which should prevail between one member of this House and another, and retired from the contest with them. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not follow the example that we set him, and he is not careful of the good name of his late leader. Why, Sir, when the Finance Minister referred to what Mr. Blake had said at Malvern Hill, and that that hon. gentleman stated he had accepted the National Policy—when the Minister of Finance stated that Mr. Blake had given the manufacturers of this country and the farmers of this country to believe, that there would be no disturbance in the policy of protection except upon the single article of corn meal for the lower Provinces, the hon.

member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that he knew when Mr. Blake was making this speech what Mr. Blake meant,—insinuating that Mr. Blake was deceiving the people of the country on that occasion, deceiving his hearers, deceiving the manufacturers and deceiving the people at large. It ill comes from the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to reflect upon the good name of the hon. the late leader of the Opposition; an hon. gentleman to whom he owes everything, an hon. gentleman who has done more for him than any other man in this country, and to whom he owes his seat in this House. When the hon. gentleman was unable to find a constituency, after he was defeated in Wellington, his late leader found him a place in Huron, and when the period had elapsed, and when the people of Huron were giving him intimation that he would have to move on, as a policeman would give an intimation to a loiterer on a street corner that he has to move on, then, Sir, Mr. Blake had to assist him, and he implored the party, and supplicated the party, and begged of the party to provide him a safe seat, and to give one of the "hives" to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not know, Sir, whether there is to be another intimation to the hon. member for South Oxford to move on, or whether this is a finally, final safe seat for him. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to one or two of the assertions made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That which deserves most attention just now is a charge made against my hon. friend of having cooked the Public Accounts, and a charge that, in the statement which he delivered to this House, he had shown a surplus for the year 1887. The hon. gentleman charged, as a crime against the Minister of Finance, that he had transferred to revenue account the receipts from Dominion lands, whereas, previously, they had been credited to capital account. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that, under his own administration, he always credited those receipts to revenue account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And charged likewise.

Mr. McLELAN. And charged likewise; and so do we credit and charge likewise. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Accounts, and study them, he will see that whereas he charged only \$80,000 or \$90,000 of receipts from Dominion lands, we have this year charged \$180,000 odd. But he knows that he always took credit for the receipts from Dominion lands, small as they were, and that they were always so treated down to 1881, both by himself and by Sir Leonard Tilley; and after 1881, when we had got this policy in full swing, Sir Leonard Tilley had such large surpluses, amounting to two, three, four, five, six and seven millions a year, that it was unimportant whether these charges were made to the credit of income or capital account. Now, Sir, in 1886, when I had the honor of standing before the House as Finance Minister, dealing with the Public Accounts, I said:

"It will be noticed that I have included in that amount, the receipts from Dominion lands. During the five years that hon. gentlemen opposite held the Government, all the receipts from Dominion lands were taken and counted as part of the revenue, and my hon. friend and predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, followed the same course up to 1881, placing these as part of the receipts from consolidated revenue account. From 1881 to 1885, Sir Leonard seems to have placed them to capital account. I suppose the reason will be found in the fact that he had a large surplus each year during that period, and it was immaterial whether they should be placed to capital or to revenue account. But, Sir, I think the House will agree with me that as we have made large expenditures in the North-West in opening up the country by railway, and incurred a large debt for that purpose, as we have made a large expenditure in surveys, in the North-West Mounted Police, in the Indian treaties, incurring large liabilities, it is but right that whatever revenue or return we should have from the lands in the North-West, should be placed to revenue account to meet the interest that we are paying on the expenditures and the sinking fund that we are providing in order to pay off that indebtedness. I think the House will agree with me that we should do that instead of increasing the taxation of the country. Should we receive from the lands in the North-West a larger

Mr. McLELAN.

sum in any one year than would meet the sinking fund we have to provide towards the payment of our indebtedness there, and the interest upon our indebtedness for that expenditure; then it might very well be placed to capital account, but until that point is reached, I think we are justified in placing it as hon. gentlemen opposite did, and as Sir Leonard Tilley did till 1881, to revenue account, and I have therefore proposed for the present and future to deal with it in that manner, calling it and using it as so much revenue, instead of increasing the taxation in order to meet our wants."

That was the proposition that I made to the House and that was agreed to by the House; and although the hon. gentleman was present, and although he knows the custom that had been pursued by himself and Sir Leonard Tilley, yet he now comes down and says that because these are charged to the surplus, there has been a cooking of the accounts. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what would be a cooking of the accounts. If Parliament makes a particular grant to be charged to capital or income, and that is sanctioned by Parliament, it would be a cooking of the account to transfer it, contrary to the orders of Parliament, to some other direction; and the House will remember that when the hon. gentleman came into office in 1874, and a large sum had been passed by the preceding Parliament to capital account for the purpose, I think, of changing the gauge of the railway, the hon. gentleman, in order to diminish the surplus that Sir Leonard Tilley left behind him, charged this amount, which Parliament had declared should be charged to capital, to income, in order to reduce the amount. That, Sir, is what may be called cooking the accounts, doing that which Parliament declared should not be done. Now, the hon. gentleman two or three times in his speech, and in all the speeches he has delivered to this House this Session, and I may say in almost any speech of any length which he delivered to this House in any Session, makes the charge against the Government that they have driven many people out of this country. Why, Sir, one is almost amazed at the assertion of the hon. gentleman, when we look back to the period during which he administered the Government of this country and at the condition of the country during those five years, and when he has under his hand the proof that the people of this country went out during that period of depression by hundreds of thousands, and sought homes, and made a permanent settlement in the adjoining country. I have only to refer the hon. gentleman for an answer to all his assertions that we have driven people out of this country, to the statement made by his late leader in this House, on March 24, 1884. Mr. Blake, speaking of the loss that the Province of Quebec had incurred, said:

"The immigration of French Canadians to the Eastern States has, no doubt, assumed alarming proportions, in two respects—first, in the extent of the departure, and secondly, in the character of the exodus. It is proved by the very thorough examination that took place in the year 1882, under the instruction of the Legislature of Massachusetts into the question, that it has only been within the last ten or fifteen years that this immigration has assumed such large proportions in that part of the country. It was only within a much shorter period, five or six years before 1882, that it began to assume the character of a permanent settlement in the country to which these people went."

And if the hon. gentleman will take five or six years from 1882, he will get back to 1876 and 1877, when the hon. gentleman administered the affairs of this country without the remarkable wisdom and statesmanship which he now claims to possess. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke of the meeting of French Canadians in the United States at Lowell. One of the resolutions passed at that gathering of French Canadians recites as follows:

"Whereas, since the French Canadians have come to this section, they have reached a population of 400,000 in New England, and whereas a large number have become proprietors, paying large taxes, and whereas for the most part the young men propose to make their homes here; Resolved, that we protest against that portion of the report which says that we are a horde of industrial invaders. And whereas we have to live five years in the country before we can become citizens of this glorious Republic, and the French Canadians have been here in large numbers but five or six years."

That would bring them to 1836-7, when they reached a population of 400,000, and determined to become permanent residents of the United States, having been driven out of Canada by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is other evidence before that Commission of the Legislature to show that the French Canadians went to the States for employment, and that finding employment there, and having no hope of ever being employed in their own country, while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they determined to remain in their adopted home. The hon. gentleman has said that we are losing our very best men, the men that statesmen desire to retain in a country. Well, the hon. gentleman has here the proof that 460,000 went out in 1876 and 1877, under his administration, seeking labor in the United States, which his policy denied him at home. I find by the United States census that there were in the United States in 1880, including all these that the hon. gentleman drove out, 36,385 operatives in the cotton mills, 6,096 blacksmiths, 7,581 shoemakers, 3,447 brick and tile makers, 15,036 carpenters and joiners, 5,000 railway employees, 50,000 laborers not specified, 22,000 domestic servants, 21,000 laborers, 2,000 harness and saddle makers. So that the hon. gentleman, by his policy, drove out these men and women to work in the workshops of the United States. Following these there went out 1,379 traders, 1,520 doctors, besides lawyers and clergymen; and in addition to all these, there went out 50,000 farmers to supply the wants of those who were driven from this country to the United States. We have changed that policy. We are seeking to furnish employment to our own people in our own country; we are seeking to keep our own operatives and artisans and agriculturists at home. The hon. gentleman, before declaiming so loudly against the present Government for having helped the exodus, should consider that under his own policy he drove out of the country from 400,000 to 500,000 people, and gave a permanent character to the exodus to the United States. The hon. gentleman complains we are now in a bad position because there has been a grant given to Prince Edward Island last year, and he complained that we had taken in British Columbia, which he urges was entirely premature. I would have thought that, backed up as he is by the little Province of Prince Edward Island, the hon. gentleman would have had a good word to say on behalf of that Province, whatever maledictions he might use against the Province of British Columbia. Then he said that there were great demands upon the Government for bridges across our great rivers and for harbor improvements, &c. Well, the hon. gentleman has given this House to understand that, under any policy he might adopt, there shall be no aid given to public works, either railway bridges or any other public work in the country, should he again assume the reins of power. The hon. gentleman has referred to the controllable expenditure of the country, and has compared, I regret to say, not fairly, the controllable expenditure of Canada with that of Great Britain and the United States. The hon. gentleman seems to take on all occasions a special delight in contrasting our condition with that of the United States, always endeavoring to make the contrast appear to our disadvantage. We have had speeches from the hon. gentleman in which he desires connection with the United States, and represents Canada in such a destitute condition that it would be the greatest exercise of charity on the part of the United States, if they would take into their Union such an impoverished country as he represents us to be. But he goes on to make this comparison between the controllable expenditure of this country and that of the United States, and he says:

"You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we were told that no economy could be practised; no substantial economy could be practised in the affairs of Canada."

Then he refers to his own record from 1874 to 1879, how he cut down the expenses in that period, but he did not tell us how far he came from meeting expenditure with revenue, and what was the deficit. In this comparison he cuts down the controllable expenditure of the United States from \$75,000,000 to \$54,000,000, and builds up the expenditure of Canada in all possible ways. For the purpose of comparison, he puts in our expenditure on Indians, \$1,200,000, and on mounted police, \$800,000, or \$2,000,000 together, as a controllable expenditure which could be reduced. The hon. gentleman knows something of the history of the Indians on the other side. He knows that there is always a special grant, a very large sum provided for the maintenance and care of the Indians, and for guarding against the inroads of the Indians there, and he knows something of the enormous cost to that country of the Indian wars that from time to time have been waged there. There was a return called for in the United States on the 24th January, 1882, showing the cost of the Indian wars for the ten years from 1873 to 1882, and it foots up an amount of \$223,891,264 that the people of the United States have had to pay for Indian wars during the period of ten years. Now that we have provided a large sum for the maintenance of the Indians, and have provided \$800,000 for the maintenance of the mounted police to keep them in check and in good behavior, \$2,000,000 in all, the hon. gentleman puts that in the column of controllable expenditures which he says should be reduced. Then he puts in lighthouses, \$600,000. I suppose, under his wise and economical statesmanship, he would put out the lights of every lighthouse, and save that expenditure. Then there is the protection of the fisheries, \$400,000. My hon. friend near me says that the hon. gentleman would make all things dark. He has been blackening the picture from the time he first entered Parliament until the last speech he has made; he has always been making the blackest possible picture of this country. You may go over this list which the hon. gentleman would compare with the expenditure of the United States and of Great Britain, and he says that we are expending an enormous proportion greater than the expenditure of Great Britain and the United States in matters which are controllable, and therefore, he says we are enormously extravagant, because that expenditure is \$12,950,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are getting mixed. That is for Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. I find that he says:

"I find in England, excluding services of education and similar services, and their legal expenditure, I find their civil list amounts to £1,000,000 sterling, their public works, £1,708,000, their civil departments, £2,468,000, with which we have nothing to compare."

He takes that out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some reporter's errors in one or two lines there, and the hon. gentleman may be deluded by that; but I will tell him, if he likes, what I did say.

Mr. McLELAN. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman has been mis-reported, and that there is no necessity for me to refer him to the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake, and especially to that line which is printed in large capital letters, "dishonest and absurd."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman want to know what I did say as to the expenditure? I will tell him, if he likes, as he seems to be very much mixed as to what I did say. He is quoting an erroneous report of my speech.

Mr. McLELAN. I accept the statement that that report is erroneous, and therefore there is no necessity to

pursue that further, but I say that, if you make a proper comparison with the United States and Great Britain, considering the extent of the country over which we administer the Government, the comparison is not unfavorable to our country. But the hon. gentleman complained that the Finance Minister had not said anything about the Canadian Pacific Railway and the obligations which he says will be thrown upon the country in consequence of that arrangement. The hon. gentleman should have waited until that question was before the House before he made his complaint, and should have heard the explanation which the hon. gentleman will be able to give, the satisfactory explanation that he will give, that there is really no responsibility entailed upon the revenues of the country by the arrangement we have made. Why, the press of the hon. gentleman himself, when the terms were first made public, declared that the arrangement was as favorable as could be expected, and there was really no obligation thrown upon the country. The hon. gentleman comes back to the question of the taxation of the poor man, and he has been there so often and has been striving so long to excite our sympathy on behalf of the farmer and the laboring man, that one would think he was weary of the task he has undertaken. He wants to know what is free and what is untaxed in this country. I tell the hon. gentleman that, in regard to the necessities of life for the laboring man and the farmer, there are more articles untaxed or more lightly taxed than there were under his administration. The hon. gentleman says that we can get old masters free and rough diamonds free, and then he goes on to say, what about sugar? The hon. gentleman makes an enquiry about sugar. I should like to ask him, what about sugar? I am glad that the hon. gentleman is seeking for information. I hardly expected, after the declaration that he had made that he was able to grapple with this great problem of the taxation of the country, that he would come down to this House and confess his ignorance upon the sugar question. Still, there is no man in this country that should more earnestly seek for information upon the sugar question than the hon. gentleman opposite. That hon. gentleman had a teacher at one time; he had an old master at one time. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) undertook to give him some instruction at one time on the sugar question, and I supposed that, having that hon. gentleman behind him, he would not have found it necessary to appeal to this side of the House for information on the sugar question. In 1877, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), then supporting the hon. member, delivered himself thus on the Tariff debate:

"There was another point to which attention had been directed, and that was the sugar duties. He ventured to say it was a question regarding which the people might have expected legislation at the hands of the Government. An article of that importance, from which a large amount of revenue was collected, ought to have been more prominently referred to, considering the opportunity the Government had had for collecting information in regard to it."

You will see how the hon. member for Halifax berates the hon. gentleman for not having collected information on the sugar question during recess.

"He was aware that the Government might say they did not feel in a position to try an experiment in the present condition of the revenue."

The hon. gentleman now is ready to try an experiment, to the sacrifice of three-fourths of our customs duties; but in 1876, in his own budget speech, he says: "It is no time to try experiments;" and the hon. member for Halifax, sitting beside him, says perhaps that was the reason he did not operate. But he says:

"They might have proposed it if they had taken the trouble to consider the information submitted to them."

It seems to me that the senior member for Halifax had been endeavoring to furnish him, and had furnished him, Mr. McLELAN.

information which he did not even take the trouble to consider upon that question.

"He thought the sugar interest had not been fairly treated in that respect. Every hon. member in business knew that the Government had laid down a rule that certain articles purchased in the United States could not be introduced in this country."

I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of this speech, but he says:

"If the Government had applied that same principle to sugar, he would not have complained; but the principle applied to the manufacturers had been refused to the sugar refiners. The sugar interest demanded some consideration, because, if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade, in the Maritime Provinces, at the present moment, involved from three to four million dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States. We sent our vessels with outward cargoes, which were sold in the West Indies, and they were obliged to take the sugar to the United States to have it refined. Cargoes of sugar pass through the Boston refineries, and in twenty-four to thirty-six hours were exported into Canada again, under a bounty of 50 per cent. Such a system could not continue very long. In a short time when the Americans found out that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and then it would be seen how disastrous the present policy was."

Then he goes on to quote Lord Derby's views upon the same question. So the senior member for Halifax, in 1877, recognised the ignorance of the hon. gentleman upon the sugar question, and sought, as one of the old masters, to give him instructions upon it; but he seems not to have been successful. The hon. gentleman comes down now and says: What about sugar? Well, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman, first, that we are not taxing sugar now nearly so high as he taxed it from 1874 to 1879.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh!

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says 'Oh.' I have given him some information. It seems that more than one hon. gentleman on that side of the House desires to receive information on the sugar question. In 1878, we imported 109,000,000 lbs. of sugar, and upon that there was paid in duty \$2,783,605. In 1887, we imported 2,466,000 lbs of sugar, and the duty upon that, nearly double what it was in 1878, was \$3,245,347.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How much did the refiners get?

Mr. McLELAN. Well, you go down and ask the poor man, ask every man how much he paid for his sugar from 1874 to 1879, and how much he paid during the year 1887, and he will tell you that there is a very perceptible difference in favor of the present period. Now, Sir, if we had imported at the same rate of duty last year that we did in 1878, the duty would have amounted to \$5,003,476, or an increase of \$1,758,127. Therefore, if we had the same rate of duty upon sugar last year that we did in 1878, we would have received \$1,750,000 more of duty. Then there is the article of tea. If we had taxed it as the hon. gentleman taxed it, there would have been another million of revenue. But, Sir, I am sure he amused the House and he amused the country with the calculation he made as to the amount of taxation upon the poor man's family in consequence of this iniquitous tariff. He commences with the sugar question, and he tells us that the mechanic, the laboring man, who only earns \$400 a year, consumes 182 lbs. of sugar in a year, or for a family of five, 900 lbs. of sugar, or nearly half a ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better read what I said, then you will not fall into such a blunder.

Mr. McLELAN. I will read what he said:

"I have made a sort of rough average of the amount of taxation paid in Canada by an ordinary mechanic receiving that income, and having a wife and three or four children. I find that such a family will consume 2 lbs. of sugar a day."

Two lbs. of sugar a day, 365 days in a year, for a family of four, half a pound a day to each one, 180 lbs. of sugar.

Why, Sir, the average consumption of sugar in the Dominion of Canada for a family, on the average, rich or poor, is only about 40 lbs., and the hon. gentleman would, in his kindness, give to this poor man 180 lbs. of sugar, in order to swell up that \$48 a year of taxation upon the poor man. But this is not the limit of his generosity to the poor man. He says that down in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, after he had imposed \$48 duty upon the poor man for sugar, on dried fruits, and all these other luxuries, he says that in St. John, and I suppose in all the Maritime Provinces, they pay \$8 or \$10 a head more for their flour. Why, Sir, \$10 a head would give the poor man twenty barrels of flour. His late leader, Mr. Blake, went down to the Maritime Provinces, where he carried the poor man's shirt, containing nine yards, and the hon. gentleman goes down to the Maritime Provinces with 180 lbs. of sugar for the poor man, and 20 barrels of flour for a family. Why, Sir, that is four barrels apiece. We are about a million people in the Maritime Provinces, and according to the hon. gentleman the Province of Ontario supplies us with about 4,000,000 barrels of flour. Good for the Province of Ontario. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is, so far as I can make the calculation, that there are only about a million barrels of flour going down from the Province of Ontario to the three lower Provinces. What is the use of following these calculations any further? \$48 and \$50 a head for every head of a family, represents \$50,000,000 of revenue collected on these articles. I suppose my hon. friend the Finance Minister will be very glad to get so much revenue in order to wipe out the deficits which the hon. gentleman incurred from 1874 to 1879. Then he goes to the west. He is not so generous there because he tells them they are taxed on iron, and he puts it as if the iron duty enters the soul of every poor man in the North-West. He says that a man in Manitoba who builds a house requires two tons of iron. He says he requires \$86 worth, which would be equal to two tons and a quarter. The hon. gentlemen's mind must have been running over to Dakota, to that country of cyclones and tornadoes, where the people have to secure their houses. I remember, when I was down in Nova Scotia, meeting the wife of one of my constituents who had gone to Dakota. She was visiting there, and in reply to questions she said she liked the country pretty well, except the tornadoes. She was asked what they did when tornadoes came. She replied that they built a cellar in which to go. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) evidently thought that the houses had to be iron fastened to meet tornadoes such as they had in Dakota. Then there was a ton and a half of iron for the barn, and so on. I am afraid, if I had not made a promise not to describe the hon. gentleman's speech as intolerable rubbish, I would now feel compelled to say that it was intolerable rubbish to talk to intelligent farmers, mechanics and laborers as to the taxes imposed on a family consuming 180 lbs. of sugar and 20 barrels of flour and requiring two tons of iron to secure the house and one and a-half tons of iron to secure the barn, and so on. But the hon. gentleman said that this tariff would destroy the export trade, and he says that his friend Mr. Paterson had time and again referred to it. His friend Mr. Paterson had a little story that we have never disturbed. In 1878 the Norwegians had a craze for buying old ships, and they came to Canada and bought \$1,250,000 worth of old ships, and that was placed in the returns as exports, by which the returns for 1878 were increased, so that Mr. Paterson has been able to make a favorable comparison with 1886 and 1887; and I suppose in a short time we shall have the same Norwegian ships trotted out again to do duty on this occasion. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) also stated there had been a great reduction in the volume of trade. On every point to which the hon. gentleman refers his own record stands as

condemnation of the words he utters, and it is no wonder he wishes to go back to 1874 to wipe out the record for that period. Let me trouble the House with a reference to our trade, and I will only refer to that with the United States. I go back as far as 1854, and I had some papers prepared some time ago by the statistical officer of the Customs Department of the values of the imports from the United States of articles enumerated in the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1855 to 1886 inclusive. The total value in those twelve years was \$520,278,650. In the next twelve years, from 1867 to 1878 inclusive, the value had run up, not decreased, as has been stated time and time again by hon. gentlemen opposite, to \$337,589,194. If you take the next twelve years, allowing for the three years at the same rate as the nine years that have passed, the value of trade with the United States will reach \$1,000,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite have been all the time declaring that our trade had dropped away to almost nothing, and that we should obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in order that it might increase by leaps and bounds. We should be pretty well content with our trade, considering we are supplying so largely our own people, as is evidenced by the importation of raw material for manufactures. We ought to be content, moreover, with our trade, especially when we contrast it with that of the great country which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) wishes us to join, in order to increase our trade. In 1887 the total value of imports to the United States was \$752,000,000, exports \$725,000,000, total \$1,472,000,000, which, for 60,000,000 of people, gave \$21.63 per head. The value of Canadian imports was \$112,000,000, exports \$89,000,000, total \$201,000,000, giving \$40.48 per head. While the *per capita* trade of the United States was \$24.63, that of Canada last year was \$40.48. If the hon. gentleman will reduce the number of our inhabitants from 4,800,000, as he wishes to do, and place it at 4,600,000, that will give a total value of \$44 per head; so I think we should be content with the progress we are making, and the manner in which we are progressing. The hon. member for South Oxford says that all we have to do is to obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and our export trade will go forward by leaps and bounds. The hon. gentleman has not pointed out the articles that we can export to the United States in order to build up that great trade, unless there are included exports of articles through the United States to the old country that now go by the St. Lawrence and are shipped from our own ports. The hon. gentlemen has told us that we have two customers, the United States and Great Britain. As was shown by the Finance Minister, and by almost every hon. gentleman who spoke on this side of the House, the articles of which we have a large surplus for export are the very articles of which the United States has a large surplus to export. I have before used an illustration of this, and it has been used elsewhere, but I may perhaps be permitted to give it on this occasion. The measure of the United States in the staple articles, of animals and their products, and of grain of all kinds is full and overflowing. Our cup is also full and overflowing; and is it common sense that, their cup being full and overflowing, we should, as the best outlet for our overflow, put our surplus into that cup already overflowing? No, we should pursue that course we have followed in the past, of facilitating exports direct to the mother country, the land that requires them. We should by all possible means cheapen the cost of transportation to the sea in order to benefit our agriculturists. But the hon. gentleman says: There are the great cities of the United States, New York, Chicago and Boston, all of which are ready to take the products of our farmers. The hon. gentleman did not tell us there were American farmers all around those cities, in closer proximity than are our people. He tells us that it is unwise to build up our own cities, and

that we are building up Toronto, Montreal, Halifax and Quebec at the expense of the rural population. The hon. gentleman would strike down every industry in this country and tell the farmers that they may send their products to the United States. He ought to have told them, however, that one city within their reach does more to increase the value of their lands than a hundred cities many miles distant from them. There is an article in *Scribner's Statistical Record* which I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to. It is respecting the value of farms; and he said a good deal here about the value of lands, and tried to make out apparently that the value of lands in Ontario had decreased. I do not think it is worth while to discuss the question as to whether Mr. Blue or the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the more accurate in his figures, but the fact remains that in the North-West during the period which he refers to there have been sales of \$20,000,000 worth of land, a large portion of which has been paid in cash either to the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The following is the quotation which I wish to refer to:

"The gross value of farms is greatest in Ohio; New York follows, then Illinois, and Pennsylvania. The value per acre ranges highest in the densely populated States of the North Atlantic group, gradually decreasing westward throughout the Northern Central group. Southward, the value decreases greatly, the lands of the cotton States barely averaging five dollars per acre with the improvements.

"The highest value per acre accompanies the densest population, and the greatest relative importance of manufactures and other industries. In other words, the greater the proportional number of inhabitants dependent upon other industries than agriculture, the greater the value of agricultural property consequent, of course, upon the higher prices resulting from the greater demand for farm products, and their more complete utilization. Much that is waste in a sparsely settled agricultural region, has a commercial value in cities and towns. Straw, burned as of no value in one place, sells readily where population is denser."

The hon. gentleman will see, and the country will see, that by his striking down the manufacturing industries of the Dominion; by his being willing to sweep them out entirely with one blow, he would do more to depreciate the value of lands in this country, by driving away all the artisans, and mechanics, and laborers, and those who purchase the farmers' products, than has ever been done by any policy previously enunciated. The hon. gentleman perhaps will deny that he wants to give over the manufacturers. We have been told in this House this Session, that it is useless to have upon the Statute-book an offer of reciprocity in natural products in the present state of the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says: You have not the right bait on your hook; and another hon. member says: It is only playing with the question to make this offer. But, Sir, they are going to bribe the Americans by giving over to them all the manufacturing industries of this country, and as the bait is not sufficient the hon. member for Norfolk says: We will bait the hook with the manufacturer, we will give you free access to our markets; and if the Americans cannot see that they will take the entire manufacturing industries of the country there would be no inducement for them to accept his challenge. The hon. member for South Oxford wanted to shut down all the manufacturing industries of the country, but he made one exception. If you turn to that resolution of the hon. gentleman you will find this one exception, and that is that all the manufacturing industries of the country were to be swept away except the distilleries. He accepts the excise duties; he protects the manufacturer and distiller of ardent spirits and beer, in the country. The man who spins cotton, the man who smelts iron, and the man who digs coal and performs all the other duties of life necessary for the production of articles may be sacrificed, but the man who distills ardent spirits and makes whiskey and beer must be protected. Why, Sir, a short time previously, when the Dominion Alliance was in session here, the hon. gentleman advocated that we ought to amend the

Mr. McLELAN,

Temperance Act in order to have prohibition, but now he comes forward with this resolution which would protect the distillers of whiskey and the manufacturers of beer; and those are the only manufacturers that he proposes to protect in the whole land. Mr. Speaker, I have only one or two more points to refer to. The hon. gentleman was good enough to quote, in answer to the Minister of Finance, some remarks from President Cleveland, and in those remarks President Cleveland is advocating free trade. He is advocating a reduction of duties in order to reduce the price of goods. The hon. gentleman wants free trade with the United States. He wants our articles admitted free, our lumber, our barley, and so forth, and at the same time he furnishes a proof to the House that that freedom will reduce the price. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has given in evidence that in those articles that they require the people of the United States pay the duty on the articles which they receive from Canada. The hon. gentleman concludes by referring to the debt, and he says the debt has grown to enormous proportions and that we have nothing to show for it, except assets so unprofitable that they cost about a million of dollars to take care of. Well, Sir, I have not looked over the list of assets lately, but I dare say there are some assets there for which the hon. gentleman is responsible, and there are some of our assets that I do not think we expend much money for taking care of. I do not see anything in the Public Accounts for taking care of the locks at Fort Francis, and I do not see anything charged for taking care of the Neebing Hotel and a great many other things that the hon. gentleman is responsible for. When the hon. gentleman talks of the increase of the public indebtedness of this country and of our having no assets for it, I suppose he refers to his own deficits from 1875 to 1879-80, amounting in all to about \$7,900,000, for which he is responsible. I suppose he includes in all indebtedness for which we have no assets, the four and a half millions discounts, which he lost upon the bonds which he sold in Great Britain. I did expect, Sir, that an ex-Finance Minister, standing up here and representing a Government that had increased the public indebtedness at the rate of about \$8,000,000 a year for five years, and had comparatively nothing to show for it, would have been a little more careful in speaking of the public indebtedness. Why, Sir this Government is able to show good assets for all its expenses. It may be that some of our public works, such as our canals and our railroads, on which we have expended large sums of money, are not worked at such rates as to yield large profits, as is the case in some other countries. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Australian colonies—and he has sometimes referred to them to show that some of their public works are productive—he will find that the railroad charges there are equal to a tax of about \$10 a head on the people of the country. If we worked our railroads and canals at similar high rates of charges, we should have a large income from them; but the policy we have been pursuing is to cheapen the rates of transportation to the seaboard to the farmers of the west, in order that they may compete with the farmers of the United States in the markets of the world. Now, Sir, without detaining the House at greater length, I may just say that if the rules of this House permitted me to move an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for South Oxford, I should be very glad to do it, and I would do it, Sir, something in this form:

That during five years, from 1874 to 1879, the present member for South Oxford, Sir Richard Cartwright, was, as Finance Minister, mainly responsible for the fiscal policy and administration of Canada. That previous to this, and from the date of Confederation, the Public Accounts show, each and every year, a surplus amounting in all to \$11,075,063.39.

That the condition of the country when handed over to the member for South Oxford, as Finance Minister in the Reform Administration, was such that in the first year and before the effects of the change were fully felt there was a further surplus of \$935,644, making the total surpluses \$12,010,707.

That thereafter and for every year for which he arranged the tariff and expenditure, there was, notwithstanding he materially increased the taxation on general goods and levied duties on tea and coffee, a deficit, as also in the following year (the country not having recovered from the effects of his policy) amounting to \$7,970,181.27.

That when the effects of the National Policy were felt upon the business of the country, the Public Accounts again show a surplus, continuous down to the latest, 1887, except in the years affected by the North-West troubles, making a grand total surplus of \$30,375,382.

That the net debt of Canada, on the 30th June, 1887, was, as shown by the Public Accounts. \$227,313,911
From which, if we deduct the amount allowed to the Provinces to cover their indebtedness and to provide revenue..... 106,472,034

There remain..... \$120,841,877

As the net debt incurred by the Federal Government for Dominion purposes, accounted for as follows:—

Intercolonial Railway and extension..... \$33,335,971
Canadian Pacific Railway..... 61,760,785
Purchase of Canadian Pacific Railway lands..... 10,198,520
Deficits occurring from the policy of Sir Richard Cartwright..... 7,970,181
Losses on his several loans..... 4,500,000
Purchase from Hudson Bay Company of North-West, and organisation of territory..... 2,920,000

Thus making a total of..... \$120,685,457

That it appears that the total indebtedness incurred by the Dominion for federal purposes is covered by the purchase of the North-West, the construction of the great national highway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and the deficits arising from the policy of the member for South Oxford, and the losses or discounts on the loans he negotiated; whilst under the administration of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, for fifteen years, the ordinary revenues have met the general wants of the country, and permitted a large expenditure on public buildings, harbor improvements and aid to railways, as well as to meet expenses of the troubles in the North-West.

That in this latter period as well as in the former, under Sir John A. Macdonald, the country has made great advances, as shown by a comparison of some of the returns of 1873-79, with those of 1887:—

BANK AND DOMINION NOTES IN CIRCULATION.

1879..... \$23,881,324
1887..... 45,502,987

An increase in 8 years of..... \$16,621,663

1879

Deposits in chartered banks..... \$63,635,932
" savings and loan companies..... 9,426,148
" Government savings banks..... 14,702,715

\$87,764,795

1887.

Deposits in chartered banks..... \$107,154,483
" savings and loan companies..... 17,712,885
" Government savings banks..... 50,944,785

\$175,812,153

An increase in 8 years of..... \$88,047,358

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It appears to me that the hon. Minister is adopting an indirect mode of reading a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot see that the rule would apply in this instance.

Mr. McLELAN—

That the money order system of the post office has grown from \$6,788,723 in 1879, to \$10,328,934 in 1887, an increase of \$3,540,261; whilst the correspondence through the post office (the best possible test of commercial activity) in the same period, has risen from 50,840,000 letters and post cards in 1879, to 90,650,000 in 1887.

That the agriculturists have benefited in having the supply of an increased home market, as shown by the fact that the value of grain imported has fallen, in the period already referred to (1879-1887) from \$9,882,315, to \$3,630,247, a considerable portion of the latter amount representing Indian corn for distillation; whilst the importations of all articles of food and drink which

In 1879 amounted to..... \$26,610,728
In 1887 amounted only to..... 13,107,286

Showing a reduction of..... \$13,533,442 and a corresponding increase of expenditure among our farmers.

That our agriculturists have not only supplied this largely increased home market, but have also maintained a large export trade in grains,

45-1888-2

and, in addition, increased the exports of animals and their products from \$14,100,604 in 1879, to \$24,246,937 in 1887.

That the miles of railway in operation in 1887, and the movement in freight and passengers thereby, are nearly double what they were in 1879, whilst the traffic by water has also largely increased.

That the enormous increase of business as shown by the foregoing comparisons, has been conducted on a more healthy basis than that of the period from 1874 to 1879, during which the business failures were, in each and every year, greater in amount than the entire revenues of the country, averaging \$28,627,000, whilst in the subsequent period the average has been \$11,572,330.

That notwithstanding the expenditure in the completion of a great interprovincial highway from ocean to ocean, and numerous other works, all tending to develop the country by promoting internal trade and intercourse, and cheapening transport of agricultural products to the seaboard, the taxation levied on the country in the last fiscal year, in which every obligation was met, has only averaged an increase of three quarters of one per cent. per year a head in customs and excise over 1875, under the taxation imposed by Sir Richard Cartwright in customs, excise and stamps.

That whilst the credit of Canada has never suffered as did that of the United States for a period of years—the value of \$100 currency being, at one time (July, 1864) only \$38 00 in gold—nor as did that of Great Britain during the closing years of the last and the opening ones of the present century, yet it suffered so much in the hands of the member for South Oxford that the unguaranteed bonds sold by him in 1874 and 1876, amounting to \$31,633,333, netted him only \$28,064,770, while, under a changed policy and the improved condition of our credit thence resulting, these same bonds now command a premium of from 13 to 15 per cent., or, in round numbers, \$8,000,000 more than the member for South Oxford sold them at.

That eminent statistical authorities—such as Sir John Gorst, Under Secretary for India—after elaborate investigation have declared that amongst the countries of the world, Canada stands third in respect to her ability to secure investors in her funds, only paying six pence per cent. more than the United States and £1 1s. 3d. per cent. less than France; whilst the *London Economist*, in an elaborate presentation of British investments in the colonies shows that the external burdens per head of Australia were 3½ times those of Canada.

That, with this high standing, maintained until the maturity of our outstanding bonds, there will be a difficulty in placing upon the market other loans for their redemption at such a reduced rate of interest as will be practically equivalent to an extinction of at least \$50,000,000 of the country's indebtedness."

That this House views with just pride and gratification this high position which the Dominion of Canada has attained, as well as the extremely rapid progress it has made since the adoption of the policy of protection to home industries, and would impress upon the Government the duty it owes to the country, to all farmers, day-laborers, mechanics, artisans and factory operatives, to guard that policy from the machinations of those who are seeking, under the name of unrestricted reciprocity, to give over to the Americans the entire manufacturing industries of Canada, except that of intoxicants, and to impose a burdensome and relentless system of direct taxation upon the people.

That is the amendment to the amendment which I would desire to place before the House, if the rules of the House permitted. But I would not desire to do so because of any need on the part of the Government to receive instructions as to the performance of their duty of protecting the industries of the people. The Government received the mandate of the people, in 1878, to protect our home industries. The voice of 1882 repeated that mandate, and the people's command given in 1887 was that we should continue our policy of protection. This Government will discharge the high duty imposed on it by the people of this country, by doing what lies in our power to protect our industries, to give employment to our people, and to develop the great resources with which this country is blessed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise for the purpose of suggesting to the House that, at this late period of the Session, we should reach the question at as early a moment as possible. The hon. member for South Oxford gave a very elaborate review of the financial statement which I considered it my duty to lay before the House. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has replied to that speech, and thus the views of both sides are, I consider, very fairly and fully before the country. I hope, therefore, that at this late period of the Session the House will be disposed to allow the debate to rest there, and that we will at once be enabled to reach a division that will show the views of every hon. gentleman in this House, and then proceed with the business of the Session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. the Finance Minister, has certainly paid a very great compliment to my

hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), by the request he has just made. The hon. gentleman, having an army of clerks at his disposal, knowing precisely the line of argument he had to take, and the tables he required, and having every facility at his disposal for the preparation of these tables, gave to the House an elaborate speech on the Budget. My hon. friend from South Oxford had to rise in reply as soon as the hon. gentleman took his seat; and he was of course at the disadvantage of having to answer to a line of argument which he could not have been aware beforehand would be taken, and to tables which were new to him and to the House. My hon. friend has been followed to-day by the late Finance Minister (Mr. McLelan) in a speech of about two hours in length—a speech in reply to my hon. friend, which he had four days to prepare—and after the delivery of that speech, the hon., the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) has risen in his place, and by the request he has made has declared to the House that he considers the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford a speech equal in weight and importance to the combined efforts of his colleague, the ex-Finance Minister and himself. I have every confidence in the correctness of the position the hon. gentleman has taken, and I therefore do not intend troubling the House at any great length. I had some intention, considering that the hon. the First Minister the other night was kind enough to adjourn the House at a very early hour at the request of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. McLelan) who desired to have from Friday night last until to-day to prepare a statement, or procure some one to prepare it, in reply to the speech of my hon. friend—I had some slight intention of asking the hon. the First Minister whether he should not grant me a similar favor and adjourn the House now, in order that I might have time to consider the amendment of the hon. the Postmaster General, which is ten times as long as that of my hon. friend from South Oxford. But the First Minister will no doubt agree with me that while the Postmaster General's amendment exceeds ten times the length of that of the hon. member for South Oxford, it contains only one-tenth of the sense of the latter, and, therefore, will not require so much time on my part to prepare a reply to it. The hon. the Postmaster General is of a poetic and a visionary turn of mind. He gave us to-day to understand, as he did in a celebrated financial speech of two years ago, that he has seen visions and dreamt dreams. To-day, however, his reasons have taken the shape of snakes and blossoms, and he has seen snakes hidden in the blossoms. The last time he addressed us he saw blossoms without snakes; he saw blossoms, and wedding parties, and cradles, and babies, that would come up and pay the taxes. We are delighted always to hear of the visions which the hon. gentleman sees, and when he is in dreamland he is certainly much more interesting than when he undertakes to descend to the plain world of facts and figures. Then he is apt to be confused, but he is to be forgiven, because it would require a man of much larger mental calibre than the hon. gentleman to do that which he undertakes to do; but, if he does undertake that task, he ought to show a little modesty, and then he would not render himself a subject for the remarks, a little severe or a little sarcastic, of those who may happen to follow him. What did the hon. gentleman tell us when he was alluding to the speech of my hon. friend? He alluded to a remark which was interjected when the Finance Minister was referring to the time during which my hon. friend occupied the position of Minister of Finance, and said that he would like to go back to 1874, and he said he supposed he would like to go back there to rectify the errors he had made, which I suppose meant to wipe out the deficit which occurred during that period. Was it not a piece of assurance on the part of the hon. gentleman to refer to the state of the finances at that

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

time? If he remembers the state of the finances under his own administration, is it not a piece of assurance for him to talk about deficits? Can he venture to refer to deficits under the administration of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with a tariff of 17½ per cent., and compare that with his tariff, ranging on an average to 22½ per cent., when he himself as Finance Minister had to come down to the House and confess to a deficit of two and a quarter millions in one year, and afterwards to a deficit which he expected would turn out, and which did as a matter of fact turn out, to be one of \$6,000,000; that is, that he had in one year a deficit amounting to more than the deficits of the combined years of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But he found it necessary to bring that question before the House and to suggest that my hon. friend would like to go back to 1874 in order to remedy the errors which he made when he administered the finances of this country. I think the less they say about deficits the better. Then the hon. gentleman tells us, and he seemed to think it was a very weighty argument, and he attempted to be very funny and to be very sarcastic in reference to my hon. friend from South Oxford, in pointing to the fact that he had represented different constituencies at different times. I do not know that that is any discredit to that hon. gentleman, but, on the contrary, I think it shows that he is appreciated in every part of this country. I have never thought it necessary to find fault with the change of constituencies on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. If it was found necessary in the case of the hon. the First Minister to change his constituency, and that is no reflection upon him, but rather a compliment paid to the worth in which he is held in the different Provinces of the Dominion, when it was found that a seat could be obtained for him on the Pacific coast. Any of us may lose his seat, and I know that, under the pressure which hon. gentlemen have been good enough to put me to I have had enough work to hold mine. Of course, I do not think that my position or my attainments would warrant another seat being found for me, as it was for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); but, when I find that seats can be provided for prominent politicians, I think it is rather a testimony given by the people of the country that they recognise that there is great worth in the gentlemen for whom they make place, that it is recognised on all hands, and that it is not simply in the interest of any particular riding, but in the interest of this great Dominion of ours, that certain individuals should have a seat in the House. But I will ask the hon. gentleman who took his seat just now, who attempts in a side way to cast ridicule on my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because he has represented different constituencies, if he thinks the adoption of such means as the late election trial in Colchester showed were adopted there, would not secure election in almost any county. I do not think that the record in that case is of such a nature that it need be referred to very much, or that the hon. gentleman need speak of the permanence of seats of hon. members on either side of this House. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the statement made by my hon. friend as to the extraordinary exodus of our citizens to the neighboring Republic. He admitted the fact of the exodus, but he attempted to show how it came about, and he was not aware that he proved that it was only after the introduction of the National Policy, these States of the Union obtained such an influx of Canadians. That exodus has increased, as his statement showed, and has been intensified, as has been demonstrated on the floor of Parliament, Session after Session, and never refuted successfully by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not wish to thresh that subject out again, but I will remind the hon. gentleman that the figures which have been used by the member for South Oxford (Sir

Richard Cartwright) are based on reliable data supplied by the officers of the Government themselves. That is the case also in regard to the lamentable failure of the Government's policy in the North-West, and the hon. gentleman may remember that the First Minister himself expected that we would have had this year 400,000 or 500,000 souls there, whereas we had scarcely 108,000. In the Province of Manitoba, according to the calculation of the First Minister, we should have had last year 45,000 or 50,000 people going into that Province, but the records show that we only added to the population about 7,000. With these records before us, and with the census which was taken in 1885 and 1886, I think it is well for those hon. gentlemen to leave that part of the speech of my hon. friend alone, because it is unrefuted unless they can change the statements which have been given to the country. Then, the hon. gentleman referred to the question of taxation, and he waxed very witty, or thought he waxed very witty, as to the amount of sugar consumed by the people of this country. He referred to the statement in the *Hansard*, and my hon. friend asked him to read the context. He professed to do so, and members on the other side cheered him. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is correctly reported in the official debates with one exception. It is stated that the amount of sugar consumed per head of a family is 2 lbs. a day, and that the taxation is \$5 per annum. If the hon. gentleman had any knowledge at all of finance, or if he were willing to bring that knowledge to bear on this point, he would know that, when the hon. member for South Oxford had stated that the amount of taxation that would come from each head of a family on the article of sugar would be \$5 per annum, the amount of 2 lbs. per day must be wrong, that it must be an error either on the part of the *Hansard* reporter or in the printing office. What the hon. member for South Oxford said was not that the amount consumed was two lbs. per day for each family, but 200 lbs of sugar per annum, and that upon that the taxes would be \$5. If the hon. gentleman understood figures, if he could grasp the simplest arithmetical problem, he would see that there must have been a mistake in the calculation of the amount of sugar consumed. Where is the laughter of hon. gentlemen now? They laughed at an error made by the *Hansard* reporter or in the printing office; they laughed at the fact that the taxes on that amount of 2 lbs. a day for each family would be \$5 per annum, but I challenge that hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman to show that a family of four or five persons do not pay that amount of taxes on their sugar in the course of the year. It is estimated that each person consumes 40 lbs. of sugar per annum. That, with five in a family, would be 200 lbs. The hon. gentleman knows that 2½ cents a pound, at least, is taken out of the people for every pound of sugar that is consumed. Why do not hon. gentlemen laugh now? The question was not the amount of sugar which was consumed, but the amount of taxes which was paid, and that was stated by my hon. friend to be \$5 per annum, and was so reported in the *Hansard*. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show that it was any less. I need not follow him through his further statement, when he attempted to be funny again in reference to the cost of houses and barns. He ridicules the idea. Perhaps so, to hear these hon. gentlemen opposite talk as they often do talk, about the poor man not paying any taxes. This is the way they talk, and they go on to legislate in order that the poor man may escape taxes, they make him live the life of a pauper. If he settles in the North-West they do not allow him the conveniences that a settler ought to have. Sir, the figures are there, and let them worry over them as they see fit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He thinks they use wooden pegs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose he would not have them use iron eave spouts on their houses, but nail a couple of boards together and in that way run the water off. That would be good enough for settlers in the North-West. Of course, what are settlers in the North-West for, except to pay taxes, any way, and build up the Canadian Pacific Railway? Then he goes on and he calls me by name, asking to be excused for having done so. I readily grant it. He says I have stated in the House that our export trade of manufactures had diminished. He says his answer to that is to be found in this fact that when Norwegians came over to Nova Scotia they used to buy the old ships and enter these in the Trade and Navigation Returns and now they do not do that, and so that accounted for the decrease of exports. The hon. member for Halifax tells me that he is not cognisant of any Norwegians having bought any old ships about Nova Scotia, but of course that is a matter that the hon. gentleman may know themselves. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if he means to say that that wholly explains all the decrease in the exports of manufactured goods, I think he will find that he is entirely mistaken. Let him look through the list and see the manufactured articles, the export of which is being killed off by the National Policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that. I live in a city where a large export trade had been done in a certain line, whereas they are driven out to-day under the taxation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and under the drawback that they pledged themselves, as a Government, to give that trade, and it is now about destroyed. And, Sir, that firm to-day are the most ardent advocates of a policy of unrestricted reciprocity that will give them access to the markets of the United States, not only where they may have a chance to sell, but where they can buy the raw material entering into their manufactures as cheaply as the American manufacturers can buy, with whom they have to fight in Brazil, in Australia, in Hungary, Chili, and other countries I could mention. Then he thought he was making one point against my hon. friend, because he said the resolution he had offered was a proposition to wipe out the manufacturers of this country, and it was to save the distillers. Very well, that might do for a little clap trap upon the public hustings, with a not too intelligent audience before you, but one would rather wonder to see a gentleman who has occupied the position of Finance Minister, and who may, for aught I know, be called upon to fill that position again, indulging in that kind of thing, in the Canadian House of Commons, in the presence of the people's representatives. Why, Sir, can he not comprehend that resolution? To save the distillers! Why, the very reason he has asked that they be left out is not for the purpose of taxing them that they are left out, not for the purpose of protecting them at all; it is that they may be taxed, not that they may be protected, not that they may be saved—and we protect the people through them. Well, now, I think I have gone all over the points except those that are recited in his amendment—I cannot remember all that was in it. I cannot be expected, of course, to take up all those points and allude to them, as it would be impossible to remember all that the hon. gentleman said. But I think he had some reference to his deficit, and some boasting with reference to the surpluses that they had had. It is true they had a surplus, but that surplus was just so much more money taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, that ought to have been left in them. It was just so much money taken from them in order to encourage a reckless Government and an extravagant Government in going on to more recklessness and more extravagance. I do not see the reason for boasting, it sounds bad now, inasmuch as the hon. member for South Oxford showed, that unless there had been a peculiar

arrangement of accounts, differing from the arrangement of accounts during some years past, the hon. gentleman would have had to confess to a deficit this year, which he has, by the process described by my hon. friend, converted into a nominal surplus, as he calls it. He stands with it now staring him in the face, and I think he was almost honest enough to admit that in the years 1887-89, he would probably be called upon, even with the enormous rate of taxation now burdening this country, to face a deficit of a million dollars. Now, I am reminded that the hon. member touched on the price of sugar. Well, Sir, that was remarkable—the statement of the hon. gentleman with reference to the duties, that the people are not taxed so much now because less duty is paid on sugar than was paid under the old tariff. The hon. gentleman knows that under the arrangement of his tariff, sugar comes into this country in a raw state at a very low figure, while before, it came in refined, a large portion paying this duty, and of course, the price being higher, there was a larger revenue from it. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot claim that the people of Canada are getting their sugar as cheap now, under the tariff as arranged by the hon. gentlemen opposite, as they could get sugar under a tariff arranged similarly to that in force when my hon. friend from South Oxford was Finance Minister. Sir, I make bold to say, after due consideration on this subject, that I believe the sugar duties could be so arranged as to leave a protection to the refiners, and give to the people of this country their sugar at as low a figure as they get it now, and next year put a million dollars extra into the treasury to wipe out their expected deficit; and if they will go on the lines followed by the hon. member for South Oxford,—I do not say follow them absolutely, but base an arrangement on those lines,—I will venture to say that they will accomplish that result. And they will accomplish more than that. They will do away with the necessity of that commission that is sitting to ascertain the operation of this sugar combine and trust that the wholesale men, and other men engaged in the sugar trade, have entered into; they will find a remedy for this in a moment, and avoid the necessity of spending \$6,000 or \$7,000 in order to find out a remedy for the evil. If we, as manufacturers, are taking advantage of the tariff, to take more out of the people than we ought to—I say we, because I am a manufacturer myself—if that be true it is the bounden duty of the Government to reduce the taxation and take away our power of doing so. That sugar duty could be arranged by one stroke of a Finance Minister's pen so as to deal successfully with this difficulty, and at once put an end to this combine, and we would do no injury to the wholesale merchants scattered throughout the country. Sir, I believe they have gone into this combine in order to help themselves, yet I will venture to say that to-day they would rather have the privilege they had during the time my hon. friend was in office, of going to markets of the world and buying their sugar and standing their chance of making their profits on it—they would rather do that than to risk the profits they are now after they have entered into their combines, tied down, as they are, to the demands of the refiners, that can be made arbitrarily, and from which they cannot release themselves. Sir, I give that to the hon. gentleman with reference to this sugar duty.

Mr. GUILLET. Is not the hon. gentleman himself a member of combines?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am a member of an association, if the hon. gentleman wants to know, and, Sir, I do not feel that I am doing any wrong to the country. I hold this, that if I am in an association that is taking any advantage of the public, by means of this tariff, hon. gentlemen opposite are recreant to their duty if they do not wipe out the protection under which we are enabled to do it. That

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

is the hon. gentleman's answer. He will find me frank in stating the position that I am in, and, Sir, I do not claim that I am wrong. I only state this as a personal explanation. I suppose the hon. gentleman can find out all about it, if he likes to, and he is welcome to it. If there is anything wrong in the position I am in, I would like to know it and I would like to get out of it. But if the hon. gentleman thinks that I am taking an advantage of the tariff, it is his bounden duty to urge upon the Government that which will cure the evil. Wipe out your protection, and open the markets of the world to the people, and you will manage it very successfully. With respect to the manufacture in which I am engaged the difference between the cost of the raw material and the price of the manufactured article does not give any great amount of protection, and the manufacturers are met with the competition of the world, as I hold should be the case in regard to sugar and all other articles consumed by the people, and in regard to which they are taxed to an exorbitant amount. I proceed to notice a few statements made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. I notice that the tables he gave seem to be pretty fairly prepared, and for them I presume he assumes responsibility; I do not desire to criticise them, as they have already been criticised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I wish to leave them in that position. I simply wish to re-enforce the statements made by that hon. gentleman that the rate of taxation imposed upon the people is excessive, that the hon. gentleman has added enormously last year to that taxation in the form of iron duties, that he has also changed the duties on sugar so that the treasury received something like three-quarters of a million extra in taxes from the people. The Finance Minister was honest enough to admit that with all the increased taxation there is in Canada to-day depression in trade, that the progress of the country has been checked, and to that checking of progress and dulness of trade he attributed the loss of revenue that has taken place and the probability of a deficit. I was a little amused at the hon. gentleman. He is of a happy turn of mind, he is of a cheerful spirit when on the Treasury benches, but when in Opposition he has a long face and deplores and grumbles about the position of the country. When seated on the Treasury benches, however, he feels that everything is all right. He took a glance through the country and saw, what we all very much regret, a failure of crops in Ontario, which is a very serious matter for the whole country; yet he extracted consolation even out of that thought. He said that after all the short crop in Ontario was a blessing in disguise because it would prevent over importation. The short crop in Ontario is a blessing because the people are too poor to buy the goods they bought before. I have sometimes wondered how a large and kind hearted gentleman such as he is could heap burdens upon the country without having twinges of conscience; but the explanation is here. What the short crop did by impoverishing the people and making them less able to buy goods, which was in the hon. gentleman's opinion a blessing in disguise, the Finance Minister accomplished by making them poor through excessive taxation, thereby conferring a blessing in disguise on the people without their knowing it. That is the explanation of the hon. gentleman's conduct, and we can now understand that he is not so hard-hearted as we otherwise might think he is. I pass on to notice the increase in the national debt. It must be alarming to the people of the Dominion to contemplate a net debt of \$228,000,000. I am told, although I have not seen the notice myself, that the Finance Minister has given notice of a resolution asking power to effect a further loan of \$25,000,000. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out very clearly the large expenditures we shall have to meet in the near

future, the great augmentation of the net debt that is taking place, and that the time has arrived when if we cannot reach the ears of the Government, we should reach the ears of the people and lead them to put a stop to the further accumulation of debt in the interests of the well-being of this country. The Finance Minister while admitting that there was somewhat of a depression to-day, went on to point out that there were some directions in which there was light, and that our trade was increasing in some quarters. While there was a poor crop in Ontario he said there was a good crop in Manitoba and the North-West, and I very much rejoice in that fact. The hon. gentleman also said there was a great increase in the West India trade, and in order to prove that statement he gave the House some statistics. I wish to call attention to those figures, because I am unable to reconcile them with those I find in the public documents. The hon. gentleman said, at page 1085 of *Hansard* :

"I find that in 1878 the total value of the imports entered for consumption from all the West Indies was \$1,181,728; and in 1886 it had increased to \$3,249,642."

He gave those figures as showing a gratifying increase in the West India trade, a trade which the Government prided themselves on developing. The figures quoted by the hon. gentleman show an increase in the years mentioned of \$2,067,914. But I desire to ask the Minister of Finance why he gave statistics for the year 1886 and not those for 1887. Surely when we take statistics of either private or public business we want them for the present year and not for last year. The hon. gentleman should have made his speech last year—he is a year late. I will give the figures for 1887 instead of 1886, which in all fairness the hon. gentleman was bound to have done, if he wished the people to thoroughly understand the question. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1887 that the value of imports entered for home consumption from the West Indies in 1878 was \$1,033,849; 1887, \$1,942,182, so that the increase in the West Indies import trade, during those nine years, was only \$908,333, but the Finance Minister, by selecting 1886, led the country to understand that the trade had increased by over \$2,000,000. The hon. gentleman further said :

"As regards the whole trade, both imports and exports, I find that in 1878 the total value of these amounted to \$4,689,473, in 1886 to \$5,553,892."

The Finance Minister thus gave the House to understand that the total trade, exports and imports, had increased by the value of \$864,419. What are the facts? If he had dealt frankly with the House and had given us, as he was bound to give us, the figures for 1887, in reference to this matter, as disclosed by Table No. 4, of the Trade and Navigation Returns, show that the total value of the imports to the West Indies in 1878 amounted to \$4,397,996, and in 1887, \$4,017,593. Thus, Sir, instead of there being an increase in the total trade with the West Indies, as would appear by the figures given us by the Minister of Finance, there was a positive decrease in the total trade with the West Indies of \$380,403. I think I am justified in bringing that fact before the notice of the Finance Minister, and in asking him to explain how it was that in making his financial statement to this House and pretending to show the progress we in Canada were making that he should have gone back to 1886 and overlooked the figures for 1887 which must have been before him? The hon. the Finance Minister was pleased to say that in addition to developing our West India trade we were also developing our interprovincial trade, and he gave us figures to show the increase of traffic over the Intercolonial Railway, and pointed to that as an evidence of increased provincial trade. I say here, as I said not long ago from my seat in this House, that the hon. gentleman would not delight more than I would delight if it were possible for us, in a business

way, to increase our interprovincial trade. I said on a previous occasion, and I do not hesitate to say it now, that I believe the Minister of Finance is the founder of the National Policy, and has the honor of being its founder, if there be any honor in it. I believe that one of the objects of the National Policy, was as had been told us, if possible to develop an interprovincial trade. He saw the necessity, if we could not develop a foreign trade, to promote a trade between ourselves. I would rejoice with him if his figures could be taken as indicating that between Springhill, Cape Breton and Pictou, there could be a legitimate interprovincial trade, but I felt constrained to interject a question to the Finance Minister, which he was kind enough to answer at the time. I did not wish to disconcert him during the progress of his speech, but I asked him if he had a comparative statement of the expenditure and receipts during this period on the Intercolonial Railway. He said he had not, but that he considered it was a matter of very small importance—I think those were his words—in consideration of the vast benefits that would flow to this country from the encouragement of an interprovincial trade. Still, Sir, I can scarcely agree with him on that point. I ask the Finance Minister this question: Can you not develop an interprovincial trade to a much greater extent than at the present time, provided you run your Intercolonial Railway for nothing; provided you carry and lay down in the Maritime Provinces flour for nothing. Then our friends from the Maritime Provinces would buy all their flour from us, and they would not import any American flour and pay taxes upon it as they do to-day. If you bring the Springhill mines and the Pictou and Cap Breton mines and lay their products down in my city, free of cost to me, then I will purchase those products, or let you bring them over your railway, as far as it comes, free of cost, and then, Sir, I might be found using them, and that may develop the trade. But where would be the saving to the country? Why, Sir, you would be paying out of the pockets of the people of the country the expenses to run your road. We can only rejoice in a development of trade and commerce when that commerce is brought about legitimately, and when it is not brought at the expense of taxes that are taken out of the pockets of the people to pay for losses incurred in other directions.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have been able to conclude my remarks before the House rose at six o'clock, but I found there were a few points I desired to touch upon, having reference more particularly to some of the statements that were made by the Minister of Finance in the speech he delivered to this House. I have discussed what I conceive to be the effect of the sugar duties, and of our trade in that direction, and I would propose now for a short time to consider the effect of the iron duties that were proposed by the Finance Minister last Session and from which he predicted such grand results would flow. The question of the great blessings to be derived in this country from the imposition of duties upon iron has been often pictured to us. As long ago as 1882 it was brought positively before our minds and the hon. Minister of Finance, Sir Leonard Tilley, told us that the reason that Parliament was prematurely dissolved was to give the people an opportunity of pronouncing whether the National Policy was the settled policy of the people of this country or not. He told us that he was in a position to say that if the people would endorse that policy in 1882, that he knew of millions of capital that was waiting ready to be invested in the manufacture of iron in this country. The Finance Minister, in speeches delivered throughout the country in

various places, notably in the city of Toronto in 1882, during the general election, stated that to his own knowledge such was the case. I will not trouble you with long quotations but I will just read you in a few sentences what he said upon one occasion :

"I tell you—and this is not a matter of supposition but of certainty and knowledge on my part—that there are millions of dollars waiting to be invested in Canada ; millions in England and large sums in the United States waiting to come to Canada, waiting to be invested in every kind of industry, in mines and in manufactures of every kind, but the capitalists say: Your Opposition say that your policy is only the result of a temporary madness on the part of the people in Canada in 1878 because times were bad then and that it will be reversed at the next election."

He pointed out, Sir, in continuing, what the result would be if the people supported his Government and said that those millions of dollars were waiting to develop our iron industry if they did so. Nearly six years have elapsed since then, and I would ask those gentlemen, who spoke of their own knowledge, of their own certainty, not on supposition at all as they declared; whether those millions of dollars have been invested? The Government was sustained in that election, the Government have been sustained in an election since then, and I ask where are those millions of dollars that were to have been invested? But last Session the hon. the Finance Minister told us that they had found out that this blessed policy of theirs that was to build up—that was so complete, and perfect, and harmonious in all its parts, and that was working such wonders in this land, had one serious fault. They had discovered that the iron duties were arranged on a wrong basis and that this was the serious trouble in this much belauded National Policy, that was the model of perfection itself. He applied the remedy; he asked Parliament to give an increase of taxes on iron and that this would remedy the trouble. We had him prophesying what would be the effect of this change. He said: Allow the imposition of those duties on iron and you will find blast furnaces springing up in those places immediately. I am no prophet, he said, and no son of a prophet, but I venture to say that there will be found very great prosperity in this country as a result of that policy. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister to-night, a year after the imposition of those duties, when we should have some promise of the fulfilment of his prophecies, whether he can point to any instances that prove that he was a true prophet on that occasion? Although he disclaimed to be a prophet or the son of a prophet, he was a prophet, Sir, but of a certain kind. Now, the Book from which he took that quotation tells us about a class of prophets who existed in other times and in another nation. They were prophets of a people who were steeped in iniquity, who wished to continue in their perverse ways, who did not wish to be disturbed, and who said: "Prophecy unto us smooth things, and they prophesied them." I think the hon. gentleman might be classed among those prophets. I would not like to apply to him the term applied to them, that of being false prophets; but he seemed to be ready to do what they did, and to prophesy unto us smooth things. Let the public debt be heaped up, said they; let the taxes be increased on the people, let there be a shrinkage in our trade, let us draw closer the lines and restrict our commercial intercourse with other nations, let us cripple our industries and our resources; we are at ease in our beds; do not talk about the accumulation of the debt; do not talk about bad times; do not talk about men being out of work or about people leaving the country; do not disturb us in our slumbers; they said: Prophecy unto us smooth things; and the hon. gentleman did so. Now, I would ask the hon. gentleman to-night to point out some of the proofs of his prophecies. Where are the blast furnaces which he said were to be brought into existence? I should like to know if there has been one brought into existence. I would like to ask my hon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

friend from Carleton County (Mr. Dickinson) whether that blast furnace in his county whose fires were damped some years ago, has had them relighted. I would like to ask, where are the blast furnaces at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay, at Kingston, and at other places where the hon. Finance Minister said they were going to spring up? He said, there is only one thing in addition to these iron duties that we require in order to have blast furnaces established at all these points, and that is, to have the duty taken off anthracite coal. A year ago that was done and yet there are no blast furnaces at Cobourg, at Weller's Bay, or at Kingston. I have looked around the country, and I have failed to discover that any great stimulus has been given to the industry, while the iron duties imposed at that time have borne down heavily on the agricultural classes. The hon. Finance Minister told us that certain factories had increased their output. I will not challenge all the statements he made, but I will refer to a sample of them. I am not blaming the Finance Minister, who I believe was misled, but I blame the gentlemen who gave him the information. He told us that a wood screw factory was being erected in Hamilton that was not employing, but—the language was very guarded—to be capable of employing 400 hands. I think I am correct in what I am about to say, but I shall be very happy to be corrected if I am wrong. He told us that that was a new industry; but my impression is that that wood screw factory, that was to be capable of employing 400 hands as the effect of these iron duties, is the same factory that was located in the town of Dundas, five miles distant from Hamilton, for years and years, and was only removed to Hamilton.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. For twenty years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Long before the National Policy was thought of, that factory was in existence in Dundas, and as a matter of convenience, as a better shipping point I suppose, it was removed to Hamilton. I think I am correct in that statement; if I am not, the hon. Finance Minister will correct me.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to correct the hon. gentleman, if I am in order. The hon. gentleman is correct to some extent, that the screw factory, a small concern, had been in existence in Dundas for some time, and did remove its machinery to Hamilton. But this establishment which has been organised in Hamilton is eight or ten times the size of the one that was in Dundas, and its creation is entirely a result of the tariff that was adopted at the last Session; and had that tariff not been adopted that large factory would not have been erected in the city of Hamilton or anywhere else. It is entirely due to the tariff adopted last Session that that large establishment is now in successful operation, giving employment to some 400 or 500 hands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Perhaps I may be permitted to a word of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Brant has the floor.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As these hon. gentlemen live in the town of Dundas, and are conversant with all the circumstances, I am quite willing that they should state the facts, because I would be glad to know whether this is a new industry or not, and to what extent it has benefited by the iron duties.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will lead to four or five explanations of the same kind, and I think it would be better, and expedite business, if the hon. member proceeded with his speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) chose to intervene and interrupt my hon.

friend, and thereby induced this reply. Now, he ought not to have been allowed to speak, or else I think the hon. member for Wentworth should be allowed to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would have stopped him at once, but the hon. member for Brant seemed to be willing to have that interference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is willing that the hon. member for Wentworth should speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but if we go on in that way, we shall have four or five speaking on the same subject.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The reason I was willing to give way was that the hon. member for Wentworth represents Dundas. I do not represent it, but I know all the facts, and I would just say—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would interrupt the hon. gentleman. These statements will very well come after the hon. member for South Brant has concluded his speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, I think the House is pretty well seized of the fact. At any rate, the hon. Finance Minister has been misled as to this being a new industry, started under the stimulating influence of the tariff, and it is possible that the gentleman who gave the explanation is the same one who gave the information to the hon. Finance Minister, and it would be natural that he should wish to make the best of the case. These cases which are given of manufacturers sending in their own statements about their output being so much greater than before, and all that kind of thing, really do not prove anything. We are capable of using business arguments, and determining for ourselves as business men what the effect would be; and to speak of an increased number of hands in my factory or your factory or anybody else's, proves nothing in an argument of this kind. It is quite possible that there might be, in these cases, something such as there is in the city of Toronto. If you consider the manufacturing industries located there, and say, in such a year, only a few years ago, there were only so many factories in existence, but to-day there are so many, hon. gentlemen would say they are the effect of the National Policy. Some of the factories are not the effect of the National Policy, but were in existence years before the imposition of the National Policy, and were simply transferred from one city to another. Cases of that kind continually offer themselves; and they were thus transferred, not under the stimulating influence of his National Policy but of the bonuses offered by rival towns. For instance, I need refer, as an illustration of this statement, to the offer made lately of a bonus of \$30,000 by the town of St. Mary's to a factory in Paris, to induce the proprietors of that factory to remove their establishment to St. Mary's; and should that offer be accepted, no doubt some hon. gentleman opposite will claim the establishment of that enterprise in the latter town as due solely to the National Policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I would like to ask him whether the National Policy and the bonuses had not something to do with each other? Does he think the bonuses would have been given but for the National Policy?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will answer the hon. gentleman. I believe that in that particular case, the effect of his tariff has not been to stimulate that industry to that extent, as I was able to show when the reciprocity debate was before the House; I gave the testimony of the manufacturers in that line given before the committee of this House in 1886, in which they declared that the increase in the tariff would be injurious instead of beneficial to them. But the National Policy has had this effect, that manufactures have been transferred, by means of the bonuses, from one place to another; and I tell the hon. gentleman further, that one other effect of the National Policy has been this:

Whether that effect has been good or bad I will not stop now to argue, but one effect has been to concentrate numerous small establishments into a few large ones. Take, for instance, the large boot and shoe manufacturers. You will find that they employ a large number of hands, but how does that come about? Is it that there are so many more men employed making boots and shoes than formerly? I think you will agree with me that there are not, but you will find that where formerly boot and shoe makers were widely distributed and employed men in their own shops—each boot and shoe maker employing in his own shop, in his own town or village, several apprentices—to-day the large factories have absorbed these smaller institutions, and the men who were formerly employed in smaller shops now have to turn to something else or to go into the large factories. You cannot say, therefore, that these factories are the effect of the National Policy, but you must trace them directly to the combining of the small shops into large factories. I have always made these statements with the reservation that I am willing to be corrected if wrong, and I make them to-day under the same reservation. But I have asked, time and again, hon. gentlemen to point to me a single manufacturing industry now in existence in this country, that was not in existence years before the National Policy came into effect at all.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must allow the hon. member for North Brant to proceed with his speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Wentworth was not allowed to interrupt, and, as a matter of course, the hon. member for North Perth must not object to the same rule being applied to him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would have been quite willing to allow the hon. gentleman to interrupt, but as I do not intend to occupy the time of the House long, he will have the perfect right to rise after I have finished, and enumerate the numerous industries which have been started after the National Policy, that he knows of. I have denied that there are any, but, if hon. gentlemen opposite say there are any, I have asked them frequently to name them. That there are more factories to-day in existence, more woollen mills, more cotton mills, and more factories of that kind, I do not deny.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But can it be expected that the country is to go on increasing in population, and hon. gentlemen opposite will surely not urge that we have not increased somewhat, though at a slower pace than we should have increased—and that there should not, in the natural order of progress, be also an increase in these different kinds of manufactories? But in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may establish the claim they urge on behalf of the National Policy, they must prove that industries are to-day in existence in Canada which were not in existence before the National Policy was adopted. Sir, the great manufacturing industries of this country were in existence years before these hon. gentlemen attained the Treasury benches the second time. Years before that, the manufactures of Canada were exhibited at the Centennial Exhibition of Philadelphia and challenged there the admiration of the world; and as the result of the display our Canadian manufacturers there made and which attracted the attention of the people of Australia and Europe, a foreign trade sprung up in those industries which still continues, and I believe a larger trade would have been promoted between Canada and the outside world had not these manufacturers been restricted and burdened by the imposition of the National Policy. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point to a new industry which has been brought into existence by the National Policy. Take the census of 1871, take the census

of 1881, or take any tables you may know of, of a later date, and point to me any new industry started since the National Policy. I will not deny that you may find some, but I venture to say that the lines will be very few and very difficult to name. I was told once by a gentleman, when I put this question on the public platform, that there was a pin factory started in Galt and that such a factory was unknown in Canada before the adoption of the National Policy. I accepted his statement, but I was corrected afterwards by a gentleman who stated that years before the National Policy came into force there was a pin factory in existence somewhere else in Canada. Another gentleman stated that the electro-plate business was brought into existence in Hamilton by the National Policy. I was not able to point to contradict that statement, but my impression is that there was one established in Canada before the adoption of our protective tariff. Therefore, these glorious prophecies, those grand, proud swelling words, which are uttered by Ministers and their supporters, are mere sound and fury, and carry no argument, unless those gentlemen are able to point to the case of any new industries which have been started into existence by our National Policy. Let these hon. gentlemen look over our census of 1871, and they will find that all these various industries about which we now hear so much, were in existence in this country then and prospering. I wish just to refer briefly to a statement that was made by the Finance Minister, and which afforded me some pleasure. I was pleased to hear him state that while he imposed an additional duty of \$2.44 per ton on pig iron the price had only increased \$1.25 per ton and he argued from that that the manufacturer in Canada had not availed himself of the full amount of duty, but that the foreign manufacturer in order to get his goods in Canada had to lower his prices. I think the facts hardly bear out that statement. I have not got access to the papers from which the hon. gentleman quoted. He selected the months of December and February, but I thought it would be as good a test as any, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in this to take the figures from the *London Economist*. These figures are pretty reliable as a rule, and taking their quotations on pig iron for the month of March, 1888, and the corresponding month of March, 1887, they show the following exports from Great Britain to British North America:—In March, 1887, the export was 1,252 tons of pig iron, valued at \$3,492; in 1888 the export was 1,877 tons, or a larger import in 1888 after the imposition of the high duties, and the value of that was \$4,639. I call the attention of the Finance Minister to this fact, that in 1887, that iron averaged per ton, as quoted in the *London Economist*, £2 15s. 9½d., while the quotations of March, 1888, are £2 9s. 5d.; so there you find a reduction in the price in the old country, in Britain, of something like \$1.52 on iron, and if you add to that the \$1.25 that the Finance Minister admits it has to pay here, you have an increase of \$2.77, provided the price of iron had not fallen in the old country market. I have not got the same months the Finance Minister had; I have not any access to them, but I have taken March, 1888, and compared that with the corresponding week in 1887, which I think is just as fair a comparison. Now having spoken with reference to the question of iron, and the duty on iron, and what it has failed to do in its effect on manufactures, notwithstanding the grand promises we had held out to us, I wish to ask the attention of the House for a few moments to another point on which the Minister congratulated the House, as being part of his policy, and that was when, in his round, swelling tones, he declared that the policy of this Government was to protect the labor interests of the country, to protect the artisan, the mechanic, the workingman, that their interests had been taken under the fatherly care of this Government. Well, Sir, I charge that that is just what this Government have not done. They have protected the manufacturers, or they

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

have sought to protect the manufacturers, but I deny most emphatically that they have given any protection to labor at all. I think I can demonstrate that, instead of granting any protection to labor, they have discriminated against labor, they have oppressed labor, they have brought unjust competition to bear against labor in this country. Why, the very tables the Finance Minister gave us to show the increase in the output of the Londonderry works as the result of his tariff, if I understand his tables aright, though his figures are rather confused, demonstrate, if you go into the calculation, that while there are more hands employed in those Londonderry iron works, the rate of wages per hand is less than it was before. What does the workingman feel in reference to this matter? Is it any benefit to a mechanic to know that the shop in which he works is somewhat enlarged, and that other mechanics are found by his side, brought as it may be from Germany, from England or from the United States, to work at the same wages, or to lower the wages which he has received? What the mechanic and the laboring man want is not work for more mechanics. The country as a whole may benefit by the importation of more mechanics, but the interest of the laboring man and the mechanic of Canada is that his condition shall be improved and his wages raised, and he does not consider that he is benefited by a policy which brings in other artisans, so that he has to work for less wages, and I think it is proved by the tables of the hon. gentleman himself that this is what the Government have done. What have the Government done in reference to the protection of labor? They have, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pointed out, taxed the workingman upon everything almost that he consumes. There is scarcely an article which he needs in his household, or for the use of his family, or for his own use, that is not heavily taxed; but, in regard to what he has to sell, his labor, have they protected his labor? No, but they have taken taxes out of the public treasury of this country, taxes that in part were paid by these hard-working, industrious mechanics, and have given them to mechanics in England and other countries to help to pay their passages to Canada to lower the wages of the mechanics who are working in our factories. That is the way in which those hon. gentlemen protect our labor. It is almost amusing that it did not raise a feeling of indignation to hear an hon. gentleman professing to speak of protecting labor, when all the effect of his policy is to burden the mechanic with fresh taxes and to open the market and compel the mechanic not only to contend against the labor market of the world, but also to take the taxes which he has contributed in part and apply them to the purpose of enabling other mechanics to come here and lower the wages which he was receiving before their advent into this country. The hon. gentleman spoke as to the condition of the manufacturers, and there has been a great deal of sympathy expressed on account of the manufacturers. What is the condition of the manufacturers in this country to-day? Of course there are manufacturers and manufacturers. Some of them, I suppose, are doing fairly well; some, I suppose, are doing very well; but some are doing very ill indeed. That will always be the case. Fortunate circumstances may perhaps attend one man's ventures which may be absent from another's, so that under any tariff some men will prosper in business while others may not; but take trade as a whole—and I call the attention of the Finance Minister to this, because he stated in his speech to us last year what I believe to be a truth, and I like to quote truth whenever it is stated by the Finance Minister, and he saw as a public man, and knew what he was giving utterance to a year ago, and that was that production in manufactured goods in this country had about overtaken consumption. He was within the mark that time. Sometimes he is charged with overshooting the

mark, but he was within the mark that time. Production has not only overtaken consumption, it has done more, it has outrun consumption, and, as a result, you have found men who, in order to save their capital, in order to save their resources, have found themselves under the necessity, as they considered, to band themselves together in order to restrict production and to keep up the price, which of course means a hardship to the consumer. The hon. gentleman recognised that, and he suggested that it would be the duty of the Government, and of every Government under those circumstances, to look abroad and to use every energy they were possessed of to open up new and foreign markets which might take the surplus of our manufactures; and he told us that the Government had sent commissioners to various countries, to the Argentine Republic, and to Brazil, and to other countries, to open up additional trade. But no result has come from those efforts. I think a commissioner was sent to Australia, but I am afraid that nothing has resulted from that either. But, while the hon. gentleman admits the absolute necessity that our manufacturers should have larger fields in which to operate, he tells us that he is an avowed opponent of any scheme to open a market of 60,000,000 of people at our own doors or to give our manufacturers a chance to open that market. Why, instead of sending commissioners to these distant countries, does he not himself, with tenfold the ability of the men he has sent there, go to the neighboring Republic, to the capital of the United States, to which he was invited to go, where he was told that they were ready to treat on a basis of larger commercial relations with us, and see if he could open up the markets of that great consuming people of sixty millions? Our manufacturers may be timid. Capital is always timid. Our manufacturers may dread radical changes, but, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright has pointed out, what the manufacturers of Canada have to be anxious about is this, that, as soon as the United States are able to reduce their duties on raw material, or to wipe them out altogether, as they soon will be able to do in view of their overflowing treasury, then the Canadian manufacturer will be subjected to a closer, a keener, a stronger competition than ever before. That, Sir, being the case with the American manufacturer, and that being the case with our manufacturer, under the policy of expenditure that has been followed by these hon. gentlemen, they will tell you that the maintenance of high taxes upon their raw material would place them at a disadvantage in their own country, to say nothing of the absolute disadvantage that they would be under competing with the Americans in other parts of the world. Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose we leave the subject of trade, and finance, and figures, which are dry, and discuss lofty and exalted principles. We had a little novelty of that kind the other day when the Finance Minister did so. The Finance Minister left off his discussion of trade and commerce in order to read hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House a lecture as to how they ought to behave themselves. He was kind enough to tell us that a party, in seeking to obtain power, should only seek power for the sake of the good they would be able to do when they got there, for the sake of giving effect to their principles; that if a party sought to attain power simply for the sake of holding and exercising power, it was a most unworthy, a most base thing. Sir, I agree with him. It was refreshing to hear sentiments so grand from the Finance Minister—not that I mean to say he is incapable of feeling them, but he has to deal so much in a hard, matter of fact region, that he does not often soar into the region of fixed principles. But I would like to ask him this question, agreeing with him in that: If it be proper for a party, in seeking to attain power, to do so with a single eye to carrying out their principles, and giving effect to them, whether he does not think it would be a good plan for a party, after they have attained

power, to retain their principles while they remain in office. I think that would be well. Now, we can tell exactly what the hon. gentleman's principles were when he was struggling for power; but let me ask him, in all frankness, Has he held on to his fixed principles since he got in? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a departure from sound principle by one or other of the gentlemen opposite, when I see a Tupper and a McLelan sitting in the same Cabinet. I think there must be. I cannot conceive, myself, that one gentleman who denounced another as the high priest of corruption, who pictured him as robbing his fellow passengers with false arms in a stage coach—I cannot believe it possible that these two men were honest at that time, and can be found sitting in the same Cabinet together to-day, unless there has been a departure from principle on the part of one or the other. I will do the Finance Minister the credit of saying this, though, that he did not seek a seat in the Cabinet with the hon. member for Colchester, (Mr. McLelan), but the member for Colchester sought, and was willing to accept, a seat in the Cabinet side by side with this gentleman that he had thus described. I am afraid there has been a departure from principle somewhere. I would like the hon. gentleman, when lecturing this side of the House, to remember that while it is a high, and a lofty, and a proper thing to be actuated solely by a desire to maintain principles when striving for the Treasury benches, it is equally laudable to maintain these principles in all their purity when occupying this seat. I would remind him that it would be only a proper thing, in maintaining these fixed principles, if gentlemen, having that sense of honor of the way in which public business should be conducted, would be willing, in making an appeal to the electorate of this country for a renewal of their confidence, to go before that electorate and say: Gentlemen, these are our principles, this is our policy, these are our acts, this is what we have done; judge whether we have been faithful stewards of your affairs; in your hands we leave the decision of this case. We have empanelled you as a jury, and to your verdict we will bow. Sir, gentlemen of fixed principles, gentlemen who will trust to their principles and believe that they are right, would not hesitate for a moment to go to the country under such circumstances. But have these gentlemen opposite ever dared to go to the country on their principles? Have they ever dared to go to the country and fight their opponents in a fair field with no favor? No, Sir, the records of this country show not. Sir, gentlemen of fixed principles ought never to condescend to such acts as the Gerrymander Act, as the Franchise Act, as the Revising Barrister Act, as the Returning Officer Act, if they felt strong, and confident that they were virtuous in their principles. Sir, I am afraid there has been a departure from fixed principles on the part of members of the Cabinet—though undoubtedly their sole desire in seeking to attain that position was not to remain there a day, or a year, but simply to give effect to principles that they believed in. My hon. friend beside me says, and I believe that is true, that, perhaps, with them there is one grand, overshadowing principle, which outweighs all other considerations to which they may bow, and that it is their fundamental principle to cling to office, no matter by what means, or under what circumstances. But then my hon. friend the Finance Minister will say that that is a high and lofty principle. He will not stand on the pedestal that he did the other day when delivering a lecture to gentlemen on this side of the House. Well, now let us examine and see what are the fixed principles of the party opposite. What is their policy? I remember last year and the year before, gentlemen on this side of the House had a fixed policy on a particular question, that it was the duty of the Federal Government to allow the Provincial Governments to exercise their undoubted rights within their constitutional sphere; and,

therefore, they moved a resolution censuring the disallowance of Manitoba railway charters by the gentlemen who are in power. Well, Sir, we were answered by hon. gentlemen opposite: We will not consent to the abandonment of the disallowance policy, we will not consent to allow Manitoba to charter railways that will tap the Canadian Pacific Railway and divert the trade of our great North-West into American channels. They pointed out to us that millions and tens of millions of dollars of the taxes of the people of the older Provinces had been expended in building that road, and it was not in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not in the interest of the older Provinces, that disallowance should be abandoned, and they would not cease their rights, as they claim to have the right, to disallow the charters and thus prevent our trade from being diverted. Well, there was their policy, fixed and unalterable, a year ago. Where are they to-day? The very same gentlemen have now on the notice paper a resolution to be offered by the Finance Minister himself, by which he will ask the assent of this House, not only to permit Manitoba to charter railways to take the traffic of the North-West, to carry it into American channels, but that we shall guarantee the interest for 50 years on \$15,000,000 to enable them to do so. This is the fixed principle of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, they had a fixed principle in reference to this National Policy, to the industries of the country that were to be protected. Among them was to be protected the great tree, fruit growing and nursery interest, which, they claimed has sprung up in this country as one of the beneficent results of their National Policy. Well, Sir, what is the fact? We had one day the First Minister and the Minister of Justice rising and declaring that though the Americans had put these articles upon their free list, and though we had a statutory officer upon our books, saying if they did that we would do the same with their products, these hon. gentlemen said they would not do it, that they had the liberty to select what they saw fit, that they would not consent to do it, that it would be treasonable to the interests of the country to do it. Within one short week the hon. the Finance Minister came down and said that that was all wrong, that already an Order in Council had been issued placing those articles upon the free list, where they remain to-day. One of the fixed principles of hon. gentlemen opposite has been that Canada must not discriminate against the mother country. Yet in that very Order in Council they discriminated against the mother country by declaring that those articles might come in free from the United States but not free from the land against which they would on no account discriminate. They had also a fixed policy in regard to the manner in which they would deal with the liquor traffic. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the First Minister put their heads together and a Bill was introduced known as the McCarthy Act. What was the result? They abandoned that principle, I will not say voluntarily, but they had to abandon it after an appeal to the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire. Their fixed principle of dealing with the liquor traffic is a thing of the past and all that remains of it is in the shape of taxes to the extent of nearly a quarter of a million to pay for the blunder the Government committed at that time. Then they had until a short year ago a decided policy and principle in dealing with the Americans and our fisheries. They were not to be allowed the use of our fisheries on any consideration; the Treaty of 1818 was to be entirely carried out and we were to uphold our rights. Less than a year ago the Minister of Finance went to Washington and arranged a treaty by which under certain conditions the Americans would be permitted to enjoy every privilege that hon. gentlemen opposite declared Canada would never consent to accept. I am not finding fault with the fisheries treaty, it is not necessary for the purposes of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

my argument, but I am simply pointing out that one year the Government had a fixed policy and were determined to carry it out, and in fact did carry it out in such a manner that the Finance Minister has declared that it produced a feeling of irritation in the United States that led us to the borders of war, and yet now we find an abandonment of all those contentions, all done it is said for the sake of peace. The Finance Minister himself had a policy last year with respect to the United States, and he was not disturbed by the prospect of what was known as the Retaliation Bill being passed in the United States. Some fears were expressed in regard to the results that might follow from non-intercourse with our neighbors, and it was thought it would prove very injurious, but the hon. gentleman could even see in that Bill, as he saw in the poor crop in Ontario, a blessing in disguise. The whole outlook was not dark, there was a silver lining to the cloud, and he went on to picture the silver lining and it appeared to be not a silver lining but the bright cloud itself, and the non-intercourse would be in Canadian interests. What were the hon. gentleman's statements in regard to that non-intercourse Bill, as given to us last year? He said then:

"Non-intercourse would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews and St. John, &c., with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand."

That certainly would not be a bad result. Cities could not be built up except by providing employment for the people and giving a stimulus to trade generally. Hon. gentlemen opposite claimed it was part of their policy to build up great cities, and the effect of passing a non-intercourse Bill on the part of the United States would be that our cities would be built up with a rapidity we could scarcely understand. What more did the hon. gentleman say?

"Non-intercourse would lead England to put on differential duties on grain to such an extent as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the great farming industry of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change in this Dominion."

If the result would be that it would advance our agricultural interests to such an extent as to produce a marvellous change in their favor non-intercourse would be of great benefit to us, and it would not be a cloud with a silver lining but a cloud white altogether with perhaps a dark rim. Yet this was the fixed principle which hon. gentlemen opposite declared a year ago, but within a year the Finance Minister comes to this House and declares that if the non-intercourse Bill had been put into effect it would have been the most disastrous thing that could have happened to Canada, and one of the great objects in surrendering what we did surrender to the United States of the fisheries was almost necessitated by the state of public opinion over there, owing to the policy we had pursued and to the danger that they might put into effect that very non-intercourse, which, according to the hon. gentleman's statement last year, would have been fraught with blessing to us. I think, therefore, we may fairly ask hon. gentlemen opposite when they read us lectures with regard to having fixed principles, to be themselves consistent not only in their utterances but also in their actions, because I would venture to propose this question: What principle is there that has been held by the party which occupies the Treasury benches which they are not ready to sacrifice if necessary in order to hold their present seats? There has been a changing and a vacillating course, their promises have been broken and violated, their pledges have not been kept, they have not succeeded in giving that prosperity to the country which they promised that the country should enjoy. They to-day sit there with all their predictions not only unfulfilled but with many of them looked upon in the light of events that have transpired as having been perfectly ridiculous in their nature and in their expression, if I might be permitted to use language as strong

as that without giving offence to hon. gentlemen opposite. But it is not too strong language to use when we look at their prediction of immigration into the North-West, when we read the predictions of the First Minister endorsed by the Finance Minister, given five, six or eight years ago and look at the actual result to-day, and on comparing them the question will force itself upon all minds. Can those hon. gentlemen have ability sufficient to manage a great and prosperous people like the people of Canada when they are unable to gauge with greater accuracy the state and condition of this country and the results likely to follow from the course and policy they are initiating? I will touch for a few moments on that which the hon. the Finance Minister has been pleased to term a new principle and new policy that we were grasping at. Several hon. gentlemen have pleased to tell us this and in the same breath have quoted the speech of the late leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) in which he stated that one of the settled principles of the Liberal party was to secure reciprocal trade relations with our neighbors to the south. We are told it is an entirely new principle, and the Postmaster General was pleased to tell us that the resolution offered by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was annexation in disguise. He sees, he tells us, a snake in the resolution, and he seems to imply that this is a party ready and anxious to promote annexation with the United States. I do not think there is any necessity for saying things that are offensive in their nature when it is not at all necessary. What right had he to charge any such sentiments or the holding of any such sentiments upon gentlemen on this side of the House? Did he produce a tittle of proof that the great Liberal party that were represented in that resolution by the mover, have ever advocated annexation to the United States? Why; no, Sir, he did not. He would have failed of proof, and I say that I am only tempted to mention this fact because the hon. gentleman has provoked it by seeking to fasten the charge upon the Liberal party of this country, that they desired a severance of the political relations that bind them to the mother land. I only allude to the fact that if he wants to find the annexation party he would find it in days gone by, not in the ranks of the Liberal party, but in the ranks of the party he himself belongs to to-day. He would have found men prominent in the party with which he is connected, in high places in the State and in high places in the mother land advocating annexation. Therefore, before he attempts to make an insinuation, or to make a statement of that kind, he should make himself aware of the history of this country, and know what the history of the political parties of this country has been. I hold in my hand what purports to be the annexation manifesto of 1849. It is said to be reprinted from the original pamphlet with the names of the signers. I have not time to read it, but I will read you the 6th article, and what does it say:

"Of all the remedies that have been suggested for the acknowledged and insufferable ills with which our country is afflicted, there remains but one to be considered. It propounds a sweeping and important change in our political and social condition, involving considerations which demand our most serious examination. This remedy consists in a friendly and peaceful separation from British connection and a union upon equitable terms with the Great North American confederacy of sovereign States."

I find, Sir, appended to that document such names as "J. J. C. Abbott," I find the name of "John Rose," I find the name "D. L. Macpherson." Will the hon. gentleman answer if he has ever known any persons bearing those names or any names having before them those initials? and if he has I would suggest that he would confer with them and ask them whether they are the individuals who signed their names to that document, the sixth article of which I have read to this House? If he finds they are the same gentlemen then I would ask him in very modesty, before he levels charges of treason and rebellion against this side of the House, that

he should take care that his own skirts, and the skirts of his own party are clean in this matter. In the course of the debate which took place on unrestricted reciprocity, we were told by the hon. the Finance Minister in his speech the other night that there was a certain gentleman who came from the United States and sought to place himself at the head of the Liberal party, to carry out the principle of commercial union. He gave us the name of that individual. He said it was Mr. Wiman. He said Mr. Wiman was a gentleman of large means—and the Finance Minister seemed to speak feelingly and knowingly when he said it was a great advantage to a party to have a man of large means connected with it. My friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said: "Like Sir Hugh Allan." What made him make that interjection? I will let him explain himself. But the Finance Minister understood the advantage of it. The hon. gentleman was pleased to say also that Mr. Wiman was a man of great ability and acknowledged power as well, and that he had come here to attempt to put himself at the head of the Liberal party and to lead the Liberal party to adopt commercial union. He told us also that the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was too much for the gentleman from New York, and that he had got the better of Mr. Wiman, with all his wealth, and all his ability, and that he had rescued the Liberal party from Mr. Wiman's leadership, and had thus saved the ship of the Liberal party from being dashed into pieces on the rocks of commercial union, but only to be stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. I know nothing of Mr. Wiman myself. I am a humble member of the Liberal party sometimes consulted with, sometimes knowing of what is going on within the ranks, and perhaps knowing as much of what goes on as the hon. the Finance Minister himself. Not that I claim to have any great intelligence or influence but simply from the fact that we would not consider him as trusted a member to admit to the caucuses even with all his ability, as I am myself. I am not aware that Mr. Wiman ever attempted to set himself up as the leader of the Liberal party in Canada, but I have the statement from the hon. gentleman himself that Mr. Wiman not only set himself up to be, but that he actually was the leader of the Finance Minister. Why, Sir, what glorifications we had over the consummation of the fishery treaty. What pæns of praise were sung by the High Commissioner to the plenipotentiaries who arranged this fishery treaty. Great praise was given to them, and the Finance Minister, in that self-sacrificing manner which so eminently characterises him, took nearly an hour and a half to describe the admirable qualities of those gentlemen who had been engaged in the superhuman task of defining the Treaty of 1818. But it all came back to the Finance Minister, because those plenipotentiaries were appointed, at his suggestion, because he made representations to Mr. Bayard and Mr. Bayard made representations to the United States Government and Sir Charles made representations to the British Government and those representations were carried out, and, as a matter of fact then the credit came back to Canada's High Commissioner, as being the one who conceived the project of settling this question and devising the means whereby it could be settled. In a moment of frankness the hon. the Finance Minister told us how all this came about. Shall the Canadian High Commissioner have the credit? If he was the first cause, yes; if he was not the first cause, no. Was he the first cause? He was not. He himself told us he was not. Why, he told us that the way he came to go to Washington, and the reason he took the initiatory step was, that our mutual friend, Mr. Wiman, told me that he had a conversation with Mr. Bayard, and if you go over there Mr. Bayard will talk to you about the trade relations between Canada and the United States. Here is an admission that he received his instructions from Mr. Wiman, and although Parliament

was in session—may be there was a holiday at that time—the Finance Minister takes a trip across to Washington, sees Mr. Bayard, and then followed the result that we all know. The point I wish to get at is this: The Finance Minister, who charges us with having sought to put ourselves as a Liberal party under Mr. Wiman's leadership, and charges Mr. Wiman with having sought to obtain the leadership of this party, he himself has confessed that he was a follower of Mr. Wiman, and, as far as we know, the only follower that Mr. Wiman had in this country, and that he followed him in this direction with the results that followed from it. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite—I wish to ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper) if he is in his seat, what he thinks of the conduct of the Finance Minister of Canada who has himself declared that this Mr. Wiman was "our mutual friend," and the member for Pictou knows what he told us about Mr. Wiman. He told us that Mr. Wiman was the apostle of commercial union, the apostle of unrestricted reciprocity or anything else that would lead to annexation. That is the description that was given to us of Mr. Wiman by the member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper). The member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) described Mr. Wiman as a renegade Canadian. What do these gentlemen think of the Finance Minister acknowledging him "his mutual friend" and acting upon the suggestion of this annexationist, and this gentleman who is the apostle of anything that would tend to annexation? I think that the hon. the Minister of Finance need not have looked to the Liberal party as those likely to follow Mr. Wiman's lead or those likely to look for a new leader. It would rather bear the significance and we would be more justified in considering that the hon. gentleman himself was prepared to enter into a league with Mr. Wiman to bring about not unrestricted reciprocity, but commercial union with the United States, than he is to charge the Liberal party that they sought to effect it by means of Mr. Wiman himself. Sir, he has declared that he had communications with Mr. Wiman, that he had negotiations with him, that he had received suggestions from him, and that he had acted on those suggestions; and I think he will not find that the Liberal party have ever done that. Now, Sir, the Liberal party have adopted the principle of unrestricted reciprocity, that is, they desire to promote the trade and the varied industries of this country. The agricultural interest of this country is not benefited, as I think the hon. gentleman himself will now be almost prepared to admit, by his so-called National Policy. What they want is larger markets and freer markets. Much of their produce has to go to the neighboring states as almost their only market. It is met there by heavy duties. The like products in the United States are so large and great in comparison with the quantity that we send to them that our products do not regulate the price in that market, but their own greater products regulate the price; and under these circumstances, as the hon. Minister of Finance himself pointed out, the Canadian seller has to lose the duty. Therefore we propose by this policy of unrestricted reciprocity to secure an open market, in order that the great agricultural interests of this country may reap the benefits that would flow to them from wiping out the American duties, and giving them the amount of cash which those duties represent in addition to what they now receive from the sale of their products. But the hon. gentleman tells us that the Liberal ship is stranded upon the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, I ventured to say to the hon. Finance Minister, when he said that, that he was very near there himself. It was about the only time that I perceived a shade of irritation upon his countenance. He had taken one or two previous interruptions from me in good temper; but when I felt impelled to point out that he was very near unrestricted reciprocity himself, he turned upon me rather

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

fiercely, and said he was at a loss to understand the mental organisation of a man who could not understand the difference between unrestricted reciprocity and an unrestricted offer of reciprocity. Well, I do not dwell on that. I was sorry for the hon. Minister of Finance when he said it. The mental organisation is not a peculiar one, I trust, in this country. It is a mental organisation that you will find among honorable men, I take it, in any country—the organisation that believes that when you make an offer to a man you make it in good faith, and that making it in good faith you will be honorable enough to carry it out if he accepts it. That is all that is peculiar in the mental organisation of some men, and I venture to say that that is all the hon. Finance Minister did. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), who spoke with power and authority—I know not whence he got it—told us that the offer made by the Finance Minister of Canada to the American commissioners in reference to trade relations was as broad and free as it was possible to make it. Sir, I cannot understand anything that could be plainer than that; I cannot understand a trade that could be more free and unrestricted if the offer had been accepted, than that involved in the proposition which the hon. gentleman himself made. When the hon. gentleman was asked by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), did you offer what you did not mean to grant? He answered, no, that would be a mean thing to do, and he would not do it. If he made an unrestricted offer, the broadest, freest possible offer, to settle this fishery question, and to give the Americans free access and all the rights to our fisheries that we enjoy ourselves, if he offered to give them unrestricted free trade upon the land as well as upon the sea, and if the United States had said, we will accept your offer, and the commercial barrier shall be removed from the sea as well as from the land, and commercially we shall be one people, I say from his own description of his offer, he would have been bound as a man of honor, and doubly bound as one of the trusted plenipotentiaries of the British Empire, to have consented to that arrangement with the United States. Sir, he asked, in replying to the question of the hon. member for East York, if I had made this offer, and if the American Government had said, well, we will accept so and so, and we will not accept so and so, would I not be at liberty then to say, no, I will not agree to that? Grant that there is some argument in that; grant that if they had made an offer of partial reciprocity, then he might say, this partial offer of reciprocity that you make has been well considered by you, and will work more in your interests than ours, and I cannot consent to it. But if they had accepted the unrestricted offer, and had said, we will adopt what you have suggested, perfect, unrestricted freedom of trade, then, Sir, I hold that the hon. gentleman would have been bound, and would have had no excuse for rejecting such an arrangement. Therefore, Sir, we were not so very far apart a short time ago. This hon. gentleman who lectured us on fixed principles, ought to have held to the fixed principles he had when he was negotiating with Mr. Bayard, and was making this offer to that gentleman. If he had remained true to that fixed principle, he would have been to-day found in accord with the Liberal party and seeking to give effect to that offer of unrestricted freedom of trade to the American Government on perfectly equal conditions. Sir, the Liberal ship is not stranded on the shoals of unrestricted reciprocity. I do not think it will be stranded there. The hon. Finance Minister himself, sailing in his ship of unrestricted reciprocity, a few months ago, anchored in the waters of unrestricted reciprocity bay. The command of the ship was for a time given to him by the captain, who wanted to sleep and take his ease; but some of his crew from the county of Welland, some from the county of Lincoln, and some from other counties, mutinied and said, if you put us to trade with these people, they will be smarter

than we are, and we shall be beaten in the bargain; and they woke up the captain and called upon him to resume the command of the ship in place of the mate; so the anchor was lifted, and the ship was drifted to sea, and now they are drifting about, no one knows where, I suppose for some fixed principle to which they can tie their ship. No, Sir, the offer that was made by the Canadian people and adopted by the Liberal party is this. We propose, what I understood the hon. Minister of Finance proposed, to go to the United States and say, we are living on this same continent, we are speaking the same language, we are people descended from the same nationality, we are a people of the same blood,—let us reason together, let us talk this matter over, and see whether it will not be better for both of us to remove these artificial barriers that divide us. Let us see whether we cannot have access into each other's markets and trade together as a people in perfect amity, although differing in our political institutions, for Mr. Bayard was very careful to say that by no indentment whatever did he propose to alter the political status of either country, but simply that he desired we should commercially be one people, and thus thrive, prosper and progress. Let the hon. the Finance Minister tell me, realising as he does the vast importance of this interprovincial trade, and the great wealth that a great interprovincial trade flowing freely in natural channels must produce—let him tell me that he is insensible to the effect of the wave of prosperity that will sweep over Canada, should we be permitted to enjoy the benefits of that vast interstate commerce which has made the great American nation one of the greatest nations on the face of the earth to-day. Should that freedom of commercial intercourse be brought about between the two countries, which would have the best of the bargain? Which is the better, to have a market of 5,000,000 or a market of 60,000,000? Would we not be the gainers thereby? Yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us to-day that our duty is to prevent our obtaining access to this great market by every possible means, because Canada's interests do not lie in that way. Why? Is it because it would not benefit our agricultural interests? Some hon. gentlemen opposite have ventured on that line of argument, but I venture to say that the hon. the Finance Minister will not. And I venture to say that hon. gentlemen opposite who have given utterance to this opinion will be glad to recede from that position. The great lumbering interests of this country must assuredly benefit by it. So must the mining industry, the fishing industry, and the shipping industry. There remains but one industry, so-called, the manufacturing industry, and what do hon. gentlemen opposite tell us with respect to that? They must all admit that free commerce between the two countries must be of great benefit, I will not say incalculable benefit, to the agricultural, the mining, the fishing, and the shipping industries of the country, to, in fact, nine-tenths of the people of Canada; and yet peradventure, because it might jeopardise the business standing and wealth of the remaining tenth who are engaged in the manufacturing industries, they oppose this policy. Is that the principle that prevails on the Treasury benches? Or do they hold to the old constitutional maxim of "the greatest good to the greatest number?" Hon. gentlemen who speak about fixed principles ought to take that as a fixed principle, and then let them tell me where the justice is in denying the right and the liberty to trade and increased prosperity to nine people in the country simply because of the danger, and I believe in many instances only a supposed danger, to the establishment of the other the tenth individual. They say that this policy will crush out our manufacturing industries. Why, the hon. the Finance Minister, in one part of his speech, declared—and I was glad to hear him

declare it—that Canadians were the equals of any people on the face of the earth in a fair field and no favor. That was a sentiment I was glad to hear him utter, but I did not like to hear him say afterwards, with a singular want of logic in one who possesses a logical mind, that Canadians, who are the equals of any men on the face of the earth, could not hold their own with the people of the United States in manufacturing, in a perfectly fair field and with no favor, such as would be afforded were unrestricted free trade to exist between the United States and this country. As I have said on a previous occasion, that policy does not mean the Canadians bars down to the Canadian manufacturers, and the American bars up to the Canadian manufacturers, but it means all bars down and a fair field and no favor to both. Now, then, can the hon. the Minister of Finance go back on the statement he made, with apparent sincerity, that the Canadians would be able to hold their own under these circumstances? If the manufactures of this country would be destroyed under unrestricted free trade with the United States, how would their destruction be brought about? I would like the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is a manufacturer himself, to tell me. I think he must admit, as a manufacturer, that the only way they could be destroyed would be by the manufacturers on the other side of the line being able to sell their products at lower prices than can those of this country. That is the only way in which I can see our manufacturing industries would be killed by this policy. And if the American manufacturers, under unrestricted free trade, could sell their goods cheaper than could the Canadian manufacturers, it seems to me the Canadian consumer must be now paying more for his goods than he would be under unrestricted reciprocity, notwithstanding all the assertions to the contrary of hon. gentlemen opposite. Do they not see that they must take either one horn of the dilemma or the other? We can in a perfect free and open market hold our own; or if we cannot, it can only be because we are forced to charge higher prices than would the American manufacturers. I propose to take that horn of the dilemma should it be presented to me. I believe the Canadian manufacturer, under perfectly fair conditions, would be not only able to hold his share of his own Canadian market, but to secure his share of the trade of the United States as well. If this offer, which we made in the resolution that was voted down, had been instead endorsed by this House, and were accepted by the United States, it would produce some changes, and in these changes no doubt some men would suffer. That is an incident of everyday life. These changes and reverses are taking place continually, but I believe its great effect as a whole upon the country would be to give a stimulus to all our industries. I believe that it would promote immigration to our shores, develop and extend our North-West, and remove the feeling of irritation that exists in the Maritime Provinces by opening to them their natural markets. I believe that it would give to the people of Ontario their natural market, I believe it would weld our country together and solidify us as a Canadian nationality; I believe it would make us free commercially, and bind us together politically as a strong Canadian nationality, built up on the North American continent, a nationality that would do credit to the people from which we have sprung. I have been led into making these remarks in reference to this question, because I was disappointed in hearing the Finance Minister declare so emphatically against this policy, which, if I understood his offer to the United States aright, he proposed to them in good faith, not many months before. I do not desire to continue the debate any longer, I have made these remarks, as they occurred to me, in the endeavor to give expression to what I consider to be the principles of the Liberal party, and the hon. member for North Perth may now avail himself of the

privilege of pointing out to us any new industries which have been brought into existence in this Canada of ours under the influence of the National Policy.

Mr. HESSON. I understood this debate was to be closed as soon as the hon. gentleman had completed his remarks, but as he has thrown out to me a challenge, I think it is but fair now that I should take that challenge up, by pointing out what has occurred in my known constituency with reference to establishment of new industries which did not exist there before the adoption of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman may refer, if he does not choose to accept my statement, to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) who knows whereof I am about to speak. I refer especially to an industry which has been brought into Canada from the State of Michigan, where its headquarters existed, and which gave employment to some 500 men. Owing to the policy adopted by the Government, the proprietors of this industry found they could not go into Canada with their manufactured goods and sell to our Canadian millers, and, consequently, as they possessed a specialty of their own, which had a large sale, here, they came over to our side. They came to our city, and seeing that the premises there were lying idle which formerly belonged to the Thompson William's firm, but had been silent for a number of years, they made a proposition to open works there. The town gave them a small bonus of \$3,000, and the result was that those gentlemen established a business there which has given employment to 120 or 140 skilled mechanics, and they are paying every year from \$150,000 to \$160,000 in wages. This is what is called the Smith Mills Purifying Company, and they manufacture a special article for mills. They brought many excellent hands with them from Michigan, including Mr. Hayward, the manager, with whom I engaged in conversation a short time ago. Speaking of the effects of commercial union, I asked him what the effect would be on that business. He said: "Mr. Hesson, I do not hesitate to say that the business would be closed up in four months if such legislation should take place in Canada. If we could get our goods into Canada we could manufacture them more cheaply in Michigan, in Jackson, than we can here, but, in order to keep the Canadian market, we find it better to manufacture here. If unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union were carried out, we would close our works in four months." My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) knows very well what that means as far as my own city is concerned. I leave other gentlemen to speak in regard to their own observations, but, as the hon. gentleman threw out a challenge that no industry had been established in Canada under the National Policy, and asked hon. gentlemen to say where any existed, I think it is only right that I should make this statement. That industry would not have come to Canada but for the protective policy of this Government. In future, I think my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) will not throw out that challenge when he knows now, if he did not before, that there are industries—and that is one of them,—that have been established in this country under the National Policy. I will not occupy the time of the House further, as I understand that there has been an arrangement to close this debate to-night.

Mr. TROW. I beg to correct the statement of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). I had no desire to rise on this occasion, but my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that no new industry had been started under the National Policy, and my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) took up the challenge and said that a large industry had been started in the city of Stratford. I may state that that industry was started in the city of Toronto long prior to the time when it was brought to Stratford. It was started in Toronto under the name of Holland & Co.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

I had something to do, as my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson) knows, with bringing it to Stratford. I had the honor and pleasure of taking down \$8,000 to Toronto to bring the plant which was under way to that city long before it was brought into Stratford.

Mr. HESSON. It is quite correct, as my hon. friend has stated, that this industry was brought to Toronto. I believe the company had existed there for two years, but as they found they could do better with us than they could in Toronto, they removed to Stratford. My hon. friend is quite correct in stating that he took the \$8,000 to Toronto, and, as he is aware, I was one of the guarantors of the fund until it was adopted by the corporation; but I may say that they would not have been in Stratford or in Canada if the National Policy was not in force.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the company in question commenced operations in Toronto, not by reason of the tariff laws at all, but by reason of the Patent Act. The company had a patent, and every hon. member knows that that Act requires that the articles which are patented must be manufactured in Canada within a certain time, I think within two years after the patent is issued. They desired to preserve their monopoly under the patent laws, and, therefore, they opened their factory in Canada instead of in the United States.

Mr. COOK. I have heard for the first time from the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that there was an arrangement made by which this debate was to be brought to a close. I am not aware of such an arrangement. I think every member has a right to speak at any time he thinks proper, and I do not think the member for North Perth, the Finance Minister, the leader of the Government, or any gentleman in this House, or any number of gentlemen have a right to make an arrangement to gag any hon. gentleman in this House. For my part, when I feel disposed to speak, I will speak, and I will not be dictated to by the leaders on either side of the House. I propose to offer a few remarks on this question, and I am going to do it as briefly as I can, if hon. gentlemen on that side will hold their peace for a time. If they do not, it will take me so much longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. It does not make much difference to me when they cheer, as far as I am concerned. This is probably the proper time when any hon. member may discuss any question of importance in connection with the tariff rates of the country, and the members on both sides of the House, in this and in former debates have discussed the questions relating to the peculiar calling and also questions which they did not know so much about; but I was surprised to learn from a speech of an hon. gentleman who is interested in the lumber trade that the National Policy was a blessing to the lumber trade. I propose to deal with that matter for a time, but I do not propose to confine myself exclusively to the lumber trade. I think I know something about that trade, and I have the authority of a gentleman, who is perhaps the most intelligent of all the lumbermen of this country, and who is a supporter of the present Government but is opposed to the National Policy, that is Mr. Campbell of the Muskoka Lumber Co., who stated to me yesterday in Toronto that the National Policy has caused a loss to the lumbermen this year of not less than \$2 a thousand. When you take into consideration the vast amount of lumber which is manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, you will see what an immense loss the lumbermen and the people of Canada have sustained. But I will go more minutely into the matter of the lumber trade. I will not deal with the lumber trade in the lower Provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and the spruce trade in Quebec. I

shall not allude to the trade in the North-West or British Columbia, but I shall confine my remarks almost exclusively to the pine trade in Ontario and Quebec. I think I will be able to show pretty clearly how that trade stands. I wish to show to the House the sales that have been made by the Province of Ontario since Confederation up to the present time. Before Confederation the hon. gentleman now leading the Government was in the habit of dealing out to his supporters, piece by piece, without any sale, or money, or reward, such limits as they felt inclined to take. He has adopted the same principle in the North-West Territories, giving to all his supporters timber limits in those territories that come within the jurisdiction of this House. In 1871, under the Sandfield Macdonald Administration, we had a sale in the Province of Ontario of 487 square miles, at an average price per acre of \$241.62. In 1872, we had a sale on the north shore of Lake Superior, when Mr. Scott was Commissioner of Crown Lands, comprising an area of 5,031 square miles, the average price of which was \$117.79. A great deal of that section of country was very poor, because a large amount of land had been put upon the market, and the price was low. But on the whole it was a very good sale. In 1877, there were 375 square miles sold, at an average of \$201.97; in 1881, 1,397 square miles, at an average of \$532.03; in 1885, there was a sale of 1,012 square miles, which averaged \$304.87. Last year there was a sale of 459 square miles, at an average of \$2,859 per mile. Now, hon. gentlemen will see how rapid of late the price of limits has increased. What is the cause of it? Well, it simply means that American capitalists are coming over here and acquiring our limits, competition is becoming greater, consequently the price is increased. I claim that what is now going on in reference to timber limits, will occur in all other businesses of the country. I claim that if our markets are thrown open, and we have the privilege of dealing with the Americans, American capital will come into this country, and what is now occurring in lumber, will take place in the mining interests, the agricultural interest and the manufacturing interest. Now, I will give some figures concerning the timber limits under license in Ontario. I give the figures for 1886; I do not take the figures for 1887, because a great many licenses have not been renewed in consequence of the depression in the lumber trade. The lumbermen are not very flush of money; and, therefore, have not yet renewed their limits. In 1886 we had under license in Ontario, 18,486 square miles, or 11,831,840 acres, estimated at \$1,000 a mile, which would give a total value of \$18,486,000. We have in the Province of Quebec—I take the figures for 1886 for the reason that we have not the Crown Lands report for 1887, which will not be brought down till the meeting of the Provincial Legislature. We have in Quebec, in 1886, 46,078 square miles of timber limits, or 29,489,920 acres, at an estimated value of \$500 per square mile, which gives \$23,039,000. The total value of timber limits in Ontario and Quebec is put down at \$41,525,000. Now, we all know the timber resources of the Province of British Columbia, and of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The timber of British Columbia differs from that of the Lower Provinces and of Quebec, because the spruce limits renew themselves every 8 or 16 years, according to the closeness with which they have been cut, and from the fact of the timber growing so thickly, the trees being so close together, the ground is sheltered, and there is a perpetual moisture, so that the fires do not destroy them, as a rule. Therefore the spruce limits in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will remain in perpetuity. Now, Sir, there was cut, in the Province of Ontario last year, 2,839,016 standard of logs, at 200 feet to a standard, making 567,803,200 feet; and at \$10 per thousand, we have the total value of pine in the Province of Ontario for 1887, as \$5,678,032. In Quebec, according to the report of 1886,

they got out 2,187,098 standard of white pine, making 437,419,600 feet, which, at \$10 a thousand, would give a value of \$4,374,196. Therefore we have a total of pine timber in Ontario and Quebec for 1886 and 1887, of 1,005,222,800 feet. Now, according to Mr. Campbell's figures, the Canadian lumbermen are losers to the extent of \$2 per thousand; but I take it at \$1 per thousand, so that upon that vast amount of lumber, we are losing, according to that estimate, \$100,522 a year. Then there is another great difficulty in that we have to compete with the American lumber in Michigan and Wisconsin. We have to cut our lumber considerably thicker than they do on the other side; as an average we cut it one-sixteenth of an inch thicker than the American lumber, so that upon every 16,000,000 feet of lumber that we manufacture, we lose yearly a million feet, which is a very serious loss. Then there is a difficulty in getting Americans to come in and purchase our lumber, in consequence of their customs duty being so great. The fact is that we have to send our lumber there and pay our transportation, and then when we get it into the American markets at Albany, Troy and other large cities, we have to compete with the Michigan lumber. Now the estimate is that we lose from this fact, upon the whole cut of our lumber from Ontario and Quebec, no less than 62,826,425 feet, which at \$10 a thousand, would amount to \$628,264 per year. We have a still greater difficulty to contend with. In consequence of the duties on our lumber we are unable to take inferior classes into the American market, but we are obliged to send the best and to do so we have to cut the finest trees and leave the poor ones to rot. Taking an average, I suppose probably one-quarter of the timber is left in the woods, but that could be marketed if we had unrestricted trade. We could send our coarse grades there and relieve our market in Canada, which would be a very great advantage because lumbermen are all aware that the coarser grades prevail. We sustain a still further loss, and it is a very important one. If we had unrestricted trade with the United States we would not be compelled to ship our lumber in the rough. There is a duty of 35 per cent. upon manufactured lumber, that is planed lumber or lumber put in shape for building purposes. That is a very serious matter. If the duty were removed we would manufacture lumber in Canada for the American market; we would be able to send lumber tongued and grooved and in proper condition for house building and other purposes, and this country would have the further advantage of having mills erected for the purpose and labor employed here to a very large extent. At the present time several of our lumber kings, such as Mr. McLaren and Mr. Bronson of Ottawa, have large planing mills at Burlington, Vermont. They send lumber there and it is manufactured and sent all through the United States. If we had unrestricted trade with the United States all that work could be done in this country by our own people. I have prepared an estimate of the number of men we would employ under such a state of things. I place the loss on freight alone at other \$400,000. The loss on these three items is therefore \$2,033,486 a year, or taking the nine years during which hon. gentlemen opposite have had the National Policy in force, that policy which was going to be a blessing to the lumberman, the manufacturer, the agriculturist, the miner and the laborer, the loss has been \$18,301,374. I have made another estimate and I find that we employ about 24,000 men in the woods getting out logs and timber. The last census shows that there are employed at saw mills, shingle mills, door and sash factories, 47,352 men. Those figures give a total population of 356,760, taking five to a family. I remember that only last Session when the Minister of Finances was proposing to increase the duty on iron he declared that in a very short time we would obtain an increased population of 100,000 people on that account. I claim that by manufacturing lumber in Canada and being

able to ship it free to the United States we would employ directly half a million people. What do we find in regard to all the manufacturing establishments of the country which hon. gentlemen opposite claim they have protected? In all the manufactures of this country there are only 206,583 persons employed, and I am sure not more than one-half of those manufactures are protected by the National Policy. I claim, therefore, that the lumbermen as a whole do not receive that fair consideration from the Government which they should obtain. I will not speak of the vast amount of money employed in plant required for the manufacture of lumber to place it in a state for shipment or speak further of the question of the increased value of the timber limits in this country; but we know that the Americans gave the increased value to our timber limits and that many of the citizens of Ottawa and those largely employed in the lumbering trade were at one time foreigners, and they have been the means of developing the lumber resources of the Ottawa Valley. At the last sale of timber limits Americans who have not heretofore been interested in Canadian limits, were the means of increasing the price of those limits to such an extent that the limits are now considered to be one of the main sources of revenue to the Province of Ontario. I will not detain the House by giving details of the lumber shipped to the United States last year, but I may just say that we shipped 508,304,000 feet, of the value of \$5,209,023. I now refer to shipments to the United States and not to any other foreign country. There can be no doubt that the American market is the proper market for the lumber of this country. We have exported timber to Great Britain and in small quantities to other countries, but Great Britain will not take our better class, for they find they can obtain timber to suit their purposes cheaper from the Baltic. We find, moreover, that the Americans are more inclined to pay high prices for lumber than are the people of Great Britain, and, therefore, we must look to the United States for our market, and the sooner we make arrangements with that country to admit our lumber on good terms so much the better will it be for Canada. The United States will also be the gainers thereby, because at present they have to pay very high prices for coarse grades of lumber. If we were at liberty to ship the coarser grades of lumber the Americans would be benefited by that to a greater extent, and then our lumber coming into competition with theirs, the prices would be somewhat reduced. I happened to be in the House at the time we were discussing the probabilities of this tariff system—this blessed National Policy that hon. gentlemen opposite then proposed to inaugurate. After they came into power in 1878 I did not happen to be in Parliament when that system was inaugurated, for like many other hon. gentlemen I was swept out by the bugaboo cry of the National Policy. But just as soon as the electorate discovered that it was a sham and a snare they re-elected me and I have been here ever since. I expect to remain here as long as I like, notwithstanding the efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite to defeat me, not alone in the election contest, but in the law courts. I had the pleasure the other night of telling the Finance Minister that now that the election had been decided and that there was no chance of another election, that he might appoint a collector of customs at Penetanguishene, a place he had kept open as a sop for his friends in the event of another election. I understood that the hon. gentleman stated something across the floor of the House to the effect that he had made the appointment, but I did not catch his words. I hope he has made the appointment, and I hope he has made a good one. We have heard a great deal about the balance of trade. We were told that unless the National Policy were adopted we would become poorer, and that the balance of trade would be against us. But what is the result? In the time of Mr. Mackenzie the balance of trade against us amounted to

Mr. Cook.

\$11,876,910, and according to this year's reports the balance against us is \$24,678,519, a difference of \$12,801,609. I would like to ask the Finance Minister what has become of his promises which he made when his party were in Opposition, and when he was the financial critic on this side of the House? But it was said the poor miners at that time were in dire distress. Have they been benefited a great deal by this National Policy? The condition of the farmers at that time was one of the great cries. Sir John—if I may be permitted to use his name—who was leader of the Opposition, then said he would not touch the National Policy unless the farmers were to be protected. And one of his friends (I think it was Dr. Orton) moved a resolution that the farmers should share in the blessings of the National Policy. How have the farmers shared in that policy? We find that in agricultural products there is a falling off of \$8,454,854. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, we consume it. Consume it, by whom? How many people more have you got to consume it now than you had then. You have only got 400,000 people more. The fact is the farmers have become disgusted with the whole matter and they are not raising the amount of cereals they raised at that time. The farmers have been disappointed and disgusted because they expected something great from the National Policy and they did not get it. Although I was defeated by the cry of the National Policy, I must do the farmers of my constituency the credit to say that in the county of Simcoe they were not hoodwinked by the National Policy cry, because in every polling booth where the farmers voted they increased my majority instead of decreasing it. It was only in the towns that my majority was decreased, and that was on account of the promises that the villages were to be built into towns and the towns into cities. They were to have more smokestacks in the towns, and the towns were to be crowded with artisans. I remember the hon. the leader of the Government when he was in Barrie, the chief town of the county, stated what he was going to do for that town, and that he was going to make it a city. It is a town still and has not progressed nearly as rapidly as some of the other places. He appears by his presence to have put a blight on the place, because immediately after the inauguration of the National Policy the increase was much slower than it had been for years before, and, Sir, that town has many years yet—unless they get such legislation in the Province of Ontario—before they will attain the position of being a city. It is said that during the last nine years the National Policy has been in force that a good deal has been done for the manufacturers in the country. We know that every other industry in the country, the farming, the lumbering and the mining have been bled to support the manufacturers, and yet we find that the manufacturers have only increased their export this year over that of 1878 by \$1,635,804. The fisheries was another industry they were going to foster. How do they foster that? By a reduction of the export this year as compared with 1878 of \$53,556. The hon. gentleman stated before he got into power that the Province of Ontario would become a pasture field and that we would grow nothing but cattle. It appears, however, that those gentlemen by the National Policy have made this country a pasture field and that they grow nothing very much more. Let us take the total export of lumber, and we find that we have exported \$1,637,242 worth more this year than we did in 1878. I would like to know what the National Policy has done for that industry? The National Policy was the means of putting the hon. gentleman opposite in power and the means of defeating Mackenzie's Government, but Sir, the National Policy is not the means that has kept those gentlemen in power for the last two years. It is something else that has been done in the name of the National Policy, because the people are sick, and tired, and sore of that policy. They are kept in

power by such means as the Minister of Finance stated when he said: It is well to have a Mr. Wiman in your ranks, a gentleman of means. They had some bloated manufacturers and we all know of the leader of the Government going to Toronto and calling those gentlemen together and asking them to put up the capital to keep him in power. We know where the means came from. When they resurrected the Neebing Hotel, the steel rails, and the Fort Frances locks, as the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan) did to-day, I would refer them back to the Pacific scandal; and if the truth could only be known, we have had greater Pacific scandals than that of 1873, and many of those hon. gentlemen on that side of the House owe their seats to that Pacific scandal. Perhaps that member from British Columbia is one of them, with his fine white shirt front, or as a lumberman would say, his boiled shirt, who wishes to detract attention by calling names and making jibes, but perhaps he will not be successful in drawing me from my trail.

Mr. BAKER. Does the hon. gentleman address his remarks to me?

Mr. COOK. Of course. They were going to stop the exodus. They said the people were going out of the country too rapidly; the country was being depopulated; it would never do. But what classes have gone since? The flower of the country. Not the old men and the children, but the young men, twenty or twenty-five years old, who have just received their education, they are the men who go to swell the numbers in Uncle Sam's dominions. After we have been at the expense of educating them, and before they have become of any serious benefit or advantage to the country, they leave us and go to another country; and no wonder we are not growing the cereals that we did before. No wonder that our mines are being depleted; no wonder that the lumber trade is not in as flourishing a condition as it was in 1873, although one of the greatest depressions that was ever known swept over this country, and not only over this country, but over the United States and all other countries in the world, except little Switzerland, which was the most free trade country in the world. But those gentlemen on that side of the House did not hesitate in crying mad dog all along the line, or in declaring that we were not true to the country. They were the disloyal men at that time; they were the men who were crying stinking fish, and saying that the resources of the country were becoming depleted by the system adopted, a system that had been in vogue for years under the management of the leader of the Government. Sir, when he got to this side of the House, it was anything to return to the Treasury benches. He did not care how his friends decried the country, or what injury they did to the country, but when we on this side of the House state the plain facts of the case, we are disloyal. Well, Sir, I will have something to say about that loyalty question after a while. The hon. gentleman's chickens are coming home to roost. More than one hon. gentleman on this side of the House has spoken of the somersaults that have been taken by gentlemen on that side of the House during the last fortnight; most of them have been standing on their heads, if they have any heads. But if I were sitting behind a leader or a Government that would ask me to do as the hon. gentleman who leads them asked them to do within the last two or three weeks, I would soon tell them what I thought of them. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us in one breath that he made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity to the United States, and in the next breath I did not do it, or, at any rate, if I did, I did not mean it. Fine diplomatists they are to represent this country! Great High Commissioner! Wonderful man to deal with a nation like the United States! He says to them, we will offer you so and so, and then he comes home and tells us on the floor of

Parliament, and the people of the United States too: We did not mean it; we only did it to draw them out; we only did it for a lark; we wanted to see how far they would go. Then he states that he did not meet a man in that country who was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity; he was in every class of society, from the highest to the lowest, and every man was against it. But he forgot to tell us what measures were being discussed in Congress at the present time. He forgot to tell us about the Mills' Bill that is going to reduce the taxes of the United States, by a vast amount. He forgot to tell us that President Cleveland, in his inaugural address, stated that he proposed making a reduction in the tariff. He forgot all these things, or probably he thought the people of this country do not read. Well, the hon. gentleman spoke of Mr. Wiman as the leader of the Liberal party to day, and the disciple of commercial union, and said we were going to be stranded on the rock of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, Sir, I am willing to be stranded on that rock; I would prefer to be stranded on it than on the rock of the National Policy, which has been a pretty hard one, not only on the branch of business with which I am connected, but on almost every other industry in the country. But the Finance Minister was a big man while he was there. He could consult with Mr. Wiman on that occasion. Mr. Wiman was not above his notice before he went there; and does he think that we have forgotten that Mr. Bayard recommended the hon. gentleman to the position of plenipotentiary? Does he forget that Mr. Wiman told Mr. Bayard that he thought Mr. Tupper would be a good man for that position? Was it Mr. Wiman that recommended him to Mr. Bayard? Was it Mr. Bayard that recommended him to the Home Government? And was he the spontaneous choice of the Home Government? We have some light thrown on the diplomatic arrangements that have been going on between the two countries; but, Sir, it is an exhibition that I hope I will never again witness the like of. Something has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, in reference to the question, how are we going to manage affairs so as to meet our expenses, suppose we obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? How are we going to raise the revenue? Well, the hon. member for South Oxford has stated pretty plainly how it is to be done. We know from the past history of the country that these gentlemen opposite, through their extravagance, have increased our expenses during these last years from \$23,000,000 to \$35,000,000, and increased our national debt to a very large amount, about \$100,000,000, or thereabouts. Then they raise the cry of direct taxation, should the policy we advocate be adopted. That is their great bugaboo. All over the country their supporters are crying themselves hoarse with declaring that the Grits propose to have direct taxation. I am not in favor of direct taxation. I do not believe it would be practicable in Dominion politics and I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it would not do to have it. But we have, as it is, a large direct taxation in this country, and the people do not find fault with that. We have a direct taxation in Ontario for municipal purposes, which, in 1873, amounted to \$5,605,779 or \$15.54 per head. In 1879 it amounted to \$7,157,366, or \$16.27 per head, and in 1885 to \$8,323,370 or \$17.20 per head. But the people have the opportunity of turning out the men who transact their business in the municipal councils, and if those gentlemen do not manage their affairs properly, the people soon get rid of them. Such would be the case here if we had direct taxation, and the hon. gentlemen opposite would not long remain on the Treasury benches. If every man who went into a store paid the price of the goods without taxation, and then was met by the custom house officer on going out and forced to pay the duty in cash separate from the price of the goods, he would soon find out what he has to pay under the present

extravagant administration of the Government. But as it is, the people now pay taxes without knowing what they pay. On every \$100 of revenue that is collected the people have to pay \$54. Now hon. gentlemen opposite say a good deal about the deposits in the post office savings bank, and point to them as a source of wealth to the country. Well, the people put their money there because the Government give 4 per cent. and because there is no risk of loss. People who are afraid to invest their money in business put their money in the post office savings bank because they believe they are the safest institutions. You remember, Sir (Mr. White, Renfrew) because you were in the House at that time and took a lively interest in the debate, how you and your friends spoke of the faults of the system then in existence, and glorified in the system that was to be put in vogue when you succeeded in attaining office. I regret, Sir, that you did not succeed in reaching the Treasury benches, because I think you would be much more capable than some hon. gentlemen who got there. But now, when there are vacancies occurring in the Cabinet, it would give unbounded satisfaction to us on this side, so long as a Tory Government must be in power, to see you occupy one of the Treasury benches. I do not say this to boom you because you do not require it, and your leader must know you by this time, as you have been a long time in Parliament and have materially assisted your party throughout the country in their elections. To judge from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, you would think it was all sunshine throughout the country, and that there was not such a thing known as destitution at all. These hon. gentlemen ought to visit some of the quarters in our cities, and they would soon discover that the contrary is the case. Only a short time ago, sermons were preached in every pulpit, throughout the length and breadth of the country, on depression and on the dire distress of the people. Only the other day, the Rev. Mr. McDonell, of St. Andrews Church, in Toronto, preached a sermon on that question, in which he stated that if he were to attend to all the cases of poverty brought under his notice, his usefulness as a minister would be gone, because he would have to give the whole of his attention to looking after the poor of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about soup kitchens. There are worse than soup kitchens now, and there are soup kitchens are all over the country. The people whenever they get the opportunity are going to visit the sins of this Government upon the Administration, and I hope that opportunity will not be long in coming. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that on this question of unrestricted reciprocity the people are heartily with them. But let them only dissolve Parliament and go to the country and they will soon find out that the reverse is the case. Hon. gentlemen opposite take credit for the National Policy. Well, in my constituency, at every meeting held, both in the towns and in country places, my opponents on the platform, whoever they might be, took this National Policy as their stock in trade, and yet every time they attempted to talk on that question they were hooted. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite are in office, it is due solely to the Gerrymander Act. Why, if the representation of Ontario in this House were based on a fair numerical adjustment of the population, instead of the Government having a majority of sixteen from that Province, they would have a majority of only one. I would like to ask, therefore, if that Gerrymander Act was an honest fair Act. I think the hon. gentleman should follow the principles laid down in England, whereby the counties are not laid out by the Government of the day, but by the judiciary. I wish he would do that, and further, that he would change the constitution so that the Provinces would raise their own revenue, so that we would not have the Province of Quebec or the Province of Manitoba, or the Province of Prince Edward Island, or the Province of Ontario coming

Mr. Cook,

to the Government on their knees, rapping at the doors of the Government, and asking for subsidies. The Provinces are the masters of the situation. The Provinces existed long before the Dominion was known, and to-day the Provinces ought not to be hampered in that way. They should be as free as the water which flows over into the Niagara River. It would make the Provinces more economical to do this, because, if they had to depend upon their own resources, they would be very careful with their funds, but now they say, we will expend our money, we will make our people happy and contented, and then we will go to the Dominion Government, and we will give Sir John a wink as to what we are going to do in the next election, and we will get what we want. As far as the National Policy is concerned, I think these gentlemen have come to the end of their tether. I was amused to hear the Finance Minister declare that he was to have a surplus of \$97,000, when in reality he has a deficit of \$350,000. How did he do that? By changing his accounts, by a sort of *hocus pocus*. If I had a book-keeper, or if any man in business in this country had a book-keeper who would so fix the accounts, he would dismiss him at once. The fact is that the hon. gentleman forces a trial balance, and he should be amenable to the law, and he would be amenable to the law if he were in the employment of any private firm. He is in a humiliating position to-day, by making these changes in his books, I suppose by giving instructions to his clerks to make the changes which have been made. How much more manly, and upright, and just it would have been if the hon. gentleman had come forward and said honestly: We have a deficit of \$350,000; how much more would we have thought of him; but, when he changed that deficit into a surplus of \$97,000, what will the hon. gentleman's friends think of him when they learn the fact? But, perhaps, he does not care about it. Perhaps he is going to leave us, he is going to London, where he can live comfortably and can hobnob with the nobility of the land, where he can keep in the midst of his wine tumblers and that sort of thing, and no doubt he will be better there than Croesus was when he was surrounded with the greatest amount of gold that any man ever had. I give the hon. gentleman this credit that he is very obliging, very respectable, and I will not say very intelligent, because everyone knows that he is intelligent and obliging and respectable, but I think in his capacity in London he deals fairly and honestly and liberally with every class of the community that comes from Canada, and I give him credit for that. There is one question I have rather overlooked, that is, the mineral resources of the country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister last year attempted to do something for the mineral resources by increasing the taxes, but that is not the way to increase a national industry. I say the taxes should be removed altogether, that it should be as free as the air that blows, and that, under those circumstances alone, will we be able to succeed in this country, particularly with the small population which we have. If we were a great country, like the United States, with 60,000,000 of people, we would be in a different position. If we had that barrier taken down, the manufacturers of this country would succeed better than they do now. The market has been glutted to a large extent. We have not the consuming population those hon. gentlemen promised us, and, except in regard to taxation, they have signally failed in the promises they made as to the results of the National Policy. What have we done in the way of minerals? It is well known that this country is possessed of great mineral resources, gold, copper, iron, silver, lead and other minerals. Last year, we only exported of all our minerals \$3,805,959 worth, and in the last six years we only exported of silver, iron and copper, \$318,660 worth from the whole Dominion. Now, what do we find on the other side? We find that in Michigan alone they

produced in the last census year 45,830,000 lbs. of ingot copper, valued at \$7,979,000, while in the same year the iron mines of that State produced 1,838,712 tons of ore, valued at \$6,034,000. The copper companies of the State paid, in four years, from 1882 to 1885, dividends aggregating \$10,352,000. We have as good copper mines in this country if they were developed, as they have, but we will never develop this country until we can induce people to come into it to help us to do it. If we would take down the barriers on both sides, American capital would flow in here. Perhaps some manufacturers would succumb, and some of them should, because if they could not live with a market of 65,000,000 or 70,000,000 of people, while they can exist on a population of 5,000,000, they should go to the wall. We have no right to pamper them. There is no reason why the people of this country should be taxed to keep them up. Then, salt was another of the great industries that the Government were going to protect. They did protect it and what was the result? The first return we had from the Geological report was in 1880, and that shows that the export of salt was 472,000 barrels, while in 1887 it was only 106,643 bushels, valued at \$9,463. In Michigan, in 1860, when they were just developing their salt industries in the Saginaw Valley, they produced 4,000 barrels; in 1870, they produced 621,352 barrels; in 1880, they produced 2,635,538 barrels, and in 1886, they produced 3,677,257 barrels. So they steadily increased during those years, and we did not increase, though our salt is, I am told, as good as any which is produced in the Saginaw Valley. But the difference is this, the salt manufacturers of Michigan have 60,000,000 of people to sell to, and our salt manufacturers in Canada have only a few people to sell to, and, therefore, they could not succeed. Now, I want to make a few comparisons in order to show this House that although we have the finest country on the face of the earth—I believe there is no better in America, at all events, for growing cereals—our farmers are not progressing. Why, Sir, the farms of this country are not nearly so valuable as they are on the other side. Farm property in the State of Michigan, or Indiana, or New York, is almost double the value of land in Ontario, and the best part of Ontario, too. Now, I will give you a comparison between the city of Rochester and the city of Toronto; the emporium of Ontario, one of the finest cities, probably, in Canada, not to make any invidious comparisons. We all know that Rochester is a slow-going place compared with other cities of the United States. Therefore I am prepared to make a comparison between Rochester and one of the most prosperous cities of Canada. Land for business purposes, in the heart of the city of Toronto, is worth \$1,500 a foot, in the city of Rochester, in the same business part of the city, it is worth over \$3,000 a foot. So much for the value of land. If we had unrestricted reciprocity our farming lands would be worth as much as they are on the other side of the lines. Now, Sir, I will give you a comparison in wheat. In the State of New York they grow 14·3 bushels per acre; Pennsylvania, 12·6; Ohio, 13·3; Michigan, 16·4; Indiana, 13; Illinois, 12·9; Missouri, 10·9; California, 12; Kansas, 15; in Ontario we grow 21 bushels per acre, four or five bushels more than the best wheat-growing States in the Union. Now, how does this compare with the statement made by the Minister of Finance with reference to wheat growing in the North-west—60 bushels per acre? Sir, the farmers sitting on this side of the House—and I know something about growing wheat myself; I have done a little in that line—all shook their heads and laughed. Every farmer, I don't care who he may be, who has ever grown a bushel of wheat in this country, well knows the exaggerated statement made by the Minister of Finance. He made a similar statement a few years ago about the enormous yield in the North-West, and he reiterated it the other night, that they grow 60 bushels

to the acre. Why, Sir, the farmers would laugh at him. He cannot go and hold a meeting among the farmers of this country, anywhere, and make such a statement as that. If he does, they will say that if his other statements are as correct as that, they would know just how much confidence to place in him. Then there is the question of spring wheat. In Nebraska they grow 12·7 bushels per acre; in Minnesota, 13·2; Wisconsin, 12·7; Dakota, 13·1; Iowa, 11·4; in Ontario we grow 16·1 bushels per acre, over three bushels per acre more than they do in the best States of the Union. Then we come to oats, and that brings me back to the canvass of 1878, when the leader of the Government went holding forth with his Neebing Hotel under one arm, and his steel rails under the other, and I don't know but that he had a model of the St. Frances locks. But he depicted them to the people. These were the three great cries he had against the Government. \$10,000 in the Neebing Hotel. And the Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General had the hardihood to repeat these things. The Postmaster General might have let them die, but he felt inclined not to. But at present I am speaking of oats. The hon. gentleman spoke of myself as a lumber king, and he said the lumber king buys all his oats in Chicago, all American oats. I wrote the hon. gentleman a letter contradicting the statement. I do not know whether he received the letter, but he reiterated the statement, and I then had a statement put in the papers. I think he is a pretty close observer of the papers, although he may have overlooked that small item. I had a statement inserted in one of the papers that the statement he had made was entirely unfounded. Up to the present time I have never bought an oat from the State of Michigan or any other State. If I can buy them cheaper there, I will go there to buy them. Hon. gentlemen do it themselves. They go to the other side to buy everything that they require, that they can get here just as well. They are such sticklers for their country, and their National Policy, and the manufacturers of this country. Why, Sir, we know that hon. gentlemen even go to London to buy their clothes. They have the measures taken, even for their clothes, in a shop on Bond street, in the city of London, and the clothes are sent out here. Whether they fit them or not, I do not know, but the poor tailors of this country have discovered that a great many men who are loud-mouthed in their cry for protecting that class of industries, do not get their clothes made here, after all. Well, Sir, in the State of New York they grow 29·6 bushels of oats per acre; in Michigan, 32·9; Wisconsin, 31·1; Missouri, 26·2; Pennsylvania, 28·1; Indiana, 28·8; Minnesota, 34·6; Kansas, 31·9; Ohio, 32; Illinois, 34·5; Iowa, 34; Nebraska, 32. In Ontario, we grow 37·1 bushels per acre, so that we grow, of all these cereals, more bushels per acre than do the most favored States of the United States. Now, after looking at these figures, I want to know how it is that the farmers of this country have not raised more grain than they did in 1878? Why should there be such a falling off? Then there is the great question of barley. Barley is one of the most profitable crops our farmers raise. We exported last year over 5,000,000 bushels to the Americans. They will always take our barley, they are always glad to get it. Suppose, now, the duty of 10 cents per bushel was taken off barley going to the United States, what an advantage it would be to the farming community of this country! Now, we have an opportunity of making terms with the Americans for unrestricted reciprocity. I think it is within our reach, if our Government would only take the matter in hand. I do not wish to make it a question of turning the Government out of power. I am honest in my conviction that the Government should take hold of the matter and give us unrestricted reciprocity. They have discovered that the National Policy has been a failure, and knowing that they should grapple with this

great question. By doing so they might keep themselves in power ten years longer, and I would be pleased to sit in Opposition for ten years if they would give us that great boon rather than cross the floor and sit under the National Policy. But if hon. gentlemen opposite do not give the people that for which they ask, and meetings have been held in different parts of the country and resolutions unanimously passed in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, then they will discover when it is too late that they have made a mistake in not taking the advice given them from this side of the House. I know it to be a fact that many of our large and wealthy manufacturers are only waiting for the bars to be taken down to enter the United States market and compete with the Americans on their own ground. They can do it. Give them the opportunity; do not decry the ability of the Canadian manufacturer and workman. History has shown that the freer trade is the larger are the wages received by the workingman. Compare the wages in England and in Germany and you will at once see the difference. Those are the two European nations having different trade policies, Germany being highly protective and Great Britain free trade. Here is a comparison of wages:

| | Gr Britain. | Germany. |
|-------------|-------------|----------|
| Bricklayers | \$7.56 | \$4.21 |
| Masons | 7.68 | 4.07 |
| Plasterers | 7.80 | 4.23 |
| Carpenters | 7.66 | 4.11 |
| Blacksmiths | 7.37 | 4.25 |
| Oigarmakers | 6.07 | 3.68 |
| Coopers | 7.50 | 3.97 |
| Laborers | 4.70 | 3.11 |
| Saddlers | 6.33 | 3.96 |

In conversing, some time before the question of reciprocity arose, with a prominent Conservative in Toronto, he said to me: The moment you propose that resolution Sir John will haul up the loyal flag and the people will flock to him. The Premier has hauled up the loyal flag, as he has done on many occasions before; but he has got to be a pretty old man and there are a great many young men coming up who cannot be hoodwinked, the young portion of the country cannot be carried by the loyalty cry and will not be hoodwinked by it. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will raise this question at the general election, because I am satisfied that if that cry is raised we will be the victors. You know the story about the Quaker and the mad dog.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. COOK. The Quaker said: I will not raise my hand against it, but I will give it a bad name, and forever afterwards it will be called the mad dog. The hon. gentleman is going to raise the loyalty cry, and like the Quaker is going to raise the cry of mad dog, hoping that that will bring the people around him; but he is very much mistaken. Let me say a few words about loyalty. Who have been the loyal party? I am descended from the United Empire Loyalists, and I do not yield my loyalty to the leader of the Government or any one else. Hon. gentlemen opposite are loyal so long as it keeps them in place and power and they get the benefit of it. So soon as they see they could, by turning round and hob-nobbing with the United States, gain any advantage, politically, they would do it quicker than any men living, for it is a question of keeping themselves in power. I believe the leader of the Government is desirous of promoting the well-being of the country, but if it stands between him and political success, then the interests of the country will have to give way to political success. Who signed the annexation manifesto? Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well. The leader of the Government knows that he sat in council with some of those men. Who burned the Parliament buildings at Montreal? Why, the Tories. Who rotten-egged the Governor General, Lord Elgin, at Montreal? Why, the Tories. That very mace now lying on the Table before you, Mr. Speaker, has a history. The beaver was stolen from it at the time of the fire in Montreal. Who did it? The men who burned the Parliament buildings and rotten-egged the Governor General, that stole the beaver off the mace. Who was it that hoisted a black flag in Toronto? It was the Tories. Wherever there is anything disloyal you will find a Tory mixed up with it and when there is anything to be carried out that is not loyal it is carried out by the party who are always claiming they are the loyal party in the country.

The House divided on the amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright,

"The net debt of the Dominion of Canada was \$140,362,069 on the 30th June, 1878;

"That the net debt of the said Dominion was \$228,235,786 on the 31st March, 1888;

"That the total annual expenditure of the Dominion was \$23,503,158 for the year ending 30th June, 1878, and \$35,658,161 for the year ending 30th June, 1887;

"That the estimated expenditure for the year ending the 30th June, 1889, is \$35,421,440, wholly apart from divers known unprovided expenditures which will raise the total amount likely to be expended to at least \$37,000,000, being an increase of the net debt to the amount of \$88,000,000, and of the total annual expenditure of \$13,500,000, in the space of 11 years;

"That the said debt and expenditure have increased in a ratio very far in excess of the increase of the wealth and population of the country during the said interval;

"That the said expenditure is provided for by a system of taxation so adjusted as to press with extreme and unjust severity upon the thrifty and industrious producer, and especially upon all farmers, day laborers, mechanics, artisans, and factory operatives, who are at present subject to a customs taxation on articles necessary to life and comfort, amounting to nearly one thousand per cent. more than that levied upon members of the corresponding classes in Great Britain and Ireland

"That the mischiefs caused by the present system are further aggravated by the very general substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duties, whereby the injustice of the existing mode of taxation and the unfair preference shown to rich consumers over the less wealthy is at one and the same time increased and concealed, and that it is expedient that the said injustice should be remedied and that the wealthy classes should be compelled to bear their fair proportionate share of the burden of taxation;

"That this House views with alarm the extremely rapid increase of the debt and taxation of the Dominion, especially in view of the fact that there has been contemporaneously a very great reduction in the debt and amount required for necessary taxation by the United States, and that this House is of opinion that any considerable addition to the debt or taxation of the people of Canada will work very great hardship to the great bulk of the population and will tend powerfully to place them in a position of great disadvantage as regards the people of the United States, besides seriously prejudicing their chances of securing improved commercial relations with the people of that country."

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Armstrong, | Fiset, | Mills (Bothwell), |
| Bain (Wentworth), | Fisher, | Mitchell, |
| Barron, | Flynn, | Mulock, |
| Béchar, | Gauthier, | Paterson (Brant), |
| Bernier, | Geoffrion, | Perry, |
| Borden, | Gillmor, | Platt, |
| Bourassa, | Holton, | Purcell, |
| Bowman, | Innes, | Rinfret, |
| Brien, | Jones (Halifax), | Robertson, |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich'd), | Kirk, | Rowand, |
| Casey, | Landerkin, | Ste. Marie, |
| Casgrain, | Lang, | Scriver, |
| Charlton, | Langellier (Quebec), | Semple, |
| Choquette, | Laurier, | Somerville, |
| Cook, | Lister, | Sutherland, |
| Davies, | Livingston, | Trow, |
| De St. Georges, | Lovitt, | Tureot, |
| Dessaint, | Macdonald (Huron), | Watson, |
| Doyon, | McIntyre, | Weldon (St. John), |
| Edgar, | McMillan (Huron), | Welsh, |
| Eisenhauer, | McMullen, | Wilson (Elgin), |
| Ellis, | Meigs, | Yeo.—66. |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Audet, | Ferguson (Renfrew), | Masson, |
| Bain (Soulanges), | Ferguson (Welland), | Mills (Annapolis), |
| Baird, | Foster, | Moffat, |
| Baker, | Freeman, | Moncreiff, |
| Bell, | Gigault, | Montague, |

Mr. COOK.

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bergeron, | Gordon, | Montplaisir, |
| Bergin, | Grandbois, | O'Brien, |
| Bowell, | Guilbault, | Perley, (Assiniboia), |
| Boyle, | Guillet, | Perley (Ottawa), |
| Brown, | Haggart, | Porter, |
| Bryson, | Hale, | Prior, |
| Burns, | Hall, | Putnam, |
| Cameron, | Henderson, | Reid, |
| Cargill, | Hesson, | Robillard, |
| Carling, | Hickey, | Roome, |
| Carpenter, | Hudspeth, | Ross, |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe), | Jamieson, | Royal, |
| Chapleau, | Joncas, | Shanly, |
| Chisholm, | Jones (Digby), | Small, |
| Oimon, | Kenny, | Smith (Ontario), |
| Cochrane, | Kirkpatrick, | Sproule, |
| Cockburn, | Labelle, | Stevenson, |
| Colby, | Labrosse, | Taylor, |
| Corby, | Landry, | Temple, |
| Costigan, | Langevin (Sir Hector), | Thompson, |
| Coughlin, | Laurie, | Tisdale, |
| Coulombe, | Macdonald (Sir John), | Tupper (Sir Charles), |
| Couture, | Macdowall, | Tupper (Pictou), |
| Curran, | McCulla, | Tyrwhitt, |
| Daly, | McDougald (Pictou), | Wallace, |
| Daoust, | McDougall (O. Breton), | Ward, |
| Davin, | McKay, | Weldon (Albert), |
| Davis, | McKeen, | White (Renfrew), |
| Dawson, | McLellan, | Wilmot, |
| Denison, | McMillan (Vaudreuil), | Wilson (Argenteuil), |
| Desaulniers, | McNeill, | Wilson (Lennox), |
| Desjardins, | Madill, | Wood (Brockville), |
| Dickinson, | Mara, | Wood (Westmoreland), |
| Dupont, | Marshall, | Wright.—117. |

Amendment negatived.

House resolved itself into Committee on the resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :—

Resolved, That the Governor in Council may, by proclamation, whenever it appears to his satisfaction to be desirable in the public interest so to do, either reduce or remove entirely or in part, the export duties provided for by section six of the Act respecting the duties of customs, and by schedule E thereto, or by an Act in amendment thereof.

Resolved, That section nine of the said Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

"9. Any or all the following things, that is to say :—Animals of all kinds, hay, straw, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), salt, peas, beans, barley and malt, rye, oats, buckwheat, flour of rye, oatmeal, buckwheat flour, butter, cheese, fish of all kinds, fish oil, products of fish and of all other creatures living, in the water, fresh meats, poultry, stone or marble in its crude or unwrought state, lime, gypsum (ground or unground), hewn or wrought burr or grindstones, and timber and lumber of all kinds, unmanufactured in whole or in part, including shingles, clapboards and wood pulp, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by any Act at the time in force, upon proclamation of the Governor General, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

Resolved, That section ten of the said Act be repealed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Just state the alteration proposed to make in the existing law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What articles are left out?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The article of green fruit is left out because they are now there by proclamation.

Mr. MULOCK. Will not the repeal of the Act repeal the proclamation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the proclamation has placed them on the free list and nothing would subject them to duty but an Act of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the proclamation depend upon that Act?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What are the articles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now reading the articles omitted from the old list. Green fruit is omitted, bran is omitted, seeds of all kinds for the same reason that they have been included in the proclamation, that is they are

partly free; plants, trees, shrubs, coal and coke, hops, wheat, Indian corn, flour of wheat, flour and meals of any other kind, lard, tallow, salted or smoked meats are omitted, and there are added that are not now in the present list, fish of all kinds.

Mr. MITCHELL. Salted as well as fresh?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, fish of all kinds; also fish-oil, fish products, fresh meats, poultry, wood pulp, stone in the rough, marble in the rough, burr and grindstones, lime and calcined gypsum. I may say that many of those alterations are made in conformity with the Mills' Bill, so that I have adopted the same designations as were used there and have added some articles; for instance, stone in the rough, marble in the rough, grindstones, calcined, gypsum, and poultry, which are included in the Mills' Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Were not wheat and the produce of wheat in the Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, none of those were in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the hon. gentleman's reasons for omitting those articles that he now omits from the statutory offer beginning with bran, if I took him down correctly, and going down to salted meat?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated that while you would be prepared as a question of treaty, to put on any number of articles that you might not desire to have made free, because taking the arrangement as a whole you obtain the insertion of other articles that you desire very much. When you come to make those articles free by legislative enactment it became necessary to revise the list and the list would be revised from time to time. I am governed to some extent by the movements made in the Congress of the United States. I considered it not desirable to embrace in this articles which are not embraced in the Mills' Bill, and I have embraced a number that are embraced in that Bill. I think we must now deal with the revision of the system from time to time. While we retain it as a statutory offer, it must be from time to time revised in such a way as to meet the interests of Canada and the wishes of our own Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is coal in the Mills' Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not feel disposed to take up the time of the House, as gentlemen much more able to discuss the Budget than myself desired to speak and have spoken at considerable length; but I cannot allow this measure to pass without again, as I have done Session after Session, calling the attention of the Government to the fact that wheat and the produce of wheat, and corn and the produce of corn, have been omitted from the list. I have repeatedly on former occasions pointed out the great injustice that is done to the lumbering and fishing classes in my own county by the principle that makes them pay a duty on the food they eat as well as the clothing they wear, and everything that enters into the consumption and maintenance of life. I feel that year after year, when the system of protection is being aggravated very much, that it is an injustice to that class of the community, to allow such an opportunity as this to pass without adding these items to that statutory offer of reciprocity. I am not going to make a speech about it; it is useless. If I did not know it was so hopeless I would take up a good deal of time to prove to this House the injustice, and I would feel it my duty to divide this House on the point. But as I have done it before, and may have an opportunity of doing it again before the Session closes unless the Government revise their decision, I will not take up the time of the committee now. I there-

fore simply enter my protest against the omission from that statutory offer of these articles, at the present time, when everything looks so favorable to our getting the United States to meet us on a fair reciprocal basis. I think if there is anything that should be put on the free list it is the food of the working classes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I object to the course the Government are pursuing in this matter from exactly the opposite reason to that stated by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I think their course is objectionable on several grounds. It is objectionable because I think it is humiliating in this country to be playing this sort of a game with the United States. I object to playing a game when I am playing second with a low card, never have a trump and never get a trick, and that is exactly the position we are standing in with relation to the United States. I also object because I think as a matter of principle any such arrangement, whether by treaty or by statutory enactment is in itself antagonistic to the National Policy. I contend that if we are to carry out the National Policy we must carry it out in its entirety. We cannot add a little bit here, and take off a little bit there, and say we will put this or that on the free list; and at the same time do justice to the great bulk of the community. I merely mention these two grounds, because I think the time must soon come, and the sooner the better, when if the Government are to stand by the National Policy, which this House and the country have supported them in, they must begin by repealing that statutory clause altogether. It may be said that that clause is only permissive; yet so long as we have it on the Statute-book, it is to some extent binding and obligatory upon us. If not, why do we put it there? We must also remember what we seem to have forgotten on this side of the House at any rate, in the debates that have taken place, that this country has not stood still since 1878—that what would have been a perfectly just and reasonable policy at the time of the initiation of the National Policy may naturally be expected to be entirely unreasonable and unsuitable to the present conditions. If the National Policy has done anything during the time it has been in force, it must have created a great many industries, and therefore have placed the country in an entirely different position. Therefore, acting as we are doing now is almost equivalent to saying that the National Policy has not altered the condition of things in this country. I contend that it has altered them, and very much to the better, and it is because I believe in it that I do not wish to see it hampered in its operation by a reciprocity treaty or by any such provision as this, which is in some respects as binding and obligatory as a treaty. For these reasons I object to the course taken by the Government. In pursuing it, I think they will be digging a pitfall into which they will ultimately fall.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I regret that the hon. gentleman should have taken from the list any article that was there before. He has taken off corn and corn meal, and wheat and the flour of wheat. In doing so I think he is making a very great mistake. He is certainly not acting in the interest of the agricultural population of this country. He is leaving on barley; yet when there was no duty at all imposed on American barley coming into this country, none came; the barley went in the other direction. Does he suppose that the Americans are going to act on that statutory offer by taking the duty off barley if he leaves the duty on corn? It is in the interest of the agricultural population, who are raising stock, to have the privilege of obtaining corn from the United States to feed to their stock, because we raise in this country a quantity of that article altogether inadequate to our wants. The hon. gentleman proposes to agree to have free trade with the United States in certain natural products in which the exports are

Mr. MITCHELL.

from Canada; but in regard to those articles which Canada imports he does not propose that any statutory offer shall exist. In making that proposition I cannot believe the hon. gentleman to be sincere. It looks like an attempt to put on the Statute-book an offer which he knows will not be accepted. What is he asking the House to do? He is asking it to guarantee the interest of a very large sum to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to remove the restraints that exist against the importation into the United States of the growing products of the North-West, and yet he proposes by removing wheat and wheat flour from that statutory offer to interfere with the freedom of trade between the North-West and the United States. I say that in doing that he is taking a retrograde step. If he is, as he says, in favor of free trade in natural products, why does he remove any natural product from the list? He is either in favor of free trade in natural products or he is not. Why, every Minister who has spoken on the subject has declared himself in favor of free trade in natural products. Then, why remove any natural product from that statutory offer. Take another case. The hon. gentleman told us he was in favor of free trade in coal with the United States. He has told us so repeatedly. But now what does he propose to do? He proposes to take coal out of the statutory offer. He proposes to keep upon the people of Ontario a tax that is imposed upon the people of none of the other Provinces; he proposes to retain this very large tax that falls exclusively upon the people of Ontario. The hon. gentleman knows that he has repeated every Session, and hon. gentlemen behind him have echoed his statement, that the tax on coal does not increase the price of Canadian coal in Canadian markets. But he knows that he has collected nearly \$1,000,000 from the people of Ontario on coal alone. There is not a town or city in the Dominion, there is not a town or city in the Province of Ontario, the people of which do not consume coal during five months of the year, and yet the hon. gentleman undertakes to impose a serious tax upon them, which must seriously weigh on their earnings. Why, I have seen myself, during the present winter in London, the children of poor people purchasing 10 cents, 15 cents, or 20 cents worth of coal or wood, and the hon. gentleman proposes to impose a tax upon the fuel which is to keep these people in comfort during the winter season. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes to do. He knows that at present there is a Bill before Congress proposing to remove the duty upon coal, which Bill will probably be carried, and yet, in order that he may avoid removing the tax upon coal, which falls very severely upon the poorer population of the cities—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What Bill does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I refer to the proposition that is now before the Congress of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any tariff Bill?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at this moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know of no such Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has not taken the trouble to read the American papers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have followed them closely.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman now is proposing to remove coal from the list in the statutory offer. Why does he do so? If he thinks that there is no proposition to be made by the United States, no mischief, even according to the protectionist's view, can arise from leaving coal there. If there is to be such a proposition, the hon.

gentleman puts it out of his power to place coal on the free list; and I say it is a serious tax upon the poorer population of Ontario. Then the hon. gentleman has referred to the effect of the proclamation that has issued. Of course the proclamation does not remain in force when the statute upon which it rests is repealed. The proclamation falls with the statute. The articles are put upon the free list, but they do not remain there. If they do, there is no provision of the law that the former state of things shall be revived. I do not know whether there is a provision in the hon. gentleman's tariff Bill which provides that the enumerated articles shall be subject to a certain rate of taxation. If so, it is possible that those articles might be so included, but I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to put those articles, upon which the duty has been removed by the proclamation, in the tariff, upon the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are on the free list now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman propose to put them on the enumerated free list of the tariff?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are on the free list by law.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that the proclamation by which they are put there is gone when the statute is repealed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I say if you repeal section 9, you repeal the proclamation which was carried in virtue of the power given by section 9. There can be no doubt about that. If an article is put upon the free list and there is no statute to interfere, and there is a provision that the former state of things is not to revive, it will remain on the free list. It will require a positive Act to revive the tax once it is removed, but the hon. gentleman knows there is a provision in the law that all enumerated articles—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not an enumeration of the articles to leave them out of the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They will require to be put on the free list and specified in the tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says no. I have not looked carefully into the Act for that purpose, but certainly the reason he has given is not at all adequate. The hon. gentleman says he proposes to follow the Mills' bill. I find that petroleum is put in that Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that I proposed to follow the Mills' Bill. I said the very reverse.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said he would leave certain articles out of this Bill, because they were left out of the Mills' Bill, and that he would include certain articles because they were put in the Mills' Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did, but, I did not say I proposed to follow the Mills' Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement the hon. gentleman has just made, is wonderfully like the same thing:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a great distinction between the two. I stated that when you came to deal with this question by legislation, both Governments were left entirely free to pursue the course that their own interest indicated as the best. That is the position I took, and wherever I found in the Mills' Bill an article I wanted to take advantage of and to make free I embraced it in this list, and if I find an article in that Bill that it is not in the interest of this country to have free, I am under no obligation whatever, because I know it was put in the Mills'

Bill purely and simply with the view of considering the interests of the United States market.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the Mills' Bill were going on the line which the hon. gentleman mentioned and without reference to what might be done here, it is very extraordinary, as the hon. gentleman must see, than the articles of corn should be left out. What I was calling the hon. gentleman's attention to was that he might find that while the Americans would be willing to give us a remission of duty upon barley and a number of other articles, the natural products of the country, they might be willing to do so wholly upon the condition that we would be willing to take the duty off corn; yet the hon. gentleman puts it out of his power to accept an offer which on the whole might be advantageous to the country. Even taking the hon. gentleman's view that some of them are more advantageous than others and some may not be advantageous at all standing alone, they might be advantageous taking the whole together. The hon. gentleman has said that his leader has stated that they would like to have reciprocity with the United States in natural products, and I am calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is seeking, by these provisions, to leave out some of those natural products, the free interchange of which he thinks would be to the advantage of this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find myself between two fires. In the first place, my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) objects to our having a statutory clause at all. I must remind my hon. friend that we are not bringing forward a statutory clause, but that, from 1849, in the old Province of Canada, this clause has been on our Statute-book. The Treaty of 1854 enlarged it very much; then, in 1866, the treaty having been abrogated, the clause was again put on our Statute-book, and it was re-enacted in 1867, 1868, 1870 and 1879. So we are not bringing forward the clause now. I am inclined to think that, if it was not already there, we might not be occupied as we are at this moment, but, the clause being on the Statute-book, we are of the opinion that it would not be wise that it should disappear, it would not be wise, at the present time and under the present circumstances, that it should be taken away. I do not hesitate to state to the House my position and my opinion in reference to this subject. I am in favor of having all the products of the farm, the products of the forest, the products of the mine and the products of the sea made free between these two countries. In my judgment, we might adopt the whole of that policy, and I say more, that both parties in this country have professed to desire that for many years. In my judgment, such a policy would be one that might fairly be entered upon with advantage to both countries, but we know that all our efforts to obtain a reciprocity treaty which would make all these products free have entirely failed; and, under those circumstances, the legislature of Canada ever since 1849 have been placing a statutory provision in their laws in regard to a number of articles—not all those which were in the Reciprocity Treaty, not by any means all those articles which would be embraced in the category to which I have alluded in the products of both countries—but they have selected a number of articles to be placed in this position. Now the time has come when it is clearly indicated on the part of the Congress of the United States that they do not intend to deal with fiscal question by any other mode than by legislation, and we find a Bill brought forward in the House of Representatives there which proposes to place certain natural products of this country and of others upon the free list. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on the other hand, unlike my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who thinks this provision goes too far, complains that it does not go far enough, and he speaks especially, he says, in the interest of the lumbermen. What

is the first clause of the Bill? It is a new enactment which I am asking the House to put on the Statute-book in the interests of the lumbermen. I do not think my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), much as he may object to making some of the natural products free, will say that it would injure the lumbering interests of Canada to obtain free admission for all our lumber to the market of the United States.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Our lumber, but not our sawlogs—that is the point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the position in which we find ourselves. Here is the great lumber interest of this country which has the prospect of having the market of the United States opened to it free by the Mills' Bill, which I am strongly of opinion will become law during the present Session of Congress. If that is put on the Statute-book of the United States, we would not be able to take advantage of it, because there is a provision which says that no lumber shall be admitted into the United States free from any country which has an export duty on logs. We have an export duty on logs, and the first clause in this Bill is to enable the Governor General in Council to remove that export duty on logs so as to give the great lumber interest of this country free admission into the markets of the United States, if that Bill passes. I have already stated why this measure has been revised. It is one thing, as I have already said, to make a treaty, but it is an entirely different thing to deal with questions of this kind by legislative enactment, and the moment this question is settled, as it undoubtedly is settled by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, that it is in violation of their constitution to deal with these fiscal matters without legislation passed by both Houses, we have to decide how far we shall go on one side or the other. The United States will decide to put on the free list, as they did in regard to lumber, such articles as they think will conduce to their own interests without any reference to our action. We, from time to time, will revise our list, and deal with our fiscal policy precisely as the Congress of the United States declares it will deal with theirs. We will make such articles free as we think the interests of Canada demand, and we will impose duties on such articles as we think the interests of Canada require. I think that will commend itself to members on both sides of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred to coal. He must not forget that this Government without being moved to it by any party anywhere, removed the duty on anthracite coal, which had given us a revenue of \$500,000 a year, and the hon. gentleman knows that the Province of Ontario, from which he comes, largely receives the benefit and the advantages of the remission of that duty. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware that, deriving, as we do a large revenue from coal, it might seriously derange our financial arrangements if suddenly, in relation to that or any other article, an alteration were made, and we were placed in such a position that we would have no option but to make that article free. We have confined this list to such articles as it would be in the interest of Canada to make free, and that will be subject to revision from time to time as, in the judgment of Parliament, it may be found necessary to act in the interests of this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. the Finance Minister has referred to my objections to the form of the statutory offer, and he says I referred especially to the lumbermen and to the fishermen, and in that he is correct. He states that the provision in the first part of the Bill covers any advantage which the lumbermen might fairly expect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so. I said the first clause was in the interest of lumber and in the interest of salt, which are the two articles the first clause deals with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend knows that no proportion of the class of people I have referred to in the Lower Provinces, will derive any benefit whatever from the first clause. Talk about salt. Can they take salt from Western Ontario down to the fishermen along our coast?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not mean to say that; but I meant to correct myself in saying that the first clause dealt entirely with the interest of the lumbermen. I had omitted to state that salt is also included, and that it had no reference to the hon. gentleman's constituents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking from the standpoint of constituents now, and from the standpoint of a very much larger sphere. I wish to let the hon. gentleman understand that the advantages given, as he claims, to the fishermen by the first section of the Bill providing for salt—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I had no reference to advantages to fishermen whatever. The salt industry is entirely an Ontario interest, so far as the action of this Bill is concerned. It had no reference to the fishermen whatever. I merely referred to it as being in the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman referred by special direction to the objections I took on the ground of the fishermen and lumbermen, and when he spoke of lumber and salt I assumed that he meant to point out the special advantages to be derived by the class of constituents I represent; the fishermen of that section of the country know better than the hon. gentleman that a very large portion of the population of the Maritime Provinces is largely engaged in fishing, and another large portion engaged in lumbering.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And they have all the salt free now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know they have salt free, but the hon. gentleman put forward the question of salt, and I assume that he referred to that as he did to the question of the lumbermen being benefited by the first clause of that Bill. As to the advantages lumbermen get under that Bill, I do not think it has anything to do with the duty on flour and provisions that are used by men engaged in the lumber business. When I speak of the lumber interest I do not allude only to the men who carry on business in the woods, but I allude to the laboring classes that form so necessary a part of the lumber business, forming forty to one of the class the hon. gentleman refers to, the lumbermen proper. Now, I think it is pursuing a course to be regretted to leave out all these items and also the item of coal; and I think it is pursuing a course not to the advantage of the country. The hon. gentleman speaks of the advantages that have been given to Ontario by the admission of hard coal free. Why should a special portion of this country be selected for special advantages under this Bill? Why should New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and a considerable portion of Nova Scotia too, be left out of the advantages which free coal would give them? If there is a loss of duty amounting to nearly half a million, by the act of the Government, in the admission of anthracite coal free for the benefit of Ontario, why should not the Maritime Provinces participate in those benefits, by taking the duty off soft coal? My hon. friend will say it would tend to discourage the miners of Nova Scotia. Sir, I was speaking to the manager of one of the leading mines in Nova Scotia the other day, the Spring Hill mine, and I asked his opinion about the effect of free coal. He said he would be glad to see coal free, he wanted no advantage from it; and he pointed out to me why, and his explanation was perfectly satisfactory. I can see no reason whatever why our people should be subjected to the disadvantages which result from the treatment which they have

received by the preferences given, as shown in the instance the hon. gentleman has referred to in the case of Ontario and free coal. Now, this treatment has been going on quite long enough. I recollect the subject was brought four years ago before the then Finance Minister, the present Governor of New Brunswick, and an intimation was given very like a half promise that the duty would be taken off cornmeal, and I dare say some hon. gentlemen will recollect it. Now, if the hon. gentleman takes out of this list of statutory articles which they propose to make free, omits from it corn and the produce of corn, wheat and the produce of wheat, and barley and the produce of barley, if the American adopt the Mills' Bill and put them in, he precludes this country from getting the advantages of the powers that these very gentlemen would have the right to exercise under the law now, if these things were included. The hon. gentleman speaks as if we were to follow the United States alone. Why should they only follow the United States? Why should they only follow the Mills' Bill? The hon. gentleman says that if the United States make a certain article free, it is for the interest of Canada that that article should be made free also, that they may come, Session after Session, and take powers to make it free. Why do they not take powers now and reserve to themselves the right only to accept such articles as are in the interest of Canada—and this House would not hesitate to give them the power. That is, in my opinion, the course these hon. gentlemen should pursue, and not pursue that which is evidently their determination, refuse to let the food of the people come in free. It is time this legislation for localities was done away with. I would remind my hon. friend that it has been stated in the press of the United States that there should be a clause—I do not know whether it should be put in the Mills' Bill or whether in a separate Bill, because there is a separate Bill talked of—there should be a clause put in one of these Bills that the free list which it is proposed largely to extend by that or some other Bill, shall not apply to Canada or any country that has certain stipulations against the United States which Canada has to-day. Now, Sir, one of these is fish, and I would like to know if my hon. friend is determined to impose upon the fishermen of our country the exclusion of fresh fish from the markets of the United States?—for that is what that Bill would mean, if there is anything in the statements of the American press. I need not tell my hon. friend that it would mean hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the fishermen of the Province of which I have the honor to represent one county. It is a very serious position in which to place the fishermen of our country, in the future, in carrying on their business. I need not tell this House, because a dozen men in this House already know it, that to some counties in the northern portion of New Brunswick, and especially the one I represent, the free markets of the United States for fresh fish are of the greatest importance, and are, perhaps, the source of the living of a large number of people during the winter season in catching fresh fish and sending them through to the United States. But I very much fear, from the tone of the press of the United States, and what is said in relation to the treatment Canada has given them, that we may find ourselves excluded in the article of fresh fish from the markets of the United States, and I would very much regret it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I have no doubt the Finance Minister is correct when he said that the changes proposed by the American tariff Bill were more with reference to their own interests than to the interest of Canada. But be that as it may, I think it would not be wise for us to close the doors against any proposal looking to the enlargement of the free list between the two countries. Now, the list which is proposed by the present resolution omits some of

the important articles which we do not import from the United States, that is to say, animals of all kinds, hay, straw, potatoes, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, buckwheat, oatmeal, buckwheat, flour, cheese, gypsum, timber, and lumber of all kinds, manufactured wholly or in part, including clapboards and wood pulp. Now, it must be remembered that we do not import any of these articles from the United States at the present moment; therefore putting them on this list is merely with the object of conveying to the country the idea that we are going to be very generous in making an offer to the United States for the free admission into our country of certain articles when these articles are placed on the free list of the United States. The omission of coal and wheat from the free list may, it appears to me, prevent our having the advantage of the Mills' Bill, provided it passes. The hon. gentleman drew attention to the fact that last year we paid, as he said, although I see it is corrected in his revised speech, \$1,800,000 on lumber shipped to the United States. If they place that on the free list and other articles which are on the free list at present they should also place coal, which the hon. gentleman says they propose doing, and we should place certain articles, not coal or wheat, on the free list, then I am afraid it might prevent their allowing that clause to go into operation. They might say that unless you admit all those articles free, including coal, coke, wheat and breadstuffs of all kinds, we will not admit lumber and other articles which it is to the interest of this country should be admitted free into the United States. It would, therefore, be wise for the Government to take power, whether they exercise it or not, to be able under certain circumstances that may arise, when the Government may be able to dispense with the revenue which they at present derive from the importation of coal and which I admit is a large item—if the Americans should place coal and other articles on the free list the Government would be able to deal with the matter, if they saw their way clear to do so. If they put it out of their power to deal with it and the Americans pass that Bill enabling lumber and other articles to go in free to the United States, I say they may naturally turn round and say: We are not going to give you what you offer unless you place all those articles on the free list in Canada. It is in that the Finance Minister would do well to amend his proposal and place those articles on the free list, coal and coke and breadstuffs of all kinds, so that they may be able to deal with the matter if occasion should arise by the Americans placing them on the free list, otherwise those interests in which we are concerned in the proposal now before Congress might lose the benefit of free admission of articles into the United States.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if it is his intention to include flooring and siding in manufactured lumber.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We say manufactured in whole or in part.

Mr. WATSON. You specified clapboarding. I regret that the Finance Minister has not seen fit to place on the free list the two articles which some of the members for Nova Scotia are afraid unless they are placed on the free list will not be admitted into the United States free. As representing a country that might be supposed to be protected by the duty on wheat, I say that Manitoba regrets as well as New Brunswick does that the duty has not been taken off wheat. The Americans are now coming into the North-West to buy our hard wheat, which has brought 10 cents more per bushel in Dakota this year than in Manitoba. In fact they have sought that wheat in large quantities, notwithstanding the duties, and about 100,000 bushels have been shipped to the United States for seed, with a view to improving the quality of wheat grown there. It is well known that the area for producing hard wheat is

rapidly diminishing, and I believe it would be to the interests of Manitoba to place wheat on the free list. A duty on wheat is no protection to any farmer in the Dominion, it simply prevents their selling wheat in the best market available. I also wish to draw the attention of the committee to the duty on coal. I believe if the duty were removed from coal a large part of the North Western States would be supplied with soft coal from mines in the North-West. There has been a large shipment of anthracite coal from Banff mine to California, some 10,000 tons having been shipped already. If we had unrestricted reciprocity a large portion of the North-Western States would be supplied from our North-West coal fields, and if coal were placed on that list we might hope to have unrestricted trade. Another article from which the duty should be removed is potatoes. There have been a hundred carloads of potatoes sent to St. Paul and Chicago during the present season, and some also to St. Louis. It was my intention to have addressed the House on the question of unrestricted trade, but I am able to say that so far as Manitoba is concerned we have nothing to protect and no benefit can be obtained by us from a protective tariff. We are in a position to defy the competition of the world in natural products. Of manufactures we have very little indeed, and we do not wish to have them protected to the injury of the development of our agricultural resources. Manitoba would hail with pleasure the adoption of such a policy as has been introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We grow the best wheat, we have the largest number of acres in natural products, and if we had free intercourse with the United States, the North West would prosper more than it has in the past. I hope that agricultural products and agricultural implements will be placed on the free list ere long. It is as important for a farmer to obtain cheap implements as it is to protect him in anything for him to grow. The duties paid on certain articles are imposed in the interests of two or three constituencies in Canada. The duty on fruit, which has been referred to, benefits only two or three constituencies. Coal in a like manner. Hon. gentlemen from the east have explained to me that if coal was placed on the free list they would be in a better position than at present. It is unnatural for coal to reach further west than Ottawa. Not a ton of coal from Nova Scotia goes as far west as Toronto. If the Government propose to operate a railway in the interests of the coal miners of Nova Scotia and carry coal free to them, but at the cost of the people at large, it may be done. This policy of free trade should be ratified, and ratified in the very near future.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems entirely to misapprehend the scope of this measure. It is not to place anything on the free list. We have not power to put anything on the free list in the manner to which the hon. gentleman has referred, coal or wheat or breadstuffs entering the United States. It is the other way. All this does is to enable us, in case of legislation in the United States making the articles free, to place them on our free list by an Act. The hon. gentleman must not forget, and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) must not forget, that we have had coal on the statutory offer since 1879. The United States have not placed it on their free list. There are only two tariff measures now before Congress and neither the Mills nor the Randall Bill has any reference to coal, corn, wheat, flour or meal.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). Does the hon. gentleman say Indian meal is not in the Mills' Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it is not, and while we have had it on our statutory offer since 1879, as well as coal, coke, and meal, and grain, and flour, and potatoes, not one of those articles are in either of the Bills that are before the United States Congress. It has been shown that putting

Mr. WATSON.

those in the statutory offer has not accomplished anything at all. We have tried that and it has failed. In fact I am inclined to think it has had a very contrary effect. I am inclined to think that putting coal on our statutory offer leads them to the conclusion that it is a great advantage to us to have coal free, and that rather prevents its being put on the free list in the United States. The same thing may be said of wheat and those other articles. I am just as anxious as the hon. gentleman is to see them include potatoes and I hope their Bill may be still amended before it becomes law as to include potatoes, and therefore I am anxious we should be in a position to take advantage of it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Do you wish them to include coal and wheat?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not said that. I said we have had it in the statutory offer since 1879 and neither the Mills' Bill nor the Randall Bill now before Congress propose to make those articles free.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has told us two or three times to-night that those articles were on the statutory offer since 1879. Knowing as he does the hostility to anything like free trade in the United States during that time, he has taken good care not to tell the House what I believe to be, is the change of sentiment, and what others believe to be the change of sentiment in the United States, in the direction of free trade. Notwithstanding the arguments that are made to the contrary, I believe that the free trade sentiment is making its way in the United States, and in view of that fact it is now proposed that we should take off some of the most important items, such as coal and wheat, from the statutory offer. I think the present time is the best chance for our offer being accepted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is naturally enough in a difficulty. He and his colleagues have brought things to such a pass here, that we are now, according to his own statement, face to face with a considerable difficulty. I understand that the real reason for taking those off is, as he almost admitted, that he cannot dispense with the revenue he receives from them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not like to lose it without having means to provide for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware that the hon. gentleman by the mode in which they have conducted the public affairs of this country have brought us to the condition in spite of the enormous taxation that we are face to face with a deficit. Under those circumstances, with a known deficit of about a million on the next year, he does not like to face another deficit, of as far as I can judge, a million and a quarter of dollars, if those articles should be placed on the free list. I think that the hon. gentleman is playing with edged tools. I have no doubt that when his proposition comes to be known and discussed, as it will in a short time be known and discussed in the United States Congress, that very much the conclusion will be drawn that has already been drawn and that is that he is carefully eliminating a number of articles which the United States might export to us in considerable quantities, and take from us in return other articles we desire to make free. As my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mitchell) very properly says there was no disposition during the last nine years on the part of the then American Government to relax their highly protective system, but it does seem very expedient to us, to say the least of it, that now that there is good ground to believe that their opinions are altering, that these articles should be left on the free list. The hon. gentleman very materially reduces the scope of the articles which he had formerly proposed to make free, and I am bound to admit that there is force in the objection he took as to the probable loss of

revenue. I think that he will find that the action he is now taking will be apt to be construed to our disadvantage and that it will prevent a number of articles which would be greatly to our advantage to put on the free list in the United States, from being put there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it is possible that can arise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would consider it a serious question if I could take that view. I do not think it is possible that any person in Congress can object to the elimination of those articles. How can they take objection when they have refused to accept it for nine years, and when they find that in a number of articles they propose in their Bill to make free we immediately take power for the Governor in Council, the moment their Act becomes law, to make those articles free also?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is just as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out. We sell the Americans no Indian corn, as the hon. gentleman well knows. I do not suppose we send a bushel except for the purpose of seed to the United States. On the other hand, everybody knows that but for our arbitrary tariff restriction we would import considerable quantities of corn from the United States. Then, as the hon. gentleman knows, too, we want to get our barley in there free. I think there is great force in the objection made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that in striking out such an article as grain we may possibly prevent the Americans from admitting such articles as barley free.

Mr. WATSON. I finally comprehend the question and I have this to say, that I believe the Government ought to place such articles on the free list as would induce the Americans to give us reciprocal trade in certain lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The offer had no such effect. We have had it there since 1879.

Mr. WATSON. It is only now we could reap advantage from that. As far as we are concerned in the West we had nothing to trade with the Americans, but we find now that notwithstanding the duty they are seeking our potatoes and wheat to-day, and we wish to have those articles they are seeking in the American market placed on the free list if possible. I know that the Minister has not power now, but I wish he would take power to put them on the list, and the American people who are legislating now in the interest of the American citizens would, I am sure, ask power to place them on the free list also. I maintain that the Canadian agriculturist is handicapped by this policy. He has to pay more for his farm implements and he gets less for his farm products than he did before. It has been stated in this House that the farmer does not pay more for his implements than he did before. I know from my knowledge of facts and from my own experience that the Canadian farmer has got to pay a little more than the extra duty on implements, and more than that again in Manitoba, because the excessive freights charged on implements going into that country makes up the difference for the duty. I wish to see the agriculturist legislated for now, and I say legislation has not been in his interest, although that has been contradicted in this House by members, and by members from the North-West too. I hold that the farmer of the North-West, who should be encouraged by this Government in settling that country, is handicapped as compared with the American farmer of to-day. A farmer in Dakota can buy his implements 35 per cent. less than a farmer can in Manitoba, and in some instances it is more than 35 per cent. less, because of the excessive freight to Manitoba. If time would admit I could give you the list of

necessaries a farmer requires to settle on a farm in Manitoba, and what he requires to settle on the same farm in Dakota. The balance is in favor of the American farmer by \$270. That is the cost of the goods taken from actual figures paid in 1887.

Mr. FISHER. If I understand the hon. Finance Minister, he has taken off certain things which are in the old standing offer, because he does not find them either in the Mills' Bill or in the other tariff Bill before the United States Congress; but I find, notwithstanding this, that there are a lot of things in this offer which are not in the Mills' Bill. The hon. Minister mentioned potatoes as one article which he hoped to see introduced into that Bill before its passage through Congress, and therefore he left potatoes in this standing offer. Do I understand him then to build a hope that what articles he has in this standing offer will be placed in the Mills' Bill before it becomes law, and that we shall have that opportunity to have all these articles free? I did not understand him to say that much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. FISHER. Then, I ask him why he has taken some articles off, and left some on which are in the same position. I would like him to say why he has left on animals, for instance, which he does not hope to have introduced into that Bill, and taken off such things as wheat, Indian corn, flour, Indian meal or meal of any other grain, lard, tallow, salt meats and smoked, some of which are still left on the free list by the Order in Council lately passed by the Government? The hon. Minister has not explained his reason for picking and choosing between these things at all, and I do not see why he should have taken from this standing offer these particular things. Does he intend it to operate against particular classes in this country, who might enjoy the freedom of the things which are put on the free list? I cannot understand any other reason for his having omitted these articles. I sympathise with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who has called attention to the fact that Indian corn and meal and meal of other grains are removed from the chance of being put on the free list. Not only are the fishermen and lumbermen interested in these articles, but a large portion of our farming population as well. The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that Indian corn is not grown in this country to any extent, and we cannot raise it as cheaply as it is raised in the Western States. The farming community, especially in Ontario and Quebec, buy these grains from the Americans for fattening their cattle, which they export and make a profit on. Therefore the duty imposed on corn is a detriment to them, making their meat dear, and putting them at a disadvantage in competing with the Americans in the English market. This is only one article, and I think others would come under the same reasoning. I was surprised to find the hon. Minister so candid as to say that he based this legislation on the legislation which was taking place at Washington. He did not say it in so many words, but he practically acknowledged that he is regulating our tariff by the action of the American Congress. Yet it was only a few days ago that his followers called us disloyal, and applied almost every opprobrious epithet to us, because they said we proposed to give the American Congress some power over our tariff. If it is so disloyal and wrong on our part, how is it possible that it is right in the Finance Minister of Canada to make this proposition? I say the hon. Minister and his colleagues are driven to it by the tortuous and varying policy which they have adopted towards the United States. While at one time, as they did in 1878, they try to threaten the United States into reciprocity, at another time they try to coax them into it to such an extent as they are willing to go, but will not accept anything except what they are will-

ing to give. But just now the hon. Finance Minister stated that he was going to take some of those things from the standing offer so as to intimidate the United States, I understood he went to try and force them to give us a chance of getting some of our articles free into that country. I think the Government's experience in the past in trying to intimidate the United States should show the hon. gentleman that he is not likely to succeed to-day, and I do not imagine that the United States are going to be influenced by his action in this matter. But so far, I have not had any sort of information from the hon. Finance Minister as to the reason he has taken these particular articles out of the standing offer, while he has left others which are exactly in the same category. If he does not explain that, we can only suppose that he has been entirely arbitrary in his selection.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a matter of considerable and continually growing importance, with reference to the admission of certain classes of corn into this country free of duty. It is well known that the system known among farmers as ensilage, or green feeding of cattle, is carried on in many parts of Western Ontario as well as in the section I represent. It is produced from green corn, which is taken from the green stalk. This corn is grown from a seed which does not ripen in Canada, and which the farmers have to import. That seed is imported every year in large quantities, and the dairymen and farmers of the country would consider it a very great advantage to be allowed to import that kind of corn free. In the county I represent it is a new business, but last year some 200 bushels were imported for such purposes, and this year I am informed by the dairymen 600 bushels will be imported for seeding purposes, and the success of the dairymen in carrying on that system will depend on the cheapness at which they can obtain that food.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I understood the hon. Minister in the early part of his speech to emphasise that it has been and is now the policy of his party to obtain a treaty which would admit as far as possible the products of the farm, the sea, the forest and the mine from the one country into the other free of duty, and he gave us to understand that that policy was embodied in the old statutory offer. He has now revised that statutory offer, and has introduced a new one omitting certain articles which by proclamation were taken out of the old statutory offer, and are now on the free list; but as my hon. friend behind me has remarked, he has omitted a large number of articles that were in the statutory offer and has limited the general character of that offer very largely. I think the House is entitled to know at greater length why he has done this. The hon. member for Northumberland asked a question on the subject of Indian corn and never obtained an answer. Why was that included in the old statutory offer and omitted in this? If the hon. gentleman is desirous that we should have reciprocity in the natural products, why omit these articles in the statutory offer? I hold the substance of a letter which the First Minister is alleged to have written a year or two ago to a leading statesman in the United States. It is contained in the letter of Mr. J. S. Ritchie, of Acron, Ohio, a gentleman well known in Ottawa, addressed to the *Washington National Republican*, and in that letter the First Minister stated what the policy of his Government was. Mr. Ritchie says:

"When the first Morrison Bill was under consideration in Congress I received a letter from the Canadian Premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, accompanied by a list of all the articles covered by the above mentioned provision (the standing offer) in her tariff law, and a large number of articles not there enumerated. In that letter he promised that if the Morrison Bill passed and included any or all of these articles in its free list, or admitted them at a lower rate of duty, Canada would at once treat all such articles which were the product of United States in a like manner. I gave that letter to Mr. Hewitt, the present mayor of New

Mr. FISHER.

York, who was then an active member of Mr. Morrison's committee, and he gave it to Mr. Morrison, who expressed to me great satisfaction with the proposition contained in it. The letter, I believe, is to-day among the papers of the present Ways and Means Committee, and I do not doubt that the offer contained in it is as good as the day it was made."

The hon. gentleman will see that the expression of belief that Mr. Ritchie gives utterance to is not well founded, because the promise of the First Minister is not kept. A new statutory offer is introduced by the hon. gentleman, which, while it is extended to certain articles not mentioned in the old offer, deliberately omits a number that are mentioned in it. If they were omitted for the purpose of revenue, that reason is indefensible, because the taxation bears very heavily on the poorer classes. I would like to know whether the First Minister has changed his policy or whether he is prepared to adhere to the proposition he made in his letter to Mr. Ritchie. Before the hon. gentleman asks us to carry this resolution, he should explain why the articles in the old offer have been omitted in the new one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will read over *Hansard*, he will find there an answer to all that both he and the hon. member for Brome have said. In endeavoring to draw a distinction between a treaty and a legislative enactment, I have endeavored to mark the difference between a broad comprehensive policy entered into by two nations by treaty and a policy of each country deciding to adopt in reference to this matter just what suits its own interests. If the hon. gentlemen are not able to appreciate the distinction, I am afraid it is due to my inability to express what I feel upon the subject, in the mode in which I ought to be able to express it. It appears to me perfectly plain and simple that a policy which would be a sound, a rational and a judicious policy for a country to enter into by treaty covering all the natural products of the country is one thing, and it is another thing when one country declares it will not have a treaty or any reciprocal arrangement whatever, but will from Session to Session be entirely free to act just as its own interests require. That being the case, I view the position from that standpoint. I have never said that I decided to put everything upon our free list that I found the Mills' Bill made free. If the Mills' Bill or if the action of the United States Congress makes free an article which I do not consider it to be in the interest of Canada to make free, I will not put it in this clause. The articles put in this clause are put there to show what, in the judgment and the Parliament of Canada, we intend to take advantage of, should they be made free on the other side. I have put articles in this clause that are not in the Mills' Bill, but I do not confine myself to the articles mentioned in that Bill, because there are other articles which, should they be made free by the legislation of the United States, we would like to take advantage of. There are other articles that might by treaty be dealt with as a matter of deliberate arrangement, but which we would not be prepared at the moment to make free upon the action of legislation over which we have no control. I hope I have made myself intelligible. I have tried to explain everything in the fullest and frankest manner possible, and I hope hon. gentlemen will consent to review the statements I have made when they see them in print, and allow this proposition to pass.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is creditable on the part of the hon. the Finance Minister, after the criticisms and suggestions which have been made by hon. gentlemen on this side, to try and lead us from the argument that we have presented. It has been stated that the hon. gentleman intends to put potatoes on the free list, no doubt in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. But on the other hand, he refuses to put corn on the free list. If there is any articles at all shipped from the United States that would be

compensated by the free admission of barley to the United States, it is the article of corn. The hon. gentleman well knows that the farmers of Canada paid \$20,000 during last year to get their barley into the United States. Now, there is not another item that would be more likely to be traded off for free admission of barley than corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have had barley on our statutory offer since 1879, and barley does not appear in the Mills' Bill or the Randall Bill at all, so that we gained nothing by that. We have had both corn and barley on the offer and neither one nor the other has been made free.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not say that barley is on, and the hon. the Minister is not going to prevent me from making my argument by saying it is not in the Mills' Bill. I say corn is the only item that we might have to trade off in return for barley being admitted into the United States free, and the hon. gentleman has not explained why he has put potatoes on and left corn off.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as potatoes are concerned, there was a great doubt as to whether it was in the Mills' Bill. In fact, it was supposed at first that it did include potatoes. But it was found subsequently, by the provisions of the full and complete Bill, that it was considered potatoes would come under the head of vegetables otherwise enumerated, and, therefore, potatoes were not included, but there is a strong reason to hope that, before that Bill becomes law, potatoes will be included. We have had corn and barley on our statute since 1879, and we have had wheat and flour and other articles, and that has produced no effect whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not continue them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The reason, as I have stated, is that we propose to deal with these questions from our own standpoint entirely.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has over and over again stated that he has had these articles on the statutory obligations of 1879, but he fails to answer the argument which I advanced against that, and which was referred to also by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), that we know that, after the repeal of the Washington Treaty, a feeling had grown up in the United States, arising out of the fishery difficulties, which was hostile to any commercial relations between the two countries at all. That feeling has existed pretty well for seven or eight years, and, although the hon. gentleman had that statutory obligation there, the argument which I raise in reply to that is that a change is coming over the people of the United States, that their financial difficulties demand that a very large reduction shall take place on the articles coming into their country, and, judging by the Mills' Bill, a very large quantity of free goods will be admitted. My hon. friend the Finance Minister continually refers to the fact that this statutory obligation has existed since 1879, but he fails altogether to give an explanation why potatoes and coal are not in, and why cornmeal and corn are taken out; he fails to realise the change which has taken place in the sentiment of the people of the United States, and so his answer is no answer at all. He is evading the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The reason which the hon. gentleman would be a reason for repealing the Act altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He says he does not think so; then, why does he make the change in regard to these articles, and put articles there which are altogether contrary to the reason which he has given? He puts potatoes there, though he knows they are not in the Mills' Bill, with the hope, as he says, that at some future period or at some

time or other the United States Congress will legislate in the direction of free trade.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is good reason to think so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then he should put corn on the list also.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that I would put corn on, even if they did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He said he was in favor of free trade in natural products.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said, as a whole.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he does not take power to deal with this as a whole. He deals with it piecemeal. Suppose the United States were to put the whole of the natural products on the free list to-morrow, the hon. gentleman does not take power to deal with that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would be very questionable whether you ought to. I have endeavored to explain that, as a matter of treaty, covering the whole, I would be willing to do this, but I never said that this should be done by legislation, seeing the power of the Congress of the United States to throw our whole financial arrangements into confusion by dealing with three or four articles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has now repeated what he has said six or seven times before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may have to repeat it five or six times yet before the hon. gentleman will understand me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the people of the United States have reciprocity in natural products, they will not enquire whether it is under a treaty or under legislation. The effect is the same.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the same.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say it is the same. If that advantage is obtained, it is the same to the people of this country if it is done under legislation as if it is done under a treaty.

Mr. BOWELL. The one is permanent and the other is not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman had better stand up when he wants to speak.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not talking to you.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are interrupting me.

Mr. BOWELL. Very well, I beg pardon. Go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says we are not to take power to throw the financial affairs of this country into confusion. He is not likely to do that without sufficient reason, and Congress would have the same reluctance to throw the financial affairs of the United States into confusion. He has not given us any valid reason for doing what he has done. He proposes to put certain articles on the free list which he admits the United States have not yet put on the free list by any Bill which is before Congress, and he has taken off some articles that are included in that Bill. He says he does not know that he would in any case put corn on the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You have said that a great many times.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, it seems to be necessary to repeat it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That statement has been repeated twenty times to-night, and it is one o'clock in the morning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Quite so, but the hon. gentleman might have concluded this debate several hours ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did my best to do so, but the hon. gentleman knows that I could not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The people of this country are in favor of putting all these articles on the free list.

Mr. HESSON. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is opposed to reciprocity in natural products?

Mr. HESSON. I am, in some of them, certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman has been misstating his position this Session, and also in other Sessions, because he has voted to put that provision on the Statute-book which the Minister of Finance is now proposing to repeal. In fact the only hon. gentleman who has had the courage of his convictions, the only hon. gentleman who has spoken on this subject and has stated what he felt, is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who says he does not believe reciprocity in natural products would be good for this country. Other hon. gentlemen are acting as if they were in favor of that reciprocity, but they are simply pretending that they are. The Finance Minister has been on each side of this question several times during this Session.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be that the law is as the Finance Minister says. I am not going to enter into any controversy with regard to that, but I hope the Finance Minister will not be offended if I ask the Minister of Justice to give us an assurance on that point. The Customs Act of 1879, section 6, declares that the articles mentioned shall be admitted into Canada free of duty whenever a proclamation issues. Now it is purposed to repeal the proclamation under that clause.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not the proclamation.

Mr. MULOCK. No, but to repeal the clause on which the proclamation rests, and it is said that the repeal of the clause will not affect the proclamation. I do not propose to argue that point, but that is a question on which I would like the assurance of the Minister of Justice, for whilst that may be law, it is possible there is a doubt. There are certain orders that the Governor in Council can repeal, and others that he cannot repeal. A proclamation standing under that clause, resting upon the clause in question, I take it, is not repealable by the Governor in Council, but if you repeal the clause and leave the Order in Council standing, it may be that the Order in Council may be repealable under some other provision of the law. Now, I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it is quite clear in his mind that the proclamation under which green fruits, and fruit trees, and so on, articles that are not now to be renamed in the substituted clause,—whether it is perfectly clear to his mind that that proclamation cannot be repealable by any other than an Act of Parliament?

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand the position to be this: These articles had a duty imposed on them by statute, and by the same authority, that is, by a statute of this Parliament, power was given to the Governor in Council to make what was practically an enactment upon that subject for the repeal of these duties. Now, in pursuance of the powers given in section 9, the Order in Council was issued, and the proclamation went forth effecting a repeal of the duties which were imposed upon green fruits, and upon certain seeds, plants and shrubs. My view is that from that moment the enactment imposing the duty upon these articles was repealed and cannot be re-enacted except by this Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. GILLMOR. I regret to discover that the Government are not disposed to place corn upon that statutory offer, because it has not been responded to in the United States. It is very important to New Brunswick and to my own constituency that corn and corn-meal should be admitted free of duty, and during the campaign of the late general election, there was an impression given currency to by my opponents that that small grievance was going to be redressed. I regret to discover that the Government are not so ready to put corn on the free list, even if the States do take duty off corn. I have not heard the Finance Minister say yet that he would respond to that, that he would meet the United States with regard to the duty on corn and cornmeal. I wish he had left it, at least, on the statutory offer instead of removing it. I understand his position is that Government are going to exercise their own judgment as to how far they can accept reciprocity, as long as it is not general, and there is some force in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. But I do think that the duty on corn and cornmeal, even if it is kept on flour, ought to be removed, because you do not protect any industry that is now producing corn in Canada to any extent. I understand that there are two or three counties in Ontario that produce corn, but it is not exported at all from the Maritime Provinces, and we import a large quantity of corn and cornmeal. It is a matter that largely affects the poorer classes. While much of it may be used to feed horses and cattle, a very considerable quantity is also used by the poorer classes of the people. I think you might well have left the moderate duty in your statutory offer. I do not think the people are going to have this duty removed from corn and meal quite as soon as they were led to expect by my opponents during the last campaign. If you would keep it on meal and allow corn to come in free, you would encourage our grist mills. Many of the grist mills you had before are now abandoned, but if you allowed corn to come in free, you would encourage the manufacture of grain into meal. The hon. Minister, who is a leading man in the Maritime Provinces, has intimated or hinted that he does not know whether he would meet the Americans half way, but in the interests of the people of that section of the country I would be very glad if he could meet their wishes in this respect.

Mr. MITCHELL. In relation to the duty on corn, I presume one of the objections the Minister has to its removal is the loss of duty. Now, I do not think the loss of duty would be so much as the hon. gentleman imagines, because I do not suppose any one would ask that the duty should be taken off corn that is used in the country for distilling purposes. What we ask is that it should be taken off corn when it enters into the consumption of the people and for the use of stock.

Mr. FISHER. The Finance Minister said a little while ago that he had over and over again answered the question which the member for Prince Edward Island had put to him. It is true that he has told us that he believes it is in the interests of the country to keep corn off the statutory offer in the future. Now, I would like to know why the Government think it to be in the interest of the country to do so. I would like to know whether it is that they believe that this is an industry which requires protection, or whether they believe it is a fair subject for taxation, or whether there is some particular interest to be conserved of which the Finance Minister has given us no inkling whatever. I have no objection to the Government taking the power to put upon the statutory offer such things as they think in the interests of Canada, but I want to know why they think it is in the interest of Canada that corn should not be put in such an offer. When the hon. member for Bothwell intimated that perhaps the Minister would not put corn upon the free list, even if the

Mills Bill did contain it, and that he means to keep it for the sake of the duty, the hon. Minister did not say anything to the contrary. I think he is going back on his own statements that he wants to go as far as he can in the way of reciprocity in natural product.

Mr. HESSON. I confess that I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's reasoning. He has endeavored to make it appear that the exporters of barley from this country do not pay the duty, and that if the Americans took the duty off we would get a higher price for barley. Now, if it will work in one instance, why would it not work in another? If the exporter pays the duty in the case of barley, may it not be possible that he will pay the duty on corn and cornmeal? Did it ever occur to the hon. gentleman in that way?

Mr. FISHER. What do you think yourself?

Mr. HESSON. I have my opinion, and you may study the question out for yourself. But you will see how difficult it is to convince gentlemen who think that we must pay the duty in both instances. It is merely impossible, if we export barley, to pay that duty. Why, then, may not the Americans, in the export of cornmeal, be presumed to pay the duty? They do not produce barley and we do not produce corn. They require our barley and we require their corn. It is perfectly clear that we do not pay in both instances. I know hon. gentlemen opposite always endeavor to prove that on sending products into the American market our farmers pay the duty. It cannot be a reasonable or a logical conclusion to suppose that the people will believe that if this is true in one instance it is not also true in the other instance. I am not in favor of the Government taking into consideration the propriety of taking the duty off grain or flour. It would be a most unwise course, and in the interests of my constituents I will never consent to the removal of the duty from wheat, oats, flour or meal and a great many other articles I could enumerate. Our market in Canada is better than that of the United States for all these articles, and our market has been better since the duty was imposed. That is perfectly certain, and our farmers and business men realise the fact, and while we export our surplus to the old country the United States is not our best market for the articles indicated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to be guilty of any discourtesy to the hon. gentleman, but I may say that I see no object in placing corn in the statutory offer. We have no desire to induce the United States to legislate so as to place corn on the free list. We have no object in doing so. We do not send any corn to the United States. Whenever it is the policy of Parliament to make corn free, then we can make it free, but there is no object in placing it in this offer.

Mr. FISHER. By parity of reasoning the United States might decline to put barley on the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say at once that the United States will place barley on the free list the moment they come to the conclusion that it is in the interests of their people to do so, and when they do that we shall be in a position to make barley free also.

Mr. FISHER. If the Americans do so for their advantage they do not care whether it is put on the free list or not. Under these circumstances it is no object to us to give power to the Government to put it on the free list.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to state that it is not in the interests of the people, particularly the poorer classes, to put corn on the free list; because that is the only inference I can draw from the objection of the hon. gentleman to placing corn in the statutory offer? If he takes that position we have a distinct issue, and one the country can understand. What I con-

tend in regard to corn is this: It is a food consumed by the poorest classes, and it is grown in only two counties in Western Canada to any moderate extent.

An hon. MEMBER. Half a dozen counties.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is only raised to any extent in about two counties. When we do not raise an article that enters into the food of the poorest class of the population, when it is used by the farmers for food and by the lumbermen and teamsters to feed their horses, it ought not to be taxed. The hon. gentleman says it is not in the interests of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I put the question: Did I understand you to say that it is not in the interest of Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whenever Parliament decides.

Mr. MITCHELL. When the Government of the day which controls Parliament decides.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; Parliament which controls the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. We hold the reins, but you show us the way to go according to the old song. I contend that the hon. gentleman by his acts, if not by his words, decides that it is not in the interest of Canada to place corn on the free list. If there is one single article discussed that should be on the free list it is corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend had better make a clean breast of it before he sits down, and tell the House why the Government of which he was a member placed a duty on corn and cornmeal, which they kept on all the time he was a member of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to apply to one of the minor members of the Cabinet, as Sir Hugh Allan styled us, in the celebrated case which the hon. gentleman knows something about.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you acknowledge that?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I have the honesty to acknowledge that I was a minor member. I do not know, without referring to the statute, whether the statement made by the hon. gentleman is accurate or not. I certainly did not think that the Government maintained the duty all the time I was in the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am willing to accept the fact that it was so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it was not so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am willing to accept the fact. It does not lie in the mouth of the Finance Minister, who occupied a more prominent and important position in that Government, to put such a question before me, which, as the letter of Sir Hugh Allan said, was one of the unimportant members of the Cabinet, who was not a person of sufficient importance to discuss important questions such as those which were discussed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As this is a matter of public policy I should like to be certain that I understand the statement of the Minister of Finance. I understood he was in favor of the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By treaty.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then I understood the hon. gentleman to say that in the event of the American placing all those articles on the free list he could not say that the Government, so long as he was a member of it, would reciprocate

in all those articles, but there might be some to which he might take exception.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I endeavored to draw a broad distinction between a treaty and legislation, between making articles free by treaty and by legislation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That is an evasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You may call it an evasion, I do not. I call it a frank, statesmanlike statement.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is endeavoring to take credit elsewhere for being in favor of an exchange of the natural products of the two countries, but he is guarding himself all the time with this reservation, that unless it comes just in the way to suit himself,—and which he says cannot be given,—he is not going to admit the natural products of the United States so far as he can control it into the Dominion of Canada, although the Congress of the United States may express their willingness and may pass an Act admitting the products of the Dominion of Canada into the United States. If that is his position I wish the hon. gentleman to distinctly understand that we shall know him for the future, because we do not intend to allow him to take advantage of both sides of the question. We shall know henceforth that although the hon. gentleman is expressing his readiness for free exchange of products he is throwing difficulties in the way.

Mr. HESSON. I hope the Finance Minister will hold the position he has always held in this country of fairness and independence, and I do not think that any threat coming from the other side of the House will very likely change his views. In reference to the imposition of duty on corn, I wish to say that there is another consideration besides that for the House. That duty has had the effect of reserving our market for oats and peas and the coarser kinds of grain. Hon. gentlemen cannot help seeing the difference between a treaty and between an Act of legislation in this House. By a treaty we can say to them: If we take off the duty on corn, will you give us an equivalent in another direction? If by an Act of legislation we remove the duty on corn, it means leaving our market exposed to the Americans and getting nothing in return.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It means getting cheaper corn.

Mr. MULOCK. We could get in our barley.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman must take the ground that we are not producing the corn and the cornmeal, and the people must pay the duty.

Mr. MULOCK. Let me ask you one question?

Mr. HESSON. I am sure there is not a gentleman in this House who does not understand the position the Minister takes on this question, as to our legislation here and by one stroke this House wiping out the tariff imposed on this grain, which we have felt in the interests of the country, and which I hope the people of this country will maintain, we will not be leaving our markets exposed to be flooded from the other side. By a treaty we can get something in exchange. They may under a treaty give us their market for free fish if we take the duty off grain, but if you do so by an Act of this House you expose the markets of the whole country simply to gratify gentlemen who will censure the Government afterwards for acceding to their wishes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. HESSON. I venture to say it is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is really a terrible thing to have such a censure pronounced by an old time supporter of the Government on the policy of the Government for the last ten years. Does not the hon. gentleman see that according to his argument nothing could be more

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

absurd than the policy of the Government for the last ten years since this offer has been on the Statute-book?

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) if the United States produce anything that can be used in substitution for Canadian grown barley, more particularly the best kinds of beard barley.

Mr. HESSON. I think not.

Mr. MULOCK. Well that answers the question at once as to who pays the duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Life is too short to settle that question now.

Mr. MULOCK. I know the party on the other side is not agreed as to that question of duty. I heard the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) insinuating and suggesting that the Canadian people are paying the duty on goods going into the United States. What does the Minister of Finance say on that question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything.

Mr. MULOCK. I remember that in 1878 when the Premier was in Opposition he drew a very beautiful picture of the Canadian farmer paying the duty on barley. Does any one know what was the policy of the Administration on the question we are discussing to-night? Why will they not admit us into their secrets? A little while ago during this very Session, the Premier said that he was not going to allow the Americans to pick and choose, and they had got to go to the whole hog or none. The Premier said that and all his followers said it after him, and the Conservative press in Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal, all said that the Americans must accept the whole statutory offer or nothing at all, but they had hardly finished their tune when the Premier changed his tune.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got a telegram from Washington.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. I want to ask the Finance Minister if the policy of the party which he represents is going to be changed every day and every hour by some Bill that may be introduced into Congress, and are we to be imitators of the people of Congress, or are we to consider the interests of the people of Canada? If it is in the interests of the people of Canada that we should have enlarged and freer trade relations with the people of the United States in natural products, let us not adopt this narrow policy now proposed, which will, at all events, have the effect of preventing the farming community of Canada obtaining a free market in the United States for some of their cereals; more particularly barley. If that is not what the Minister is aiming at it is where he is going to arrive. He is preventing the American people placing on their Statute-book any offer to Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ours is to be a sham offer.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it is practically a sham offer, and there do not appear to be two members on the other side who have the same opinions on the question. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) who I suppose is on the borders of going into the Cabinet, now says he is against placing trees on the free list. If that be the case I hope he will vote against the motion.

Gen. LAURIE. I deeply regret to have heard that the Government were not prepared to take into consideration at the present time, the free importation of corn. I fully realise of course that revenue must be raised, but I do sincerely regret that there is no present indication showing of any desire to put corn on the free list.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Vote against it then.

Gen. LAURIE. With regard to voting; when the time for voting comes I shall vote as I think proper. At the

same time the Minister of Finance states that it is a matter which rests with Parliament. I wish to say that I shall be most happy to support him in any resolution that he will bring forward when he considers Parliament is ready to deal with this question. I think the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has expressed the proper view in regard to this question. I do think it is a matter of extreme importance to the people living in our Province that grain should be placed on the free list. I do not think, however, that it is necessary we should have it in those resolutions, because in placing it on those resolutions we would have it on the free list, without any corresponding benefit for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all.

Gen. LAURIE. That is my view at all events.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad to find my hon. friend from Shelburne (General Laurie) has experienced a change of heart since 1879. In 1879 we had a colonization committee sitting in this House from day to day. That hon. gentleman did not hold the responsible position which he now holds as a representative of a constituency in this Dominion, although he held as he does now, a very high military position. At that time the committee were endeavoring to obtain evidence on which to base a National Policy, and before that committee my hon. friend was called as a witness. A number of questions were put to him as to the effect of a duty on corn and cornmeal on the farming industry of the Province of Nova Scotia, and he replied to one and all of these questions by saying that the duty on cornmeal would not at all be opposed to the interests of any class in the Maritime Provinces. I, as a member of the committee, pressed him on that point. I said that as a representative of a county in the western part of Nova Scotia. I believed that it was very important to the farmers there to have this article free for fattening, but he persisted that it was not. In fact, he said that a duty would stimulate the introduction of coarse grains, which would be quite as good for the farmers as corn. Now, Sir, I find that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. Is it because he has become a representative of a constituency in Nova Scotia; at any rate, I am glad to find that he has changed his mind, and has come to the support of those who have been for years endeavoring to induce the Government to take the duty off cornmeal. I am glad to find that I, who brought this subject last winter to the attention of the hon. Finance Minister, who kindly promised to take it into his consideration, have in the gallant general an able ally, and I have no doubt that in the near future we shall be able to secure that change we desire, the removal of the duty from cornmeal.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman is rather flogging a dead horse. He states that in 1879 I was prepared to advocate a duty on cornmeal. I am now speaking of taking the duty off corn, and I pointed out that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) had expressed my view, that we might well keep the duty on cornmeal, but take the duty off corn, and so encourage the grinding of corn in our own country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Finance Minister stated it was the confirmed policy of both parties in this House to favor reciprocity of trade in natural products. We have certain friends in the United States who are fighting strongly for more extended trade relations between that country and Canada, and I think it is exceedingly unfortunate that at this juncture the hon. Minister of Finance should have considered it his duty to give our friends there a slap in the face.

[Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

45-1888-6

Mr. McMULLEN. He is doing it by taking from the free list an article that we declared to be free of duty, and he is placing us in such a position that we shall not be able to reciprocate if they put it on the free list. I think it is unfortunate that he is taking this retrograde step at such a time.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Without entering into the question of the advisability of interchanging the articles produced here with those produced in the United States, my view is that the present is about the first occasion since this Act of ours has been on the Statute-book, that the American Government have shown any disposition to reciprocate in any of these articles. The Americans, in the Bill before Congress, place a number of articles on their free list, as to which they are willing to reciprocate, and they have left out, not accidentally but by design, certain articles that to my mind, is equivalent to saying, we do not think it is to our interest that those articles should go on the free list; and if that is the American view, the passing of this Act is simply the withdrawing of the balance of those articles which they have said to us they will not reciprocate in, and I think it is the true and statesmanlike position for us to occupy to leave those articles for the further consideration of Parliament.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). There is no doubt that we in the Maritime Provinces are a unit in favor of the removal of the duty on corn, and I believe our people are just about as anxious to have the duty taken off cornmeal.

Mr. GILLMOR. I said that.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). But it seems that for the purpose of protecting a small number of people in Ontario who raise corn, the rest of the Dominion should be saddled with that duty, and at the very time proposals are being made in the United States in favor of reciprocity, we withdraw these items from the standing offer. I have listened attentively to the hon. Minister of Finance as to the difference between a treaty and legislation; but in regard to natural products it seems to me that we should maintain the same position that we did before, if we expect our neighbors to meet us with legislation that may culminate in a treaty. But it seems to me that the Government are taking the present course, either for the purpose of raising a revenue or because it is part of the National Policy that reciprocity must be subordinate to it, although the party supporting that policy profess to be in favor of reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman speaks of this duty as having been levied in the interest of Ontario. It may be that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec expect to receive some consideration in this matter. But I would ask the hon. gentleman and all the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces to recollect that the House in years past voted \$150,000 to aid the fishermen.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend from Lambton, deserves commendation for the interest he has taken in an article in which I have taken some interest. If there is an article in which he is deeply interested it is petroleum, and I notice that in the Mills' Bill petroleum is made free. If the Government were to take the duty off that article, they would confer a great boon on the Maritime Provinces and Eastern Canada generally.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. They would not have put it in the Mills' Bill, without good cause.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to endorse the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Prince Edward with regard to seed corn, and I trust the Finance Minister will take it into his favorable consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a new question and we will consider it.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I move that :

Section 10 of the said Act be hereby repealed and that items 592 and 781 of schedule C of an Act respecting the duties of Customs, chapter 33 Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, be repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof.

592. Coffee, green, except as herein provided.

781. Tea, except as hereinbefore provided.

I may state that that change is for the purpose of dropping out what is now quite surplusage—that is section 10 of the Act which has entirely lost its force in consequence of legislation in the United States. It does not affect any change in the tariff.

Mr. WELDON. While I do not dispute the legal view of the Minister of Justice, it seems to me there would be no harm in having a provision that the proclamation continue in force. My own opinion in looking over the matter carefully, is in accord with the view of the Minister of Justice. Still there is some doubt, and it would be better by some clause just to leave that proclamation in force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are tea and coffee free altogether?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, a duty of 10 per cent. on tea from the United States remains, but this legislation which is surplusage is removed for the purpose of taking away what has lost its significance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what way does it lose its significance?

Mr. BOWELL. Having repealed that clause of the law which empowers the Government to impose a duty of 10 per cent. on tea from the United States, it was necessary to change the item in the free list which affected coffee and tea, and which reads as follows:—"Tea from the United States, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*." Then turn to the free list. you find that coffee and green tea, as provided by section 10, 49 Victoria, chapter 33, is free. The proposition is to strike out the words "by section 10, 49 Victoria, chapter 33. Coffee, green, as hereinbefore provided." That is except as provided by the item to which I first called the attention of the committee. That leaves coffee, green, free, except when imported indirectly from the United States, and precisely the same remark applies to the tea, 781 of the tariff, where it reads the same way: "Tea, except as provided by section 104." Section 10 is repealed, and in order to avoid any difficulty in the interpretation of these clauses hereafter, tea is made free except at hereinbefore provided; that is it comes free from all parts of the world, except when it comes indirectly through the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that coffee or tea when imported direct from the place of production are free?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. But if they come from Great Britain, France or the United States, they are subject to a 10 per cent. duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, only when they come from the United States.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That the excise duty on spirits manufactured from raw or unmalted grain used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond, shall be the same as that on spirits manufactured exclusively from malted barley.

"That when any substitute for methylated spirits is supplied to any manufacturer in accordance with section 233 of the Inland Revenue Act, the price thereof shall not exceed the actual cost with the addition of 15 per cent.

Mr. FISHER.

I may state to the committee the explanation of that is this: When the Inland Revenue Act was framed only two kinds of spirits were made—first from raw grain and second from malt. The former were allowed to use up to 10 per cent. of malt, though in practice the amount barely exceeded 4 per cent. This was duty-paid malt. The latter used malt entirely and in bond. Hence to put them on a footing of equality 2 cents a gallon extra was charged as spirit duty as an offset to the malt duty levied on the grain distillers. Last year a distillery was started in Halifax, which did not come exactly under either of these definitions, as they proposed to use 15 to 25 per cent. malt and the remainder raw grain. Section 130 of the Inland Revenue Act established a duty on the raw grain spirits at \$1.30 a gallon and on the malt spirits at \$1.32 a gallon. As the distillery at Halifax used a greater percentage of malt than was allowed to the raw grain distilleries the rate of \$1.32 a gallon was established by the Department as the duty on the spirits produced there and this duty has always been collected and the object of the resolution is merely to remove any doubts which may arise as to the proper duty to be collected on such spirits. There is no increase in duty. The duty remains the same, but this removes a doubt that might arise in that connection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Why does the hon. gentleman specify barley. The spirits made in Ontario are entirely made from Indian corn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will not affect that in the least. It only removes a doubt arising from the effect of the different portions of the grain and malt duties.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought there was to be no change in the duties this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no change in customs duties, but there are two or three in excise.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are there any changes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will allow me to read the resolutions, he will see.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have asked a simple question, and I want a civil answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The last thing in my mind would be to treat my hon. friend with anything except marked courtesy.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not had much of that lately from you.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I simply thought that, by reading the resolution, I might give him the information better than I could state it. The first resolution is :

That the excise duty on spirits manufactured from raw or unmalted grain used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond shall be the same as that on spirits manufactured exclusively from malted barley.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the provision if it is made from potatoes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not affect that at all. It does not touch the manufacture from potatoes or from corn.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Department of Inland Revenue issue a general declaration in reference to these preparations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There does not seem to be any statutory provision as to the manufacture of alcohol from roots.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is another question. The second resolution is :

That when any substitute for methylated spirits is supplied to any manufacturer in accordance with section 233 of "The Inland Revenue

Act," the price thereof shall not exceed the actual cost with the addition of 15 per cent.

The explanation of this resolution is that these methylated spirits have hitherto been manufactured by the bonded manufacturers and the Department of Inland Revenue has had suspicion for a lengthened period that these spirits, the duty on which is 15 cents a gallon, have been largely used for potable and other purposes to which only pure spirits, duty \$1.30 a gallon, should be applied. It is intended to withdraw the privilege of manufacturing the methylated spirits from the bonded manufacturers and to place the supply under the control of the Department, who will supply wood alcohol or wood naphtha to varnish makers and others. The 15 per cent. added to the cost is to pay for handling and to prevent the loss which would otherwise accrue from withdrawing the duty collected on the manufacture of methylated spirits.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to undertake the manufacture of alcohol in the Inland Revenue Department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The details will be fully explained when my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue introduces the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will not object to our discussing the matter on the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the fullest explanation will be given then. The third resolution is:

That the excise duty on cigarettes whether the product of foreign or of domestic leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, shall be 60 cents on every pound; and on those weighing more than three pounds per thousand, \$1.00 per pound.

The explanation of this resolution is that the present inland revenue duty upon cigarettes is the same as on cut tobacco, viz., 20 cents per pound. The duty on cigars is \$6 per thousand, weighing say 12 pounds to the thousand, or say 50 cents per pound. The growth of the cigarette business has been seriously threatening the cigar revenue, while costing much more for stamping, &c. It is proposed to raise the duty to 60 cents per pound on ordinary

cigarettes and to \$1 per pound on those weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand. The customs rate is \$2 per pound and 25 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that increase the duty on cigars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but on cigarettes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How much revenue will you get out of it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a great deal.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this to increase the consumption of cigars?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will have that effect. The 4th resolution is:

That the excise duty on all cigars, whether the product of foreign or of domestic raw leaf tobacco, when put up in packages containing less than 10 each, shall be \$7 per thousand.

The explanation of that is that the present duty is \$6 per thousand and the extra dollar per thousand is to pay for the increased number of stamps used upon the smaller packages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that these resolutions take effect from and after the 2nd day of May.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Wednesday, May 2, 1888.

No. 46

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BANK ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) to amend the Bank Acts, chapter one hundred and twenty of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is to make a further slight change in that portion of the Act which enables certain producers and manufacturers to issue warehouse receipts which will be as security in the hands of the persons loaning money upon them. The provision of the Bank Act enumerates various manufacturers who shall have the right to issue warehouse certificates, manufacturers of timber, and various others, and I propose to add distillers. I may mention that one of the principal reasons for this change is the provision of the statute requiring the gauging of spirits, which makes it necessary that distillers should carry a very much larger stock than they otherwise would do, and it seems reasonable that such large concerns should have the right to issue warehouse receipts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Acts chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of the Bill is simply to enlarge the right of appeal in reference to British Columbia and the North-West Territories. There is a provision in the present Act with reference to appeals from Maritime Provinces, giving appeals where the amount is above a certain sum, even though the action did not originate in the Superior Court. It is desired to extend that provision to British Columbia, and to provide some system of appeal in reference to the North-West Territories. The provision for appeal which I propose to make with reference to the North-West Territories, is that by leave of the Supreme Court, or of a judge thereof, an appeal may be allowed from the decision of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories, although the matter may not have originated in the Superior Court.

46-1888-1

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIES asked, 1. What is the amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for the Lake St. Peter and River St. Lawrence improvements, up to this date? 2. What is the total amount of interest on such advances? 3. What part of such interest has been repaid by said Commissioners to the Government? 4. What was the expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from expenditure on capital account? 5. What was their net revenue for same year? 6. Does this expenditure include any, and what expenditure, in the harbor of Montreal? 7. What amount now remains unexpended of the sums authorized by the Act to be advanced the Harbor Commissioners for the completion of the Lake St. Peter channel, and which amount the Government, in the resolution submitted by Sir Charles Tupper, ask for authority to expend? 8. What is the estimated amount yet required to complete the widening and deepening of the channel in Lake St. Peter and the River St. Lawrence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1. The amount of the advances made by the Government to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal up to this date is \$2,725,504.10. 2. The total amount of interest on such advances to the 30th June last was \$794,028. 3. All of the interest above referred to has been paid. 4. The expenditure of the Harbor Commissioners for the calendar year 1887, apart from expenditure on capital account, was, according to the statements made by them to the Government, \$327,290. 5. Their net revenue for the same year, \$289,885. 6. They divide their expenditure as follows:—\$220,123 as applicable to the harbor, and \$107,187 as applicable to the channel. 7. The amount unexpended of the sums authorised, which the Government asks for authority to expend on the channel, is \$279,495.90. 8. The Harbor Commissioners estimate that it will take the whole of this amount and \$20,000 additional to deepen the channel to 27½ feet at low water, and that to straighten and widen it so as to make it easier of navigation, would cost say \$200,000 more.

QUEBEC HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIES asked, 1. What amount has been advanced by the Government to the the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for the purpose of constructing the Lévis Graving Dock, up to date? 2. What is the total amount of interest accrued thereon, and how much, if any, has been repaid the Government? 3. What amount has been paid towards the sinking fund? 4. What amount has been paid out of capital by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the Government for interest and sinking fund on the bonds deposited with the Finance Minister as security for advances made by the Government on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and the tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles? 5. What amount has been actually paid to the Government by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on their bonds?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 1. The amount advanced by the Government to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for

the purpose of constructing the Lévis Graving Docks, up to date, is \$838,000. 2. The simple interest thereon payable in advance from 17th December, 1878, to 19th April, 1888, amounts to \$204,454.32, of which no part has been paid. 3. Nothing has been paid towards the sinking fund on such advance. 4. The amount paid out as capital by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to the Government for interest and sinking fund, on the bonds deposited by them with the Finance Minister as security for advances made by the Government on account of harbor improvements in Quebec and a tidal dock at the mouth of the River St. Charles, is estimated at \$493,706.64. 5. The amount actually paid out of their revenue by the Quebec Harbor Commissioners for sinking fund on the last mentioned bonds, is, so far as can be ascertained, \$98,621.59.

CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION AT CINCINNATI.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Is it the intention of the Government that Canada should be represented at the Centennial Exposition to be held at Cincinnati, and opened 4th July next?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention of the Government to be represented at the Exhibition.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution, namely:—

That in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, the Governor in Council may raise by way of loan such sum or sums of money, not to exceed, in the whole, the sum of \$25,000,000, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion of Canada, and for the carrying on of the Public Works authorised by the Parliament of Canada; such sum or sums of money to be raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt, and the raising of loans authorised by Parliament, and the sum so raised hereunder to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. The rate of interest on any loans raised hereunder not to exceed four per cent. per annum.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS AND PAPERS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to enquire whether the papers to be placed on the Table of the House, with respect to the disallowance of railway charters in Manitoba, have been printed and will be distributed to members before the discussion on the resolutions is entered upon?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are pressing the printers to have the papers printed immediately, and no doubt they will be distributed without delay.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the Government also bring down papers with respect to disallowance in British Columbia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Were they asked at the same time?

Mr. LAURIER. Not so far as I am aware, but they would properly belong to the discussion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will bring them down as well.

Mr. McMULLEN. Up to the present time 92 orders have passed the House for returns since we met on 23rd February. Only 27 returns have been brought down. The Government have intimated their desire to have the business of the House closed in about two weeks, and the condition of business in the meantime, as evidenced by returns brought down, is in such a state that it is impossible for the Opposition to discharge their duties efficiently if they are

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

not supplied with the information asked. I moved a resolution asking for a return of fees paid to counsel in the case of the Queen vs. St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company, but the return has not yet been brought down. Out of eight orders I moved myself only one return has been brought down, that in connection with the Strathroy post office. Only three returns a week have been submitted. I should like to know whether the Government's intention is to furnish the Opposition with the information they have asked, or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The returns are being brought down as rapidly as they are prepared. Some of them require a great deal of work and they cannot be brought down at an earlier period. They are brought down each day as they are ready—I do not know whether they are three, four or five a week. I know I have brought down a number, as other Ministers have done. But the hon. gentleman may rest assured that our attention is given to this matter, that the returns are brought down as rapidly as they are ready, and orders for their immediate preparation have been given in the different departments. However, if the hon. gentleman will send me a memorandum of any particular return he requires, I will make special enquiry about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like the return in the case of the Queen vs. St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company; also the correspondence in relation to the establishment of a model farm in the North-West.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman will send me a list I will notify the different departments, because the Government are as earnest as hon. members in obtaining these returns as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a little unreasonable in the matter. I moved for a return three or four years and it took two years to bring it down—it was in relation to the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman may get the returns next year: he need not hurry.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 60) to amend chapter twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolutions adopted in Committee on Ways and Means (May 1st) were read a second time and concurred in.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) "An Act to amend chap. 33 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the duty of Customs."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) "An Act to amend chap. 34 of the Revised Statutes respecting Inland Revenue."

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADVERTISING COUNTERFEIT MONEY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 108) respecting the advertising of counterfeit money. He said: It may be somewhat useful to the House that I should make a short statement explaining the reason for introducing this Bill, because it is designed to put an end

to what has been a very great evil, and is a growing evil in Canada. For some years past persons in the United States who are known as "confidence men" have been in the practice of obtaining in the Mercantile Agencies lists of the names of persons who do business in different parts of Canada, and who are supposed to be of somewhat weak financial standing, and of addressing to those persons circulars in which they intimate to them that for very small sums of money they will furnish them counterfeit notes, either of the Dominion of Canada, or of the United States, and they are accustomed to send on the requisite specimens of the "goods," as they call them, which they are willing thus to sell. Those goods which they thus offer are described by various names. Generally they are called "green goods," or counterfeit notes, and sometimes they are called "cigars" and sometimes "green cigars." Various other cant names of expression are made use of which convey plainly enough to the person receiving the circular the intimation that if he sends his money he will get a supply of counterfeit notes. Although it has not been generally known that this practice prevails to any very great extent, the fact has been ascertained that every week from the city of New York thousands of those circulars are sent into Canada. The result being, that in many cases persons are induced to enter into a correspondence, and the correspondence is followed very frequently by personal negotiations on the part of our people with those confidence men. The plan which is then pursued is this: An applicant for those "green goods" so called goes to a place indicated in the circular and he is shown, for his inspection, a bundle of notes which are in most cases perfectly good and finds that they are of a description which can easily pass current. He pays his money for the bundle of notes which is supposed to be wrapt up in a satchel, to be given to him or to be left at a place where he can call for it. He finds, after he has paid his money and when he seeks to obtain his parcel or his satchel, that rubbish—either sawdust or blank paper—has been inserted in the parcel instead of the notes of which he saw samples. So generally has sawdust been used that the whole business is called under the name of the "sawdust circular business." The fact is that efforts have been made by the police authorities of New York to put a stop to these practices, but the ingenuity of those confidence men is shown by the dexterity with which the efforts of the police have been evaded from time to time. I may say that one of the practices by which the persons engaged in this kind of business attract attention and persuade the public that the notes which they introduce are notes that are easy of circulation, is by inserting from time to time in the American papers false accounts of bank note plates having been stolen from the Treasury, by which the public are given to understand that the production of apparently genuine notes is a very easy matter, and the "goods" as they call them are thereby advertised as being more like to appear genuine and easy of circulation. The business which I have referred to is carried on in many places with occasional variations, but I may say that in some cases the person to whom the circular is addressed sends his money—and generally speaking the remittances are not very large—in answer to the circular, expecting to receive in return counterfeit notes but he often receives no answer at all and the money is thus lost. It is a significant fact that the leading operators in this business in New York are many of them known to be worth from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and they send from week to week, as I have said before, thousands of those circulars into Canada. It has come to our knowledge within the last two years, that the business has been taken up in Canada, and that in two or three places in this Dominion the same operations are being pursued by swindlers of this description, who have come here for that purpose from the United States. A large number of letters which have been written by persons to whom circulars

were thus addressed are in my possession dated from various points in all the Provinces of the Dominion, and indicating the disposition on the part of persons to whom those circulars are addressed, to enter into the nefarious operations which the circular invites them to begin. One of those I may read as a specimen of hundreds. Many of them are from persons engaged in business and who are supposed to be not at all likely to engage in transactions of this kind. This letter is dated February 9th, of last year, and this person says:

"DEAR SIR,—I received your letter a few days ago, and am so busy that I could not attend until to-day.

"Please send me \$25 (twenty-five dollars) worth of the goods by return mail, with instructions how to sell them. I am trading with the country people a good deal in the run of a year.

"I mean business. Send the goods as soon as possible and I will send you a post office order by return mail."

This is only one of many hundreds such that are in our possession from various points in the Dominion. Some of these, I regret to say, are signed by persons holding very respectable positions, commercial and otherwise, some of them municipal officers, some of them justices of the peace, several of them public functionaries, from whom one would expect a very different line of business. I may state as an illustration of the extent to which these operations are carried in the United States, and the difficulty of detecting them, that a pamphlet has been issued in Washington on this subject, in which lists are given of the fictitious names which are used by persons engaged in this business. The way in which these lists get into the possession of the police authorities here is that the person engaged in sending these circulars, finds it necessary so often to change his address and his alias, that the letters very often miss him and go to the dead letter office, whence they are transferred to the hands of the police. At one part of this report, two pages closely printed are taken up with the aliases and changed addresses of one man who was engaged in this business; and the writer mentions that another notorious offender had 81 names and addresses, and that another party, whose right name is unknown, now has 136 different aliases. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that persons in Canada are engaged in these operations of sending out circulars as well as sending and receiving bogus money, it is proposed by this Bill to make both the sending of circulars and the receiving of the money criminal offences.

Mr. EDGAR. Can the hon. Minister tell us whether the present criminal law is not capable of reaching this class of offenders? Has it never been put into operation against them? Is entirely new legislation required? Perhaps he will also kindly tell us, as there seems to be reciprocity in this business, at any rate, between the United States and Canada, whether there is legislation on the subject on the other side.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think special legislation is required, especially to cover the offence of entering into an agreement. I may say that the Bill now before the House, is very like one which is being adopted in the State of New York. I think the New York Bill does not make it an offence to receive such goods, but otherwise it is similar.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 89) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 8, Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to move a substitute for this clause, making the electoral districts of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario, and Cariboo, in the Province of British Columbia, exceptions to the provision that the nomination of candidates at a general election shall be on a particular day.

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to substitute for this section the same provision that is contained in sub-section 2 of section 14 of the present Act, but limiting the provision to the electoral districts of Algoma and Cariboo. It changes the Bill in order to make exceptions of those two districts.

Mr. EDGAR. This only applies to general elections. Do the Government not think it would be well to provide that one and the same day should be fixed for bye-elections as well, when there are more than one?

Mr. THOMPSON. That suggestion, I think, is hardly applicable to the present section.

Mr. BARRON. I have an amendment to propose to the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice, and to which I referred slightly the other day. I think it is an amendment which must present itself favorably to the minds of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I think it is hardly right or proper that it should be in the power of the Executive, whether it be composed of hon. gentlemen on that side or on this, to bring on the elections when there are vacancies during a recess just when it suits their particular purpose, and perhaps in some cases bring them on rather hastily without due consideration to the interests and rights of the people in any electoral district, or in others so slowly that for some considerable length of time the constituency may be unrepresented. Now, in the amendment I intend proposing to the House, I have endeavored, as far as possible, to follow the spirit, if not the letter, of Imperial legislation, and hon. gentlemen in this House who seek to copy the English practice will be glad to know of that. I find that the practice in England in some respects is not unlike our own. There the Speaker acts upon the receipt of a writ to the effect that a member has been promoted to the House of Lords, or upon the certificate of a judge of an election being voided, or upon the certificate of any two members of a vacancy having occurred. There, under the statute of George IV, I find that a period of fourteen days was allowed to elapse, during which time the Speaker was required to act on receiving notice of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of any constituency. Now, under a subsequent and amending statute, 24-25 Vict.—and to this statute I would like to draw the attention of this House, because it shows the spirit of improving legislation in England—the period of fourteen days was shortened to a period of six days; and if any hon. gentleman will look at the Act, he will see that the preamble recites the fact that it is necessary to shorten the time in order to expedite the bringing on of elections. Well, under that statute the Speaker is required, as he is required with us, immediately after that delay, to issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Our statute provides also that the Speaker must issue his warrant “forthwith,” but in England I find the practice is to proceed as expeditiously as possible after the warrant reaches the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That gentleman is at once required, on receipt of the warrant, to issue the writ. In fact, so important is it that he should do so at once, that any neglect of this duty or any delay in the transmission of the writ to the returning officer is made a misdemeanor. Now, there is no such law as that here. As soon as a war-

Mr. THOMPSON.

rant here reaches the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, very serious delays, as we know, occur, so that I think the amendment I propose must present itself to the favorable consideration of hon. gentlemen in this House, who seek to copy as closely as possible the well established practice followed in the old country. Now, I will proceed to show the serious delays that have occurred here and the undesirability of continuing the practice which has heretofore existed; and I will ask the House to bear with me for a few moments while I show them the delays which have occurred in the issuing of writs in some particular cases, and I shall not go beyond this Parliament to seek for instances. In the case of Yarmouth, the judge certified to the Speaker on the 13th of August, 1887, but the writ did not issue until the 18th of October following. There was thus a delay, because I presume that when the judge certified to the Speaker, the latter complied with the provisions of the statute, which is said that he shall “forthwith”—because “forthwith” is the word used—issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I presume, therefore, that as soon as he received the judge's certificate, the Speaker acted upon it and issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. But, although the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the writ, as I presume he did as soon as the Speaker received the certificate from the judge, on the 13th August, 1887, the writ was not issued until the 17th October, 1887, or three months later. The delay, therefore, that took place was, no doubt, due to the Executive, in delaying the issue of the writ for a period of three months, and the election did not take place until the 18th November following. Thus, the people of the electoral district of Yarmouth were unrepresented in the Parliament for a period of four months. Now, take the case of Dorchester. In that case, the judge certified to the Speaker in August, 1887, but the writ was not issued until the 21st December following, being a delay of four months for which the hon. gentlemen opposite have to account. How was it that this period of four months elapsed after the warrant was issued by the Speaker to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before the writ was issued? And the election only took place on the 7th January, 1887. Thus there was a period of five months during which that constituency remained unrepresented. I think the Government should account for that delay. They should also account for the undue haste exhibited in the case of the Shelburne election. In that case, the judge certified on the 9th November, 1887, and the writ was dated on the 18th November following, so that only a period of nine days elapsed between the time when the Speaker received the certificate from the judge and the issuing of the writ. How is it there was only nine days delay in that case and a delay of five months in the case of Dorchester? The result was that the delay in the case of Shelburne between the time the judge certified to the Speaker and the time the election took place was only one month six days, whereas in the other two cases the delay was four months and five months respectively. Take the case of Gloucester, which is represented by the hon. the Postmaster General. In that case, there was still greater haste displayed, the judge having certified on the 5th October, 1887, and the writ having been issued on the 8th October, 1887, so that it took only three days for the judge's certificate to reach the Speaker and the certificate and the warrant of the Speaker to reach the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the time between the date of the judge's certificate and the election was only twenty-four days, as compared with four and five months in the first two cases I have given. Then, take the case of the county of Cumberland, in which only one month elapsed between the judge's certificate and the election. Take also the case of Haldimand. In that case the judge certified on the 15th October, 1887, and the writ was dated the 24th October, 1887, so that only nine days elapsed between the date of the judge's certi-

ficate and the issuing of the writ, and only 28 days altogether elapsed between the date of the judge's certificate and the election. Take the case of Victoria, N.S. The judge's certificate was dated the 7th October, 1887, and the writ was issued on the 28th October, showing a delay of only eleven days. And the election was held on the 21st November, 1887, thirty-four days thus elapsing between the date of the judge's certificate and the date of the election. Then, take the case of East Northumberland. The judge's certificate was dated on the 16th November, 1887. The writ was issued very hastily, it was issued within twelve days, on the 28th November, and the election was held on the 22nd December, 1887, only thirty-six days elapsing. In the case of Prince Edward county, the certificate of the judge was dated the 9th February, 1888, the writ was issued on the 22nd February, 1888, thirteen days elapsing between the judge's certificate and the date of the writ, and the election was held on the 10th March, that is, thirty days after the judge's certificate. In West Middlesex, the judge's certificate was dated the 20th February, 1888, and it only took two days for that certificate to come to Ottawa by post in order to reach the Speaker's hands, and for the Speaker to issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue his writ for a new election; whereas, in the case of Yarmouth it took three months, and in the case of Dorchester, four months. Then, take the case of L'Assomption. The judge's certificate was dated the 3rd March, 1888, and the writ was issued on the 9th March, six days only elapsing, and the election took place on the 3rd April, 1888, only thirty days elapsing between the date of the judge's certificate and the election. Now, in those cases where the time has been short, it is a very peculiar coincidence that they are electoral districts returning members to support the Government; but, in those cases where great and serious delays have taken place, it is another peculiar coincidence that those are constituencies which send members here to support my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). If such delay is possible in one case, and such extraordinary haste is used in another case, it is evident that there should be some amendment, and the amendment which I ask the House to adopt is the following:—

In the case of a vacancy happening in the House of Commons by the death of any member, or by a member accepting any office, or by a member resigning his seat, or by reason of the seat of any member being declared void under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act (except as in the next succeeding section is provided for), then and in every such case, the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall have, according to law, addressed his or their warrant, as the case may be, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ to fill the vacancy, and in the other electoral districts of Canada be within twenty days after the day when the Speaker or any two members shall as aforesaid have so addressed his or their warrant.

The committee will see that that section provides for the case of all vacancies arising when the House is not in Session. It provides for the two cases, where the Speaker is required to issue his warrant, or, in the case of his absence or sickness, or when there is no Speaker, for two members to address a warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is only in cases where the writ has to be issued by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on receipt of the Speaker's warrant, but there are cases where a writ has to be issued on the order of the House, and that section, if it went no further, would not deal with the cases where the writ has to be issued on the order of the House. Therefore, I have to ask the committee to adopt another section which I propose shall come immediately afterwards, in order to meet such cases as I have spoken about. Let me, for a moment, speak of the case of Russell, and the case of Kent, in order

to show how delays have occurred, and how necessary it is to avoid these delays hereafter in any electoral district. In Russell, the Speaker issued his warrant before the 23rd February, 1888, or he so informed the House. The writ was issued on the 5th April. But, on the 23rd March, the House had ordered the writ to issue on the motion of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). It took eight days after this House ordered the writ to issue for the writ to be issued. Why was that delay? Hon. gentlemen sometimes say that they do not know who is to be the returning officer. We could very easily get over that difficulty if the law was altered so as to get permanent returning officers, but surely, when this House orders a writ to issue, it cannot be said that it takes eight days to communicate with the candidate, because I believe that is what they do, as shown by their history in the past, and to find who should be the returning officer. At all events, in Russell it took eight days to issue the writ after the House had ordered that the writ should issue. In Kent we find the same thing. On the 28th February, the House passed a resolution that the report of Mr. Justice Osler should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It took a month for that committee to report to the House, and what was done in that case? That is a delay which should not be allowed to occur again, especially when the House is sitting and the constituency is therefore deprived of representation. However, the committee did report, and the writ was ordered to be issued, but in that case it took ten days for the writ to issue. Kent is not so far away that the Government could not communicate with the gentleman who was running in the Conservative interest, and find out who was to be his returning officer, in less time than that, but it required ten days before that writ was issued. In the case of Russell, the order of this House was practically disobeyed for eight days, and in the case of Kent it was disobeyed for ten days. In order to meet a case of that kind, I propose to ask the committee to adopt this clause:

"When a new writ for an election has to issue upon the order of the House of Commons, then and in every such case the day for the nomination of candidates shall, in the electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and in the electoral district of Algoma in the Province of Ontario, and in those of Gaspé and Chicoutimi and Saguenay in the Province of Quebec, be within thirty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have ordered the writ so to issue, and, in the other electoral districts of Canada, shall be within twenty days after the day when the House of Commons shall have so ordered the writ to issue.

I think, if these amendments are adopted by this committee, and by the House, they will be in the general interest of the entire country.

MR. THOMPSON. I am not prepared to say that the hon. member's suggestions may not have a good deal of merit, and that some measure might perhaps be devised to meet what he thinks is an uncertainty as to the time when the writ should issue and the elections should be held; but I do not think he has made out a case for the amendment which he has read. I understand his objection to be, in regard to the elections which have taken place since the general election, that undue delay has taken place in the issue of the writ and the holding of the elections, and his object is to prevent a recurrence of that delay. The hon. gentleman cited, irrespective of the two cases dealt with by the House, eleven cases of bye-elections and in nine of them he had rather to complain of precipitation than of delay. In the cases of Yarmouth and Dorchester, in both of which the vacancy occurred long before there was any probability of a Session of Parliament, he complained of the delay of four months in one case and three months in the other. In the other nine cases the hon. gentleman will remember the statement that in Shelburne there was a delay of but nine days; in Colchester, less than a month's delay; in Cumberland, a month; Haldimand, nine days; Victoria, eleven days; East Northumberland, twelve days, Prince Edward, thirteen

days; West Middlesex, two days; L'Assomption, six days. If there was any other, I missed it from not hearing the hon. gentleman. But his statement to the House practically is this, that out of eleven cases with which the Government have had to deal, in nine of them they pursued a course that his amendment would direct us to pursue, and in the other two cases, the vacancies occurred at a time when there was no occasion at all for any haste in holding the elections. The hon. gentleman has stated that it seems desirable to follow the English practice upon this subject, but I think he has not quoted to the House any English statute bearing upon this subject, of the kind which he asks us to adopt. I think there are very good reasons why such a statute does not exist in England, and why it should not be adopted here. One reason appears to me to be this, that if we make the statute rigid, that the election must take place within that period, then the effect of such an enactment is to invalidate the election which does not take place within that period; in other words, to come down to details, that the Speaker should issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and if any misadventure should occur, or any miscarriage, through death of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or his neglect, or his illness, or through failure of the postal connection, or through neglect of the returning officer, the election should not take place, or the nomination should not take place precisely within the twenty days which the hon. gentleman points out, then no election can take place. If the hon. gentleman does not make it as rigid as that, he has to leave the matter still in the hands of the Government, subject, of course, to the responsibility which the Government has to this House. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be unwise to make the change, and that the hon. gentleman has not made out a case by the illustrations which he has cited.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, in arguing against the proposition of my hon. friend, has also argued against the principles of the Bill. The same accidents which he says are possible in the cases referred to, in the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, might take place at a general election, and yet we do not refuse to provide for holding all the elections over the country on the same day, and the nominations on the same day, in a general election, because such misadventures may happen. The hon. gentleman says that we have not followed the plan of the English statute. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman seems to overlook the difference between our circumstances and those of the people of England. In the United Kingdom, the Government do not appoint the returning officers, the returning officers are named in the statute; the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is not controlled or interfered with by the Government that issue the writs. There is a duty imposed upon him by law, and that duty he is called upon to discharge. The hon. gentleman, therefore, will see that the difference between the position of the matter in England and this country arises largely from the action of the Government here in repealing the law which names certain parties as returning officers. The hon. gentleman will also see that the Government have no more right to name returning officers, and to interfere with the freedom of the people in holding an election, than they have to name for the people a candidate whom they shall be called upon to elect. There was a period in the history of England when the Crown named the candidates, and called upon the electors in various parts of the United Kingdom to support the candidates so named. But that is not the law or practice in the United Kingdom at the present time, and it ought not to be the law or the practice here. The hon. gentleman says my hon. friend has not made out a case. Why, my hon. friend pointed out two cases where the

Mr. THOMPSON.

writs were delayed for upwards of three months. Now he says that there are only two cases out of some ten or twelve. Why, two cases out of ten or twelve are a very large percentage, quite sufficient to influence the constitution of this House. There is no more reason for the hon. gentleman retaining the power that he possesses under the law, to perpetuate an abuse, or create an abuse which did not before exist, than there is to continue the old abuse of non-simultaneous elections. Sir, they have not simultaneous elections in England at the present time. And why not? Because no abuse has ever grown up. The writs are issued as a matter of course, after Parliament is dissolved. The Crown does not interfere, and can exercise no control over the issue of those writs. No Minister would for a moment be permitted to interfere with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the discharge of his duties. Those writs are issued as a matter of course. The elections where the Government is likely to be opposed are just as likely to come on first as those where the Government are likely to be successful in carrying the constituency. So there being no abuse, no change has taken place in the law. Why were elections made simultaneous here? Because the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government used the powers of the Crown in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, Sir.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says no, but I remember very well when the hon. gentleman, in a general election, held some elections in July and others nearly the first of October. I remember in 1867, when some elections took place in July, and my own election took place on the 17th November, and the elections in Nova Scotia took place on the 19th, when there was no supporter of the Government, except the hon. member who is now Minister of Finance, returned from the Province to support the Administration. I want to know why that was not an abuse? I want to know why, in 1872, when the general election was spread over more than two months, there was nothing to complain of? I want to know why it was not this abuse of the authority of the Crown, this interference with the liberty of the people in the choice of representatives, that did not lead to the demand for simultaneous elections? There can be no doubt whatever on that point, and the hon. gentlemen, driven from their own ground, now undertake to perpetuate an abuse, or create an abuse, of another sort. And why is it? Why, that, although the law provides that the warrant of the Speaker shall issue forthwith under certain circumstances, that a writ shall issue immediately by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the hon. gentleman undertakes to render that law nugatory and of no force by the usurpation of the power to appoint returning officers. If the hon. gentleman refuses to appoint a returning officer, of course it is impossible for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to discharge his duty. The House may order the writ to issue, but there is nobody to whom that writ can issue, for the Government have usurped control of the appointments, and it is impossible for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to discharge his duties. There has been an abuse in that respect. We have had an instance in Kent. Why did the hon. gentleman refer that matter with regard to the election in Kent, and the report of the judge, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? It was done to secure delay, it was to prevent the writ being issued. They said: We must have the evidence published, we want to know what the case is. I told them that the evidence did not indicate the views expressed by the judge, and the Minister of Justice found it so. They said: We want to know what the evidence is, and the committee must judge. A whole month was consumed in printing the evidence. Then the hon. gentleman said: This committee has no right to review the evidence,

and criticise the decision of the judge; they would be sitting in review as an appellate court and over-riding the decision of the judge, and therefore we have no right to look at the evidence and estimate the accuracy or inaccuracy of the judge's conclusion. We must accept his report as a matter of course, as perfectly correct. So the position was taken that while a month was wasted in getting the evidence printed it was not to be looked at when printed. And then the matter came before the House. What then happened? The House ordered the writ to issue forthwith. Was that order obeyed? No. And why not? Because the First Minister and his colleagues, having repealed the law which named the returning officer, as he is named in England, usurped the power to appoint a returning officer to discharge the trust that the law had imposed on them; they failed to advise His Excellency as was their duty to do. When the House and the law says the writ shall issue forthwith, what right has the hon. gentleman to neglect to advise His Excellency to make the appointment at once? The law was set at defiance. Ten days were wasted. There was further procrastination; not until two months had elapsed from the date the vacancy was reported to the House was the writ issued. Yet the hon. gentleman says there is no abuse. Why, there were three months and a half in Yarmouth, four months in Dorchester, and six weeks in Kent, of delay. This is a monstrous condition of things. If the hon. gentleman persists in retaining the power to appoint the returning officer, he should indicate the individual for the five years, or for the continuance of the Parliament, and should appoint a returning officer for a Parliament. If such a course were followed there would be someone to whom the writ could issue. Why should there be Government interference at every turn in every election? The hon. gentleman knows that there has been interference; that there is a meddlesome exercise at every election held; he knows the people are wearied and disgusted with the delay, and that the election in Kent to-day is taking place at a time when every farmer is busily occupied with his spring work. The convenience of the public interests are as nothing in the estimation of the Government, so long as they can manipulate a constituency and use the power they possess for the purpose of party interest. If the Government do not want to accept the amendment of my hon. friend, let the Minister of Justice amend the Bill so as to secure the nomination by the Government of a returning officer during the continuance of the Parliament, and then there can be no meddlesome interference, then the writ will issue as a matter of course in obedience to the law to the party so indicated; but the Government now set the law at defiance. The abuses committed by Charles I, for which he lost his head, were not grosser than those that are being committed by the Government of the country to-day. If the people of this country had not been degraded and debauched by the conduct of the Administration, if their political independence had not been sacrificed by the conduct of the Government, they would no more tolerate such proceedings than the people of England would tolerate the interference of the Crown in matters which concern public affairs. The First Minister knows that he has prevented the free expression of public opinion at the general election from the course taken; he knows that he has prevented the free expression of public opinion in the constituencies where elections have been held since the general elections took place, and that system is being persisted in by the Government setting the law at defiance and refusing to advise the Crown immediately in order that the law itself may be obeyed. My hon. friend made out a strong case in favor of the amendment he has proposed, and the Minister of Justice has not at all answered the objections he made to the law as it now stands. New abuses are being perpetrated, and

we seek to have such an amendment to the law as will tie the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite and prevent those abuses being repeated. The proposition is a reasonable one, and the Minister of Justice, with his sense of justice, must be satisfied that there are abuses which should be corrected, and which I do not believe he is disposed to allow if he were in the position to take his own course.

Mr. THOMPSON. I listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks with a great deal of interest and pleasure, but my pleasure would have been increased if he had spoken to the Bill. Let me offer a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman's remarks on a matter which is not referred to in the Bill, the Kent election case, in regard to which the hon. gentleman appears to have utterly forgotten the leading facts on which he based his comments. It is not a fact that the printing of the evidence for the committee occupied one month. The committee were instructed by the resolution of the House to advise the House what course ought to be pursued in view of the report which the learned judge made upon that case. I hold in my hand the evidence on which the committee were asked to advise this House. It occupies 129 closely printed pages, and when the committee met and that evidence was in the hands of the chairman, not a member of the committee had seen it. I admit the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was sagacious enough to be able to come to a resolution as to what advice should be tendered to this House, without reading the evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I had read it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I had not and there were several other members who were in no better position, and they desired before passing judgment to see the evidence. I asked under those circumstances that the evidence be printed, for there was no other way of getting it into the hands of the committee, and instead of the printing taking a month, I venture to say, although I am speaking from recollection, it did not take six days.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think one month was consumed from the time of the reference to the committee until they made their report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Look at the date.

Mr. THOMPSON. The second observation I have to make with respect to the delay is that the decision of the committee in that case was such that delay was inevitable. The decision of the committee was, in view of the report the learned judge had made, that the time which had elapsed without representation of that constituency was sufficient. So that if the committee had reported earlier they would, under any circumstances, have advised a delay in the issue of the writ. The hon. gentleman's next comment on the Kent election case was that we had no right to hold the election to-day, when every farmer was busy with his crops—perhaps a very serious inconvenience, perhaps not a greater inconvenience than holding an election at a time of year when in that county not one-fifth of the voters could go to the polls on account of the condition of the roads. But in any case let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment which he supports proposes a fixed date for the election, which cannot be averted or changed, notwithstanding the greatest inconvenience might arise to the community. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's argument with reference to the Kent election case. The hon. gentleman's next argument in favor of the amendment was that the Government have no right to appoint a returning officer at all, yet the amendment does not contain one syllable on that subject, it simply fixes the day within which the election, if an elec-

tion is to take place, must take place, and it leaves the question of returning officers precisely as it is under the present law. Now, as I have said, if the election does not take place within that period we have to wait, not till after the twenty or thirty days elapsed in some of those cases; not even for the three or four months which seems to have been an intolerable delay by some of my friends opposite; but we have to wait until Parliament shall pass a statute to meet those special cases. The hon. gentleman told me that I was arguing against my own Bill in stating the jeopardy of allowing an election to be entirely defeated by fixing a time within which delays take place. My Bill is entirely silent upon that subject. It has nothing to do with it whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not mention the subject from beginning to end. The Elector Act which I am amending, the hon. gentleman sees, contains provisions with reference to a general election which might be jeopardized, only in relation to that part of it which requires an election to take place on one and the same day throughout the Dominion. And it is only subject to the jeopardies which exist between the issue of the writ and its reaching the hands of the returning officer. Within a certain number of days after he receives the writ he is to have the election, but the amendment proposes that besides that delay and jeopardy arising from the mail, if there should be any miscarriage between the time the warrant issues and the writ issues, the election shall be defeated when it is impossible to hold it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago, when he was addressing this House in answer to my friend behind me from Victoria (Mr. Barron), that he had made no case, because out of some ten or eleven bye-elections which had taken place delay had only occurred in the cases of Dorchester and Yarmouth and, that in every other instance the writ had issued without delay. But as there has been delay in two cases there might have been delay in all the other cases as well, and that is exactly what my hon. friend wants to prevent. Why should there be any delay at all in those cases and no delay in the other nine cases. At the present time there is no rule whatever. The writ may be issued at once as soon as the vacancy occurs, or it may be deferred for two or three months. There is only one rule as far as I can understand, and that rule has been put into practice, namely, the convenience of the Government. If it suits the convenience of the Government to withhold a writ it is withheld, and if it suits their convenience to issue it at once it is issued at once. Take the case of Dorchester, for instance. It is well known that they went around from door to door and knocked at this man's door and at that man's door asking if any one would be willing to sacrifice himself on the altar of his party. They found no victim; they waited two or three months and at last they had to let the election go by default and let my hon. friend the present member for Dorchester be elected by acclamation. In the county of Yarmouth they did the same thing, but they found a victim there to sacrifice himself and he was defeated. In the other cases when they found the chances were good, and the result proved their chances were good, they issued the writs immediately. My hon. friend's object is that there should not be a rule in an election for the convenience of the Government, but a rule which would act uniformly to the advantage of the Government or the Opposition, or to the detriment of one or the other. What reason can there be against this? Why not have the law declare that the writ shall issue on a reasonable delay and that there will be no undue favor on one side or the other. The hon. gentleman stated that the amendment of my hon. friend did not contemplate the appointing of returning officers, but the Government have told us again and again that they will keep in their hands

Mr. THOMPSON.

the choice of the returning officers and that they will not trust the present officials, who by the nature of their office ought to be returning officers; that they will not trust the registrars or sheriff, because, as was stated some time ago by the Prime Minister, those men being appointed by a hostile Government might be hostile to the Government of the day. I think it is a very bad reason, but we cannot help it, and as it is so we must stand it. I appeal to the sense of justice (if there is any left on the other side), when they have to deal with friend and foe, why not have a uniform law? Why not declare the writ shall issue within a reasonable time? It may be that in one case it would work injuriously to the Government and that in another it would work in their favor, but at all events it would be even justice to all. You can provide for permanent returning officers, when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery will know at once to whom he should direct his writ, and my hon. friend will be happy to withdraw his amendment if you do that. I do not see any better rule to have uniform justice than the one proposed in the amendment before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says there is no such provision in his Bill by which accidents such as he hypothetically stated might arise, in the case of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend being adopted. Why, Sir, the very first clause of his Bill gives rise to the same possibility of misadventure. The Bill says:

"The Governor General shall fix the day for the nomination of the candidates at the election, and shall, at every general election, fix one and the same day for the nomination of candidates in all the electoral districts."

What if the writ should go astray? What if, before the writ reaches Cariboo or some other district, it should be lost? There is the same possibility of misadventure in that case as there is in the case where the time is limited. The time always has been limited. You say all the writs shall be returned before a certain day, when the writs are issued. There is such a provision, and you can make the time long or short, as the law stands now, within which the writs may be returned. Now, the objection of the hon. gentleman in that respect is really no objection at all. Does the hon. gentleman refer to cases in which this power that the Government holds in its hands has been abused? He says there are but two instances mentioned by my hon. friend. I draw his attention to another, the case of the Kent election. The hon. gentleman says there was no delay in the Kent election. The hon. gentleman forgets that a long time elapsed from the time that election was reported and when the evidence was printed. My complaint was this, and I have had sufficient to show that the reason for asking that that evidence should be printed was not a genuine reason, and was not the reason which influenced the Government and their friends in asking that the evidence should be printed. I have stated that the hon. gentleman himself, after that evidence was printed, refused to consider the evidence because he said we were bound by the decision of the judge and we could not go into the question at all, as to whether there had or had not been such corrupt practices as the judge reported. Why, Sir, if we were not at liberty to enquire into that fact there was no object in having that evidence before us, and yet there was a delay of nearly a month in getting that evidence printed. When it was printed the hon. gentleman refused to act upon it, and refused to consider it. When the report was made to this House and it was ordered that a writ should be issued there was still a further delay of ten days, because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could find nobody into whose hands that writ could be delivered. The statute says that the writ shall issue forthwith, and yet the Government nullified the provisions of the statute by refusing to name the returning officer. There are two ways in which that difficulty can be got over, that is

to accept the amendment of my hon. friend, or let the Government name a returning officer during the continuance of Parliament in every constituency throughout the country. They have named returning officers at last election. Why do they not say: These parties shall be the returning officers until this Parliament is dissolved, and then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery can issue his writ to that person without the interference of the Government at all. We have pointed out again and again on this side of the House that in England the Crown never interferes with the matter of the appointment of a returning officer, or never interferes with the issue of the writ. The Clerk in England does his duty, as he has sworn to discharge his duty; and as he is not allowed to do his duty, as he has sworn to discharge it, in this country in consequence of the improper interference or negligence of the Government in advising His Excellency to appoint the returning officer. Now let the Government name a returning officer during the continuance of a Parliament, and then the law may be complied with. Then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may issue the writ as the law says he shall. While you agree to such a statute, you render it unworkable by reserving to yourself a dispensing power, such a power as one King in England lost his head for pretending to. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say it is a gross abuse of the power he possesses; I say it is contrary to the obligation into which he has entered as an adviser of His Excellency the Governor General. Did he not swear to give His Excellency proper and true advice, to carry out the law of the land as it was intended by Parliament it should be carried out; and is it not violating the spirit of that law which says that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall issue the writ forthwith when he refuses to name the man to whom that writ can be issued? Why did you not advise His Excellency to appoint the returning officer the moment Parliament gave the order? We know very well why it was not done—because the hon. gentleman knows on whom he relies. He knows that those who assisted him to put that Act on the Statute-book are ready to wink at the misconduct of the Government on this question; and when we propose an amendment to the law to carry out the purpose of Parliament, he seeks to defeat that proposition, not because it is not reasonable or will not have the effect of securing a fair and just administration of the law, but because it will take away from him the power which he has abused, both in advising His Excellency and in disregarding the order of the House.

Mr. BARRON. The objection made by the hon. Minister of Justice to my proposed amendment is that delays might occur which would render it nugatory. That objection applies as much to his Bill as to my proposition. But the hon. gentleman could not have read the statute which he proposes to amend, for section 15 of it provides:—

“Whenever from unforeseen accident, delays, or otherwise, the proclamation hereinafter mentioned cannot be posted up so as to leave the required delay between the posting up of the proclamation and the nomination day, or whenever any candidate dies after being nominated and before the close of the polls, the returning officer may fix another day for the nomination of candidates.”

That section will still be in force, and if there is any such occasion as the hon. Minister pointed out, the election can still be carried on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) improved or strengthened his argument by his violence of language. It is very remarkable that whenever we are concerned with the franchise or the appointment of returning officers, he is so strong in his opinion that he threatens us with losing our heads; but when he speaks so strongly, I think he has lost his head already. It is a new reading of history that

Charles the First lost his head because a writ was delayed twenty days. The hon. gentleman says the Government have usurped the power of appointing returning officers. Well, it happens that the Government are authorised to appoint returning officers by the law of the land; it happens that it is a duty forced upon the Government by the law of the land, and they would be guilty of breaking their oath if they did not appoint the returning officers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you do not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do recommend the appointment of the returning officers to His Excellency, and His Excellency has been pleased to appoint the returning officers that we recommend in carrying out the law of the land. But it seems to me that it answers no good purpose to enter into a general discussion as to whether the law was right or wrong with respect to the appointment of returning officers on this occasion, or the general principles under which elections are carried on. Now, if the hon. gentleman is anxious to alter the law, let him prepare a Bill and introduce it, and we will discuss it. It is too late this year to discuss it, but there will be four years before a general election, and the hon. gentleman who moves this amendment can make it a portion of that Bill. Meanwhile, I think the hon. gentleman should allow this Bill to go through. The hon. Minister of Justice says that he is not prepared to accept this amendment or to delay his measure for the purpose of making it a portion of it. I think the hon. gentleman, having expressed his views, had better reserve his amendment to be a portion of an Election Act which the hon. gentleman can bring down next Session.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the reason of the delay in the two cases of Kent and Russell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is especially my duty as First Minister to look after the election lists.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Oh, yes, it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether my hon. friend interfered when he was First Minister. Perhaps my hon. friend thinks it was his duty; it is not mine.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not interfere, but I saw that the law was carried out. You did the reverse.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the law provides that the writ shall issue forthwith. Everybody knows that the writ has not issued forthwith in a great many cases, for various reasons, and therefore the law is not obeyed. It is a matter of notoriety that in the case of the city of St. John, when its representation was vacated by the decease of my friend, the late Mr. Burpee, five months were allowed to elapse before that vacancy was filled, although the law provides that when the Speaker is notified of a vacancy, the writ should be issued forthwith to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and it is after the writ is in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that these delays occur. Then, there are the cases of Haldimand and Chambly. In 1886, when it was desired to test the popular pulse, various reasons were given for delaying the election in Haldimand; it was impossible to have that election until the new voters' lists came into play, and certain serfs of the Crown should be included in it. But, although that was the case in Haldimand, the election in Chambly was hurried on before the new lists were prepared. It seems to me that where accidents of that kind occur, there is the greatest abuse—or if the hon. gentleman objects to that term, there is a remarkable irregularity, to say the least, in the course the Government have seen fit to pursue under an Act, which, as I understand, it, was intended to secure the im-

mediate filling of vacancies, and it was with the same object that my hon. friend's motion was proposed.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that this is quite an important question. The only objection the hon. Minister of Justice has offered to the amendment is that by some accident the writ might not arrive in time; but it has been pointed out that section 15 provides for such an occurrence, and, as the hon. member for Bothwell has pointed out, that may occur in the case of a general election. Now, it seems to me the spirit of the Act requires that as soon as the Speaker is notified of any vacancy, according to law, he should at once issue his warrant, so that the vacancy may be filled up. The instant the warrant passes to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the Government take hold of it, and, under the present system, can delay the election as long as they please. My hon. friend who moved the amendment has not gone beyond the present House, but in 1885, in the case referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, the warrant of the Speaker was in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 12th July, 1885. On the 16th July, 1885, enquiry was made in the House of the Government as to whether the writ was issued in that case, and the only answer that the hon. Minister gave was that he would enquire about it, and he was enquiring nearly three months before he decided to issue the writ. It was nearly the end of September before the writ was issued. When, however, a vacancy occurred in the city of St. John, owing to the acceptance of office on the 30th October by the present Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, the writ was issued on that same day for the election in that constituency. It seems to me that the writ should issue within a certain specified time, say twenty days, as named by my hon. friend, after notice being received by the Speaker of a vacancy having occurred or of an election having been voided. Surely the Government could, without difficulty, appoint a returning officer in that time, and they would then carry out the spirit of the Act. We find that in one case the Government were able to name a returning officer within two days, and, therefore, it may be presumed that a delay of twenty days would be ample time for a similar purpose. In that case, there could be uniformity, whereas to-day the Government, when it suits them, may delay the election for an indefinite period, as they did in the two flagrant cases of Yarmouth and Dorchester. The hon. the Minister of Justice says that there was no Session of Parliament in the case of Chambly before the election took place, and that, therefore, the election took place in ample time. But in that case the election was held in July when there was no prospect of any Parliament being held until the following winter; and although the Franchise Act had been passed, the Government did not wait for the electoral list to be revised, but held the election in July, despite the fact, if the contention of the hon. the Minister of Justice is right, that there was not the slightest necessity to do so, because there was no probability of any Session of Parliament being held for some months. It seems to me that in justice to the electoral districts, and to carry out the spirit of the Act, there should be no delay on the part of the Speaker issuing his warrant and at once putting the machinery in motion for the purpose of having an election. Let a reasonable delay be given, and then the responsibility will fall on the Government, and surely, judging from past experience, there ought to be no difficulty in the Government carrying out their duty within the delay suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. THOMPSON. The objection now is that in Chambly the writs were issued too soon.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Not so.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is really very difficult to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. In most cases, they complain of Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

the delay being too long, but now they change their tune; and, after first taunting us with undue delay, they complain of too much haste. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that this amendment would have compelled the election to be held in Chambly at once, contrary to the argument which my hon. friend has just presented that the Government ought in such a case to wait until the electoral lists were revised. I would just say a word to the hon. member for Bothwell with regard to my contention as to the effect of the evidence in the case of the county of Kent, because I am sure, had he spoken of the matter when it was fresh in his memory, he would not have said that my contention that we should wait for the printing of the evidence was insincere, in view of the fact that when the evidence was printed I held that the finding of the judge was conclusive and could not be reversed by this House. My contention was that we had no right to say from the evidence that the judge's finding was wrong, but that we were bound to read the evidence in order to be in a position to advise the House as to whether the corrupt practices which the judge said had prevailed in the election for that county were of so flagrant a nature that we should disfranchise the constituency. We did refer to the evidence for the purpose of making the report which we made to the House; and if we had not reviewed it, we could not have conscientiously come to the conclusion we did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman certainly has forgotten the discussion that took place and a portion of his own report. He proposed that we should declare that the constituency had been sufficiently punished by being deprived for a time of representation in this House. I pointed out that the evidence disclosed the fact that the constituency did not deserve to be punished at all, and the hon. gentleman's contentions was that the judge having said there was no reason to believe corrupt practices had extensively prevailed in that constituency, we were bound to accept that statement as true, no matter what the evidence might show. That was the position of the hon. gentleman, and that was his justification for putting that provision in the report, and refusing to accept any amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have said that was my contention, and I say again we are not at liberty to refer to the evidence in an election case for the purpose of revising the decision of the judge, but can only refer to it for the purpose of advising the House whether the corrupt practices that prevailed, prevailed to such an extent as to justify steps to be taken to disfranchise the constituency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not meet my statement squarely. I do not say that we should sit in judgment and review the decision of the judge, but the hon. gentleman embraced in his report the inferential statement that the constituency was corrupt and deserved punishment, but that it had been sufficiently punished by the delay that had already occurred in its representation; and when I pointed out to him that there was not a tittle of evidence to show that the constituency deserved punishment, he said we had no right to look at the evidence in that matter, but to look only at the report of the judge. That was the position he took. Therefore, it was not the evidence that the hon. gentleman was examining in order to make his report, but it was the decision of the judge that the House had before the evidence was printed at all. The hon. gentleman says we are hard to please on this side. He says that we complain about the haste in issuing the writ in Chambly and the delay in issuing it in Haldimand. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the circumstances connected with those elections. The late member for Haldimand died while Parliament was in session, and it was proposed here that the writ should issue. The Speaker issued his warrant, if I remember rightly, and the hon. gentleman, when we asked him why the writ did not issue, de-

clared that there was no necessity for any hasty, that the new voters' lists were being prepared, and that it would be wrong to hold the election before that list was completed. Parliament he said, had by its legislation already declared that the existing voters' list was imperfect, it had altered the qualification of electors, and we must wait for the new list. That was the declaration the first Minister made on behalf of the Government. The Government set the provision of the law at defiance, and justified their course in that matter on the ground that a new voters' list was being prepared, and that, until that list was prepared, there ought not to be an election. That was the hon. gentleman's position. It was either right or it was not right. Some two or three months later, there was a vacancy in Chambly, and the hon. gentleman disregarded the rule which had been laid down in the case of Haldimand, and ordered a new writ to issue at a time when the old voters' list was the only one under which it could take place. Both these cases occurred at the same period of time, and what we are now calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to is the fact that there was one rule and policy adopted in the county of Chambly and another rule and policy in the county of Haldimand. Both of these could not have been right. One or the other rule should have been adhered to, and we now propose to make such a change that the discretionary power the Government possess and have abused as has been shown very clearly, should no longer be left in their hands, and I think it is clear that it ought not to be left in their hands, and I think we are not very hard to please. We point out what the abuse is, and what the remedy is, and we do not want the abuse which occurred in Chambly or the abuse which occurred in Haldimand to be repeated. We wish to see the law amended and made what it ought to be, so that justice may be done and that, when elections are held, they may fairly reflect the public opinion of the constituency.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice thought I complained in regard to the election in Chambly. He said that the reason why the elections in Yarmouth and Dorchester were delayed was that there was no Session of Parliament at the time, and there was no necessity for holding an election, but the election in Chambly was held in July, the vacancy having occurred at about the same time as that in Dorchester, but the Government issued the writ in the first case and not in the other.

Mr. THOMPSON. My argument was not that an election should not be held in summer, but that there was no ground for complaint if it was not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Surely, if the Minister of Justice will not accept this amendment on any other grounds he will when he sees how it must distress the Finance Minister to witness this lack of fixity of purpose on the part of his colleagues.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not seen it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely the hon. gentleman will understand that, when a certain rule was adopted in regard to Chambly, and an entirely different rule prevailed in Haldimand, we had good reason to propose a change. If there was ever any case in which the power and authority of the Government were abused for a party advantage, it was in the different treatment they accorded to Chambly and Haldimand.

Amendment (Mr. Barron) negatived.

On section 7,

Mr. EDGAR. That is the section which was allowed to stand. Is it not proposed to make any alteration in that?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. The reason it is allowed to stand is, as I said the other day, because I thought part of the legislation regarding the qualification of farmers'

sons and owners' sons, was in the Franchise Act, and I think it is.

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in order to make it clear that there should be no reference to appeals for the purpose of counting the ballots, unless the list of certificates of copies could not be obtained.

On sub-section 3, of section 13,

Mr. THOMPSON. This was allowed to stand at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, who thought there should be a trial by the indictment.

Mr. LAURIER. I objected to that section because I thought it was leaving too great powers in the hands of the justices of the peace. As a rule, without any offence to justices of the peace, I would not be disposed to trust them with these very large powers. I believe it would be better to follow the spirit of the Act, and to make the offence punishable as all other offences are punishable under the Act.

Mr. BARRON. It is quite clear that under that section there is no right of appeal whatsoever.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was going to suggest that there is a Bill relating to summary convictions before the House, and in it I will endeavor to provide for an appeal in such cases.

Mr. AMYOT. I beg to move in amendment to this Bill the Bill which I introduced some time ago, Bill No. 2. It is as follows:—

Paragraph (b) of section nine of "*Dominion Controverted Elections Act*," is hereby amended by striking out the following words after the word "days" in the second line of the said paragraph: "after the day of publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the receipt of the return of the writ of election by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery," and substituting the following: "after the day fixed for the nomination, in case the candidate or candidates have been declared elected on that day, and in other cases thirty days after the polling day."

My object is to make uniform the delays in contestations, 30 days after nomination day, when the election is by acclamation, and 30 days after polling day when there has been an election. I do not think there can be any objection to this. I do not want to discuss the matter, as the House is fully informed of the facts.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will see on reflection that his Bill is not a safe one. I will read paragraph (b) of section 9 which he proposes to amend:

"The petition must be presented not later than 30 days after the day of publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the receipt of the return of the writ of the election by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

Striking out those words and saying:

"After the day fixed for the nomination, in case the candidate or candidates have been declared elected on that day, and in other cases 30 days after polling day."

Now, it seems to me, from the examination I have given the hon. gentleman's Bill, that if the returning officer, for any reason, delays his return beyond 30 days after nomination day or polling day, he would put it beyond the power of either party to controvert the election.

Mr. AMYOT. The returning officer is bound by law to make his report within a certain delay, which delay is fixed, I think, by the statute. He is bound to do it, and we have never seen an instance where he has not done it.

Mr. THOMPSON. But if he does not do so, he does not deprive any party of his remedy. But it is a very dangerous thing, I think, to allow him to prevent the return from being controverted by petition.

Mr. AMYOT. We can make a special proviso for that, so as, except in cases where the returning officer will not

comply with the law, to fix another delay for that case. I think it is fair that the delay for contestation should be the same for all the members. It is not fair to give 40 days or 60 days to one and only 30 days to another. Let us make a uniform delay for every one, and have equal justice.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that my hon friend's intention in his Bill is very good, and if the working of his Bill is not such as to meet the difficulty, if any difficulty presents itself to the Minister of Justice, he can easily frame a Bill which will carry out what my hon. friend asks for, namely, that every person shall have the same time granted to him to enter a contestation or to meet a contestation. It is very easy to frame a clause to meet the difficulty, if the Minister of Justice feels there is a practical difficulty in what my hon. friend presents. He wishes to avoid the recurrence of what took place at the last general election. It is patent to everyone that gross injustice was done to some members, that some of us were not gazetted for three weeks and some for nearly four weeks, after the returns, and some of them coming in the same day were gazetted in the next *Gazette*; in other words, there was a fortnight or three weeks of opportunity for contesting the election as against some gentlemen, while most of the ministerial candidates were gazetted almost immediately. If this Bill does not meet the case the Minister of Justice can prepare a clause that will meet the difficulty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no difficulty in carrying out the clause as proposed by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman proposes that the period within which an election may be contested shall be thirty days counting from the day of election. It is contended, however, that it is possible the returning officer might, contrary to law, delay the returns of any particular candidate for thirty days. I do not see how it is possible. The returning officer is sworn to discharge certain duties; he must within a certain number of days declare a candidate elected, then four days are given for an appeal to the county judge for the purpose of having a recount. The whole of the proceedings taken must be taken within less than the thirty days, and, that being the case, such an abuse as the hon. gentleman suggests could hardly arise. Certainly it never could arise if the Government were to allow certain officials to act as returning officers. So far as I know, since the union in 1867 not a single instance has occurred in which the period of thirty days elapsed before some candidate seeking election was declared elected. It may be that if the hon. gentleman wishes to take abundant security further amendment may be required by providing that in any case where the returning officer has failed to declare some candidate elected within thirty days a week or more time may be allowed for petitioning. But certainly thirty days covers a much longer period than is required by law to have one or other candidate declared elected, even where an appeal is made to the judge and a recount is had. If the hon. gentleman thinks the time is not sufficient it might be extended to thirty-five days.

Mr. O'BRIEN. My suggestion is that the time should count, not from the day of election in case of a contest, but from declaration day, when the vote is summed up and the returning officer makes his declaration. That should be the time from which the period allowed for filing a petition should be dated.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the matter requires to be very carefully considered, and several Acts, both the Election and the Controverted Elections Act, will require to be remodelled to carry out such a principle as has been advocated. I would remind the House of the proceedings after the holding of the poll. We have first of all after polling day the delay before declaration day, the summing up of the votes, the delay of six days and possibly a recount in

Mr. AMYOT,

the meantime as well. The petition is a petition complaining of the undue return. If we are to confine the practice to the Controverted Elections Act, we must give a fair chance to those desiring to petition, and all those proceedings have to be taken within thirty days. The return goes to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, perhaps on the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth, or even of the thirtieth day, and there is certainly no time to prepare a petition or even to know what the return is against which the party will petition in the short interval remaining unexpired. I stated to the House at an earlier period of the Session that, although I intended to introduce a Bill relating to the Controverted Elections Act and to suggest several important changes—and this is of course an important change, but I refer to other important changes—it was decided that it would be better for several reasons to wait until another Session, and no great harm could accrue by that delay, inasmuch as the probability was that few by-elections would be held in the interim. I will, if the hon. gentleman concurs in the suggestion, let this matter stand until that has been done, the Acts compared and the necessary changes made, and in the meantime I assent to the principle suggested and embodied in the hon. gentleman's Bill for having a fixed time at which all returns shall take effect irrespective of any discretion on the part of any officer whatsoever. As regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); that would be quite feasible if it were not that the petition has to be against not the declaration of the returning officer, but against the return which he makes, and which is really not made until at least six days after declaration day. That, however, could be remedied by making a provision to this effect, that on declaration day or within the six days after the returning officer should make such a return, and should make it immediately so public that every person desiring to petition would have ample notice of what the return was, and from that date have a fixed period, and a short period too, in which the election must be protested.

Mr. EDGAR. I must congratulate the Minister of Justice on having assented to the principle of the proposed amendment. I would point out, however, that even more changes will have to be made in the law. I do not find anything in the law rendering it obligatory upon the Government to fix any particular day for the return of the writ. There are uncertainties which must be removed. If we are going to fix a day by statute within which the petition against the return must be made, we must begin by fixing a date in the statute within which the return itself must be made.

Mr. AMYOT. In view of the declaration of the Minister and his promise that he will introduce a Bill next Session, I withdraw the amendment.

Bill reported.

FORFEITURES FOR TREASON AND FELONY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 88) to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, and to otherwise amend the law relating thereto.

Mr. EDGAR. I surely think the Minister of Justice must see that this Bill interferes in a most marked degree with the rights of the Provinces, because it undertakes to deprive them of their property. In this Bill the Government proposes that the land which by the law to-day when it has been escheated in some cases becomes the property of the Provinces, shall not escheat and shall not become the property of the Provinces. I surely think that cannot be a proper function for this Parliament to assume. It may be said that because it is escheated on account of crime, that that would make some difference. I do not apprehend that

it does. I has been decided by the Privy Council in the Mercer case that escheated land goes to the Provinces, because escheats are royalties. It cannot be contented that escheats for crime are not royalties and do not go to the Crown as royalties, and to the Provinces consequently. I know that in the Province of Ontario at any rate, that when before the decision of the Privy Council they were legislating about escheats, they excepted escheats for crime from their legislation; perhaps, having some doubts then as to the law on the subject. I think that those who took the provincial view, thought that escheated land belonged to the Provinces by reason of the tenure of the Crown. When a failure of heirs arose the land would revert on account of the tenure to the Crown. Probably for that reason they left out in the legislation in Ontario at all events, reference to escheats in the case of crime. But, as I said, the Privy Council has distinctly decided that escheats belong to the provinces as royalties. Take section 2 of this Bill. It says:

"Subject to the provisions of this Act and from and after the passing thereof, no confession, verdict, inquest, conviction or judgment of or for any treason or felony or *felo de se* shall cause any attainder or corruption of blood, or any forfeiture or escheat, provided that nothing in this Act shall affect the law of forfeiture consequent upon outlawry or any forfeiture in relation to which special provision is made by any Act of the Parliament of Canada."

I surely think that is taking away the property of the Provinces, and the Act seems to interfere in another respect most distinctly with provincial rights. There is provision made in this Act for the administration of assets. Section 8 provides:

The Governor in Council may, if to him it seems fit so to do, commit, during pleasure, the custody and management of the property of any convict to an administrator to be appointed in that behalf; and upon any determination of such appointment, either by revocation or by death of any such administrator, a new administrator may, from time to time, be appointed; and every such administrator shall, upon his appointment, be and be deemed to be the successor in law of the former administrator; and all property invested in, and all powers given to such former administrator by virtue of this Act shall thereupon devolve to and become vested in such successor, who shall be bound by all acts lawfully done by such former administrator during the continuance of his office; and the provisions hereinafter contained with reference to any administrator shall, in the case of the appointment of more than one person, apply to such administrators jointly.

Now I think if there is anything that belongs to the Provincial Government at all it is the right to regulate matters of administration, and I think for that reason the Bill in those respects at any rate is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. There are portions of it which, however, are different and do not bear on the rights of the Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not propose this evening to go on with the Bill in the Committee of the Whole House. I will avail myself of the opportunity of going into committee to answer the objections which the hon. gentleman has made. They only relate to certain features of the Bill, and I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman that the Bill is entirely within our jurisdiction—that we are dealing with the property of the Crown, after having relinquished our right to forfeit—dealing with the property of the criminal in respect to which the Crown has the right of ownership, as we can relinquish the forfeiture for crime. That property, which is of right ours, we shall administer in a certain way for the benefit of the convict himself. That is the principle that underlies these provisions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Can the Crown restore the forfeiture? I recollect that some years ago in New Brunswick a party was pardoned, and subsequently an Act of the Local Legislature was necessary to restore his property.

Mr. THOMPSON. By this Bill we propose to give up the property.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, in this second section, misuses the word "escheat." Forfeitures and escheats are two different things. Mr. Blackstone, in his

commentaries, points out that when there were allodial estates, and when there could not be any property except in the individual owner, there is nevertheless forfeiture. The doctrine of escheats was of very much later growth; but even in this country in cases for forfeitures for crime, they never could be more than forfeiture of the interest of the party, that is, forfeiture of the interest of the tenant in fee, not forfeiture of the property. The jurisdiction as to escheated property is necessarily in the Local Legislatures; but I think that decision of the Privy Council does include forfeitures as well as escheats. However, that matter can better be considered in Committee than in a discussion on the second reading of the Bill. I merely mention the fact that the hon. gentleman uses the word "forfeiture" properly, but the word "escheats" improperly, in the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. By another name it would smell as sweet, and we can change it if necessary. Yet, I am not willing to admit that I use the word improperly, because my authority for it is the English statute, of which this is an exact copy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But there is this difference, that in the United Kingdom the whole power is vested in one body.

Mr. THOMPSON. That does not affect the use of the word.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think the position taken by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) would surprise most lawyers, that this Parliament, in dealing with the criminal law, has not itself power to decide what the penalties shall be, and that by the decision in the Mercer case escheats do not go to the Crown. The hon. member for Bothwell's playing upon the words escheat and forfeiture strikes us as really a mere verbal and technical criticism. These words are certainly used in the ordinary sense, as the hon. gentleman will find them in any law book.

Mr. TISDALE. I think that if this House has the power, it ought to prevent any such cases as the Mercer case occurring again. There were descendants of the man whose property was in dispute. We have a large building in Toronto, which has been erected at the expense of a private individual for the benefit of the Province. I think if this House can do anything to prevent any Province taking property in that way, it should do it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to ask that this Bill be left over until it is reprinted. Several gentlemen who are absent to-night would like to place themselves on record in relation to this Bill, and at their suggestion I make this request.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This Bill has been two months before the House. It was fully discussed in the committee, as were all the amendments made to it, and it seems to me that it would be unnecessarily delaying the work to have the Bill stand over.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee (Mr. Small in the Chair).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This proceeding is irregular. The law provides that the Deputy Speaker, who is called the Chairman of the Committee, shall take the Chair whenever he is in the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Very well, I will take the Chair.

The Committee passed the several clauses and the preamble of the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER called on Mr. Small to take the Chair.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is again irregular. The Deputy Speaker must remain in the Chair; and as he cannot report to himself, the Speaker must be called in. No hon. member can be appointed Chairman of the Committee of the Whole while the Deputy Speaker is in the House, and as the Deputy Speaker cannot report to himself, the Speaker must be called in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the Deputy Speaker is in the Chair he cannot very well act as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and then get up and report to himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not, and the Speaker must be here to receive the report. The clerk says that is not the English practice, but look at our own rules which we have made for ourselves. The rule says that the Chairman of the Committee shall be called to the Chair whenever he is present. Now, the Chairman of the Committee is present and is called to the Chair. He, of course, cannot report to himself, but the Speaker must be here in order that he may report to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rule is that the Deputy Speaker, if he is in the House must take the Chair; and once he does so, he can call on any one else to take it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let us send for the Speaker.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible that the Deputy Speaker should report to himself, and the Speaker is not present. Therefore the Deputy Speaker must call on an hon. member to take his place as Chairman of the Committee in order that he may receive the report of the committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The proceeding is altogether irregular, and contrary to our rule.

Mr. SMALL then took the Chair and reported the Bill, which was read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics \$ 47,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to state that we propose to drop the item "for expenses in connection with Dominion exhibition, \$10,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Why is the hon. gentleman dropping that?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We thought it was not necessary to incur that expenditure this year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) You are not going to contribute anything to that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why was it put in?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was put in the main Estimates before it had been properly considered, and it was reconsidered afterwards.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest whether it would not be just as well to apply that amount, or more if necessary, to a proper representation of Canada at the Cincinnati Exhibition. The hon. gentleman knows that there are an immense number of Canadians in the United States, and he professes to be anxious to promote trade relations between the two countries.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is only sometimes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And, if he would assist the exhibition of Canadian products at Cincinnati, it would do a great deal towards promoting more intimate commercial relations between the two countries. Of course, if the hon. gentleman is opposed to that, such a policy would be objectionable to him, but, if he is favorable, as he professes, to more intimate trade relations, there is no way in which he could assist it better than by giving an opportunity for Canada to exhibit her products at that exhibition. Even if he or his leader is opposed to that now, they have changed their views so often this Session that perhaps we may expect them to be in favor of it when the time comes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is one difficulty, and that is that we have no authority from the Crown recommending such an expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You were merely suggesting how we might avoid the difficulty of having this \$10,000 left on our hands.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no difficulty whatever in getting the authority of the Crown for this expenditure; and therefore, if he has any better objection to offer, we should know it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I see that last year, though the amount voted for the care of archives was \$6,000, hon. gentlemen expended about \$1,200 in excess of the grant. I think the House should have some information upon that.

Mr. CARLING. This amount is for collecting historical records and manuscripts, of which there are now upwards of half a million volumes arranged, bound and ready for reference. The volumes are constantly referred to for settling disputed points. The archivist reports the vote insufficient, and for this reason it is impossible to begin copying documents in Paris. Dr. W. F. Poole, president of the American Historical Society, in his report of a visit to Ottawa in September last, made officially, to the Society of Librarians of North America, describes the Canadian archives as the most valuable collection for historical purposes on the continent.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am not objecting to his taking this small vote, but I was objecting to the Department spending nearly double the amount that Parliament voted for a specific purpose, and when money is expended in that way, it amounts to this, that it is only a farce for us to go through the form of voting money at all. If we vote a sum of \$6,000, and they spend between \$10,000 and \$11,000, the reason for going into Committee of Supply seems to be rendered nugatory.

Mr. CARLING. I think it is the practice, if any particular vote is over-run, to take the balance from another vote. I believe the money was carefully expended, and, if necessary, I can get the particulars.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I have no doubt that the amount was expended, and I am not objecting to the expenditure, but I am objecting to the principle which is involved. I do not think the hon. gentleman is justified in withdrawing from another sum voted for a specific purpose, any amount to apply to this. The whole principle is wrong. I have no doubt that the money was spent, or it would not be in the Auditor General's report, as it is.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that C. C. Chipman is down for \$400 in connection with the archives. How does that come about?

Mr. CARLING. That is not in this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No, but last year it was in, and I think it was stated that there was an appropriation of \$1,000 extra for this purpose. Yet we find that C. C. Chipman has drawn \$400 out of this fund, and perhaps that may be the reason why the expenditure of 1886-87 amounts to so much more than the sum appropriated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the arrangement previously was that Mr. Chipman had \$400 a year in connection with the supervision of this work on the other side of the Atlantic, and the hon. gentleman will see that it disappears from the vote of this year. It had nothing to do with the \$1,000 which was voted to that gentleman, and which was for an entirely different purpose. It was for the very extraordinary duty that has been thrown upon him in connection with the exhibition in London. The \$100 was paid to him by the Department of Immigration for the supervision and constant attention to this work in the Archives Branch.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this Mr. Chipman the gentleman who was in the office of the High Commissioner in London?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, he is the same person.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then he received his salary under another head as private secretary to the High Commissioner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, he was not private secretary to the High Commissioner?

Mr. LISTER. What position did he hold?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He held the position of accountant and assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. LISTER. At what salary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At a salary of \$1,800, and this was \$400 added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not hear what explanation was given why the vote had been \$6,000 and the expenditure \$10,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture was that an unusual amount of work was thrown upon the archivist, who was extremely anxious to carry on a considerable amount of work. In fact it has been very extensive indeed. This amount was taken from the bracketed vote, as the hon. member will see, but it was thought as there was sufficient money provided in this resolution, No. 45, to cover the expenditure, we took it so that they could go on with this work that Mr. Brymner was very anxious should be done during the year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that we have ever considered that when these votes for a distinctly

different purpose were bracketed, it was right to transfer one to another. I think it is a very objectionable practice. I have always objected myself to bracketing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better to avoid it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But where you state distinctly, so much for one purpose and so much for another, then it is very objectionable to remove a vote from one to the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt about that, and I have no doubt my hon. friend will see that it does not occur again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was any authority taken by Governor General's warrant or anything else?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. It was held by the department that there was enough in the total vote to allow for an excess in one branch, and this amount was taken; but I quite agree that it is not a good practice, and I am quite sure the Minister of Agriculture will see that it does not occur again.

Mr. CARLING. I may tell the hon. member that this was for agriculture and statistics, and I believe it has been a practice in the Department of Agriculture, not only last year, but for many years, and during the time the hon. gentleman was Finance Minister, I am told by the officers of the department that when a sufficient amount was voted and it overran, they would take it for another vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not recollect whether the hon. gentleman is right that the abuse may have prevailed before, but I think it is distinctly an abuse. I do not remember at this moment anything of the kind that the Minister of Agriculture mentions, but it may have occurred. Where such things were brought to my notice, I always insisted on a separate vote being taken, but it is possible that one or two occasions may have occurred.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt the practice is contrary to the rule at the present time. The old English practice, of course, was to vote the subsidy in a lump sum. Mr. Downing was the first Chancellor of the Exchequer who introduced the present practice, and from his time down to the present, it has always been the practice, in the English House of Commons, to confine the expenditure to the appropriations made; and the sum that is asked for one purpose cannot be applied to another different purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether these services were performed on the other side of the water, or here in Ottawa?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were performed on both sides. I may explain to my hon. friend that Mr. Chipman, who was appointed to the position of accountant and assistant secretary of the High Commissioner's office in London, was necessarily required when I was called back to the position of Minister of Finance, remained still charged with the administration of the duties of the High Commissioner's office in London. My hon. friend will see that it was almost indispensable that I should have the services of a gentleman who was thoroughly familiar with the duties in both departments, and consequently I appointed Mr. Chipman my private secretary as Minister of Finance; and it would have been almost impossible for me to carry on, as I have done, the administration of both departments if it had not been for the valuable services of Mr. Chipman. I dare say my hon. friend knows that he is a man of exceptional ability, and of unwearied industry. He has served long in the various departments of the public service, in New Brunswick first, and subsequently in the Railway Department at Ottawa, then in the Finance Department, and then in the Department of Railways and Canals.

There are few gentlemen better acquainted with the duties of these various services. When Mr. Dewar retired he was appointed in his place to the position of accountant and also assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office. I may say that in that position I had no private secretary. There is no charge for a private secretary in that connection. But when it became necessary for me to return as Minister of Finance, and I was still charged with the duties of administering the office of High Commissioner on the other side, it was absolutely indispensable that I should avail myself of the services of a gentleman who was thoroughly familiar with the duties of both departments.

Mr. COCKBURN. I had happened to be in London during the time of the exhibition, and was brought into very frequent contact with Mr. Chipman, and I can assure the hon. gentlemen opposite that there was no man on that side of the Atlantic who worked harder for the interests of Canada than did Mr. Chipman. I found him early in the morning and late at night, hard at work, and I know from personal knowledge that in the management of some things entrusted to him, he was the means of saving to this country several thousands of dollars. If hon. gentlemen knew his valuable services as well as I do, Mr. Chipman is the last man to whom they would grudge the small amount that is now being voted to him.

Mr. TROW. No doubt Mr. Chipman is a very worthy officer. I found him so. I had the pleasure of being in the office of the High Commissioner, and found him very attentive to his duties, and no doubt a very worthy man. The only fault we find is that he is being paid sums under different headings, and it is difficult to ascertain how much he has been paid. I find he has received \$1,799 in Immigration Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The \$1,800 is his salary as accountant and assistant secretary in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. TROW. I also find that he has been paid travelling expenses, \$170; he received as private secretary, \$250; travelling expenses again, \$48.56; cab hire, \$8.50, and \$400 in connection with the archives, making a total of \$2,862 already discovered. There may be other items that we have not discovered.

Mr. LISTER. Do I understand the Minister to say that he acted as his secretary while the hon. gentleman has been in Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Since I left the London office. He received \$600 a year as my private secretary.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister has given us a very minute description of the ability and services of Mr. Chipman. I am sorry that I do not know of his services. It is quite new to me that he is such a desirable man, although I have no doubt he is a valuable man. Is that the gentleman who is brother-in-law to the present Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, Sir Leonard Tilley?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I am sorry for that, because I would like to put in a word for him on that account. The hon. gentleman has stated that it became absolutely necessary, from the dual position he occupied as High Commissioner and Finance Minister, that he should have a confidential man as secretary. No doubt it was very desirable, that he should have a confidential man as secretary, but it is much to be regretted that my hon. friend should have attempted to occupy these dual positions, otherwise, perhaps, we would have avoided this charge of \$600. But I suppose it has been paid, and we cannot get the money back, therefore the less we say about it the better. After the testimony that has been borne to the value of Mr. Chip-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

man's services in connection with that exhibition, no doubt according to the ideas of the hon. gentleman, they entitle him to some additional remuneration. I can only say that from the first I opposed that enormous vote, which has swollen from the moderate sum which the Finance Minister stated at first to, if I am correct, over \$100,000 for that exhibition in London. It is so much money thrown away, and I hope there will be no repetition of such squandering of the public money while the country's finances are in such a deplorable condition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us my information in regard to the receipts from the Patent Department?

Mr. CARLING. The receipts from that department have increased very much indeed. Last year the gross receipts for patents and trade marks were \$76,600, or \$13,000 more than the previous year.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.). Will the hon. gentleman explain the manner of obtaining criminal statistics?

Mr. CARLING. The item of \$4,000 is required for the collection of criminal statistics from every police court and magistrate in the Dominion, the remuneration being fixed by statute. The cost of the preparation of the returns for the year is included in the expenditure.

Mr. LISTER. Who make the returns?

Mr. CARLING. The police magistrates.

Mr. LISTER. They have only cognisance of the convictions made before themselves. Is there any way of having returns sent by the clerk of the peace in each county?

Mr. CARLING. I understand the returns are made according to a schedule in the Blake Act.

Mr. DAVIES. Partial statistics are of no use, and it is desirable to ascertain whether the present system places the hon. gentleman in a position to obtain statistics for all the Dominion.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Have the Government given up the idea of contributing the usual amount of \$10,000 towards the Dominion Exhibition this year to be held in Halifax?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is matter for regret that the contribution should have been made by the Government year after year when the Dominion Exhibition was held at other places and that it should now be dropped. It will be a matter of considerable disappointment to the people of Halifax that the exhibition will not be held there this year. They have been making considerable preparations under the expectation that the usual grant would be made, and as it had been held in other places in previous years there was a reasonable expectation that it would be held at Halifax this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was with extreme regret that the Government dropped the vote; but the hon. gentleman will see that if we are to economise we must commence somewhere, and we felt this was an expenditure which we could, without any very serious injury to the country, forego this year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Perhaps the Minister would explain the working of the system in connection with health statistics, for which \$10,000 is asked. I have been unable to see that this amount is usefully expended. I observe that \$10,000 is still asked, although last year only between \$6,000 and \$7,000 was expended.

Mr. CARLING. These are returns obtained for the different cities and towns in the Dominion from health officers appointed by the municipal authorities. These

returns are placed in the records of the department, and a report is issued every year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Will the Minister tell me how this health officer appointed by the municipality obtains his information? What instructions are given to him by the Government, and what duties are imposed upon him, so that the reports may be somewhat reliable? Are there any directions given to those health officers as to their duties?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman of course will find that, if he refers to the annual report and the certificates of the medical officers which are in the report issued by the department every year.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Pretty nearly every municipality in the Province of Ontario have boards of health now. Have you given your officers directions to avail themselves of that information, and to get information from those various boards?

Mr. CARLING. An Order in Council was passed some years ago limiting this information to cities and towns of over 5,000 inhabitants, and we avail ourselves of the health officers of the cities and towns for this information.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It appears to me that we are not getting that information that we ought to, when we are asked to vote \$10,000 for this purpose. The Minister knows very well that all the duties those health officers perform are merely by their going to the sextons and copying from the sexton's book the number of deaths or burials that took place there. As far as the department is concerned they perform no other duties whatever and we are asked each year to grant \$10,000 for that.

Mr. CARLING. It is true none of those officers are appointed, except the municipality have by resolution appointed a health officer.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). All they do is to go to the sexton and obtain information as to how many were buried there. They may not obtain full information, because people who have died in a particular locality may be buried elsewhere. We might just as well not spend a single dollar, for all the reliability that can be attached to those reports. It is a waste of money, and it is evident that the Government are not making any effort whatever to have this branch made efficient. It has now gone on for a number of years. We were told at first that it was merely experimental, and that it would be in a few years of importance to the country in reference to health statistics. Many thousand dollars have been spent upon it, and I would ask the Government to-day wherein can they point to the benefits accruing from the policy of the department in this respect. I say there are no benefits whatever. The information is of no use to us, because we cannot rely upon it, on account of the manner in which those officers discharge their duties. It would be much better to strike out the item altogether.

Mr. CARLING. The information gathered from those different municipalities is published monthly, and it is very much sought after by the press and published all over the Dominion, giving the death rate of each city and town. I think it is important to have the information. It might perhaps be fuller, but the established rule has been that no place under 5,000 inhabitants could give the information because it had no health officer appointed. If a health officer is appointed in a town of less population, we have not stood strictly to the 5,000, as we are anxious to get the information. I think the amount paid those officers is not extravagant. I see in the town of St. Thomas which the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent, with a population of 10,000 or 12,000 people all that was paid to the health officer during the year was \$120.

46-1888-3

Considering this information is gathered from cities and towns all over the Dominion and that the information is most valuable to the people at large, I think it does not cost very much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. gentleman shows that what the Province of Ontario is doing for itself with tolerable completeness, the Government here are doing very imperfectly. Of course hon. gentlemen would like any information that would contribute to the general welfare of the health of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I may say for their information that Mr. Campbell who formerly represented Kent in this House has been returned by the people of Kent by an increased majority.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I may say that whatever the health officer in St. Thomas gets, be it much or little, he gets more than he earns for the services he renders. It is a notorious fact that those officers are appointed by the municipalities and they perform the duty for the municipalities. They duplicate the information which they collect for the municipalities, and if all that he does is to send to the Government a duplicate of the information he has to render to the St. Thomas Council, I should say he is pretty well paid. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture may think, but he may be in the habit of giving more liberally than that. Take for instance the officer in Toronto. He receives between \$300 and \$400, and you do not pretend to tell me that sending a duplicate here is worth that amount? Whether the cost be much or little the information is unreliable and it is not worth what you pay for it. Unless you organise that branch of the Department in a different way you might as well strike out the item altogether.

Mr. LISTER. Are those officers appointed by the Government?

Mr. CARLING. The Government appoint the health officer of the city or town.

Mr. LISTER. I observe here that the returns are very imperfect. I find that the towns of Goderich and Sarnia are not included.

Mr. CARLING. The law provides that a town must appoint a health officer, and if they do not appoint a health officer, we do not appoint one.

Mr. LISTER. We have a health officer in our town.

Mr. CARLING. That has not been reported.

Mr. LISTER. I do not say that one should be appointed, because I agree with the hon. member for East Elgin that this money is thrown away, so far as the information given us is concerned. The amounts charged by the different officers for making these returns vary greatly. In some cases the amount is \$100, and in others as much as \$300. In Brantford and Woodstock it is \$56, while in smaller towns, Galt for instance, the amount is considerably more.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman must understand that it is according to population.

Mr. LISTER. The amounts are larger in some cases than in other cases where the population is smaller.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I would like the Minister to tell us whether there is a health officer in London.

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Hutchinson, I understand, is the health officer for that city.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of this item, "Sundry persons, for 18,012 certificates, at 15 cents each, \$2,700?" Who gives these certificates, and what do they represent?

Mr. CARLING. They are medical burial certificates. they are paid to the cemetery keepers, who get 15 cents for each medical burial certificate.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister must be in error. I think he will find that the 15 cents is the amount paid by the health officer to the sexton on account of a certificate given to him. It may be that some of these sextons get the 15 cents, but I doubt it very much. This is a very large amount of money expended for that purpose, and we have no explanation to show where that \$2,700 goes.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman must have seen the report which states that the cemetery keeper get 15 cents per burial.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand, the health officer makes these returns. Why, in addition, should there be this enormous sum paid to get the certificates from the cemeteries?

Mr. CARLING. I do not think it is an enormous sum for these certificates of burial, obtained from all the cities and towns in the Dominion.

Mr. LISTER. It is of little consequence whether it is large or small, but why should it be done?

Mr. CARLING. As a matter of policy, to get the information as accurately as possibly. It has been done for fifteen or sixteen years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that represent the death rate of these various cities?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This information would be valuable, no doubt, if it represented accurately the death rate in each of these cities; but I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, who in his professional capacity is an excellent judge, whether it does so. He knows that the cemeteries adjacent to towns and cities are often made use of by a considerable section of country around. Does he know whether this death rate is that of the cities, or is it that of the cities plus a large section of country around them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I imagine that the death rate represents all the persons buried there, whether belonging to the city or the adjacent country. But the statistics are valuable because as a rule, they present a lower death rate than is found in any other part of the world; and anything that tends to show a low death rate establishes the healthfulness of our towns, and makes them additionally attractive. In that way these statistics have a certain value. I am afraid the appropriation is too small to enable the Minister of Agriculture to obtain as thorough and full information as is desirable. No doubt there cannot be a very great deal accomplished all over the Dominion with this amount of money; but in the absence of a better and more complete system of vital statistics, it furnishes that which persons investigating the relative attractions of different countries attach a good deal of importance to, as an evidence of the healthfulness of our climate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt the object is a good one, and the information if obtained would prove of some importance. What my hon. friend was asking was a small piece of information which I imagine the hon. Minister could give at once. This \$2,700 has been paid to sundry persons for what? I have not been able to gather as yet.

Mr. CARLING. It is paid to the sextons of cemeteries for burial certificates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What has this to do with the collection of statistics. The doctor gives statistics of the deaths and the causes of death. The sexton in charge of the cemetery has nothing to do with the causes of death. You want to get the population of a town, the number of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

people who died, and the different diseases of which they died, so as to see what diseases are most prevalent and what the death rate is, in order that some precautions may be taken to reduce the death rate by adopting means to prevent the inroads of any special disease that is more prevalent than others. I do not see therefore why we should pay \$2,700 a year in order to get the certificate of a sexton that a certain number of men have been buried in a cemetery.

Mr. CARLING. The certificate furnished by this officer gives the disease which each person died of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The sexton cannot possibly be able to state the disease except from information he gets from the doctor.

Mr. CARLING. The doctor's certificate certifies the disease of which the person dies and the sexton certifies that he was buried.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Why not also get a certificate from the undertaker?

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. Minister is laboring under a mistake. In former years, 10 cents or 15 cents was paid to the municipal clerk for each death certificate, and that, in the Province of Ontario, is paid out of the local dues of the municipalities. I cannot say what may be the course pursued in the other Provinces, but it may be that the Minister pays 15 cents for a certificate from the sexton, and that the sexton, in his wisdom, certifies that the man lived to a certain age and died of a certain disease. It has been proved that these certificates are worthless as data on which to form an opinion in reference to the health of any locality.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman strike this out? There is no earthly use for it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is the custom among professional men to give a certificate of death stating the age, the disease, and other facts in that connection, for which the medical man receives from the Local Government about 10 cents. Do I understand that the 18,000 deaths given in this return are the actual number of deaths that took place in the whole Dominion or only in those cities where those health officers are appointed?

Mr. CARLING. It indicates the number of deaths in those different cities and towns where there are health officers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then the information is of no value, as regards the death rate of the Dominion, because it is only partial information. There are a large number of villages and towns, with a population under 5,000, that have no officers of that kind. It would have been far better and less expensive, as regards Ontario, to take the returns made by the Legislature of Ontario of the births, marriages and deaths in the whole of that Province, instead of taking this return from special centres in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, we must have this vote, whatever may be the opinions of the House and committee as to the real value of these statistics. This system has been going on for a good many years, and the arrangement cannot now suddenly be closed. No doubt my hon. friend will consider the remarks made by some hon. gentlemen, professional men, whose opinions are worthy of all consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these statistics were all published in his report. I have looked into it, and I have not been able to find them.

Mr. CARLING. They are in the appendix to the annual report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to point out to the hon. Minister that although it is true we have recognised the desirability of having health statistics, if they were accurate, it is worse than useless to have inaccurate statistics because they are positively misleading. Now, for several years we have been pressing from this side that some different system should be adopted. My own impression is it would be far better to select a small number of points and to work them thoroughly than to attempt to carry out the system that at present exists. For four or five years, we have been pointing out the desirability of having some new departure in this matter, so that it cannot be said this question is brought up for the first time. It does not seem, however, that we are much nearer to any solution of the difficulty than when we started.

Mr. CARLING. I think we are carrying out the very suggestion the hon. gentleman made to the House of gathering these statistics from the centres of population, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that the information we have from these centres is correct. As the hon. the Minister of Finance has said, perhaps the vote is not large enough, but I am confident we are getting information that can be relied on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand from the hon. the Minister of Finance just now that these lists of deaths do not really represent the deaths of the several places referred to?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, they do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the hon. the Minister of Finance to say that they represented the number buried in the cemeteries in and adjacent to these several centres.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They cover all the cemeteries in each locality where there is a health officer, and a few of the cemeteries adjacent to these localities.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman will see that he had better reduce the vote for that reason. Last year he expended only \$7,800. That includes \$2,700 which was paid for certificates which are perfectly useless, and in fact, no one knows what they are for. Then, if you take the \$2,100 which you are asking more than last year and the \$2,700 you have paid for certificates, you might make a saving of \$5,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One objection which I see to this vote is that Ontario has a complete system of health statistics, covering the whole country, while the hon. gentleman is collecting only from a few points.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is *quoad* Ontario alone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But a large proportion of this expenditure, nearly the whole of it, is for the Province of Ontario, and in regard to that Province all you need do is to examine the reports made by the Province, which are not only in relation to these few places that the hon. gentleman obtains his statistics from, but from every locality, and then you have in a complete form what you are here obtaining in a very incomplete form. Why, then, should we expend this money to obtain imperfect statistics when we can get complete statistics without any expenditure at all? The Provincial authorities have facilities far greater than those which you have to get these returns; and, while it may be proper to carry on this system for those Provinces which have no such law as that which exists in Ontario, to extend it to the Province of Ontario is certainly a work of supererogation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). As has been stated by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), we do not take any exception to the vote for obtaining sta-

tistics, but we do object to the way in which the money is expended, and the unsatisfactory results obtained from it. I can see no benefit in getting these statistics from the cities alone. If it is desirable to obtain these statistics at all, they should be obtained from all parts of the country districts as well as from the cities; and, therefore, I think the Government should consider whether, in the interest of the country, we should not have some arrangement whereby the vital statistics of the country generally could be obtained and tabulated and pointed to and relied upon. At present, the information is only derived from the cities. It is imperfect. In the Province of Ontario far better information is obtained than this Government can obtain, because the information of this Government is only obtained from the cities. I think this is hardly worth the expenditure which is made upon it. If the hon. gentleman were to adopt a broader view and obtain the vital statistics from the country generally, it would be different, but, until that is done, I think this is simply a waste of money.

Mr. TROW. I think the Minister in charge of this department should make it imperative in other Provinces to have these statistics returned. In Ontario it is made imperative by the law for the clerk of the municipality to make his returns and to give this reliable information under a penalty on those who neglect to carry out that duty. Some hon. gentlemen has referred to the sextons, but I cannot understand what knowledge the sexton can have. It is a matter of indifference to him whether the coffin is empty or full. He knows nothing about the cause of death. He knows nothing about the matter except in connection with the graveyard.

Mr. LISTER. Does this \$10,000 cover the expenditure for registration of births, deaths and marriages, which was \$871 last year?

Mr. CARLING. No, it does not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Is the hon. gentleman asking for an expenditure on that account this year?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). In reference to this item of outlay towards the establishment and maintenance of experimental farms, \$90,000, will the hon. gentleman give us some information as to what has been done here and in other parts of the Dominion? I should like to know something about the farm in the Maritime Provinces, where it is located, what progress has been made, and when he proposes to put it in operation?

Mr. CARLING. A site has been purchased, containing 300 acres, on the Intercolonial Railway, near the town of Nappan.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What have you paid for it?

Mr. CARLING. I think it is \$16,000 for the 300 acres.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that in the county of Northumberland?

Mr. CARLING. It is on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and it is a very suitable location, as Mr. Saunders reports.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It is in the county of Cumberland?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a place in my county which is spelled Napan.

Mr. CARLING. There are two "p's" in this Nappan.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not suppose it was in my county.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the Minister tell us what progress has been made?

Mr. CARLING. None as yet. We have secured the property, and steps are being taken to construct the buildings and to put up the fencing.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has any person been put in charge of it?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Who?

Mr. CARLING. Colonel Blair has been appointed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). From whom was the farm purchased?

Mr. CARLING. I think it was from two parties. Mr. Roach was one and I cannot remember the other name.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many farms has the hon. gentleman now got? There is one near Ottawa, there is one in Nova Scotia, how many other farms has he purchased?

Mr. CARLING. There is the Central Farm, the farm in the Maritime Provinces, and a site has been secured in the North-West Territories and one in Manitoba and one in British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Five in all?

Mr. CARLING. Five in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are the farms situated in Manitoba and the North-West Territories?

Mr. CARLING. The farm in Manitoba is in the vicinity of Brandon, the farm in the North-West Territories is near Indian Head, and the farm in British Columbia is at Agassiz.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is Indian Head?

Mr. CARLING. It is near the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In reference to the farm in the neighborhood of Brandon, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is the extent of it, what price he has paid for it, and whom it was purchased from?

Mr. CARLING. I think the farm is a section of 640 acres, and I think the total cost is \$9,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman remember from whom it was purchased?

Mr. CARLING. I do not at this moment, but I can give him the information to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should be glad if the hon. gentlemen will also get the exact locality of this Brandon farm.

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. MULLOCK. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the fencing of the Central Agricultural Farm was a matter of competition, or whether it was done by piece work, and, if so, what it cost per rod?

Mr. CARLING. It was done by contract.

Mr. MULLOCK. What was the cost?

Mr. CARLING. I think it was 15 cents a foot.

Mr. MULLOCK. What kind of a fence is it?

Mr. CARLING. It is cedar posts with barbed wire.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is that the sort of fence the hon. gentleman would recommend as a sample fence to the ordinary agriculturist of Canada?

Mr. CARLING. I do not mean to say it is. But I mean that the central farm is in the vicinity of the capital of the country, it is in a beautiful locality, and it is a permanent fence for the next 20 years. I do not think it is a very

Mr. MITCHELL.

expensive fence. I know that some of the neighbors have asked the contractors to put up a similar fence around their property, and they would not do it at the same price.

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any farmer in Canada to adopt such an absurd style of fence, and invest such an enormous sum of money in the construction of such a useless article. I venture to say it will not be two or three years before the whole structure will have to be pulled down and built on a different plan.

Mr. CARLING. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman does not understand what he is talking about, because the matter was very carefully considered, and I am sure that there is not a more solid or permanent fence in Canada than that. It was said by others that the frost would heave the fence and throw out the posts, but if the hon. gentleman inspects the fence now, just after the winter, he will find the fence just as solid and substantial as it was before it was made.

Mr. MULLOCK. I mean to say that it is an utter waste of money to go on and invest such a large sum—did I understand 40 cents a foot or 15?

Mr. CARLING. 15 cents a foot.

Mr. MULLOCK. For the erection of such a fence as this. It was not at all necessary. The farm is not situated within three or four miles of this city, and a much less expensive fence would have answered just as well. I again repeat, without referring to the character of the work—for I do not wish to do any injury to the patentee of the wire used—but I venture to predict that the wire used will, in a very short time, be condemned as absolutely unsuitable, the frost will destroy it. Any one knows, after an examination of the material used, that it will not be at all durable. It is a real waste of money, in my opinion.

Aid to Agriculture Societies in the North-West Territories. \$10,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see an item of \$6,425 for labor. I would like to know how much of this was spent for fencing, and how much for drainage. In a lump sum, we have no idea what each class of work has cost. Then, I see there are three superintendents besides the workmen. What are they employed in doing?

Mr. CARLING. The chief director of the farm is Professor Saunders and he has an agriculturist employed to look after the planting of trees, and the management of the fruit department. I think these were the only two that were employed last year, excepting the laborers. But his salary did not commence until late in the fall. He is now occupying his time in making chemical examinations of different seeds, and other things in connection with the farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see here the name of Mr. McKay, superintendent, the name of Mr. Bedford, superintendent, and William Blair, superintendent, besides a foreman, and a Mr. Hurlburt, as horticulturist. What are they superintending?

Mr. CARLING. Colonel Blair, as I said before has been appointed superintendent of the Maritime Province farm, and we utilise his services in the summer time for two or three months at the central farm until he takes charge of the farm in Nova Scotia. He is a practical farmer, and is to get \$1,200. Mr. McKay has been appointed to take charge of the farms in the North West Territories at Indian Head. He is a very superior man, and we utilise his services for two or three months in the same way. He is now at Indian Head and Colonel Blair is in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. McMILLAN. My question is not yet answered. I see there is \$6,425 for labor. How much of that goes for clearing and draining the land?

Mr. CARLING. I should be very glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with that information to-morrow, but I cannot give it to him at this moment. To-morrow we will tell him exactly how much has been expended for the purposes he speaks of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister state, roughly, how he proposes to dispose of this large amount of \$90,000—what division he is going to make among the several farms?

Mr. McMILLAN. I see there is an item of \$1,076.25 for manure and \$606.31 for freight. Now, in this section of country, it may be necessary for the farmer to purchase a certain amount of manure, and as this farm is to serve as a model for the people of Canada, we should know how it is conducted. We all know that in order to manage the farm successfully the manure must be made upon the farm, and used upon the farm, because we cannot make a great deal of profit if we spend a large sum of money in buying manure. There is an opportunity in this farm of ascertaining by experiment what can be done with land that was run down in the direction of renewing its fertility without the aid of manure. Such experiments would be of benefit to the farmers. Unless, however, these experiments are carried out on a proper system they will mean money thrown away. There is just one thing I regret, and that is that there is on the central farm very little, if any, of heavy clay land, such as prevails throughout Ontario, which requires the most scientific farming. A great many of our farmers do not succeed with land of that description, yet if properly farmed it is perhaps the most profitable land we have in the Province. If a large amount of manure is to be brought on the farm, the experiments will be of no benefit to the farmers in the direction of showing what can be done with the land.

Mr. CARLING. The Government selected the farm with a view to obtaining different varieties of soil, and it contains from 35 to 40 acres of heavy clay land such as the hon. gentleman refers to, as well as other different varieties of soil. With respect to manure, we found it necessary to purchase a certain quantity in order to conduct our experiments with seeds and grains. Mr. Booth, a very extensive farmer adjoining the Government farm, purchased last year more manure than we did and paid the same price. The farm is only two and a half miles from the city and it is not very difficult to get manure; of course when we have a large quantity of stock we shall not require to purchase manure. This is not so much a model farm as a farm where experiments are made, and the results are published for the information of farmers throughout the Dominion, especially results as to what can be produced on particular kinds of soil and particular kinds of manure and certain quantities of it. As to the general expenditure I may say that it is expected that this amount, together with the sum in the estimates of the Department of Public Works will complete the purchase and the fencing and building, and leave a small amount for the purchase of stock for the central farm and different farms. This money will be devoted to completing the central farm and the farm in the Lower Provinces, Manitoba, North-West Territories and British Columbia.

Census and statistics. \$7,500

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain this item?

Mr. CARLING. We are collecting statistics all the time, and a statistical record is published by the department each year, which has proved of very great use to members of Parliament and to the people of the country.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is it necessary?

Mr. CARLING. It is a work very much in demand and it contains information that can be relied on.

Mr. LISTER. It contains a great many inaccuracies.

Mr. CARLING. If so, we shall only be too glad to have them remedied if the hon. gentleman can point them out.

Immigration..... \$116,389

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may recollect that a few days ago I put several questions to him with reference to the policy of the Government in regard to necessitous and unfit persons coming to this country. The hon. gentleman at that time gave me to understand that in the judgment of his department there was very little occasion to make any special provisions or take any special precautions against this class of persons. The information which has reached me from various part of the country is this, that a very large number of utterly unfit persons are being dumped on our shores from time to time, and that there is at the present moment something which might be fairly described as a sort of movement on the part of the authorities in the British Islands to dispose of a considerable number of paupers or persons who are only one remove from paupers, by sending them to this country. The hon. gentleman knows that in other countries a great many of these people have been sent back, but I have never heard of any being sent back from Canada. I do know that such cities as Toronto, Kingston and other cities throughout Ontario, and I believe Montreal and other places have a yearly increasing number of such persons who become a charge on public charity. I have received from a gentleman in Toronto a resolution passed by the City Council, and I will read an extract or two from it that may convince the hon. gentleman that, in the opinion of the civic authorities of the largest city in Ontario, there is a good deal of need that the Government should exercise some care in this matter. The resolution is as follows:—

"Whereas during the last winter season, and to a great extent for a number of years past, the demands on the various charitable institutions and of the city authorities for assistance to destitute immigrants have been so great and of such a character that the resources of the civic authorities and others interested in the question of providing relief for the destitute have been seriously overtaxed, and the causes which have led to this state of affairs require our most serious consideration; and whereas according to reliable information received from various sources, and from information received in some cases from the applicants themselves, a great many destitute persons have been sent over to this country by the Poor Law Guardians of Great Britain and the various charitable institutions of that country in order to relieve themselves of the further support of persons who are unable to provide for themselves in their own country; and, whereas we believe that continued efforts are being made by the parties aforesaid to ship to this country during the coming season this very undesirable class of immigrants, to the great injury of this city and the country; therefore be it resolved, That the council of the corporation of the city of Toronto enters its most emphatic protest against the continuance of this practice of shipping to this country a class of people so very undesirable, and who, being unable to provide for themselves in the old country, necessarily become a burden on the charitable institutions of this country, and help to swell the number of inmates in our gaols and asylums."

There is danger there. If the statements made by those gentlemen—and I believe a copy of the resolution was communicated to the Minister of Agriculture—have any foundation in fact, and from what has come under my own observation in other places I am inclined to believe they have a great deal of foundation in fact, there is need that a good deal of care be taken on the part of Government officials to prevent this number of such persons swelling. If the authorities who control English and Irish poor houses are allowed to do this they will scruple very little at sending several thousands of most undesirable emigrants to this country. I am not now speaking of the other question of the desirability of putting an end to assisted passages, because I understand that at last the policy of the Government is to do so, but I am speaking of the necessity of preventing our country from being made a place of

deposit for persons who are not able to earn their own living in the mother country. I can tell the hon. gentleman he will find a very considerable degree of danger that unless the strictest precautions be taken many persons of that sort will come h. re.

Mr. CARLING. I think the statements made in the country through the press in reference to pauper immigration have been very much exaggerated. I am quite sure from the statements I possess from our agents in Liverpool, Halifax, Quebec and other different parts of the country, the percentage of pauper immigration is very small indeed. I think it will be found that these statements that have been made through the city council of Toronto that there are a very large number of paupers coming into the country are incorrect, and that those who have had to be supported have been people who were not immigrants but worthless people who flock to the cities from different parts of the country. From all the information I have obtained from the officers of the department as to the parties leaving the old country to come here, the number of unfit persons arriving in this country has been very few indeed. I think the hon. gentleman will find that every precaution has been taken that can be taken to prevent any such class of people from coming into the country and becoming a burden upon the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think that is at all a satisfactory answer to the resolution of the corporation of the city of Toronto. I understand this resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. CARLING. That statement, I may say to the hon. gentleman, is a general statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It says that during the last winter, and to a great extent for a number of years past this has been going on. I am speaking with reference to what the Toronto corporation say. I have observed myself in other places that a very considerable number of persons have been brought into this country substantially by false representations. Not, it may be by authorized agents of the Government, but representations made to them by persons in the employ of various steamship companies, who did not care two straws whether the people were fit to be emigrants or not, but who simply wanted to get a commission on the passage money and swell the receipts of the various steamship lines. That was a great and serious evil, and it was all the more so because we know from our own returns that those people who are brought out, do not stay here but that a great part of them find their way to the States. A residuum of them stays here and that residuum, in other places as well as in Toronto, are neither more nor less than burdens on the charity of the people of Canada. I am not at all satisfied that any efficient precautions are being taken, and the hon. gentleman the other day stated, if I recollect rightly, that nobody had ever been sent back. I say that this kind of people ought to be sent back. I say there is neither rhyme nor reason in allowing paupers from England, Ireland, Scotland or elsewhere to be made a charge on Canada. Of course it is not necessary to require that every healthy, industrious man who comes here should be provided with capital. We cannot do that, but it is necessary to see that decrepid, infirm and unfit persons are not allowed to come here.

Mr. CARLING. I believe a letter has been written to the mayor of the city of Toronto in answer to that circular, asking him to give us the particulars and let us know when those people arrived, and where they came from, so that we can trace them and know if those people were really brought from the old country and dumped upon our shores. I can assure the hon. gentleman that everything that possibly can be done by this Government will be done to prevent any such emigration as he has reference to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I really do not think that the Minister of Agriculture has given that information which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was entitled to. In reply to the charges made by the corporation of Toronto, a respectable body, a body who had an opportunity of thoroughly investigating the whole facts in connection with the charges they had made, they are coolly told by the Minister: Oh let them make a detailed statement of where those parties came from, how long they have been in the city of Toronto, what are the circumstances in connection with their former habits, and whether they be emigrants or whether they be somebody from the surrounding country? That is hardly treating a respectable corporation like that of the city of Toronto in a fair way. I cannot see how the members representing the city of Toronto should sit here and allow that corporation to receive a slap in the face from a Minister, who as much as says, that they sent false representations to the Government in reference to the city of Toronto. I think the Minister should be a little fairer than that. He should bear in mind that he has three representatives from the city of Toronto, but it might be perhaps that the Minister of Agriculture will say: "Oh, the city of Toronto is not as true and loyally Conservative as it was before in the city council, and therefore a large proportion of the aldermen of the city of Toronto being Reformers we cannot depend upon their statement. When we find one of the first cities in the Dominion of Canada coming here with a memorial of that kind, it is right and fair that the Minister of Agriculture should treat their representations in a different way.

Mr. CARLING. How have I treated them?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). He asks me how has he treated them. I appeal to the House as to how he has treated them. He says let them make a detailed statement, let them give us in detail the whole facts so that we may examine into the affair. Is the city of Toronto the only place where complaints have come to the Government in reference to the kind of immigrants brought from the old country? It is the same report from every city and municipality almost, from one end of the country to the other. We have been told that there is every precaution used to prevent undesirable immigrants coming here, but the facts belie the statements made by the Government. The facts show that a very large number of those who come out here are not suited in any way for the requirements of Canada, and, therefore, if the Government exercised every precaution they could exercise, I say their manner of conducting the affairs is not successful and they had better adopt some other means. The hon. gentleman says that many of those immigrants in the city of Toronto likely come from the surrounding country. I guarantee that his experience, and the experience of every individual member in this House in the locality in which he resides has been that the greater proportion of those who require aid and assistance are those who have been brought out as immigrants from the old country within the last two years. I have no hesitation in saying, that there are a good many useful citizens who are immigrants, but I do say that the method and the manner in which the hon. gentleman and his predecessors have managed the affairs in reference to immigration has resulted in a class of immigrants coming here that are not suitable. When we find the labor market is entirely overstocked, and that the demand for labor has been decreasing rapidly for some length of time, it is the duty of the Government to come forward and reduce still more the expenditure on this item. Is it necessary that you should keep your large staff of agents in Europe and in Canada, when you now find the city of Toronto petitioning you not to proceed with it any further, because of the enormous number of unsuitable immigrants and the superabundance

of labor in the market, why do you not take this item out altogether? It may be said that it is necessary to keep up the same staff in Europe, but we have a High Commissioner there, and we were told that he would perform some of those duties. When we were called upon to grant millions of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway the Government said: Give us the money, let the Canadian Pacific Railway proceed and we will have the best emigration agents that can be had in Europe and we will not be called upon to spend money for emigration purposes. We liberally passed a measure appointing a High Commissioner for Canada in London, and we have made liberal grants to this railroad; and yet we find the Minister of Agriculture bringing from the old country a number of immigrants unsuited in every way to the requirements of the country, and paying large amounts of money for bringing them out. Yet the Government still asks this House to continue to vote large sums of money for this purpose. I say it is a great mistake, and the amount they are now asking ought to be reduced at least one-third. If it is necessary to keep up the High Commissioner's office, well and good. He will not be very comfortable in staying here, and let us use him as an immigration agent in London; he is capable of being a good one. We have no objection to his staying there altogether, at any rate as long as his friends remain in power. Let the money we vote to be used in bringing out a better class of immigrants, those who have small means and who will not be a burden on the country.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman tried to make out that I said something derogatory of the city of Toronto. I believe the hon. member is a member of the Committee on Immigration, and if I am not misinformed, that committee passed a unanimous resolution to-day asking the city of Toronto to give particulars as to the pauper immigration sent to that city last year. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). It is quite correct. The chairman thought he should have the information.

Mr. CARLING. My department has asked for the same information that the Committee on Immigration authorised the chairman to obtain from the City of Toronto. I think the hon. gentleman has made a statement that he should not make in this House. He says we have the same reports from other cities as we have from Toronto with regard to pauper immigration. Well, I happen to be the head of the Department of Agriculture, and I can state that the one sent from Toronto, which is a very indefinite one, is the only resolution the Department has received that I am aware of, petitioning against pauper immigration.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I suppose the hon. Minister will remember that he had a report from Montreal.

Mr. CARLING. I think that was merely a newspaper report. We had nothing official, so far as I am aware, from the city of Montreal; and I think that the hon. member will find that when the city of Toronto and the different cities look into the matter, they will see that the Government has taken every precaution to prevent anything like pauper immigration, and that the percentage of paupers coming into the country is very small indeed. I am sure this matter has been very much exaggerated, and I am afraid it has been done in some places for purposes other than the general welfare of the country.

Mr. McNEILL. I will just state that I am a member of the Immigration Committee, and was present in the committee to-day when the communication from the city of Toronto was discussed by members of the committee belonging to both political parties. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) was present when it was decided unanimously, he being a consenting party himself, that this communication should be sent to the authorities of the city of Toronto, asking for information on this subject. If there

was any insult offered to the city of Toronto the hon. gentleman was a party to it; but there was no insult intended or thought of. There was a statement made to the effect that a number of people were out of employment in Toronto, and the opinion was expressed that the Department of Agriculture should see that unsuitable immigrants were not brought to the country. After the matter had been discussed for some time, it was decided that nothing could be done until we ascertained something of the numbers of those people out of employment, and where they came from. Therefore it was determined that the authorities of Toronto, who had sent this communication, should be asked to furnish that information; and the hon. member was present at the time consenting to that which he says was an insult. I am astonished at the observations of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES. I am not going to say anything of the character of the immigrants who come to the country, because I am not in a position to express an opinion upon that subject. What I wish to call attention to is that the money voted by Parliament year after year seems to be wasted, or distributed in a manner not calculated to bring any great advantage to the country at large, but seems to be considered as a fund from which the Government may reward some of the papers supporting them throughout the country. If you take up the Auditor General's report, and look at page 112, you will find that payments have been made to almost every Conservative paper, in the Upper Provinces at least, for pamphlets on all imaginary subjects. One is called, "The Immigrant," another "Facts and Figures," another "Across Canada," another, "The Fisheries of Canada," and so on through the list. The payments made in these ways amount to the very large sum of \$49,418 which, with \$20,000 for paper, makes \$69,418 expended in that way. Now that does seem to me to be an expenditure which is unnecessary to such an enormous extent. It would seem that the Government have so much money to dispose of that it is almost too much to ask any employé who draws a handsome salary from the Government to hand these pamphlets to the immigrants as they are coming into the country. I see on page 116 that the sum of \$800 was paid to the marine mail clerks for distributing mail pamphlets, or \$100 each. It is absurd that these postal clerks on the steamers who are paid by the Government, and whose time is at the disposal of the Government, should require to be paid \$100 each for handling a few Government pamphlets to the emigrants on board. This is a sample of the utter recklessness with which the Government disbursed the emigration money. Go through the whole expenditure on immigration, and you will find it consists solely of paying out large sums of money to supporters of the Government for purposes useless, so far as immigration is concerned.

Mr. CARLING. I am sorry the hon. gentleman, when he was in office, did not do away with this grant to the mail clerks on ocean steamers; and I may say that this expenditure has been discontinued. There are no mail clerks now on the ocean steamers.

Mr. JONES. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has discovered this was an unnecessary expense, and I will be glad to see him do away with the other expenditure which appears to be a waste of public money. Here is the Hon. Hector Fabre receiving for the *Paris-Canada* \$1,739, and T. Skinner for copies of *Canadian Gazette* and advertising \$2,769. Then there is the income tax on the salaries of the High Commissioner's staff. Well we have voted in this House the income tax on the salary of the High Commissioner, and these gentlemen, I believe, are in the employ of the High Commissioner in London. Mr. C. C. Chipman, I think, is the private secretary of the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And Mr. Colman, I think, is also in the Department of the High Commissioner in England?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Well, these gentlemen are paid salaries for their work, and I have no doubt they do it well; but if they are entitled to anything more, it should be added to their salaries and not slipped in this way as an income tax. It is not a very large amount, I admit, but every dollar than can be placed in the way of these people, who compose the hon. gentleman's staff, and seems to think the country belongs to them and that they must be rewarded for their political allegiance, is given to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The salaries paid to-day to the entire staff in the High Commissioner's office is less than it was in 1883 when I took charge of that department.

Mr. COCKBURN. As the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), challenged the members for Toronto to stand up and say something to save that city from the aspersions cast upon it by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I am very glad indeed to accept the challenge. It seemed to me that the half hour he devoted to attacking the policy and the action of the Minister of Agriculture was devoted to attacking the Minister for doing precisely what the hon. gentleman himself, twelve short hours ago, had been instrumental in doing. It is to be regretted that in a matter so important to all of us as emigration, hon. gentlemen should be so far led astray by party feeling as to make it a party question. I ask the members of this House, in discussing a business matter of this kind, to put aside, if possible, for one short night, their strong political proclivities, and see if we cannot together discuss a question of this kind on its own merits. The speech of the hon. member for East Elgin is not new for us, for we had almost verbatim the same speech last year. The only little point on it that is novel is the attempt to foist on the Minister of Agriculture the charge of dealing harshly with the representations made by the city council of Toronto. Now, while I am quite prepared to stand up for the city of Toronto on all occasions, and especially for two noble wards in that city, at the same time I must say that I see nothing in the action of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture which could lead the member for East Elgin to make the attack he did. What are the facts of the case according to the hon. gentleman's own statement? The city council of Toronto sent to the Minister of Agriculture a certain statement with reference to the character of emigrants who arrived in that city. Like a courteous gentleman he acknowledged the receipt of their communication and courteously said to them: Your statements may be all correct; will you aid me in my tracing the source of this evil, if such evil there be? Will you give me all the information in your power, and let us see if we cannot get at the facts. As far as I can make out, that is the whole gravamen of the charge brought by the hon. gentleman. If the Minister of Agriculture is to be challenged in this House for simply discharging, in a courteous and gentlemanly way, the duties of his office, I do now know how any Government is to be carried on. I trust that hon. gentlemen in future will try to regard this question of emigration, with which the future of our country is so intimately connected, in a plain, simple, impartial spirit, and, for the time being, lay aside the feelings of hostility which are apt to creep up in perhaps other questions of a more general character.

Mr. TROW. I do not think it lies with the hon. member for Toronto to lecture my hon. for Elgin on what he said, for my hon. friend merely asked to be informed of the true state of the affairs in Toronto. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture, we are aware, took proper steps, and I do not know of any plan which he could have adopted better than

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

the one he did adopt to ascertain at once the actual state of affairs in the city of Toronto, and find out whether really an undesirable class of emigrants has been dumped out there by the charitable institutions, or whether they have been brought out by the Immigration Department. At all events, during the winter season, improvident people from many parts of the country, in the rural districts, where work is then scarce, find their way to the towns and cities, where the bowels of compassion of the people are more likely to be moved than in the country sections. Now, if we get proper statistics of the class of which the city council of Toronto has complained, we will then be able to judge what remedy that should be applied. I know sometimes these rumors are very much exaggerated. I recollect when the Mackenzie Administration was in power that it was said there were hundreds in this city in need of employment and on the verge of starvation; and on that occasion, whether hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House aided in the gathering of the large community that met in the railway room or not, 200 or 300 were drummed up and found their way there, demanding bread and soup, and we were accused of having soup kitchens all over the country. Well, the Mackenzie Administration took the step then that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is now taking, to ascertain the facts of the case, and instead of 200 or 300 being at the point of starvation, there were only 13. Well, the case in Toronto may turn out, as I hope it will, similarly.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Of course I receive with due submission the remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). I know he is in the habit of punishing delinquents. He followed that practice for a long time, and I suppose he thinks I am one of those delinquents and that he can use the rod for my punishment. An hon. gentleman near me says that he is an old school-master, and that might account for the punishment he imagined he was to give me. I did not complain of the Minister of Agriculture obtaining his information from the city council of Toronto. What I complained of was—and that is what the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) withheld in order to make a point against me—that the Minister should get up in his place here and make an assertion, without having the information he desired, that very probably the report was not reliable because it may have been wrong in some points. Was I wrong in saying that? Will the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) say that the city council of Toronto made a report which was not reliable? He said that I condemned him for obtaining that information. I did nothing of the kind. If the hon. gentleman would remain in this House and pay attention to what takes place, he would know better, and he would not make that kind of mistake. He says that the speech I made was the same as made a year ago. He has a good memory. He is a wonderful man. I venture to say that he has not looked at a single speech that I made a year ago or six years ago, but he is a wonderful man, he has a wonderful memory, and yet he does not remember what I said a year ago, but, while he has a long memory, what he fails in memory he makes up in assertion. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that I supported a certain matter in the committee which I did not in the House. I may say to my hon. friend, for his information, that it is not right to say anything about what took place in a committee until the report has been presented to the House. However, I will not object to that. I think it is right that the Chairman of the Committee should send and obtain full proofs, but I complained of the Minister of Agriculture making unfair assertions against the city council of Toronto without proper ground. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) said that I could not rise

above partisanship. Those hon. gentlemen say they are only going to take half the money for immigration purposes this year that they did last year; but, if you run your eye from top to bottom over the various agencies which they have, you will find the same amount of money voted for them as there was before, as there was at the time when they proposed to spend double the amount of money. What is this for? It is, as everyone knows to keep a large number of these servants employed, and also to give an opportunity to the various presses from one end to the other of this country to print immigration pamphlets, and charge the cost to the Government. No doubt they can come down handsomely at election times, and they should get a consideration for that. No doubt the Minister of Agriculture has received a handsome return in that way from the *London Free Press*, and we have only to look at that item to find that that paper received nearly \$16,000 during the year 1886-87. What was that for? Did that conduce to immigration to any great extent? I do not think it did, at all events to the extent of \$16,000. No doubt my hon. friend will say that this was for the purpose of engraving and printing pamphlets, and advertising, and so on. Very likely they did print some pamphlets, but I should think the principal part of the printing would be the enormous profits the proprietors received, and I think the Minister of Agriculture benefited in his election by the assistance which the *Free Press* has had. You may go over nearly every Conservative paper from one end of the country to the other, and you will find that they have been employed in printing immigration pamphlets. It is a very nice thing. It gets the good will of all these Tory papers. I advise my friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) to consider that immigration is a matter of more importance than to retain the present Government in power, and that the money which is given for immigration purposes is not given for electioneering purposes. If that hon. gentleman would exercise more ingenuity in that matter and would read fewer lectures to me, he might become of more use in this House than he is now. If the Government are candid and sincere, if they desire to retrench, they will commence by reducing the expenditure upon these various offices. How can you explain, when you are taking only half the money, how you require to expend the same amount in each of the offices? Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could induce the *Free Press* to print only \$8,000 worth next year instead of \$16,000. I know it would be hard on the *Free Press*. It is a good organ. It was a Reform organ at one time, but it was bought over, and now it is to have \$16,000 as a substantial inducement to support the Government every year. I have only to repeat that I do not think this money has been in the past expended in the interest of immigration. Judging from the appearance of the various agencies, I do not think that it is intended to expend this money for that purpose in the future. I think it is intended to keep civil servants outside in positions which they have occupied for some time past, and the Government do not desire to remove them; but the country demands a larger retrenchment at their hands in reference to immigration at this time, and I think, when an opportunity occurs, the people will give this Government to understand that they intend to enforce that view upon them.

Mr. McNEILL. As a matter of explanation, I want to say that what I referred to was the fact that the hon. gentleman had accused the Minister of Agriculture of deliberately insulting the city of Toronto while he had spoken of the communication from the city council of Toronto in exactly the terms, or in words in the same sense as those which were used by the head of the Department of Agriculture to-day. There was a consensus of opinion in that committee to the effect which has been expressed by the Minister here to-day, and I said that I was astonished at

an hon. member, who had been one of those who held that opinion, coming here a few hours afterwards, and endeavoring to make party capital out of the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, who had stated exactly what the Committee had stated a few hours before. I must say that I was astonished at that, and that I think it is degrading to this House that any hon. member should do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is extremely unfortunate that any hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should so far forget the rules of the House as to bring out before the House what has passed in a Committee, and it is still more unfortunate, if he wants to promote the business of the House, that he should tell another hon. gentleman, like my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that he has used language which is degrading to the House. Such remarks as that will not facilitate the progress of the Estimates in the slightest degree. They only lead to disagreeable altercations, and draw our attention away from the point before us. And I am certain that his friends on the Treasury benches will not thank him for taking the conduct of the Estimates out of their hands. Now, I want to call attention to what appears to me an extraordinary charge, one of the items my hon. friend referred to. There is in the Auditor General's report for last year a charge of \$15,807 for the *London Free Press*, and in that there was an item of 322,000 colored posters at 4½ cents. They cannot have been works of art at 4½ cents. It appears to me that that was just another instance of what I must call a most gross waste of public money, for all these 300,000 or 400,000 colored posters amount to just so much rubbish, and nothing else, flung broadcast across the country, for no earthly purpose except to enable a particular newspaper to make a good thing out of the job.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman should not make that statement without knowing —

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I saw one of the colored posters.

Mr. CARLING. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the *London Free Press* has a large lithographic establishment, and it is the only newspaper in Canada, I believe, that has one. The posters were published in English, French, German and Norwegian, and distributed all over Great Britain and Europe, and we have statements from our agents in Europe, and from the different steamboat agents, that they were most valuable in drawing the attention of the people to Canada. I am satisfied that nothing has been done that has tended more to attract people towards Canada. Such is the information we have from our agents, and from the agents of the steamboat companies, who have been pressing us to give them further supply. The price paid to the *Free Press* for these posters was certified by the Queen's Printer as a fair and reasonable price.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I saw one of these posters, and I am bound to say that if it is a fair sample of the 322,000 I will not qualify or withdraw what I stated. I think a most gross waste of public money was committed. But with respect to the whole of this, I am glad to see that the Ministers have cut down the expenditure. I believe that no worse use of public money has been made for many years than to expend it in bringing people to this country whom our own returns show we have not been able to keep here, who have been brought here largely by false pretences—I won't say in all cases on the part of the Minister's agents; but the men who brought these unfortunates here, not for the purpose of doing any good to Canada, but for the purpose of swelling their own commissions. Now, we find in the returns for Manitoba what this amounts to. We found that hundreds of thousands of people were stated, on the authority of the department

the hon. gentleman now presides over, to have gone to Manitoba, and when we took the actual census there we found that not one in five of those who were alleged to have gone there, had settled there, or remained there. Now, the danger and the mischief is this: You bring people here by false pretences, and they leave Canada and go to other countries and become, to all intents and purposes, anti-immigration agents. It is a great error and blunder to bring people here who are not wanted here, and that has been done for a long time.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Before that passes —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let us get on.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). If my hon. friend was as ready to call the attention of his supporter to the fact that he was discussing a matter not pertinent to the question —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think he has been answered by the hon. member.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Then, all I have to say is, that as to my remarks being degrading to this House, the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), having so long existed in such an atmosphere as that, is a good judge of degradation. I will therefore allow the matter to pass.

Immigration agent at Victoria, B.C. \$1,000

Mr. BAKER. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture the same this year that I did last year—if he cannot see his way clear to increasing the salary of the agent at Victoria, B.C. For the last two or three years he has got only \$1,000 a year, and I see no reason why he should not get the same salary as is given in other places where the agents gets \$1,200 or \$1,400. I undertake to say that the duties performed by that officer are as onerous, if not more so, than those performed at Calgary and Medicine Hat.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at London is only receiving \$1,000, and the same is given at Halifax and St. John. We are paying no more than \$1,000 at Medicine Hat and Calgary. We have not been able to see our way clear to make any change in the salary.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. gentleman will remember that the reason given for paying higher salaries at Brandon, Calgary and other places in the North West, was on account of the high cost of living. The same reason should induce the Minister to increase the salary paid at Victoria, B. C.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Perhaps the better way would be to reconsider the whole list. At Quebec there is an agent, an assistant, and a clerk, receiving altogether \$3,800, and there are in addition an interpreter and a messenger. Now, I notice there are eight immigration agents in the North-West. I do not know how far they are necessary, but it appears to me rather an unnecessary expense to have eight agents and four interpreters engaged in the North West, when we hear of so few people settling in that country. I presume the distance is considerable between the various points, but now the railway is running I should imagine the necessity no longer exists for having an agent at each one of those various points.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that Quebec is the great central point where the people focus. We have thousands of emigrants coming there, and we must have persons able to communicate with them and give them the needful information at the point where they touch the country. That accounts for the number of officers and the larger charge for Quebec. When we come to the question of the North-West I may say this: These agencies are widely separated, and hon. gentlemen can hardly imagine the vital importance it is to strangers coming into the country to have persons take them by the hand on their arrival giving them information

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

as to how to locate themselves and assist them to settle. There is a reduction of \$100,000 in the item, but we could not dispense with the services of these officers if we are going to have immigrants come into the country and hope to keep them here and settle them in a satisfactory way. We must have persons who possess the information and knowledge of the country to take them by the hand on arriving here. I do not think these amounts are too large, nor do I think there are too many of those officers for the purposes for which they are really required.

Mr. TROW. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in the statements he has just made. I would not press the giving up of agents in the older Provinces. I can, however, see no use for an agent at Port Arthur, for there is no land adapted for settlement in that locality.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Port Arthur is the landing point for the steamers. These immigrants will mainly go across the lake by steamer, and this vote is for the purpose of providing officers who will receive them on their arrival there, care for them and give them proper advice and assistance. They come here strangers, and I do not think that any person who has had any experience can over-estimate the importance to persons coming into a strange country, of having some one to whom they can apply for advice and assistance, and protect them against being misinformed and misled by interested parties.

Mr. TROW. I may still further say that there may probably be use for an agent at Brandon, as there is a good section of country both north and south, but I think the Government might do away with the agent at Qu'Appelle. As to the agent at Medicine Hat as very little land is taken up there or is likely to be taken up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Medicine Hat is a place to which miners will naturally resort.

Mr. TROW. Coal miners?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will find that some years ago buildings were erected at Brandon, Qu'Appelle, Medicine Hat and Calgary. A number of immigrants have gone in at those different points and they took advantage of the immigration buildings for shelter. Of course there must be some officer in charge of each building to look after it and also to see that the immigrants obtain information as to the advantages of each particular section and act as land guides to assist them in securing land for settlement. So far we have found it necessary to have these officers. If later on it is found to be unnecessary I shall be very glad to consider the question of doing away with them; at present, however, we do not see our way clear to do so.

Mr. TROW. I have seen large buildings at those places. I know there was no immigrant at Medicine Hat last fall. In regard to Calgary I do not know of any great quantity of land there except what was adapted for grazing.

Mr. CARLING. There is very good land north of Calgary, in the Red Deer district. A large number of settlers went there last year and a number are going this year. When immigrants reach Calgary we have an agent there to give them information in regard to the district, and of course to the country north of Calgary.

Mr. TROW. There is some force in the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) in regard to the expense of living in that city. I observe that the agent at Victoria receives \$1,000 while others receive \$1,300. It strikes me from the little experience I had there that a man can live cheaper in either Manitoba or the North-West than in Victoria and that provisions are much higher there than in the North-West or Manitoba. The argument of the hon. gentleman is therefore quite reasonable.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). I quite agree with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the agencies established at different parts of the North-West. People go there entirely unacquainted with the country and it is necessary to have some officer there to provide accommodation for the new arrivals for the time and assist them in locating on suitable land. Otherwise they would have to obtain the services of some one who might take great advantage of them, while the immigration agent possesses full knowledge of the country and is enabled to give them valuable information in regard to locating. In regard to doing away with the officers, I may say that I have had different applications from sections for officers to be appointed to assist settlers coming in.

Mr. LISTER. New offices?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes. I have had an application from Whitewood asking that an immigration shed should be built there, and stating that a large number of immigrants had been obliged to lodge in the railway station, and had been entirely at the mercy of the operator for accommodation. In place of doing away with any of the offices already existing, there should be more established for the accommodation of the people. The land is good and our whole country only requires to be known, and it is a very important matter to strangers to have some one to guide them and to look after their interests.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). To keep them in the country.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). You want to give proper information in regard to location. Strangers do not know where to go when they have to engage in land hunting. The land has to be mapped off, and unless you have somebody to guide you, how are you to make a proper selection? So far as doing away with them is concerned, I think it would be much better for the country to increase the staff.

Mr. LISTER. By how many?

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). In my district by about two more. I only speak for my own district.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says there are not a sufficient number of immigration agents in the North-West and that immigrants are going in now.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes, Sir.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And more immigration agents are required.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia). Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is a Mr. Adam J. Baker at Qu'Appelle. I suppose that is an important point at which to have an immigration agent. Will the hon. gentleman abolish that as an immigration agency?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Baker is not an agent at Qu'Appelle.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is he not?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, I have been informed now that he is.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has discovered that he is. Mr. Baker is down here. He has been engaged in canvassing in the county of Russell for the Government candidate, and I suppose his salary is going on and that he is paid travelling expenses from the North-West down here. The House will now see the importance of having immigration agents, and they will understand the importance of the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the Government wants more immigration agents. Of course you could not have got on in those by-elections if you did not have more of those immigration agents.

Mr. MITCHELL. They will want more of them now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Perley) says there are more of them required in the North-West, but when you appoint them in those districts they are like the non-resident clergy in Ireland, they do not happen to reside in the place for which they have been appointed. Here is Mr. Baker, an immigration agent, drawing his salary, and whose salary has to be provided for next year in the appropriation the hon. gentleman now asks the committee to vote. His travelling expenses will have to be provided, as were the expenses for the private secretary of the Finance Minister, who is sometimes on the other side of the Atlantic and sometimes on this. Those travelling expenses will be very large, but not larger than is necessary, because how could Mr. Baker be engaged in canvassing for Mr. Mackintosh in Russell, when he was appointed for the North-West, if a sufficient appropriation was not allowed to cover his expenses coming from the North-West down here. According to the hon. gentleman's statement there are immigrants going in there and there is no person to guide them. The shepherd has gone and the sheep are being scattered, and they are in danger of being taken over to Dakota, where the wolves will devour the sheep of the hon. the First Minister. The country of course will understand now why it is necessary to make this liberal appropriation, and why although we have scarcely anybody in the North-West now, we should have more immigration agents. The hon. the Minister and his predecessors in office informed us that 155,000 people had gone to that country during the past five years, and when the hon. gentleman looked at the census he could only find 43,000 of them remained. Here are 112,000 of the hon. gentleman's sheep lost, and lost because those shepherds who are so well paid for looking after the sheep, are not there to take care of their flocks. They are down in Russell and they are down in Kent. One of those shepherds received \$1,018 for looking after these sheep in Dakota.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that Mr. Smyth.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, that is the shepherd named Smyth. I do not know whether he found any stray sheep down there or not, but at all events he was down in Kent, and he was a candidate and I am glad to know that he was not a very successful candidate. The country will understand the importance now of voting the hon. gentleman's appropriation without further question. I am surprised that the Minister did not ask for more, as is suggested by the hon. gentleman behind him. Why did he not propose to appoint two or three more immigration agents for the North-West, who will not reside there and no doubt the hon. gentleman's supporters on that side would without question have voted the necessary appropriation? Why, Sir, this Government never could have got on unless this committee deals more liberally with them. They cannot keep their flocks in the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let us go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman promise to reform?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, yes, I will promise it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will he perform it though. If we have reached the hon. gentleman's conscience—

An hon. MEMBER. Where is that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It may be like the man in Richard III that it is a troublesome thing, and that every man who wishes to get on in the world with convenience and comfort to himself ought to get rid of it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has come to that conclusion, but I think the country will come to the conclusion that this appropriation is unnecessary to the extent that the

hon. gentleman has asked for. When he pays out of the public treasury a man who can be taken 1,500 miles away from the place he is supposed to be serving, to engage as a political hack in an election contest, I think the appropriation could be dispensed with.

Mr. LISTER. There is one thing I would like to say to the hon. gentleman. I suppose Mr. O'Donohue was in the service of this department also. I do not know whether he is an immigration agent or not but I think he is in the pay of the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. He is an extra clerk.

Mr. LISTER. I thought he was in the Immigration Department. Mr. O'Donohue was down in Russell too, and he is canvassing from house to house for the Government candidate. I do not know how that can be, because, if I recollect, last year he spoke in the kindest terms of the First Minister. Probably it is because of what he said about the First Minister last year that he is engaged in this occupation now.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did he say?

Mr. LISTER. I do not like to repeat it. This shows the way that the Government hacks in this country are being paid by the people's money to support this corrupt Administration. They are being paid a salary day after day, and they are employed as Tory hacks throughout this country serving in the interest of the Tory party. Only the other day three respectable young men as ever found a position in this House were dismissed for taking a part in an election against the Government, and yet this honest, honorable, upright Government, which has found so much fault with these translators, permit those miserable, wretched hacks to receive the money of the Government to malign the Opposition, and to misrepresent the position of the Government for the purpose of defeating Opposition candidates. So far as their influence is concerned, the Government has had a lesson to-day, and I think on next Wednesday they will have another lesson. When another general election comes around those gentlemen will find that they will be right here in these benches, and that better men will be occupying their positions of to-day.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This is no joking matter at all. It shows to what extent public opinion has been debauched in this country, when the Government would dare,—dare I say,—to bring one of their public officers from the North-West to take part in an election in this part of the country. Imagine for one moment the Prime Minister or a member of the English Government doing this. Would they be able to stand 24 hours against the indignation of the people of Great Britain if an hon. member on the opposite side of the House should bring such a charge against them as is being made by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) against the Administration here to-night. I say no matter whether it was a man of the standing of the present leader of the Government, or Mr. Gladstone, or any other, there would be such a howl of indignation from one end of the country to another, that the party which permitted such things would be swept out of office. There was a time in the history of this country when the hon. gentleman would not have dared to do this either. There was a time at the commencement of Confederation when the public opinion of this House and country would not permit the hon. gentlemen to sit there to and laugh at the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). When he states that the Government have brought one of their own officers, whom the taxpayers of this country are paying to take immigrants by the hand and locate them on the lands of the North-West, and have sent him to be a party hack in an election, I repeat that the public opinion of this country must have descended low indeed,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

when the hon. gentleman and the Government dare to sit there and treat the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell as they have done. I say no man can look for much from the future of this country if that thing is going to be permitted. If this country is going to occupy as high a place in the world as other countries, there must be a wholesome tone in the public opinion of the country. We are sometimes directed across the border for instances of corruption; but if an act of this kind were committed there, you would find every paper in the country ringing with it. But here we find a Government, which is safe for the present, ready to outrage every sentiment of public principle and honor, and send their officers to interfere in by-elections from one end of the country to the other. I repeat that it is a melancholy fact to the world, and it will be known abroad, that we have descended to such a condition of affairs. Therefore, the Government should now understand that this is no joking matter, that we are not going to sit here and quietly permit the Government to appropriate the funds of this country for the employment of immigration agents or any other agents for political purposes.

Mr. CARLING. The statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell is not correct. Mr. Baker has not been brought down from Qu'Appelle by the Government or offered his expenses. He came here of his own accord. He lives in this country, and his friends live in this country, and he asked the Department to give him what is given to all other officers of the Government, leave of absence.

Mr. LISTER. A singular coincidence.

Mr. CARLING. If the agent at Qu'Appelle asks the department for leave of absence, we give it as a matter of course. The officers of my department or any other department are entitled by the law to three weeks holidays each year; and if Mr. Baker asks for holidays and pays his own expenses, I think I would be remiss if I refused to him the privilege that I allow to other officers of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister denies that Mr. Baker, an official of the Government, is now taking part in the Russell election.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware whether he is or not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry to have to differ from the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow). I think he is wrong about there being no necessity for an agent at Port Arther, and I agree entirely with the hon. Finance Minister about the importance of having an agent there. It is the place where the immigrants land from the boats and go on the railway on their way to the North-West. More than that, I have been informed by Mr. Connell, the local member for that district, that within twelve miles of Port Arther there is just as fine land as can be found in any part of the country; and we know, from the reports of the commissioner sent out by the *Globe* Company, that in the Rainy River district there is as fine land as can be found in the Dominion of Canada, and it is of the utmost importance that attention should be drawn to it. With regard to the immigration agents in the North-West and Manitoba, I cannot see why there should be such differences in the salaries paid there compared with those paid in British Columbia. The hon. Minister says that the larger salaries are necessary because the duties there are very onerous. I can understand that in certain seasons of the year it is absolutely necessary that those men should be there. I can understand, from the reports that I have received, that it is absolutely necessary that the immigration agents should be on hand at the present time to meet the immigrants and direct them to the best localities. With regard to the immigration agent at Qu'Appelle, I think

his agency is one of the most important, and the most important duty he has to perform is to tell the poor immigrants who are coming in not to go one mile further west in search of farming lands on the Canadian Pacific Railway. With regard to his being absent at the present time, it is a strange thing that he did not take his holidays when there were no immigrants going into the country. Any one can understand that just now, when the busy season is coming on and immigrants are going in, it is of the greatest importance to have a man there to locate the immigrants.

Mr. CARLING. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the agent at Qu'Appelle has provided a substitute at his own expense during his absence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, last year we had a general election, and I know from the very best authority that last year and every year that there has been an election in Russell, that gentleman has been there.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got leave of absence perhaps.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No doubt he got leave of absence. But it is a strange fact that gentleman always lands down in the county of Russell when an election is coming on. He is said to be one of the best manipulators in the country. Another fact I want to draw attention to is that last year when he was down there, and no doubt paying a substitute at his own expense, the Auditor General's report shows that he received every cent of his salary, \$1,400. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has called attention to the fact, that not only he, but other civil servants are out stumping the country in the interest of the Government. I met Mr. O'Donohue in the county of Russell. It may be said that these gentlemen are not paid while they are there, and I am the last man who will stand up and question the right of any man to express his opinion, whether he is a public servant or not; but what I contend is that something like even-handed justice should be shown—that the law on one side of the House should be the law on the other side of the House too. It is only a few days since two men who hurt the feelings of the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe were dismissed summarily for the part they took in the elections. What I say is that British fair play and honorable dealing demand that the same law should be meted out to one side of the House as well as to the other, and that men should be dealt with on the same basis on both sides.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. the Minister of Agriculture does not deny that Mr. Baker is the Government immigration agent at Qu'Appelle. He does not deny that Mr. Baker is not in Qu'Appelle, where he said an immigration agent is particularly required at this season. He does not deny that Mr. Baker is here in Russell, engaged in canvassing on behalf of the Government candidate.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ignorance sometimes is convenient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He knows it now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman does not know it, but that does not alter the fact that Mr. Baker is in Russell county, aiding in the canvass for Mr. Mackintosh and doing what he can to secure that gentleman's election. The hon. gentleman nods his head; he approves of that. Well, Mr. Baker cannot be in Russell helping Mr. Mackintosh and in Qu'Appelle at the same time. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Baker has paid an agent to act in his place. Was the Government entrusted Mr. Baker with the power of appointing an immigration agent? Is this the new doctrine that an agent may delegate his powers to another

party with the consent of the Government? Is that the rule now?

Mr. CARLING. That is the rule. If an officer at Qu'Appelle or Calgary or Medicine Hat requires leave for a week or two, a substitute is appointed, or he selects one to take his place, but the substitute must be a responsible man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it the practice for agents during their absence to appoint and to pay substitutes?

Mr. CARLING. If an agent makes application at any one of those points for leave of absence, and a good man is recommended to fill his place, we will allow him to have his leave of absence.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). At election time.

Mr. CARLING. At any time at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says at all times. When did this practice of appointing agents and paying them at the expense of the regular agents arise? So far as I know, the practice is that when you give a man his holidays you do not charge him for carrying on the work of his office during his absence; and when the hon. gentleman informs the committee that Mr. Baker has employed and paid an agent to act in his behalf, he is stating a fact which shows that he has adopted a different rule from the one which usually applied in the public service. The hon. the First Minister informs the House a few days ago that the Government did not authorize Mr. O'Donohue to go or did not send him to Russell county. Well, the Government did not by Order in Council say that Mr. O'Donohue should go to Russell. The Government, as a Government, did not take any action in that sense; but Mr. O'Donohue is a clerk in the public service and he is not in Russell without the consent of his chief. Mr. O'Donohue is paid as a clerk in the Government service while in Russell, and Mr. Baker is paid as a Government agent while he is also in Russell, both engaged in the same election contest; and both these men are being paid out of moneys to which the Reformers of this country contribute as well as hon. gentlemen on that side. When hon. gentlemen wish to appoint election agents or ask parties to support their friends, they should do it at their own expense and keep their hands out of the public treasury. There is no difference between a mis-appropriation of public funds on the part of a clerk for which he is tried and sentenced to penitentiary and the action of the Government, when they put their hands into the public treasury and pay an officer who is employed in the public service and who should be giving his time to the public service while he is instead doing electioneering work. I say that this whole proceeding is in the last degree discreditable to the Government. I say it is in the last degree discreditable to them that, under the pretence of appointing an immigration agent to look after the interests of the immigrants in a part of the North West, they should pay a man for working in an electioneering contest 1,500 miles away from where his public duties as immigration agent should be discharged were he fulfilling the duties of the office to which he has been appointed. I say that condition of things is intolerable. I say it is impossible that hon. gentlemen opposite should be permitted to go on this way, and if they desire to have the session brought to an end, as we all desire it should, let them take the public moneys honestly and devote them to the purposes for which they are voted. They are not doing that when they employ a man as an immigration agent in the North-West and then send him down to the county of Russell to aid in an election contest, or permit him to go down there for that purpose. In so doing they are mis-appropriating the public moneys; in so doing they are obtaining moneys from the people and the Parliament of this country under false pretences.

Mr. MULLOCK. I am surprised to learn that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has permitted these abuses to occur in connection with the administration of his department. Of him I had expected something different, but I cannot say as much for his colleagues, and I can only look upon the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture as one of the effects of the company the hon. gentleman is keeping. I quite endorse all that has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell. This is certainly a misapplication of public money; it is certainly a breach of trust on the part of the Minister who is responsible. It is a breach of trust which if it occurred between the hon. gentleman—if he is the Minister who is responsible—in his individual capacity and any one for whom he might be a trustee, would render him liable in his person and estate in any court of competent jurisdiction. That he should, because he happens in this case to be judge as well as a trustee, abuse the position of trust which he occupies, as a trustee of the funds and the law and honor of the country, is discreditable to himself and to the Administration of which he is a member. I will just remind the hon. gentleman of another transaction in connection with his department. I had expected that the Minister of Agriculture, at all events, would have had a due regard for the public funds and for what is right and proper, but when I look over some of his ways of spending the money entrusted to him, I find ground for the opposite opinion. I see that he is now spreading broadcast over the country a pamphlet entitled "The experience and observations of Mr. Webster," who poses as a farmer from Gananoque. I suppose that pamphlet has been ordered by the hon. gentleman and paid for out of his department. This Mr. Webster, I am informed, is also an election agent, although he is in the pay of the Government, and from time to time he is sent out as such. I had the honor of meeting him on several occasions, when he posed as a farmer, and I find his name scattered through the public accounts. The hon. Minister who has evidently taken him under his wing, pays him for his pamphlets, and uses him as an agent of the Government. What must be the position of an Administration which is obliged to fortify itself in this way by misapplying the moneys and abusing the power they are entrusted with. The Government must feel their position very precarious when they resort to practices of this kind. No wonder the voice of the country is loud against them; no wonder that election after election is going against them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know what election there has been lately, since this House has been in Session, which has not gone against the Administration. Although we hear of many hon. gentlemen seeking portfolios, I doubt very much if there is a member of the Cabinet to-day who will resign his seat, for fear that it may not be filled by a supporter of the Administration.

Mr. CARLING. How about West Middlesex? That has been since the general election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about the post office in Strathroy?

Mr. MULLOCK. West Middlesex did render a temporary verdict, but we will see how it turns out when it is adjudicated upon. The member for West Middlesex was returned to this House by about the same majority as he had before. The very same day an election was held in Prince Edward, and the candidate who was defeated in 1878, who was elected in 1882, who was elected by a small majority in 1887, was returned to this House by a majority about 200 per cent. larger than that which he received in 1887.

Mr. MITCHELL. What about Missisquoi?

Mr. MULLOCK. Yes, what about Missisquoi, and Hoche-laga, and Maskinongé? Are not these indications of what the public think of this practice; and what about Kent? Of course Kent is present in the minds of those hon. gentlemen to-night, and I hope the result there will warn them that these practices can only have the same result. When a candidate was proposed in Kent, who had the nomination of the party practically in his pocket, while the protest was undetermined, he was appointed to a nominal office, and was given \$1,800 of the public money, to do what? To go out of the country at a convenient time. These are scandals that the public are becoming familiar with, but I think the country will soon resent them, and then hon. gentlemen will feel regret that they have not had more regard for the welfare of the country as custodians of the public money and custodians of the public honor.

Mr. MITCHELL. In looking over the details of the expense, I find that C. C. Chipman is put down for \$316 in addition to the \$2,000 referred to two hours ago, and I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if that gentleman is employed in his department.

Mr. LISTER. \$3,200.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, if it was \$3,200, here is \$316 in addition, which makes \$3,516. Is that the same man?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Probably the hon. gentleman does not understand that Mr. Chipman's office is under the Department of Agriculture. All the staff of the High Commissioner's office are under that department.

Mr. MITCHELL. But how does he come to draw over \$3,500? That is an enormous salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no such salary.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say that this statement on page 119 of the Auditor General's report is not correct? There we find, under the head of travelling expenses, C. C. Chipman, \$170.33. Further down we find, C. C. Chipman, advance on account of contingencies, \$146, making \$316.33. I do not know how many more items there are for C. C. Chipman. On page 112 of the Auditor General's report, I find that the Quebec *Canad an* received for publishing 20,000 "North-West of Canada," \$727.49; the Brockville *Times*, 50,000 British Columbia pamphlets, \$573.28; the Burland Lithographic Company of Montreal, for maps, and so on, \$5,907.26; the Montreal *Gazette*, 28,000 pamphlets with maps, \$746.23; the *Scandinavian National Union* of Winnipeg, 20,000 Scandinavian pamphlets, \$382.50; the Canada Bank Note Company, Montreal, for maps, &c., \$847.80—that may be right enough, I dare say—the Quebec *Courrier du Canada*, 5,000 British Columbia pamphlets, \$512.28; the Quebec *Cultivateur*, 3,000 "Esquisse de la Gaspésie" and "Notes on Gaspé," \$1,033.33; Three Rivers *La Liberté*, "Esquisse Générale du Nord-Ouest," \$1,704.70; Notman & Son, Montreal, views of Charlottetown, and so on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The view of Charlottetown is only 50 cents.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is so, but there is J. H. Brownlee, of Winnipeg, 8,000 maps of Manitoba, \$200. Then we have J. Wilson & Co., of Ottawa, stretching and binding 1,000 chromo posters, stretching chromo posters with zinc ends, stretching maps, binding, framing, and so on, \$905.20; Quebec *Chronicle*, 50,000 "Information for settlers in B. C."—which, I presume, means British Columbia, and that appears to be a pretty expensive place—\$744.92; Morrisburg *Courier*, 50,000 "Canada, its extent and resources," \$644.77. This is touching the resources of Canada pretty well. Then there is the Montreal *Colonisateur Canadien*, \$1,520; the Montreal *Monde*, \$981.51; Montreal *Minerve*, 50,000 pamphlets, "Rapport Agostini," \$1,784.93; Toronto

Mail—I suppose this was before the *Mail* learned to speak the truth—

Mr. CARLING. How much did the *Herald* get?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see anything here about the *Herald*.

Mr. CARLING. But the previous year?

Mr. MITCHELL. We might have got something the previous year, but as soon as we had independence enough to speak what we thought, we were mighty soon stopped. *Toronto Mail*, \$10,088.78. Then we have Richardson of Winnipeg, 13,000 "Facts and figures," \$624; Mortimer & Co. of Ottawa, lithographing and printing 10,000 maps, and another 10,000 maps, \$484.41; S. B. Foote, advertising in *Canada*, \$50; J. A. Carman, of Winnipeg, \$75; *Toronto Irish Canadian*, 100,000 "Across Canada," \$718.08; *Quebec Journal*, 50,000 "To Canada," \$949.50; *Pembroke Standard*, on account of work completed in September, 1887, \$.62; *Ottawa Le Canada*, 1,000 Hungarian circulars and translation, \$22.50; *Berlin Gospel Banner*, 50,000 German pamphlets, \$751.60, and then we have the *London Free Press*, the only instance in the whole lot that I find of a Liberal paper, which receives \$15,807.32.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It gets a liberal supply, at any rate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that your paper, Mr. Mills?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, it is on the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL. He gets \$15,807; *Welland Telegraph*, \$50,000; German pamphlets, folding, covering, &c., \$351; Arthur Buies \$200, "Sur le parcours du chemin de fer du Lac St. Jean, \$20." I do not object to the hon. gentleman publishing pamphlets and books to inform the public of England and Europe of the advantages of Canada as a country to settle in, but it appears to me that the distribution of the public money in the way of printing is very badly administered. I think it is a little selfish of them to keep it all among the Tory press, and I think there is an amount of trash published in some of these pamphlets that is perfectly worthless. We know the object. It is to subsidise them, and we know that the sum that is paid in advertising, to say nothing of other expenses connected with the Department of Agriculture, is utterly out of proportion to the amount of the benefit received. Sir, I am glad to see the Government have dropped out \$100,000 on account of assisted passages. I think we have been spending money most recklessly in that way, and we have no advantages to the communities in which we live. I think now the Government ought to go on and to a large extent cut off the expenses for these useless publications. I do not mean to imply that all the persons who write pamphlets do not render some service, but there is a great deal of trash circulated in connection with this department that is outrageous.

Mr. LISTER. So far as these pamphlets are concerned, with the exception of one, that of Mr. Lynch, on dairying, the rest are simply trash. They are prepared simply for the purpose of giving money to the friends of the Government; and so far as the newspapers are concerned, they are simply subsidised in the interest of the Government. I challenge the Minister to point out a single Tory newspaper from Prince Edward Island to British Columbia that is not subsidised by this Government. Why, Sir, if they want coal away down in Prince Edward Island, they advertise it in the *British Columbia papers*, and in the *Regina Leader*. Why, Sir, a gentleman who sits in this House as member for one of the Assinaboias, appears in the Public Accounts as having received something like \$5,000 last year. No wonder he could take a trip on the continent. He says he went to the continent, and he told us that he was at some uni-

versity. He has travelled on the continent at the expense of the people of this country, for which he is giving them nothing at all. Now, the hon. gentleman talks about the election. I think he had better have said nothing about the West Middlesex election. Does he not know that they dangled a post office before the people of Strathroy for months before the elections? Does he not know that every Tom, Dick and Harry who had a lot of land in Strathroy were promised that the Government were going to buy their lot at an enormous price? Does he not know that every contractor in the town was led to believe that he was going to get a contract for this building, and that everybody who had anything to do in the village, was going to be appointed clerk of works. No wonder that West Middlesex went against the Liberals this time, but wait until the next election comes, and we will show you a trick or two. Does anybody suppose that these two men, O'Donohue and Baker, who have worked for the Government in Russell, if they were Liberals, and had worked against the Government, would have remained in its service a single day? No, Sir, they would have been dismissed like the French translators. The Premier and one or two of his friends go round and say to the Speaker, dismiss that man without trial. That is British justice and fair play for you! But as long as a man is working for the Government he can go home and leave his business when he ought to be at his post in the department, and go back and forth pursuing his nefarious work in promoting the election of the Government candidate. There may be a day of reckoning for this gentleman, who may find that the position he has held, under these circumstances, at all events, is not a very safe position. How differently hon. gentlemen treat Liberals. I had occasion only the other day to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General the case of an honorable and responsible citizen who was postmaster down in Arkona in my county, and because they wanted to have his place for a political hack and supporter of theirs they dismissed him without a trial. They preferred no charge, they had no investigation, there was nothing wrong with the office, and that man was summarily dismissed, and his crime was the crime of being a member of the Liberal party of this country. They tell us that his books were in disorder. But he denies it in his letter to me. He says there was nothing against him; no charge ever made, no wrong ever took place in the office, and the statement made by the Government that he was dismissed for cause is falsified by the fact that the man who has received his position was promised the appointment of postmaster for months before the dismissal of Mr. Evarist. That is the way Liberal officeholders in this country are treated by this Government. That is the way that worthy officeholders are treated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, they must not be surprised if, when a change of Administration takes place, these wrongs are righted. There will be a fearful day of reckoning for these men who have violated the position they occupy, who have proved themselves to be unfit to be in the public service. They must not be surprised if they are slaughtered right and left when a change of Government takes place. The public service of this country cannot be kept in the position it ought to be, unless all public servants cease to be partisans, and cease to interfere in elections.

Mr. BAKER. I still wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture if I may have any reason to hope that the agent at Victoria will have his salary increased.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that if I find that the duties of that office have been very much increased, I will take an increase of his salary into favorable consideration.

Salaries of the London Office in England \$7,554

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this to be voted again this year? The hon. gentleman is not accepting any salary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has nothing to do with my salary.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to have an opportunity of saying a good word for an official of this House. I wish to offer my testimony to the manner in which Mr. Colmer, of the High Commissioner's Office in London, has discharged his duties. I have had an opportunity of knowing personally how he treated the people from Canada, and I have found his conduct in that regard entirely satisfactory.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may take this opportunity of saying that it would be impossible to find in any department of the public service, a more energetic, industrious, and painstaking officer than Mr. Colmer. The total salary paid with this increased vote is less than it was in 1883 when I first took charge of the office.

Mr. McMILLAN. I see there are three different officials who are paid the same salaries, the agents at Liverpool, Dublin and Glasgow, but each pay a different amount of income tax, namely, \$137, \$86.62 and \$30.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The income tax is so much per cent. upon the salary, and when the salary is larger of course the income tax is greater. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the salaries are not alike.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it necessary, now that we have decreased assisted immigration expenditure by over \$100,000 or about two-fifths of the whole expenditure, that all these officials in Europe and Great Britain should be maintained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is impossible to immediately change the staff. These officers have been placed in those positions, and they will have to discharge the duties to the office precisely the same as before. I may say with regard to the Liverpool office that Mr. Dyke, who is an extremely able and assiduous officer, is charged with a large amount of work in connection with continental immigration. Persons on his staff are corresponding in different languages with persons in Germany, Norway, and Switzerland, and other countries, and therefore, so far as regards the Liverpool office, which is the principal point of departure for European emigrants to this country, must be maintained. You cannot dispense with it, because you have reduced the amount of assisted passages; in fact we would rather require to increase the efforts of the agencies in Liverpool, Glasgow and Dublin with a view to attract agriculturists with capital to this country. I do not think if the hon. gentleman will give the subject his attention he will come to the conclusion that it would be wise that, because we are effecting a saving of \$100,000 a year in assisted passages, we should do away with our officers, but on the other hand we should rather increase our efforts to obtain such immigrants as will not be able to pay their own passages but will possess sufficient capital to enable them to become useful and valuable settlers in developing our country.

Mr. MITCHELL. The explanation given by the hon. gentleman is a very reasonable one.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I find that Mr. Dyke's salary is \$2,100, Mr. Graham's salary \$1,300, Mr. Connolly's \$1,000, instead of all the salaries being equal, as has been alleged. The hon. gentleman was looking at the amounts for travelling expenses, which is a different matter. The income tax is so much per cent. on the salary, and the statement of the Minister of Finance was therefore perfectly correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What agencies does the hon. gentleman propose to retain?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke at Liverpool, \$2,100; Mr. Graham at Glasgow, \$1,300; the agent at Belfast, \$1,000; Mr. Connolly at Dublin, \$1,000; agent at Bristol, \$500, and an agent at Switzerland, \$800.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I find the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) in quite mistaken in regard to the income tax payments. The same amount of income tax has not been paid by officers with the same salaries, the difference in one case being 86 to 27, and in another case 50 to 28.

Mr. CARLING. There is a receipt for each of the items certified by the Auditor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will bring the Auditor General's statement which will show that the amounts stated are perfectly correct.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the agents in Europe remunerated for their actual time while travelling?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are \$4 a day allowed for travelling expenses.

Mr. LISTER. Whether they travel or not?

Mr. MULOCK. This agent has his fixed salary, and \$1,460 are allowed him for travelling expenses, as we see by reference to the Auditor General's report, that is \$4 a day for the 365 days in the year. I suppose that during the most of his time he is engaged in his office at Liverpool.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not exactly so. He frequently makes trips to Norway and Sweden and parts of the continent of Europe to see the various agents and persons with whom he is in constant correspondence.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think that is a good way to remunerate him. He receives a certain amount as salary and he receives \$1,460 more in order to keep him from loss in case he travels. You are remunerating him in a way that conflicts with the public interest. If it is in the public interest that he should travel, he should be paid for travelling, but by the way in which you are remunerating him now you make it to his interest not to travel. I presume that it is more expensive for him to travel than to remain in Liverpool and if he receives \$1,460 whether he travels or not, and it is more expensive to travel than to remain in Liverpool, he will stay in Liverpool. I think he should be paid his expenses when he travels, and then only.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is something in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. This practice was established several years ago and when a practice is established in remunerating a public officer hon. gentlemen well know how difficult it is to change it.

Mr. DAVIES. There is a great difference between the travelling expenses of some of the agents. The agents at Liverpool and Glasgow are allowed \$4 a day as travelling expenses and Mr. Connolly in Dublin is only allowed \$2.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is in relation to the importance of the position he occupies.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The man in Dublin would seem to be just as important as the man in Glasgow.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that in another part of the accounts, Mr. Dyke gets \$450 more for travelling expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Finance seems to admit that this is not a sound way of paying those travelling expenses, but he does not hold out any hope that he will correct it. What has fallen from the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) shows the necessity of establishing a proper basis by paying a fixed salary, and if he travels by paying him for travelling.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt but this is a subject worthy of careful consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. I see Christmas gratuities in Mr. Dyke's items, \$12.54. It is a small item, but it is a strange

principle to establish to give gratuities and charge it in the public accounts.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What is the saving made in the item for contingencies for Canadian agencies? I see that you saved \$9,000 on this year's grant.

Mr. CARLING. The amount last year was \$30,000. This report is based on the actual expenditure for last year.

Gen. LAURIE. While on the item for immigration expenses I should like to ask is it probable that any better accommodation will be afforded at Halifax to immigrants waiting there before they are taken out west? I do not know whether it comes under the Department of Agriculture or of Railways, but the immigrants have no other accommodation at present than a freight shed, and it is very severe on women and children coming in an inclement season of the year that they have no place to obtain warmth and food. It does seem to me that accommodation should be provided for them rather than leave them as they are now among the sheds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have been in a place there which is to accommodate the immigrants and which is at the head of the wharf. It is not very spacious it is true, but at the same time it must not be forgotten that there is no object in having arrangements made to keep immigrants there a long time. We do not want to have them there an hour if we can help it. The trains come down on the spot and they are on their way, after a short time. The accommodation is not very ample, but there is a house at the head of the wharf to give them temporary shelter while the trains are being got in readiness to take them away.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is slightly in error. There is a room there which communicates with the shed in which the emigrants land, but inasmuch as last year, I think, some 13,000 immigrants were landed in Halifax, I do not believe the accommodation is sufficient for this large and increasing number. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will take that matter into consideration, whilst there is some accommodation there it is quite insufficient for the growing traffic.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if any portion of this \$50,000 is to be applied towards assisting immigrants who come to Canada?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not any.

Mr. MULOCK. No public money is to be expended in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. At present the question has not been finally decided with reference to children who are brought out by charitable institutions; by Dr. Barnardo and other persons, who have established with their own money homes in this country, in which the children are cared for until they are finally placed in a satisfactory position. The country has had no other charge and there has been a small assistance, I think I am right in saying of \$2, given for each of those children.

Mr. CARLING. Over 1,000 were brought out last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Two or three thousand dollars is the entire expense and that has not been withdrawn.

Mr. MULOCK. Am I correct in understanding from the Minister of Finance that the Government has decided that they will not in any way contribute towards paying for immigrants.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a shilling.

Mr. MULOCK. The only question in point is the question of \$2 for each of those children?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

46-1888-5

Mr. MITCHELL. While this subject is before the House I wish to give an expression of opinion about the allowance for those children. I entirely approve of an allowance to a moderate extent to assist those people who bring out those children. I do not think because we condemn aid being given to those immigrants generally that the same applies to benevolent societies or individuals who at their own expense bring out children. I do not think this country would object to a small contribution such as this for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It depends on the children they bring out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say as to that that the investigation has been most satisfactory. I believe it has been found that 95 per cent have been well selected and are all that could possibly be desired.

Mr. JONES. I think the hon. Minister of Finance was right in his statement that the immigrants remain only a short time at Halifax when they land there. My firm being agents for the Dominion line, by which a large number of immigrants come during the winter months, I have been able to watch the *modus operandi*, and he is quite correct in saying that we always endeavor to get them away as soon as possible, and they seldom remain there more than a few hours, in fact only long enough to have their baggage examined. There is a room there for their accommodation, but at times it is hardly sufficient for them, and we sometimes have to obviate the difficulty by keeping them on the steamers until the trains are ready. There is a house opposite the depot for the accommodation of immigrants, I do not know anything about it, and would not be understood as saying a word against it; but some of the clergymen in Halifax, who had an idea that liquor was sold in that house, started an immigrants' home opposite the deep water terminus, where the immigrants would be under the charge of people belonging to the different churches, and would be carefully looked after. I understand that the people in charge of this home have made an application to the Minister, and if the Government would make an arrangement with them, they could rely on the immigrants being carefully looked after, and kept away from temptation. The accommodation we have we manage to get along with, but it would be better if we had a little more.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the hon. the Finance Minister stated that the Government had not yet decided whether they would give any assistance to those societies which are bringing out children. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said he thought it was right and proper that aid should be rendered to them. I think the Government should seriously consider whether it would be in the best interest of the people of Canada to assist the majority of those children who are brought here. I have had frequent opportunities for a number of years of seeing and examining those who have been brought out by various institutions, and I have no hesitation in saying that they are not a desirable class out of whom to make citizens of this Dominion. I think the Minister stated that careful inspection was made to see that only proper children were brought out. I should like to know what arrangements are made for doing that. I do not know of any regulations of the department providing for any proper inspection of these children before they leave the old country. Many of these children are the offspring of a class of people whom we would not like to become citizens amongst us; many of them are diseased, and I think it should be seriously considered whether it would be wise to allow them to be scattered throughout the country, to mingle and associate with the children of our own people. I certainly think that the Government ought to decide either to exercise every dili-

gence in the selection of these children or else not to render any further aid to that class.

Mr. TROW. I dissent entirely from the view expressed by my hon. friend. In the town of Stratford there is an institution, established by Miss Macpherson, to which she has brought hundreds of children, and they are not there twenty-four hours until they are placed in good, comfortable positions for life among the farmers in the neighborhood, and thus far I have not heard of more than two out of the thousands she has brought who have not proved to be respectable citizens. I think these children from 12 to 14 years of age are the most desirable class of immigrants we can get. We have been freed from the expense of raising them until they are prepared to take positions in life for themselves, and the farmers are always anxious to obtain them.

Gen. LAURIE. It fell to my lot to place about 500 of these children, and I think the best proof that they gave satisfaction is the fact that as successive parties came out the applications for them increased so much that I had four or five applications for each one that came out, for I inferred that the people would not apply for them unless they were a desirable class. I watched over them and inspected them for a certain number of years, and while a certain number were not satisfactory, the great mass of them were satisfactory. I have watched the careers of many of them since and they have become valuable citizens.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Notwithstanding what my hon. friend from South Perth has said, I have seen many of these children as they grow up, and I consider that they are not such a class as we ought to have in our midst. They are a class brought frequently from the poorhouses and the slums of the cities of the old country.

Mr. TROW. No.

Mr. WILSON. My hon. friend says no, but he knows nothing about it; he has had no opportunity of witnessing the diseases that are prevalent among many of those brought from the old country. If we wish to sow the seeds of disease among the people of this country, we will continue bringing that class. My hon. friend desires that we should do so. I have no objection as far as he is concerned, but I desire to protect the rest of the community; and I say that my experience has been that many of those brought here should not have been permitted to remain in this country. These children, of course, are not to blame. Their diseases are inherited from their parents; but the Government would be justified if they would devise some means by which a selection would be made and we would be spared the infliction of the immigration of poorhouse children.

Mr. TROW. The experience of my hon. friend must be very limited, for the simple reason that there is not an institution for the reception of these children probably within 100 miles from where he resides, and he would not have an opportunity of considering their character in the isolated constituency he represents.

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice that a considerable amount has been expended for the examination of these children. I find eight items on page 117 and two items on page 118.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman state this, because the hon. member for East Elgin will find there is a careful examination made.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps if the hon. the Finance Minister would take an opportunity to see many of those children, he would have the same opinion with regard to them as I have. It is not my desire to make any attack or to misrepresent things in the least. But I have had the opportunity of examining into the condition of those children, and

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

I know what I am speaking. As regards the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Trow) to the effect that there is no institution for these waifs within 100 miles of where I reside, that statement comes fittingly from one who speaks of mountains thousands of miles high, and I do not pay much attention to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I remember speaking last year on this subject with a police magistrate in Chatham, where a considerable number of these children, principally girls, were left; and I think he told me that in the course of six months, there was not one of them that had not been before his court. I think, therefore, the subject is one that ought to receive the careful consideration of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Before this resolution is carried, I would ask the Finance Minister if he would call an early meeting of the Public Accounts Committee to examine into the cases of Mr. Baker and Mr. O'Donohue, and find out the exact circumstances under which they absented themselves from duty to take part in an election contest. Perhaps Friday would suit the convenience of the hon. gentleman. This is a matter which we cannot pass over in silence. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has given a very unsatisfactory explanation, and we are bound to find out how it is these public servants have been allowed to desert their posts in order to perform other duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has nothing to do with Public Accounts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). It has a great deal to do with them. This Mr. Baker left an important post to canvass in Russell, and a most unsatisfactory explanation has been given by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CARLING. In what way?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Either he is absent on leave or he is not. If absent on leave for the purpose of electioneering, his action is most disgraceful to all the parties concerned. If the hon. gentleman has been deceived by Mr. Baker—

Mr. CARLING. I have not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). There can be no more important enquiry before the Public Accounts Committee than the enquiry into the circumstances under which a man receiving public pay is neglecting his duty and engaging in an electioneering contest. If this kind of thing is to go on and there should be a change of Government, none of these men can hope to retain their places longer.

An hon. MEMBER. That will be a long time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). Perhaps so. But even if this Government continues in office, I am sure the better men supporting it do not wish to see public servants neglecting their duties to take part in a political contest. As far as we are concerned on this side, we are prepared to enter our protest against it, and will make that protest very effective, if it ever falls in our power to do so. I desire these public servants to know that if they choose to make themselves political hacks and canvass for Government supporters in an electioneering contest, they must do it at their own risk, and I desire to know how far the Minister of Agriculture has lent himself to such conduct.

Gen. LAURIE. If a public servant happened to be canvassing in behalf of a supporter of the Government, I would like to know what position the hon. gentleman would take?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman surely did not hear the debate which took place the other day on the

dismissal of some gentlemen who were not even officers of the Government, but were officers of the House, because they ventured to take part in an electioneering contest against the Government, while those who took part on the Government side were retained.

Gen. LAURIE. I regret to say that I know of a great many public servants who worked very hard in favor of an opponent of the Government in a late contest in which I was engaged.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman had the advantage of the Government steamer to carry his voters all along the coast.

Gen. LAURIE. I have already stated that is not the fact.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have sat here for two or three years listening to this discussion. I think that the question which is now occupying the attention of the committee is a serious one. Of course, the salary is not a very large one, but I would have been glad to have heard some of the members of the Government express an opinion with reference to this small matter. If it is their policy to encourage officials who are paid out of the public treasury to leave their post of duty in order to assist in elections, and to run throughout the Dominion, they should announce it. I do not think they can approve of it. I have listened to the charges which have been made. There is very little political capital to be made out of that sort of thing, but there is a principle involved, and I would be pleased to hear members of the Government disclaim any intention of using their officials, who are paid out of the taxes of the people, who are paid out of the public purse, in this way. I think it is wrong, and I would be glad to hear some members of the Government disclaim this sort of thing. It ought not to be, no matter what party is in power. I could occupy the time of the committee much longer, but I do think it is important for this country that we should have at least as much political morality as it is possible to have, and I think this is political immorality and ought not to be encouraged, and I do not think the Government can approve of this sort of thing. It would please me to hear them say it is wrong and should be discontinued, and to hear them say they will discontinue this sort of thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It occurs to me that the question put by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) comes at the wrong time and in the wrong place. We are at present discussing the Estimates and not the conduct of the Government. If the hon. gentlemen opposite choose to bring up a charge against the Government, let them do it at the right time, and we will be prepared to meet it. As to the question of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) I may say, in reference to this Mr. Baker, whose case I never heard of until to-night, that I think the statement of the Minister of Agriculture ought to be perfectly satisfactory. He says that Mr. Baker applied for leave of absence and obtained it, that he got the same leave of absence which was given to other officers, that he found a substitute to do his work, that substitute being satisfactory to the department for the performance of his duties during his leave of absence; and the Minister of Agriculture says that how Mr. Baker was employing his time he does not know. That was the answer of the Minister of Agriculture, and no other answer could be given. He did not know any more in reference to Mr. Baker.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Then he cannot read the papers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I read the papers, and I never heard Mr. Baker's name until it was mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. MULOCK. We are now engaged in voting a sum of money to pay Mr. Baker's salary for the ensuing year, and I think it is very pertinent to that question to decide whether he has been discharging his duties in such a way as to move this committee to continue their payments. There are some four or five thousand civil servants in the service of this Government, and perhaps this kind of action might go a little further, because we have seen some interference with civil servants in certain cases. Sometimes we have seen them removed from their positions, and in others we have seen them compelled to take part in elections on behalf of the Government. If the First Minister does not regard this inquiry as being limited, let him go a little further. I am not at all satisfied as to the circumstances under which some of these men have been dismissed. For instance, there were those three Irishmen who were dismissed from the canal at the instance of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). I believe he is blameable for not protecting them if he is not for obtaining their dismissal. That, perhaps, is a matter which is not germane to this point, but it ought to be cleared up. In regard to the matter now before us, if the Minister takes the ground that, as a committee, we are not entitled to do this, surely as a committee we can make a representation to the House, and that should be that A. G. Baker, or whatever his name is, was employed as immigration agent at Qu'Appelle, that he was stationed at Qu'Appelle, that at the present time the immigration business is very brisk at Qu'Appelle, that he has had some experience in managing that business, and that his business there ought to call for him to discharge the duties of his office, and that the interests of the country imperatively demand that the duties attaching to that office should be attended to, and that they will not admit of delay or of being performed by a person incompetent to perform them; and therefore no person should be allowed to vacate that office at such a critical moment, except under the greatest possible urgency. I ask the hon. the Minister of Agriculture whether this civil servant submitted to him the name of his successor who was supposed to be able to perform these duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He did not know that he was the agent.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister says he did know, but he says the Minister of Agriculture passed upon the qualifications of the substitute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not. What I said was that the appointment of the substitute was satisfactory to the department. I do not know whether it was satisfactory to the Minister or not.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know whether the Minister runs the department or the department runs the Minister, but I assume that any hon. Minister will understand his own business, and I do not think that even the First Minister, who has had great experience as head of a department, will admit that he was not responsible for everything that took place in his department. I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he knew what were the qualifications of this substitute of Mr. Baker before he granted leave of absence to that agent. Did he consider for a moment that this was not the time to grant leave of absence, and that it should only be granted under great urgency, such as a family bereavement or something of that kind, which would justify the Minister, if he were willing to do so, in recommending a change in the Department at that time. If that is not so, the Minister of Agriculture has been derelict in his duty. If everything is satisfactory, the committee will, of course, disclose it, but, if the hon. gentleman gives out that the only excuse was to enable this gentleman to go to some constituency and manipulate votes there and secure the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues in office, that

would not be a sufficient ground for the leave being granted. I think we must first find out whether this officer has discharged his duty properly, whether he was justified in leaving his office, either by the circumstances or by permission; and not till then should we vote money to continue him in office.

Mr. CURRAN. With reference to the statement made by the last speaker in connection with this man, and which he has taken an opportunity on three different occasions to repeating in this House, although I stated that the allegations he had made on two former occasions were untrue, as he has again repeated to night the statement about three Irishmen being discharged from the public service in Montreal, whose discharge I might have prevented, I may as well make, once for all, a formal statement with regard to that matter. The report originated with a young man who was employed on the Montreal *Herald*, and was utterly without foundation. In the first place, there were no men discharged, either Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Frenchmen, or men of any other nationality, from any public service in the city of Montreal, and I had nothing to do with such discharge, if it took place, and I know it did not. On the contrary, when this statement appeared in the newspapers and was copied into one or two other papers in this city and elsewhere, I stood up in my place and stated that if any such discharge had taken place, it was without my knowledge or consent, and that I would give the papers in question an opportunity of proving their assertion. I went to Montreal, and I there enquired from the superintendent of the canal what had taken place. These three men were alleged to have been discharged from the canal works because they had taken part in an election against me. I found that no such men were in the employ of the canal office at all. There are a certain number of laborers employed in the canal office every year to take charge of the locks. The superintendent of the canal informed me that certain parties had told him that during the course of the election three men who were in the habit of being engaged in the spring, were taking a very active part in the election against me, and that he went and told them that it was very much better for them, as they did not know what Government would be in power, to give their votes as they thought proper, but to take no other part in the election. It appears that the three men whom he had thus notified applied for work at the opening of the season, and he told them to come to me and get a letter of recommendation, and he would give them work. That was all that was said. Two of these men come to me and asked for letters of recommendation, which I immediately gave them, and he immediately gave them work. The third man never applied to me for a letter, and I confess I never ran after him to give him one. If he had come to me he would have had the letter just the same as the others. Now, I will read what the papers who had published this statement about me said afterwards. In the first place the Montreal *Herald*, in a very manly way, came out in the following language:—

"Some time ago, before the animosities of the late general election had subsided there appeared in the *Herald* an article in which Mr. J. J. Curran, member for Montreal Centre, was alluded to as the enemy of Irish Home Rule and a coercionist. He is represented as having made use of the political position to oppress a number of Irish laborers in this city. We deem it our duty to state how much we regret that the article in question should have found its way into our columns and lest its publication may have in any degree injured that gentleman in the esteem of his fellow-countrymen, we desire to add that the charges were unfounded in so far as they related to Mr. Curran. We differ from Mr. Curran on many questions of Dominion politics, yet we willingly acknowledge that he is a sincere friend of the Irish cause and an upright Canadian politician."

That was published on the 14th September, 1887, and I think disposed of the question in so far as I was concerned. I have stated exactly how far the superintendent of the

Mr. MULOCK.

canal was concerned, also. Then the Montreal *Post*, who had been most bitter against me all along, copied the article of the *Herald* and published a very strong article on its own account, in which it stated:

"The article of the *Herald* which occasioned the above apology having been reproduced in the *Post* and *True Witness*, it is only fair that the management of those papers should publish the disavowal. On the other hand, they also published strictures on the member for Montreal Centre, and to end if possible all causes of dispute with that gentleman they deem it proper to make the following statement: The *Herald* says that Mr. Curran is an upright Canadian politician. The management agree with that paper. He is an honorable and an honest man. The charges made against him in this paper relative to coercing poor laboring men were, they now believe, unfounded and the management regret any such allegations having been made.

"The management of the *Post* are therefore prepared to admit that when a difference of opinion comes it is possible to advocate the views of either side without having recourse to epithet. The management of this paper feel that some of the language made use of by their writers gave Mr. Curran good cause of complaint and they desire to make the amende honorable in this connection."

This was published both in the *Post* and *True Witness*, on September 29, 1887. Another paper published in this city also apologised for having reproduced the statement in question. Now, all these things must have been known to the hon. member who has just spoken. When I got up in the House I gave the most emphatic denial to the allegations that he made. Still, he persisted in them. He was requested to withdraw this statement, but he would not withdraw it. Now, I have only one thing to say, that any man who says that I have ever, on any occasion, oppressed anybody, or sought to deprive them of any position which they hold under the Government, or might hope to hold under it, because that man or men had opposed me in an election, is a liar, in the plainest language.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CURRAN. I say any man who says so, is a liar.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CURRAN. What is the order about? I say so here, and I will say so anywhere else. Now, I hope that this thing has come up for the last time, because I shall consider it a personal insult if it is again hurled against me, after the manner in which I have disproved the allegation. As I said, the papers in question came out in a most manly way and exonerated me in every respect, and from that day to this I have been well treated by them, I believe. But certainly there is no excuse for such reiterated attacks upon me in a matter that is utterly without foundation; and if all the other allegations made here with reference to public employes are of the same nature, this House can judge of their value.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the second time the hon. member for Montreal has chosen to read that article in the *Herald*.

Mr. CURRAN. I never read it before in the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. You referred to it, then, last Session.

Mr. CURRAN. No, I could not refer to it last Session, because it had not been written then.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the beginning of the Session, you did.

Mr. CURRAN. Not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I certainly understood so.

Mr. CURRAN. I stated in answer to the hon. member who spoke a moment ago, that this article had appeared in the *Herald*, but I had not the article about me just then to read.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know you referred to it, at all events.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, I did.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the hon. gentleman has made a statement, I may just as well make one too. This article was written without my knowledge, and the first I saw of it was in the press. It was written by a gentleman who then managed my paper, and when I saw the article I at once asked that gentleman—I need not mention his name, gentlemen on the other side know who it is.

An hon. MEMBER. The *Empire*?

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Empire*, if you like. I asked him what the meaning of the article was what was the foundation for making such statement against a man of Mr. Curran's position and standing. He said he had the best authority for it, that he had sent down to verify the statements of the men—the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) spoke of three, to the best of my recollection the number was six. My manager told me they had been not exactly discharged but had been refused employment on the canal. They had been employed from season to season, some of them for years, and when they went to get employment at the opening of this season they were informed that before they could be employed they would have to get permission from Mr. Curran. My manager informed me that he had verified the facts and the men had come to the office and asserted it over and over again and they were prepared to prove it. When Mr. Curran brought an action against the *Herald* I said: If those facts can be established I will defend it, and I did defend the action, till I got an intimation that the matter could be very easily settled. I believed there was every grave doubt as to whether under the libel law of Quebec the proof of the truth of the statement was always a defense, and when I came to consult my lawyer, who was a very prominent Conservative, I discovered that there were very grave doubts whether, even if every fact be proved as stated in the paper, I would not still be mulcted in damages. Mr. Curran having very handsomely offered to settle the matter if an acknowledgment was made, my lawyer said I had better do it and get rid of it. I at once said to my lawyer: If that is the case I will do it. I will say this, that Mr. Curran said more than that, namely, that he would not even charge the costs against the *Herald* if he had not a partner who was entitled to have his costs in the matter, when he found that it was done without my knowledge or information. I said to my lawyer under these circumstances: We will pay Mr. Curran his costs and make such an acknowledgment of error as you think desirable—and Mr. Curran prepared it himself, he will acknowledge it. And that at the time I said to my lawyer: Well, it is going pretty far, but we have done him some injury and I am willing to make the utmost recompense to him for it. Under those circumstances I gave Mr. Curran that explanation for publication, if he chose to use it. It was objectionable to me somewhat, expressing as it did an opinion about his private character, but at the same time I felt that, when I was doing it, it was better not to do it half way but to go the whole length and satisfy Mr. Curran. I want to say this to Mr. Curran, that every man connected with the editorial staff, and there are several of them, was indignant to think with a case which they thought clear I should have been so foolish as to settle it. I have had some little experience with actions for libel since I became connected with a newspaper. I know what the troubles are. I got into an action in which there were ten different allegations of defense, each of which would have laid me open for an action for damages. The partner of our worthy Speaker brought an action against the *Herald* in that case, brought us into court, and one of the allegations was of rather a serious character, the case being in connection with a young immigrant woman. She subsequently emigrated to Vermont. I had to send to Vermont for her, and although I proved every one of the

ten allegations except one, which had to be proved by that young woman, the old woman who brought the action hurried her away and I was never able to get sight of her again. Judge Jetté, who presided at the court, postponed the final evidence for several days, knowing we had brought this young woman there and that she had disappeared, but the result was that because we were not able to prove the tenth allegation, although we had proved nine, I had to pay \$400 damages to the worthy Speaker's partner. That was a little experience for me. My lawyer told me, as I have said, that even if I proved the facts to be as stated it was very questionable under the Quebec law whether that would free the *Herald* from damages; I said I did not believe any such thing in regard to the law. I happened to have another suit in the court, of a political character, and I got out of it on appeal on account of the declaration not having been properly drawn. I have thus had some experience of the effect of the libel law in the Province of Quebec. I made up my mind that it was better to eat a little crow than to pay large lawyers bills, and when I did make up my mind to eat the leek I did not go half way in the matter; and as Mr. Curran knows, when he prepared the letter and submitted it to my lawyer and my lawyer submitted it to me, I said: It goes rather too far, but I will sign it and pay the bill and the hon. member and myself have been friends ever since. I merely state these facts in order to explain how Peter Mitchell came to eat the leek, for he does not very often do it.

Mr. CURRAN. It is perfectly true that the apology was prepared by Mr. McMaster and myself.

Mr. MITCHELL. By yourself chiefly.

Mr. CURRAN. On the other hand I do not wish the hon. gentleman to be under a false impression, and I may say here that whatever may be the defects in the Quebec law, if the hon. gentleman is sure of what he has stated I am perfectly prepared to waive the whole question as to damages. If he imagines he can prove anyone part of the statement made against me as true, I state in the presence of this House that I am prepared to say that he shall not be mulcted in any damages and let him go on with the suit. I am prepared to establish that I had nothing to do with this matter, and that the statement I have made is true in every respect.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say you had.

Mr. CURRAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was because he was afraid he might not be able to prove it on some one or other point.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, I did not say that. I had given my experience as to what had been done in another case.

Mr. CURRAN. That seems to have led the hon. gentleman to adopt the course he did adopt, as I thought in a very manly way, in this matter. As I have said, there was no man discharged. It may have been a very tyrannical thing on the part of the superintendent of the canal to say to those men go and get a letter of recommendation from Mr. Curran. I do not think it is, because a great many come to me for letters, and although I give them, I cannot always get them work. I gave the letters the very moment the men came and I would have given it to the third man if he had come also.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Curran may have misunderstood me. What I did wish to convey to him and to this House, was that I knew nothing of the facts myself. The libel, if it was a libel, was committed before I knew anything about

it. As to the facts I endeavored to get them verified after the event, as my manager had verified them, as he said before. I told him to verify them again, and he assured me that the facts which he was prepared to prove were, that those six men, not three if my recollection serves me right, who were in the habit of going as a matter of course in the spring of the year and getting employment as they had employment before, when they did apply they were told by the manager of the canal that they would have to get a letter from Mr. Curran before they could get employment. That is what those men told my manager, as my manager told me, and he was prepared to verify that and he was very indignant with me for taking the course I did.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I think it is quite germane to the whole debate that the suggestion of my hon. friend should be entertained, because this discussion places the hon. the Minister of Agriculture in a very equivocal position. The hon. the Minister says that Mr. Baker recommended to him or to the department a person to look to his office during his absence and that this was satisfactory to the department. The hon. gentleman forgot that when Mr. Baker's name was mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) at the commencement of the discussion, he did not remember that Mr. Baker was an officer of his department at all. I would ask him how he can state now that Mr. Baker could have made this satisfactory arrangement for the conduct of his business?

Mr. CARLING. I did not say that I did not remember that he was an officer of the department. I said that I thought he was the agent at Brandon and not Qu'Appelle.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he was not aware that he was an officer at all, and when he consulted with his deputy he found that he was. However this is just a part of the programme that has been played for a long time. It was played in Halifax during the local election when an officer of the Customs Department who had enjoyed a summer holiday, on his return from his holiday and when the local election was going on, the collector received orders from the department here at Ottawa to give him leave of absence during the election and he was despatched to Guidore with fishing bounty cheques, to be distributed so as to influence the electors to vote against the provincial secretary. That gentleman's name is Mr. Morris. His salary has since been advanced, and he was used during the whole of that election with the fishing bounty cheques in his pocket, working by orders of the Department of Ottawa. It is part of the same system that Mr. Baker is carrying on in the county of Russell.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know Mr. Morris' trip to Nova Scotia, to which the hon. gentleman refers, but when he makes the statement as broadly as he has done, that Mr. Morris was sent down there to work against the Local Government by the department at Ottawa, he tells what is not correct and what it is impossible for him to prove.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I can prove it.

Mr. BOWELL. I say you cannot prove it.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say I can.

Mr. BOWELL. I give no opinion as to the gentleman to whom he refers obtaining leave at that time. I am not in a position at this moment to state whether it is correct or not, but I do deny that that gentleman or any other gentleman was sent down by the department at Ottawa to electioneer against any local candidate or any Dominion candidate either.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say he was, and I know it.

Mr. BOWELL. I say he was not, and I know better.

Mr. MULOCK. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says that no men were discharged from the canal service. That is, of course, a technical way of getting out of the difficulty. The facts are, as I understand, that the men in question had been appointed from year to year, and while they only worked during the season of navigation, yet their appointments were considered as permanent as that of any other person in the public service. To say, therefore, that they were not discharged, if when the season was about to come round again they were refused to be allowed to proceed with their work as usual, is trifling with the real substance of the question. However, the member from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) admits that an employé of this Government, the superintendent of the canal, chose to resort to the extraordinary course of intimidating three of the electors of Montreal Centre.

Mr. CURRAN. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. And that the superintendent of the canal informed those three men that if they took a prominent part in the elections they would be dismissed, or, what is the same thing, that their services would be discontinued. Now, the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) can settle this matter between himself and the canal superintendent. I presume the superintendent knew there was an election on, when he said that, and I presume he was concerned very much in promoting the election of the member for Montreal Centre, and I very much doubt if there was not some hint or other given to the superintendent about the promotion of the election in Montreal Centre. I would, under these circumstances, attach very little importance to the withdrawal and the apology that appeared in the *Montreal Herald*. I admit that to the sentiments expressed in the *Montreal Herald* should attach very much great weight as disclosing very fully the gentlemanly demeanor and the principle of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), because no one knows those better than the member for Montreal Centre himself who wrote it. But the circumstances under which they were prepared as has been stated here and under which they were published in the *Herald* I hardly think can be cited as good evidence for the member for Montreal Centre. We come right back to the fact that three men, three Irish Catholics—perhaps six, but at all events three—were driven from the public service because they chose to exercise the rights of freemen. That is the transaction. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) when he knew that wrong was done and when two of those men, perhaps from their necessities, were humiliated and compelled to come to him to ask him to get justice, knew that there was another suffering, but he had not the courage or the manliness to go to that independent man and see that he was reinstated in his office. He knew that man was unjustly treated, and I charge him with the whole responsibility. I say he is trifling with the facts when he endeavors to escape from the dilemma and when he says: I the representative of the Irish Catholic people of this country in this House chose to stand on my high position as representative of Montreal Centre, and when two of those men came and humbled themselves before me and begged for food I did not refuse them; but one other who was manly enough, courageous enough, and Irish enough to refuse to humble himself before me, I from my high pedestal refused to step down and extend a hand to him. That is the attitude of the representative of the Irish people of Canada in the House of Commons of Canada. I hold him responsible for every bit of it. I do not take back one word of it. I charge him with

the guilt of it, and no apology will come from me, let him use all the dignified and classical terms he may choose to apply to me. I say he is responsible for it.

Mr. TROW. I rise to order. What has this to do with the item under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. I think this is irregular. I would have stopped it before if my attention had been called to it.

Mr. CURRAN. I will refrain from saying anything, as I do not think the gentleman is worthy of any answer. Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Thursday).

Printed by McLEAN, ROGER & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

Vol. XX.

Ottawa, Thursday, May 3, 1888.

No. 47

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Necessary corrections to Members' Speeches, for the bound edition, must be forwarded to the Debates Office within twenty-four hours after the printed copies of the speeches have been circulated, as after that time the contractors may print the copies for the bound edition without further delay.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd May, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend the Criminal Procedure Act, chap. 174 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of this Bill is to make two changes in the procedure relating to the law of criminal libel. In the first place, it is proposed to enact that the place of trial in criminal procedure for libel against the publisher of a newspaper shall be within the Province in which the newspaper is published, the publishing office of the paper. In the second place, it is proposed to establish that the crime of libel shall be like that of perjury and two or three other offences, in respect of which it is provided in the Criminal Procedure Act that proceedings by indictment must be preceded by a preliminary investigation before a magistrate, unless the indictment is on the *fiat* of the Attorney General of the Province, or the judge before whom the indictment is preferred.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand, from the hon. gentleman's explanation of the Bill, that he does not propose to include any clause to have reference to the exercise by courts of arbitrary power of imprisonment for constructive contempt.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise merely for the purpose of giving the hon. gentleman notice that it is my intention, at an early and convenient opportunity, to bring before the House for discussion the proceedings arising out of the imprisonment of John J. Hawke, editor of the *Moncton Transcript*, for alleged constructive contempt of the New Brunswick Court; and probably before that discussion is disposed of, the hon. gentleman, if he sees the feeling of the House is in that direction, may make up his mind that it is desirable to enlarge the scope of the present Bill by making it refer to proceedings of that kind, and limiting, if such is the wisdom of the House, the arbitrary power which seems to be vested in the judges, as seen in the action of those gentlemen in question. I do not propose to discuss the matter now, but merely to give the hon. gentleman notice that I will bring forward the matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me notice, but I shall esteem it a greater favor if he informs me at a subsequent time when

he proposes to bring the matter forward, because I shall have to make enquiries at a distance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to amend the Copyright Act, chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: The effect of this Bill will be to adopt in Canada the provisions of the Berne convention relating to copyright.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. WATSON asked, What amount of lands retained by the Dominion Government as provided for in 49 Victoria, chapter 9, is situated within the Province of Manitoba? Also, what amount of said lands have been retained west of the boundary of the Province of Manitoba and east of 3rd Meridian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the defining of the lands which are to be retained under the Act mentioned have been proceeding, and they will be completed as soon as possible after the passing of the resolution respecting the company's land grant now before Parliament.

Mr. WATSON asked, 1. Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has made a selection of all lands granted to it under clause 11 of Canadian Pacific Railway contract? 2. What amount of said lands have been selected within the boundary of the Province of Manitoba? 3. What amount of said lands have been selected between the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba and 3rd Meridian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 1. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have selected nearly 7,000,000 acres of the lands granted under clause 11 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. 2. The area of lands selected within the boundaries of Manitoba is, in acres 1,818,330. 3. The area of lands selected between the western boundary of Manitoba and the 3rd Initial Meridian is, in acres, 2,989,440.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. What number of acres is there of unsold lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company propose to receive by deed of bargain and sale to trustees under sub-section c of the Resolutions now before the House? 2. What portions of such lands lie within the Railway Belt? 3. How many acres of those lands are there in Manitoba, and how many in the Territories, east of the 3rd Meridian? 4. How many acres have been sold by the company, paid for, and the deeds completed? 5. How many acres have been sold, but the sales are still incomplete? How much paid on the same, and how much remains due, and when and how payable?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am able to answer one of these questions, but not the whole satisfactorily, as the information must be obtained from the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company. I have asked the company to provide the information and I expect it any moment.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps you will answer the questions to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.

LIGHTHOUSE ON STAG ISLAND.

Mr. MONCRIEFF asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct and establish a lighthouse on Stag Island, in the River St. Clair?

Mr. FOSTER. The department has been gathering information and making enquiries with respect to the necessity of establishing a lighthouse on Stag Island, and the matter is now under consideration. At the time the Supplementary Estimates come down I shall be able to answer the hon. gentleman definitely.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT STRATHROY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Has a site been selected for the proposed public buildings at Strathroy? If so, where is the location? Has any, and what progress been made towards the erection of such public buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site has not yet been selected.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee, to-morrow, on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that there shall be payable, in respect of his attendance at each Session of the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories, to each elected member thereof, an indemnity of \$500, and to each legal expert, for the like attendance, an indemnity of \$250, in addition in each case to his actual travelling expenses, subject to a proportionate reduction for each day's absence from a sitting of the Assembly, the amount of such reduction and of such travelling expenses to be ascertained in such manner as the Governor in Council prescribes; that there shall be payable to the Speaker of the said Legislative Assembly an annual salary of \$500, and to the Clerk of the said Assembly, acting also as Secretary to the Lieutenant Governor, an annual salary of \$2,000; and that all such payments shall be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This, of course, relates to the House of Assembly in the North-West Territory. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he has considered the propriety of placing at the disposal of the Governor and Legislature of the North-West Territory the same grant as that which the Provinces receive in proportion to their population; leaving to them to appoint their own clerk, regulate their own affairs, and to spend the money so given, in the way that they think best in the public service. The hon. gentleman knows at the present time that this assembly has really no funds with which to carry on the business of legislation, except such as the Government here may place at its disposal. If there was an account opened with the Territory, the moment a Legislature is established and money placed at their disposal, when they come to be admitted as a Province of course the whole sum so received by that means could be taken into consideration. It always seemed to me, that that would be the rational way to deal with them whenever they had a legislative assembly. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has considered the subject, and whether he proposes to invite parliamentary action in the matter? It will be conceived that it would be a little more reasonable, in conferring on them the power of legislation and representation, that they should have funds with which to carry on their operations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This discussion will arise more properly on the second reading of the Bill. I will say to my hon. friend that we do not propose to put in

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

any such vote for this year. The territories are not quite without revenue, as the hon. gentleman knows, and I have no doubt they dispose of that revenue to the best advantage of the territories. Those revenues are very small, certainly, and I am quite ready to admit the merits of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. The idea is to make as little change as possible until they have a purely elective assembly representing the people. They will be obliged, after the elections, to meet very soon, and to consider what the wants of the country and what administrative action here they think would be most satisfactory for that country. The measure before the House is intended merely to carry out the principle, with all due respect to their suggestions for the future. From time to time we have had a series of resolutions passed by the mingled council, in which parties were nominated and parties elected. Those are contradictory in themselves and cannot be supposed really to represent the feelings of the people. We propose to make no appropriation of a sum to be disposed of by the Governor, there including the Legislature, until they have really a Local Legislature and ascertain what their own ideas are on the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course I do not propose to enter into a discussion, and I am making only a suggestion now. Those people are contributing their proportion to the taxes of the country at the present time. In all the Provinces a certain portion of the revenue, so much *per capita*, is paid over to the Provinces as provincial revenue for provincial purposes. My remarks had reference to the intention of the Government when the hon. gentleman's Bill is adopted, and the Legislature made completely elective. It does not seem to me, and I do not say it with a view to promoting controversy, that it is a matter of negotiation to know how much they are entitled to. As a matter of right they should be entitled to the same amount *per capita*, revenue for local purposes, as in the Provinces, and which should be accounted for at the time of Union.

Motion agreed to.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON (for Mr. POPE) moved House into Committee on Bill (No. 24) to amend and consolidate the Railway Act.

On section 2, sub section p,

Mr. MULOCK. This clause, defining the word "near," refers to the proximity of one railway to another. Would it not be advisable to define the word with reference to some point as well? In Acts of incorporation the word "near" is used to define the route taken; but I do not know how any court could determine whether any railway was exceeding its powers when it is authorized to go to or near a point. In this vast continent that might mean many miles away. While I do not wish to embarrass any company, I think it would be well to give some statutory definition of the word "near" under such circumstances.

Mr. TISDALE. It is easy to define the word, having regard to the relation of one railway to another; but if we try to define it in relation to the routes of railroads, it seems to me we should defeat the object the hon. gentleman has in view, because "at or near" any point, describing a route, will depend on all the circumstances. No difficulty has arisen from the want of such a definition, that I am aware of. Sometimes a court would hold that a quarter of a mile was near, and in other cases they might hold that two miles was near.

Mr. MULOCK. Or fifty miles.

Mr. TISDALE. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Where will you draw the line?

Mr. TISDALE. The courts will always draw the line according to the circumstances, and give a reasonable construction to the word, as they do in other cases. But I think if we define the word in a railroad Act, we would create greater difficulties than now exist.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose a railway was incorporated to build to or near a certain town which may be near a certain other town. It might be within five or ten miles of the other town, and the engineering difficulties might be precisely the same in both cases. There might be no such circumstances as the hon. gentleman suggests to enable the court to determine how the word "near" should be construed. I do not think it is right to incorporate a railway company, giving it the utmost freedom in the choice of a particular route, thus causing one municipality to compete with another, and perhaps obliging it, by force of circumstances, to give a large bonus to bring the line within its neighborhood. If the route is not defined by the Act of incorporation, you give the company practically a roving commission, enabling it not only to commit the abuse I speak of, but perhaps to affect existing rights. Therefore I am satisfied that it is in the public interest that we should not incorporate these companies at large. I would suggest this. Every railway company under the general Act, has power to build branches six miles in length, and I think the word "near" might be defined here to mean not more than six miles. In the North-West, where there is a vast prairie country, engineering difficulties would not arise to aid the court in determining the meaning of the word. Suppose a company were incorporated to build a road in the North West near to a certain town. In that vast country fifty miles are equivalent to not more than five or ten miles in the older Provinces. Surely a company should not have the power to choose a location as wide as fifty miles; but what would enable a court to determine whether it was exceeding its powers or not?

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is just as easy for a court to determine when one railway comes near another as it is when a railway comes near a point; and I think it is quite as necessary to define the meaning of the word "near" in the latter as in the former. Not a Session passes in which a number of Bills are not put through the Railway Committee saying that the railway shall commence at or near a town or city or a certain point. This certainly leaves a great deal of doubt as to the distance intended, and I think that both for the general purposes of a public railway and for the legal effect of such a provision, some definition of distance, say four, five or six miles, should be covered by the words "at or near." I would suggest to add to this clause as it stands, "and near to a point or municipality when some part of it is within five or six miles thereof."

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it is quite so easy to define the word "near," in relation to the construction of a railway, as it is in relation to its operation. The definition would have to be of an entirely different character. When we are defining the word "near" in this sub-section, we are dealing with a knowledge of the traffic and things of that kind, in relation to which proximity must be pretty close, but when we come to deal with the word "near" in relation to the termini of a railway, as the hon. member for York mentioned, a very much larger limit must be given. Then, take a charter in which it is provided that a railway shall be built from a point beginning at or near a certain town. There would then be a good deal of practical difficulty in defining that word, because we would be giving a material limitation to a large number of charters which Parliament has passed.

Mr. MULOCK. It would not be retroactive.

Mr. THOMPSON. In relation to those railways which have not been commenced, it probably would. The limitation of six miles in some cases would hardly do. Some of the statutes, for instance, are for lines not six miles in length, and it would defeat the statute altogether if we were to apply this limit to such lines. The whole thing depends on the country through which a line passes, and the kind of termini it has. The hon. gentleman's suggestion, however, deals with a particular subject, which we can consider later, if he thinks the matter is of sufficient importance.

On subsection 7,

Mr. THOMPSON. In this section I do not think there is any change in the law; it is only a little more full.

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest to add the words "or other erection" after "railway bridge."

Mr. THOMPSON. I will add those words.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it would not be well to define the meaning of the word "railway," as including the lessees of a railway. I have found in my professional practice that the Grand Trunk Railway, as lessee of the Midland Railway, have escaped all liabilities from injuries resulting from overhead bridges, by reason of not being met by this particular Railway Act. I find that the sections referring to overhead bridges in this new Bill are almost similar to the sections in the old Railway Act. The word "operate," however, if new, may cover this objection. The hon. gentleman will remember that the other night we discussed the necessity of providing that all railways leasing other roads should be liable for damages resulting from overhead bridges, such as did result in the case of the Niagara Central.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did consider this question. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to show me the case, and it seemed to me that provision ought to be made, and if we find it is not clear in the Bill that such provision is made, we will attend to that suggestion.

Mr. MULOCK. Why except Government railways? Are they not held liable as common carriers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, but we have a special Act for them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that Act provide in the same way as this?

Mr. THOMPSON. It regulates the liability of the Government as a common carrier.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON. Can we compel local railways, built under local charters, to come under this Act? They are not works at all under the control of the Government of Canada, but they are entirely under the control of the Local Legislatures, and are subject to such provisions as the Local Legislatures may pass. This Act, however, brings them in for certain purposes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, and, if they can be brought in for one purpose, they can for all. Unless these are for the general advantage of Canada, they are altogether without the purview of this Legislature.

Mr. THOMPSON. That clause is the same as the other, excepting that the other is contained in two provisions, owing to the Bill being in two parts, and this is merely throwing the two provisions into one, but, if the hon. gentleman thinks that it is of any importance, we will let that section stand.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). The hon. gentleman knows that only the other day an information was filed against a railway in New Brunswick, and my attention was called to this matter in that way, and it struck me that it was a

question whether we had any power to make any work which was within the control of the Local Legislature of the Province, liable to this Act, because, if you can do that in one case, you may make them liable to the whole of the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act. I think that, as long as these railways are under local legislation, the Local Legislature is paramount in dealing with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. The intention is only to bring them under our jurisdiction in regard to matters in which we certainly have jurisdiction, such as offences, penalties and statistics. However, we will let it stand.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt we can bring these railways under the jurisdiction of this Legislature in certain matters, but I think we have gone far beyond our jurisdiction already in declaring certain railways to be for the general advantage of Canada, though they have been constructed under local authority. I think that there is no doubt that, when these questions are argued in the courts, our action will be declared to have been *ultra vires*, and I do not think we should go any further in that direction.

On section 8,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is simply to provide that certain members of Council shall be members of the Railway Committee *ex officio*. The present law provides in section 58 that the Governor General may appoint such members as he thinks fit to be members of the Railway Committee, but this clause declares that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Justice shall be *ex officio* members of the Railway Committee of Council.

Mr. TISDALE. I think that when the quorum is only two one should be the Minister of Justice. Of course, if the whole of the members are there, it is all right, but we ought to have the Minister of Justice always there.

Mr. THOMPSON. We may go back to that question hereafter.

On section 10,

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister to sub-section *c* of this clause. It appears to give the Railway Committee power to fix the liabilities of companies transgressing the provisions of sub-sections *a* and *b*, section *a* dealing with the rate of speed at which railway trains may be run. Now, it might be held that was the only liability the railway company incurred. Of course the Minister does not intend it should have such a meaning as that. A railway running its train beyond this speed, through a thickly-populated section, might cause damage far in excess of anything for which section *c* provides a remuneration. Therefore I think it would be well to qualify section *c*, so that shall not interfere in any way with the liability of the company in any court for damages for which it might be liable.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to that. It is a mere copy, however. I propose this as a sub-section:

"The imposition of any such penalty shall not lessen or affect any other liability which any company may have incurred."

On section 11,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause, which seems to be largely new, perhaps the Minister can point out what provisions are based upon the recommendation of the Railway Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I cannot, from any memorandum I have here. If the hon. gentleman desires, we will let that clause stand for the present.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to recall the attention of the Minister to the amendment we have just made in section 10. I think we should use the word "person," in—
Mr. WELDON (St. John).

stead of the word "company," so as, for instance, to meet the case of an engine-driver abusing his power and disobeying orders, resulting in loss of life or damage, for which he might be personally liable.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very well; I accept the suggestion.

On section 20,

Mr. MITCHELL. Will not this section be required to be amended so as to make it consistent with section 17?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not, as construed together. They will have a right to review their own order, but no other tribunal would.

Mr. MULOCK. When does it become final?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is final as soon as it is made.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no appeal except to itself.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection to making a change. I propose that it read: "shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section 17, be final."

Mr. EDGAR. It is a question whether four weeks public notice of the regular annual meeting is not more than is necessary. Special general meetings should be well notified, but general annual meetings are fixed by statute.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are not those the provisions of the Model Bill?

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so.

Mr. TISDALE. Under the Model Bill it was found this Session that there was no power to call a special meeting, and the idea is to have one class of notice for all classes of meetings.

Mr. EDGAR. I think four weeks is too much notice for an ordinary annual meeting.

Mr. THOMPSON. Let it stand, please, and I will consider it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it better to have a uniform rule with regard to giving notice of those meetings, and I should be in favor of having this clause passed.

Mr. TISDALE. Four weeks is not too much for important meetings, such as the issue of bonds. All the large companies give that notice, and many of them six weeks. I think it is better to have the clause adopted.

On section 44,

Mr. MITCHELL. I think that there should be a rule that the proxies at meetings should be held by shareholders only.

Mr. TISDALE. Why?

Mr. MITCHELL. Because I do not think that outsiders should be allowed to come in and discuss questions.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In banks outsiders are now allowed to hold proxies.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think it is usual for proxies to be put in the hands of anybody but shareholders, but if a shareholder wishes to appoint his counsel, I do not see why he should not be allowed to do it.

Mr. TISDALE. It has always been the law and it has always worked well. The people may not notice those little changes and some company may hold a meeting which might be illegal on account of this.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there anything in the Act saying that the head of a municipality should be admitted as a shareholder? Suppose a municipality took stock, the municipality of course could not all be present, but it might be represented by its head.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will look into that question and see.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will you enquire as to whether the proxies should be held by shareholders or not?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to take the opinion of the House on that matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. You might consider it when you are amending the Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall.

On section 49,

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is it necessary to exclude stockholders holding less than twenty shares from the board of directors?

Mr. TISDALE. Twenty shares is the qualification adopted by the Railway Committee in the Model Bill. The committee thought that anyone who was not interested to that extent should not fill so important a position.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose that this section only applies to cases where no provision is made in a special Act for a similar sum.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I think a provision should be introduced which would prevent a director acting as security for a contractor. In many cases the security is the real contractor.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will insert that provision.

On section 60,

Mr. WELDON. Are those words "absence or illness" not too general? What do they mean?

Mr. THOMPSON. They mean that when the president is away, the vice-president shall act in his place.

Mr. WELDON. The question might be raised as to the authority of the vice-president, as to whether the president was really absent or not. I would suggest to leave those words out.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you would give the vice-president authority to act even when the president is there, and difficulty might ensue.

Mr. TISDALE. This is the wording of the old law, and no difficulty has arisen under it. The president is head, and in his absence the vice-president. It simply means that when the head is there he must do the work, but that when absent the vice-president has his powers.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to add the words "or in case of a vacancy in the office of the president."

On section 62,

Mr. HALL. I do not see any necessity for making the date of the annual balancing of accounts the 30th day of June, because there are many companies whose books are balanced, under their charters, on other dates.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object is to have the accounts closed at such a time that we can get the statistics in time for the meeting of Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me the object is very desirable, because it is well to have uniformity.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It will cause a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty to many companies if they should be compelled to change the date at which their financial year closes. Many of them make their annual statements on the 31st December.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will cause inconvenience only for one year, and will enable us to receive the statistics in proper time, and create uniformity.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Some of the companies, by their special Acts, are obliged to make up their accounts at a different date. Many of them must hold their annual meeting in May and make their accounts up to the 31st December. You might as well compel insurance companies to change the date of their annual meetings and statements of account.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We have done that.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not with every insurance company.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think this provision could apply to any company which has a special provision in its Act, and it is impossible to get the returns in time for Parliament, unless we have a uniform date. One of the recommendations of the Commission was that there should be a uniform date, and it is impossible to fix that uniform date at any other than the 30th June.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the statement has to be made up to the 31st December, it makes only the difference of half a year, and that will not entail any serious inconvenience.

On section 69,

Mr. HALL. It is a very unusual thing that dividends should be declared by the shareholders. As a rule, the dividends are declared by the directors. I suppose the object of this is that the dividends should only be declared from the profits that might be made, and I think it might be provided that the directors should only declare dividends on the clear profits of the undertaking.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is the exact section which was in the old Act, but I will consider the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the word "clear" should be struck out, and the word "net" should be substituted.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that that clause goes a little too far. It says:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend shall be declared out of the clear profits of the undertaking, unless such meeting decides otherwise."

Why should the power be given to the meeting to decide otherwise? Surely we are not going to give power to the meeting of the shareholders to declare a dividend out of capital?

Mr. THOMPSON. It simply gives them power to refuse to declare a dividend.

Mr. MITCHELL. This section really gives them power to provide for a dividend out of the capital.

Mr. TISDALE. Section 71 provides for that case.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think this clause should be amended so as to read that the dividend may be declared out of the net profits, and leaving out all after the word "unless."

Mr. WELDON (St. John). According to this, they can only declare a dividend once a year, while some companies declare a dividend every six months.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That is true.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well to insert the word "only" after the word "shall"?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the intention of the Act is to prevent the directors making a fortuitous dividend arising out of special circumstances, and to prevent the irregular declaration of dividends, and to prevent the directors, without consulting the shareholders as to what dividend shall be declared, making such a dividend.

Mr. HALL. Why are these more applicable to railway companies than to banks or any other joint stock companies?

In those companies, the directors always declare the dividend.

Mr. THOMPSON. The operations of railway companies are more expensive than others, such as banks, but, of course, I am in the hands of the committee in regard to this matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I see that this clause provides only for an annual dividend, and, supposing the annual meeting fails, no dividend can be declared that year.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The Grand Trunk has a semi-annual meeting at which it declares dividends.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why should you not say that a dividend might be declared at an annual or special general meeting of shareholders?

Mr. TISDALE. It seems to be the policy that directors shall not declare dividends without the consent of the shareholders. That has been the law, and I cannot see any reason for changing it. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has special legislation for that purpose, but I think it would be a mistake to do the same thing in regard to other railway companies. If that is done, you must authorise semi-annual meetings instead of annual meetings. I think we should be careful to see that these companies have money in the banks out of which to pay for labor, and for accidents, and all that sort of thing, and, as a rule, with regard to most of our railway companies, there is no occasion for semi-annual meetings to declare dividends, because there are no dividends to declare.

Mr. MITCHELL. The only instance I know of where semi-annual dividends are declared is the Grand Trunk Railway. The other railways are only authorised to declare dividends annually. I do not see that it is necessary to declare semi-annual dividends on any of these railways. I would suggest that the section should be so amended as to read that:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend shall be declared only out of the net profits of the undertaking."

And leave out the words "unless such meeting decides otherwise." I think that would meet the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The way in which the clause now reads is:

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend may be declared out of the net profits of the undertaking."

Mr. MITCHELL. That will do.

On section 71,

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I do not know whether there is any penalty for the infringement of this clause. If there is not, it will be nugatory.

Mr. THOMPSON. This makes it illegal, but it would be very difficult to inflict a penalty when it is the act of the whole company at an annual meeting of the shareholders.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be possible to provide some means of enforcing this section? It says that the directors shall not pay a dividend on the stock until the undertaking has been completed and opened to the public, and then they may pay interest at the rate of 6 per cent. Supposing the directors violate this provision of the law, what will you do? The clause says:

"The directors may, in their discretion, until the railway is completed and opened to the public, pay interest at any rate not exceeding 6 per cent. per annum."

If the proprietors pay more than 6 per cent., they should be held liable, and I suggest that they should be made liable for any excess, without any prejudice to the right to recover from the parties receiving the same.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will make a note of that.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We also ought to have the time specified when the railway is to be completed. I do not think any railway in Canada is really completed, and therefore there is no definite time specified.

On section 73,

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be proper to provide restrictions against shareholders disposing of stock which they have not paid up, where good shareholders may rid themselves of liability by transferring their stock to men of straw? Under the Joint Stock Companies' Act, there is a provision to meet such a case as that. Under that Act, if I remember rightly, the directors are not allowed to permit the transfer of stock that is not paid up in full, to other than substantial persons, or persons who are generally reputed to be substantial persons; and if they violate the provisions of that Act, they are liable. I would suggest that provision of the Act might be well incorporated here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would it restrict the transfer of shares very much?

Mr. MULOCK. I mean to say that when a man subscribes for stock and pays up, say, 10 per cent. upon it, and owes 90 per cent., he ought not to be at liberty to transfer that stock to a man of straw and leave other persons, who were induced to come in on the faith of his transaction, to meet the whole liability. I think there should be a limitation of transfer.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 75—I think that meets the case.

Mr. MULOCK. That only deals with the transfer of stock on which there is no arrears.

Mr. THOMPSON. But suppose an individual takes 50 shares in a railway company, on which there is a call of 80 per cent., the rest may never be called up, and would the hon. gentleman make these shares never transferable?

Mr. MULOCK. No; you must not quarrel with me, but with Parliament that has laid down the principle under the Joint Stock Companies' Act. It is one thing for them to be in arrears, that is, to be overdue, and it is another thing to have liability that has not been called up at all. Now, the Joint Stock Companies' Act provides that a shareholder cannot rid himself of his contingent liability, however remote it may be, except with the consent of the directors, and the directorate must not give that consent. I ask that the same safeguard be put in here for the protection of the honest shareholder.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very well, we will let that stand for the present.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think we need to waste any sympathies over the railway companies. I think the shareholders are in much more danger of being induced to take stock than are the railway companies to suffer. I think any gentleman who has any knowledge of the way railway companies are organised in this country, knows that there is much more danger of the shareholder being victimised, than of the company being imposed upon by allowing the shareholder freely to transfer his share. The Joint Stock Companies' Act, and the subjects it covers, are entirely different matters from railway companies. I think the hon. gentleman's grievance is entirely theoretical. It would certainly be a very inconvenient law to limit the transfer of shares. The ordinary law is that you must pay your calls in order that a company may go into effect. Now, the Joint Stock Companies' Act deals with a different class of subjects, small companies of all sorts, engaged in mercantile transactions, where business men carry on business for themselves. When railway companies are organised the general public are invited to subscribe, and they do subscribe, and they cannot transfer their shares unless they

pay calls. You subscribe to stock, and the law says that if the company impose a call, that shall be paid, otherwise the shares are free to be transferred. I think it would be a great mistake in the interests of the construction of railways, and it would rather be putting the boot on the wrong leg, to give railway companies more power over people subscribing stock than they have now.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not seeking to protect railway companies particularly, but to prevent injustice. We are now on the eve of a great boom in railway building, particularly of short lines in the North-West, and these railways incur liabilities particularly to creditors, and the provision I suggest would be, in the first instance, in the protection of creditors. We have no right to allow partners to escape their liability. These shareholders are limited partners by virtue of the Act, and the general law of partnership applies, that partners are liable to pay the creditors of the concern. In this case they are only liable to the extent of their shares. They undertake to pay at some time or other a certain sum of money. The shareholders may not choose to make calls, there may be arrears in regard to the liability, but the liabilities exist, and if unpaid the creditors can proceed against the shareholders and recover payment. To allow solvent shareholders to transfer stock and escape liability renders it possible to commit a fraud upon creditors. Then again it would leave shareholders, who perhaps did not have the consent of the directors, liable to pay in full, whereas other shareholders might be allowed to escape. I think it is proper that such a provision as I have suggested should be introduced.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If you put such a clause in the Act you will very soon have very few stockholders.

On section 75,

Mr. LANGEIER (Quebec). This section should be struck out, as it is infringing on the powers of the Local Legislatures. We have no right to determine what is personal and what is real estate; that is a question of property and civil rights.

Mr. THOMPSON. All property and civil rights in railways are under our control. As regards railways, we have a right to legislate over property and civil rights, as being within our jurisdiction and not within the jurisdiction of any other Legislature. We can absolutely forfeit or do anything we please with railways under our control, and it is only as to them this Act applies.

Mr. LANGEIER (Quebec). This section has nothing to do with the railway itself. It is more than doubtful if we have the right to determine that certain property with which we have power to deal is real or personal property. It is of great consequence, not at this moment perhaps, because I think the law is the same in all the Provinces of the Dominion. We have in the civil code of Quebec a declaration that shares in railways are personal property; but supposing the Legislature of Quebec thought proper to change that, I think it would apply to railways as well as to anything else. This question is of great consequence, on account of the law concerning marriage settlement. Under our law there is a community of property between the parties, and in that community is included every kind of personal property. It would raise a very serious question, supposing the Legislature of Quebec should make a law declaring that railway shares are real property.

Mr. THOMPSON. I admit, of course, that we should not interfere with the rights of property unnecessarily, but it must be remembered that all the other seventy-two sections have dealt with the question of property and civil rights. If we hesitate as to our power on that subject we surely must reconsider our position as to the transfer of shares and the declaration of dividends, and everything of the kind. But

the hon. gentleman will see the consequences that will ensue. If the doctrine can be sustained that it is only for the Provincial Legislatures to say whether these shares are real or personal property, this result would follow, that the Provincial Legislature might declare them to be real estate, or interest in real estate, and then they would not be transmissible in the way prescribed, and every provision of the Bill as to the rights of shareholders would have to be altered. It is inevitable that the power must rest entirely here, and we should deal with railway shares as being personal property.

Mr. LANGEIER (Quebec). I do not dispute that question of civil rights necessarily incident to railways can be dealt with by this Legislature. I do not, however, see the bearing of this determination of the nature of railway property as regards the building of a railway. What necessity is there, when we are legislating on railways, to say what the nature of railway property shall be?

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me most material to the construction and working of a railway that the interests of the shareholders shall be personal property, and that only. If we are to treat them as owners of interest in real estate, they may at any moment interfere with the operation of the railway, and claim a division of the property, and their shares would be transmissible to their heirs, and a new set of shareholders would come in in that way. It is vitally connected with the exercise of the necessary control over the companies which are authorised to construct railways under our control. I would be sorry to be disposed to interfere unduly, but it seems to me to be necessary.

Mr. LANGEIER (Quebec). I will point out the difficulty which this may bring about. It is this: Personal property is a word used in English law, but we have not that word in our Quebec law. If you state that railway property will be personal property, it will raise a difficulty in our Province, where the law is not the same as in the other Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. I now see the particular point of the hon. gentleman's objection. It may need another word added to describe the kind of personal property it would be in the Province of Quebec; and I will therefore let the section stand, with that view.

On section 83,

Mr. TISDALE. I see that that clause is changed materially, although it does not show it in the printing. There is a portion of the old clause left out, as regarding the power to sell shares, which may affect railway companies already incorporated. It is a question whether those powers should be taken from the companies that are already organised. Some of those companies from time to time do sell shares that are not altogether paid up. I think the Canada Southern, and the Grand Trunk, and possibly the Canadian Pacific Railway, have a large amount of capital stock yet unsubscribed, and under the former Railway law they would have a perfect right to sell this, while according to the present Bill they would be deprived of that right. Formerly this unsubscribed stock could be sold, or they could make loans for it. On ordinary small railways it would not matter very much; still I would like to know if there is any objection to that power being retained. It would seem to me that there is an objection to its not being retained in the case of companies now incorporated, and I should think we ought to be careful how we should deprive them of rights they have had up to this time.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see what is the use of retaining that provision.

Mr. TISDALE. Formerly they could sell or pledge the stock.

Mr. EDGAR. Not unless it is subscribed.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, they could get subscriptions for it. It struck me it must have been put in the Railway Act for some object, and I think we should be careful in making such a radical change.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is far better the way it is in the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the view of the Minister of Railways was that it was too large a power to give to directors, to sell or pledge unsubscribed stock.

Mr. TISDALE. I have not heard that any railway companies object to this provision, but I know that in times past some of them have used that power to raise money. We know the Grand Trunk at one time sold several millions of that sort of stock, and, by what the hon. gentleman opposite says, I think the committee have hardly got the correct idea about the matter. There is a very material difference between people buying at 20 cents on the dollar, and subscribing so that they will have to pay 100 cents on the dollar. I might be willing to buy \$10,000 and to pay \$1,000, but I would not want to pay \$10,000 and be liable to be assessed for a hundred, when it is only worth 10 cents. As you will see by the stock quotations, the companies deal in this by millions. I remember well when Parliament authorised the Grand Trunk to enlarge their capital stock, and they sold it at 10 cents on the dollar and realised a great deal of money, because it tempted people to buy it in the hope that it would be worth something. Though this was a very large power under the general Railway Act, we should be careful that we do not put ourselves in the position of legislating away companies' rights.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not my hon. friend fighting a phantasm. I do not think the illustration he has given occurs at all in relation to this particular section. The section says:

"The directors may sell, either by public auction or private sale, and in such manner and on such terms as to them seem meet, any shares so declared to be forfeited, or may pledge such forfeited shares for the payment of loans or advances made or to be made thereon, or for the payment of"—

That is, only shares subscribed.

Mr. THOMPSON. What he complains of is that the provisions of the late law are left out, which enables the sale of unsubscribed stock by the directors.

Mr. TISDALE. After the word "forfeit" is left out several words, "Any shares remaining unsubscribed of the capital of the company and they shall be allowed to pledge for loans of money." That is a serious change and might affect some rights of those companies very largely.

Mr. HALL. I think it ought to be left out so far as general powers are concerned. The illustration the hon. gentleman gave of the Grand Trunk was by special legislation and under special circumstances. We can always give that power under similar special circumstances. I think the power is wisely left out of this Bill, of giving the company permission to sell their stock at less than its par value.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think the special legislation the hon. gentleman referred to went so far. The special legislation authorised the company to increase their capital, and I think they sold it under this power of the general Railway Act.

Mr. HALL. They ought to have had special legislation for both.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does seem to me that power like that should be specially given. Those special powers are often overlooked by people who become shareholders. It

Mr. TISDALE.

is unsafe to entrust power like that to every class of directors.

On clause 86,

Mr. MULOCK. I would point out that if you allow a shareholder to transfer his stock, on which there are no arrears, and on which he is liable to creditors, you allow him to escape from the provisions of that Act. The shareholder who is liable at the time ceases to be liable if you allow him to transfer. Section 86, pretending to give security to the creditor, can be defeated under the provisions of a prior section.

On section 88,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think you should have added the words, "Which shall be open to the inspection of shareholders."

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think that might be done.

On section 89,

Mr. THOMPSON. The Act at present provides that 10 per cent. of the capital stock must be expended on the construction of the railway within three years. It is proposed by this Bill to change the amount to 25 per cent. and to reduce the time to two years.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does that affect any special charter already granted?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that this is rather hard, because a large amount raised from bonds or otherwise may be expended, although 25 per cent. of the capital stock may not be expended within two years, and if not the powers of the company cease. I think if this were put into effect it would cause the forfeiture of almost every charter, because the system is to do the work by Government subsidy and the issue of bonds, and it is very seldom that 25 per cent. of the stock is expended in ten years, much less in two years. I think 10 per cent. would probably be enough.

Mr. THOMPSON. Ten per cent. would probably be too low. We might make it 15 per cent. instead of 25.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be better to make this a percentage of the cash paid, because capital stock embraces a great deal that is given away for nothing.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you said the cash, that would mean nothing at all.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose a company had \$1,000,000 capital stock, and gave away \$800,000 of it; there would only be \$200,000 which represented cash.

Mr. THOMPSON. We should make it so that it is impossible to give away that much stock.

Mr. MULOCK. Every special Act allows stock to be given away in that way.

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be subject to this provision, which would make that unworkable.

Mr. EDGAR. As I understand, this provision will only apply to cases where there is no time limit fixed by a special Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 90, sub-section d,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose a railway company was desirous of crossing an Indian reserve, which is not held in fee simple, but in common, how would it obtain the power?

Mr. THOMPSON. The title could be given with the assent of the Crown,

On sub-section e,

Mr. EDGAR. Surely this section, which permits a company to remove trees which stand within six rods from either side of the railway, or which are liable to fall across the railway track, cannot be intended to apply to the open country, because it would include trees in a man's orchard.

Mr. THOMPSON. If they fell on the track.

Mr. EDGAR. It includes all trees. If you strike out the word "or" it will be all right.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think there ought to be some provision that if the timber that is felled by the railway company is converted to their use, they ought to pay for it.

Mr. TISDALE. That is covered further on.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope it is, because the companies take timber and convert it into bridges, and refuse to pay the proprietors.

Mr. MITCHELL. There may be hardships about that. I have heard of a railway company going through a country and taking trees which were nothing but rampikes only about the size of a man's leg, and the owner made a claim on the company for using some of these rampikes for ties. We know that if certain obligations are placed on the railways they may be taken advantage of by some of these proprietors.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a claim once put in for something of that kind—but I will spare the hon. gentleman's blushes, and not go on.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I confess I have not heard anything from the hon. gentleman that removes the objection against placing the railway companies in any different position from that which they will occupy under the amendment I suggest. I do not know to whom the hon. gentleman refers. He should have told the committee when he went so far as he did.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall certainly do so if you wish.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). But no matter whether those trees to which he refers were, in his opinion, of little value or not, they were the property of somebody else, and they should not have been converted by the company to their own use without compensating the proprietor. However, I am not speaking with regard to this particular subject, because I do not think it should have been alluded to by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), but I say that when trees are removed from the vicinity of a railway by the railway company and used in the construction of the railway, or for any other purpose, the value of those trees should be paid to the adjoining proprietor.

On sub-section g,

Mr. INNES. I would like to call the attention of the House to the large powers this section gives a railway company in respect of the closing up of roads, or making permanent embankments. You will notice by this section that it gives the company the power to make an embankment, and to close up a road or a road allowance. Of course section 91 provides that the company shall leave the road as nearly as possible as it was before, but we know well that in many cases railway companies exercise rather arbitrary powers in that respect. Section 92 provides for compensation, but in the case of municipalities it is very difficult indeed to assess the damages, because no individual is concerned. I think the section should be modified so as to be as much as possible in the interest of municipalities. There is a case in point in the corporation of Guelph, of which the hon. member for Renfrew knows. When the

Grand Trunk was constructed, a good many years ago, they made a large embankment of 20 feet across the road allowance, and that road has never been made, and the company has never made an under-crossing. The matter is now in litigation. It is just possible, according to the terms of the clause, that the Railway Committee may make the under-crossing, but it provides here for inclined planes, and these may be of such a nature as to render the crossing in a sense useless or impassable. I think the clause should be modified in some way so as to conserve the rights of the municipality as much as possible, and to provide that these crossings shall be of such a nature that they will be useful. It should also provide for proper compensation to municipalities.

The Committee reported.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Bill. On section 90, sub-section g,

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member who called attention to the necessity for making a provision in favor of municipalities as regards the interference with embankments, aqueducts and bridges, will, I believe, acquiesce in the view that the company should have these powers. I have made a note of his suggestion that the municipality should have such protection, but in the meantime there can be no objection to this clause passing.

Mr. INNES. Do you mean both with regard to the proper crossing and with regard to the compensation?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. In this clause, the word "permanent" is quite new. I fancy it is taken from the English Act, but that makes a serious difference in the law as it has existed hitherto, because this gives power to the railway company to construct a permanent embankment across a roadway. That is entirely unusual, under our practice.

Mr. THOMPSON. As we go on, the hon. gentleman will find that there is a provision that, if the level of the highway is to be altered, the consent of the municipality has to be obtained, and if that consent cannot be obtained, it goes to the Railway Committee.

Mr. INNES. I think it is left altogether to the Railway Committee, and the power is taken out of the hands of the municipality.

Mr. EDGAR. That is in regard to running along a highway. I would like to ask if it is proposed to allow a railway company to obstruct a navigable stream?

Mr. THOMPSON. They cannot obstruct any navigable streams without the approval of the Governor in Council, under the Acts respecting the navigation of rivers.

Mr. EDGAR. Should not the power given under sub-section h be subject to the approval of the Railway Committee?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman will find that it is so.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask whether, under this clause, a railway is entitled to make all these obstructions in any direction without coming under the subsequent sections? Apparently, in regard to the permanent location of the road, its profile and alignment, the Railway Committee has control, but I think that in regard to these

temporary proceedings they ought to have some control also.

Mr. HALL. I think some power should be given to a railway company in regard to highways. There is sufficient provision for Government control under sections 183, 184 and 185 of the general Act.

Mr. EDGAR. That is in regard to permanent construction, but this is only temporary.

Mr. LAURIER. These permanent powers taken under sub-section *h*, seem to be in conflict with clause 91, because the latter reads:

"The company shall restore (as nearly as possible) to its former state, any river, stream, water-course, high way."

Now, sub-section *h*, on which we are now, contemplates that the company shall have power to alter. I suppose the word "permanently" has been added since. It could not have been the original intention.

Mr. THOMPSON. A highway, for instance, is to be restored as nearly as possible to its former state. It cannot be restored to its former place if it has been diverted.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, but if the alteration is to be made permanent how can it be restored to its former condition?

Mr. THOMPSON. The highway can be completed as well as it was before, or as nearly as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. The section now reads:

"Divert or alter, temporarily as well as permanently, the course of any such river, stream, water-course or highway."

Then clause 91 says:

"The company shall restore (as nearly as possible) to its former state, any river,"

And so on. Does not the hon. gentleman see a contradiction?

Mr. THOMPSON. It would be so, excepting for the words "as nearly as possible." I think that is about as closely as we can get for a provision of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is doubtful whether we can give such power. Of course they can do so in the English Parliament, because there is no other body having jurisdiction, but here there are Local Legislatures under which all the property of the country is situated, and while we are authorised to incorporate a railway company, we cannot insist upon giving to that company any other powers than those which are necessary to its existence. We cannot do what we might do, if property and civil rights were under our jurisdiction. If a Province were to say, for instance, that a railway should grade the track in a particular way, that would apply to railways of the Dominion, or it might apply just as well to railways of the Province. If a railway of the Province could exist when such powers are being exercised, so could a Dominion railway, and we could not protect the Dominion railway against the public policy of a Province.

Mr. THOMPSON. We cannot legislate on the subject of railways at all, if the hon. member's views are correct. We cannot invade the rights of property by allowing a company to take any lands, and if we cannot give them the right over land, the railway cannot be built.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My statement is, and it is in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, that if you have power to create a railway corporation, you have power to confer upon it all powers that are necessary to the existence of that corporation.

Mr. THOMPSON. And to enable it to carry out its undertaking.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But cannot go beyond that. Suppose you were to authorise a railway company to build a road, and they located along some river or water-way which would seriously interfere with the drainage of a large section of the country. I say you could not do that. That is my contention; and you could no more do that than a Local Legislature could deny you the right to create a railway corporation. Property and civil rights being vested in the Local Legislature, of course, do not deprive this Parliament from creating a corporation where such corporation comes within the exceptions in the 92nd section of the British North America Act. But surely you cannot give a railway corporation powers beyond that. For instance, you could not say that a railway corporation shall not drain its lands in the same way as any other portion of the municipality affecting the public health; you could not say that if a railway corporation were to create a particular nuisance, you had the right to say, by legislation here, that it should not be called upon to drain those lands in some other way. That is under the jurisdiction of another body, and they have just the same right to legislate with regard to the conduct of the company created by this Legislature as they have with regard to the conduct of any citizen within the Province.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am afraid we cannot convince each other on these doctrines.

On section 101,

Mr. EDGAR. Do they decide who shall receive the compensation?

Mr. THOMPSON. In connection with the preceding clause I suppose it would be all right. It is just adopting the words of the Act amending the Indian Act of last Session.

On section 130,

Mr. LANGEIER (Quebec). I would suggest the propriety of changing this provision, which requires the map and the book of reference to be deposited in the office of the Clerk of the Peace, and make it the office of the Registrar, which is much more accessible to the general public, I think, in all the Provinces.

Mr. EDGAR. Besides, the Clerk of the Peace has no vault or safe place for keeping these plans, which are valuable and should be preserved for future reference. But the registry offices always have vaults.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, I think it should be the registry office.

On section 150,

Mr. LAURIER. This section provides that if the opposite party neglects to give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by it, or does not give the name of the person whom he appoints as arbitrator, the judge shall on the application of the company, appoint a person to be sole arbitrator. This seems to me to be rather arbitrary, as it would put the proprietor in that case altogether at the mercy of the sole arbitrator.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

On section 159,

Mr. LAURIER. This clause provides that the arbitrator may be a person professionally employed by either party. Is not that contrary to the general principle, that no one should be arbitrator who is interested in the suit or has expressed an opinion on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the same as the law at present, and was really made in the interest of the property owner. The fact is that property owners, in nine cases out of ten, select some personal or professional friend as their arbi-

trator, but who is really an advocate, and the party on the other side does the same; then a third party, if they do not agree, is appointed to judge between the two.

Mr. EDGAR. The practical result of this is, as I know from professional experience, that the Railway Company employs one man who is a skilled surveyor as their arbitrator, and he, understanding the case, does not call in the number of witnesses that one not cognizant of the facts would. The other side selects their arbitrator on the same principle, and thus a great saving is made in the expenditure which would be entailed by calling in a large number of witnesses. Then, if these two disagree, they call in a third party.

Mr. THOMPSON. It looks unsound in principle, but it works really well after all.

On section 164,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section changes the percentage from double the amount mentioned under the notice served under section 146, to 25 per cent.

Mr. WELDON. On a small amount of land, 25 per cent. would be very little.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). Better leave the law as it is.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, we will say 50 per cent.

On section 169,

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to one great inconvenience which has arisen under the old clause. Our judges have decided in several cases, that no compensation can be awarded for witnesses, because, as they said, the witnesses must appear voluntarily. I have known cases where the parties have succeeded as against the railway company, but had to pay hundreds of dollars for witnesses, because the judges held that the witnesses appeared voluntarily, and that, therefore, the allowance to them could not be taxed. I think there should be some provision that the party that loses should pay the witnesses. Of course I am speaking of the law in the Province of Quebec, which is exactly the same as this clause, and it is under that that the judges have taken this position. I know, in my own practice, that a client of mine had to pay \$250 for witnesses, though he won his case.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will insert the words "including a proper allowance to witnesses."

On section 173,

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). That does not state how long notice shall be given before the application.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think the General Manager should be inserted, as well as the other officers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, we will insert that, and make the notice ten days.

Mr. EDGAR. Why is the last part of the old clause left out?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is provided for in section 176.

On section 175,

Mr. THOMPSON. This is intended to enable the Railway Committee to provide for the safety of trains passing over crossings in regard to which the Railway Committee are authorized to provide for the intersection. At present, the Railway Committee have only the power to approve or disapprove of the crossing, and sometimes, when the Committee ask that certain precautions shall be taken in regard to the crossing, they are told that they have no jurisdiction, and they can only get the control by refusing to agree to allow the crossing until the parties are willing to adopt the

precautions. That is very inconvenient, and, therefore, this provision is made.

Mr. EDGAR. Does that arise in reference to the difference between the Grand Trunk and the Ontario and Quebec Railways.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not. I did not hear that fully, but I have seen cases where this difficulty has arisen.

On section 176,

Mr. SHANLY. As this clause is somewhat cognate to sections 11 and 102, which have been allowed to stand, and as this section is a new one, I hope the Minister will allow it also to stand.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will agree to allow it to stand, as it is cognate to other clauses which are standing, but it is not new. It is simply a recasting of sub-section 13 of section 6.

Mr. SHANLY. In the expropriation of one company's property by another, that has not hitherto been the law. It is provided for in section 102, which has been allowed to stand, and therefore I ask that this should be allowed to stand also.

On section 177,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I cannot help thinking that this is an objectionable section, and that it is in all probability, beyond our jurisdiction. This section undertakes to control all crossings of railways, whether these are incorporated by the Provincial Legislatures or by the Parliament of Canada. Now, while we have a right to control corporations constituted by the Parliament of Canada, I do not think we have any authority to exercise jurisdiction over other corporations that have an equal right to existence, and an equal right to be protected against regulations and interference by a body that did not create them. Certainly the power to regulate or control implies the power to destroy, and the Bill here might establish regulations that would be so vexatious or so burdensome as completely to destroy the profitable character of roads that were incorporated by the Provinces; in fact they might make such regulations as would induce every railway corporation to seek to become a corporation of the Dominion, rather than of any one of the Provinces. I was not in the House during the Session that the Minister of Finance (I think it was) passed the Bill that usurped control over nearly all the railways of this country. This is the first time the subject has come up since that period, and I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to the provisions of the British North America Act upon this subject.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow it to stand for the present? We can discuss it more fully hereafter.

On section 183,

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to that clause, a very radical change is made in it. The old law provided that whenever a railway was carried along an existing highway, as distinguished from crossing it, the consent of the proper municipal or local authority thereof should be first obtained. I do not think the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should be substituted for that local authority.

What means can they possibly have for knowing about the local interests affected by running railways along highways in every municipality where they may be constructed? It is not one of the class of cases that I think it is at all proper for the Railway Committee to undertake, and it is one that the municipalities have been accustomed to deal with.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will let that stand.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This subject is worthy of a good deal of consideration, and I think the time has come when the people of this country ought to have more protection against railways than they now have. It will be utterly impossible for the Railway Committee to deal with the various cases which will require to be adjudicated upon. There seems to be a conflict between this clause and the 187th clause. This clause says:

"A railway shall not be carried along an existing line of highway."

But shall merely cross it. Clause 187 says:

"Whenever any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorised to be constructed, upon, or along, or across any street, or other public highway."

Clause 183 makes no provision whatever for any restriction being put upon railways as to the manner in which they shall cross highways. Then clause 187 provides, as I understand it, that no railway shall be constructed along or across any street or public highway at the railway level, without previously obtaining the consent of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Well, that that would be all right if it was practicable, but how in the world can the Privy Council undertake to deal with the numberless cases throughout the Dominion where protection is required for the public? I am sure every member of this House must have within his own knowledge a number of cases where life and property are in danger every day in the week by railway crossings. I know one case of a crossing on the Northern railway, which is practically within the yard of the Northern railway, where there is not a day that life is not in danger. It may be said that this is the business of the municipality, but the municipalities have never yet, in any case that I am aware of, taken the matter up, and it is very certain that the Railway Committee cannot act, because the labor imposed upon them would be interminable. There should be some speedy and expeditious way of having these questions properly adjudicated, so that a railway shall not be permitted to cross a highway in a manner dangerous to life or property. Now, such a state of things as exists in the case I alluded to, and in several other cases within my knowledge, would not be tolerated in any other country. Any one who has travelled in England knows that, even upon branch lines upon which there is the least traffic, either by road or by railway, such a thing as a level crossing without some protection to the public is not permitted under any circumstances. But here we allow railways with long trains to go back and forward over crossings without affording any protection whatever, and the public have just to take their chance. The only protection they have is the privilege that, if a man is injured, he can bring suit against the company for damage, but that is a very poor compensation for the loss of life. I think the Government ought to deal with that class of cases. It has been supposed hitherto that it was so important to get railways built, that we should not interfere with their freedom of action in such matters, and that it was better to run a certain amount of risk than to put railways to the immense expense which they must incur if they provide proper protection. I do not think this 187th clause can be acted upon. I should like to know how, in cases such as I alluded to, and such as must be within the knowledge of this House, how it is possible that a Railway Committee of the Privy Council can give us redress? It is one of those cases in which, it being nobody's business to act, and in which a remedy cannot be obtained without a great deal of expense, nobody undertakes it, so that we go on from year to year with an increased traffic, and the railways furnish no protection to life and property. I do think it is something that ought not to be tolerated any longer, and it is not tolerated in any other country in the civilised world.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. EDGAR. I think that we should get section 183 amended as suggested. We want more protection to the public against railways. The whole of the plans and profile of the railway must be first submitted for the approval of the Railway Committee, before they can do anything. That is the safeguard, and it is a check on the companies. I propose that we should go back to the old provision that a railway shall not be carried alongside a road unless leave is obtained from the municipal or local authority.

Mr. HALL. It is idle to compare the condition of affairs in this country with that in England. It is said that there is no country where this state of things exists except Canada; in the United States level crossings are the rule, rather than the exception. It is idle to expect that we can have overhead and under-crossings; we are obliged to have level crossings in nine cases out of ten. The provision inserted is a very wise one. It would be unwise to go back and give power to municipalities to dictate as to how crossings shall be made. We might just as well tell individuals that they need not give up their lands to railways unless they are compensated according to the terms they choose to ask. Municipalities would impose crossings on railway companies which they could not comply with. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council will safely guard the public interests, and it is a better tribunal resort than the one existing under which railway construction was first commenced in this country. The change is a wise one and it is in the general interests of the people.

Mr. O'BRIEN. No one has interfered, and the evil still exists. I do not say that we can get under or overhead crossings at every concession line; but some authority should have interfered in this matter long ago. Under this Bill there is no interference, for it will be impossible for the Privy Council to take up all these cases. How are the people going to travel from remote parts, even of Ontario, to Ottawa, to see the Privy Council, in such a case as I have in mind this moment? I am not, I repeat, proposing that the company shall be obliged to make crossings at every concessional line, but there are a number of cases where gates should be erected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a point as to which I can confirm the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has last spoken. I recollect extremely well that in Kingston, within two or three miles, eleven or twelve deaths occurred from the dangerous state in which railway crossings were left for many years. It was only after an enormous number of remonstrances and delegations had been sent to Ottawa, at very considerable expense, that the Railway Committee were at last, I believe, induced to take action. I doubt whether even at this moment the several crossings to which I allude have been put in proper shape. I dare say the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) will recollect the rather notorious crossing at Collins' Bay, where as many as ten lives were lost in the last twelve or fourteen years, and other crossings in the same vicinity where also lives were lost, and the crossing at Cataraqui Road going out of Kingston. The appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is a very tedious, expensive, and unsatisfactory proceeding. Very often the Ministers are away, very often it is difficult to obtain appointments at convenient times for delegations, and bringing people to Ottawa from a great distance necessarily involves a heavy expense. I should like to hear the opinion of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly). I know, as a matter of fact, not mere cases of inconvenience, but cases of very serious risk to lives of all persons who cross the railway track to occur, and if any means can be devised for giving some remedy, it is exceedingly desirable it should be done, even if we have to arm the judges of the land with some discretionary power to deal with the evil.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite remember the crossings to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has referred. They were peculiarly dangerous; but I do not suppose that he, any more than the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), intends to propose that all level crossings shall be done away with, because, in this country, it would be utterly impossible to provide overhead or under-crossings. But, at the two places referred to by the hon. member for South Oxford, the crossings were peculiarly dangerous from the short turn in the road. In cases of that kind I think it should be insisted on that overhead crossings be constructed. I rather think in one of those cases, that of Cataqui Road, the danger has been removed lately, or, at least, it has been proposed to provide an overhead crossing. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) finds fault with the system of level crossings, especially in the vicinity of railway stations, but he does not tell us a remedy. If we do not refer the matter to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it is not to be supposed that that body can take cognisance of these dangerous crossings; but, when reported to them, this would be done. The Railway Committee is the general court of appeal in these matters, and they could inspect crossings complained of through their officers. In the case of old-established crossings the municipalities might very fairly be asked to assist the railway companies in making the necessary improvements. Some of the earlier crossings were not dangerous until population increased and the roads were more used. Still I think the appeal is properly placed in the hands of the Privy Council, because they would have to deal, not only with cases of level crossings, but with regard to the other subjects covered by the clauses of this Bill in which they are made sole judges. In those instances the same objection might be taken, and it might be contended that some other authority should be established other than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think the clause as it stands is fairly protective. The appeal, I repeat, should be in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I do not think it is right or just that such matters should be left in the hands of municipalities, in regard to which I do not speak too harshly when I say that they are not, as a general rule, inclined to make very just arrangements.

Mr. COOK. In cities and towns I think gates might be erected at level crossings. We have an instance in Toronto in connection with Parkdale, where a great many accidents occurred. The Privy Council had been applied to frequently, but they would not move in the matter until, finally, there was an accident by which there was valuable life lost, and then the Privy Council gave the privilege to build the subway, and it was built. On King street there is a crossing for about eight tracks, and that has been in a disgraceful condition for a number of years. Accidents occur there frequently, and finally a fatal accident having occurred, the Privy Council insisted upon the railway authorities in the city building a subway there. The railways run through the town of Parkdale and in some places the crossings are very dangerous; one place particularly so, because of a curve in the road, and a high grade, where the trains come with great speed, and in this place, to my own knowledge, accidents have frequently occurred. In places like this the railway companies should be compelled to put up gates, and it would not be very expensive. I believe that the public should be protected a little more than they are, and I believe, with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that it is too expensive and too difficult to appeal to the Privy Council in such cases. It is too difficult to move the Privy Council when a railway company is concerned. Railways are great corporations, and they have very great influence. I do not care whether it is the hon. gentlemen who are

occupying the Treasury benches to-day, or whether other gentlemen, are in power, but I know to my own knowledge that both sides are influenced largely by those corporations. Therefore, I think it would be in the interest, not alone of the Privy Council and of the members of the Privy Council, but of the country at large, that those influences should be removed, and that there should be a general Act by which the public would be fairly protected. The public of this country are not protected as they should be protected from those railway corporations, and I think it is about time that this House should study the public interest. I believe that the Privy Council would find it much to their advantage to see that the public are protected against those great railway corporations.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and with the hint which has fallen from my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that in cities and towns there should be gates on the crossings. I am not so familiar with western Canada, but in Montreal it is never thought of having a level crossing without a gate. If they have none in Toronto, I can say that at the Parkdale crossing they have done a great deal better, they have made an excellent under-crossing, in that instance, when the municipality had come to the aid of the railways.

Mr. O'BRIEN. How long did it take to get that done?

Mr. SHANLY. I do not know that, but it ought to be remembered that when those roads were first constructed they were scarcely dangerous at all, and that they only become more dangerous as the population increases. That is the case with the Parkdale crossing, and as I was the first person that constructed it I ought to know something about it. When it came to be a great thoroughfare, and instead of being as formerly, a country crossing, it was actually in the city, the necessity came for giving increased protection. I remember the case, for I was applied to by some Toronto people for my opinion. As well as I remember, the Privy Council took notice of it. They had a meeting with the railway authorities, who divided the expense and made an excellent safe crossing, better than gates could be. I know that the King street crossing is a dangerous one, and I know that it is in contemplation now to do something the same with it as was done in the case of the Parkdale crossing.

Mr. COOK. Oh, yes; it is under way now.

Mr. SHANLY. From having been a crossing in the open common it became a crossing in the middle of the city. I am still of the opinion that the Privy Council is the proper court of appeal in those matters.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) has alluded to Montreal, and says that all the railway crossings in the streets are provided with gates. He does not know perhaps that outside the limits of the city proper, there are densely populated localities where the railways cross numerous streets, and where there are no gates to provide for the security of the people. He knows probably that every year we have to deplore the loss of many lives on account of the want of proper cautions on the part of the railway companies. I think it would be better if we had a clause in the Act which would immediately provide, instead of leaving it to the Railway Committee, that wherever a railway line goes across a densely populated town or district, the law would compel the company to build gates immediately and provide necessary safeguards against accidents. This would be moving in the direction that my friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) had indicated. Take, for instance, the town of St. Henri, in the western portion of Montreal city, which has 2,000 of a population. The inhabitants of that town have applied several times to the Grand Trunk

for gates to be put on the streets where the railway line crosses, and they have also applied here, but as yet there are no proper safeguards against accidents there. It is my opinion that the law should provide immediately that whenever a railway crosses the street of a town or a village where the population is dense that gates should be put there. If this were done those accidents which we deplore would be avoided, and it would meet the object which we have in view.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree with my hon. friend that some of the suburban towns around Montreal have become, to all intents and purposes, cities. I am entirely in favor of having gates or safeguards being used where there is a large population; and not only am I in favor of it, but I would make it imperative that gates and keepers should be provided for those crossings.

Mr. DENISON. In Toronto the citizens have complained for a great many years of these level crossings not being protected. There are a great many level crossings in Toronto, and I know of only two instances in which there are gates. If anything can be done in this Railway Bill to protect the citizens of towns where there are large populations, I think it should be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My attention has been called over and over again to the very great indifference of the railway corporations, one and all, to the destruction of human life. The fact appears to be that when accidents to life happen the survivors are ready enough to bring claims against the railway companies for compensation; and, generally speaking, the railway companies, to do them justice, are willing to consider those claims and make settlements; but it is nobody's business to take steps to prevent the recurrence of such accidents, and the consequence is that year after year a succession of fatal accidents occur at particular crossings. Now, if this matter is going to be left to the discretion of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it appears to me that the Railway Department should also be called on to investigate every case of death which takes place at a crossing. That might well be made a part of the functions of that department; and in such cases, it should be the duty of the Government, as the natural protectors of the lives of the people of this country, to see that effective steps are taken as far as possible to prevent the recurrence of similar disasters. There is no use in leaving the matter to private parties, because they will not exert themselves further than to obtain compensation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the observations of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). If this Bill does not provide, it ought to provide, that in every case of death caused by a railway, the Government ought to make an investigation.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Why wait for death?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or in any serious accident to the person; for these accidents almost invariably result in death. I think the Railway Committee should investigate such cases and have a report, because that is the first necessary step towards taking such measures as will prevent the recurrence of such accidents, and the Railway Committee should be clothed with power, not only to make the investigation, but to apply the remedy.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite prepared to endorse what the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said on this question. In my own riding there are many places where there is very great risk of the loss of life almost every day, not only from crossings, but from trains running close to roadways. If the municipalities are not given power to do something in the way of insisting on railways putting up high fences so as to prevent teams being fright-

Mr. DESJARDINS.

ened, and caused to run into ditches or against fences, and upsetting the vehicle to which they are attached, these accidents will undoubtedly continue to happen. In some cases the railway companies have put up snow fences, and have carried them close to the crossing, so that a person driving cannot see a train coming until he is right upon the crossing. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to advocate changes for the protection of cities, but my hon. friend from Muskoka and myself are here to advocate such changes as are necessary for the protection of life in the country districts as well. I hold that the municipalities should not be prevented from compelling a company to erect fences along the line where it runs beside a public road. If the matter were left to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as the hon. Minister of Finance suggests, and if every constituency were compelled to bring before them the same number of accidents that happen in my constituency, they would not be able to investigate all the cases that would come before them. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) says about level crossings. It is impossible at present to do without them in Canada, but I think that any hindrances, such as fences and shrubbery, should be removed, and I think the municipalities should have power to enforce their removal; and where the railway companies erect snow fences in winter close up to the crossings, they ought at least to be taken down during the summer. If the public have to come before the Privy Council with all such complaints, when there are perhaps forty or fifty crossings in each county, it would be quite impossible for the Privy Council to deal with all these cases. I do not see that a better arrangement could be made than to allow the municipalities to stipulate what protection should be afforded in the interest of the travelling public.

Mr. SHANLY. Will you guarantee the municipal councils being reasonable?

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite admit that in some cases they might be unreasonable. At the same time, there should be something done to protect the public from these accidents which are continually happening, and which will continue to happen unless some change is made.

Mr. BRIEN. In the town from which I come there is one of the worst crossings in Canada, where accidents are constantly happening. A year ago last winter a young man with a bobsleigh ran upon it, when a train came along, and he was thrown on one side and the bobsleigh on the other. The railway fences are built up close to the crossing, so that one is on the crossing before he can see the train coming. Last summer a poor unfortunate fellow, while attempting to drive across, had his horse killed and his own head taken off. Action was taken against the railway corporation, who were, of course, quite willing to settle. The law provides that trains must travel through the town only six miles an hour, but they almost invariably travel at a more rapid rate, especially in shunting. I think it would be in the interest of railway companies themselves if some provision were made by which the public could be protected. The corporation or city council have made application to the railway company two or three times to do so, year after year, and invariably there reply has been that if the corporation will pay the man, the company will furnish him. That is equivalent to treating the corporation with contempt, and I think that now is the proper time to adopt some provision by which the public would be protected.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think it was Sydney Smith who said that if a director were tied in front of every engine, accidents would be less likely to occur. Many members of this House visit my country place, and every time they do so they run very great risks, as there are three very dangerous crossings on the way. Only the other night, on my way

home, I had to wait half an hour for an engine to pass up and down over the crossing on the Gatineau road. No serious accidents have as yet occurred, but no doubt if this thing continues, some very serious accident will some day occur. On the road to Aylmer we have two very bad crossings, and I quite agree with the hon. member for Muskoka that country people ought to be protected quite as well as the city people, and that railway companies should be bound to provide against serious accidents resulting from these unguarded crossings. I hope the Government will see its way to do this, because this is really an important matter.

Mr. SHANLY. Would you advocate that for every level crossing?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would, certainly, for every level crossing in the county of Ottawa.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is, no doubt, a very important portion of the Bill, and it is well it should receive the utmost attention, I am quite willing, in accordance with the request made, to allow the clause to stand over for future consideration; but I would ask the hon. members who have given this matter some attention this evening, to examine again the clause in connection with the existing practice and the difficulties which have arisen under that practice, and I think they will find that this section is a change in the direction of providing for the public safety. Whether it is adequate or not will remain to be considered, but it is, I think, a decided improvement in that direction. The discussion of this particular clause commenced by the suggestion that we were taking away the power of control from the municipalities, and that under the existing law there could be no crossing over a highway without the consent of the municipal authorities. In the first place, we must provide, as has been suggested by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Shanly), for the arbitrary refusal of the municipality, because that is not provided for in the existing law; but, as regards the control of the municipality being sufficient for the purposes of public safety, hon. gentlemen will observe, on reflection, that it is under that system all the present difficulties and negligencies have occurred. While the law provides that there shall be an absolute veto in the hands of the municipal council, so little control has been exercised by the municipalities, that not only have the necessary safeguards never been taken, but that the matters in dispute have never been brought before the Railway Committee for adjudication. The present law works, as I understand it, practically in this way: No railway crossing on a level shall be made, and no railway shall run along the public highway without the consent of the municipal authorities. A railway is built with or without that consent. Generally speaking, no doubt, that consent has been obtained. Since I have been a member of the Railway Committee, in only one case, and that in the Province of Quebec, has a municipal authority objected to a crossing, and the matter had to come before the Railway Committee, and then the public interest was safeguarded to the fullest extent. In nearly all other cases, the consent has been given practically out of the general desire which municipal authorities have to give every facility to railway companies; and they pay but little regard to the chances of accidents, when those chances are balanced by the danger of the railway being diverted to some other locality. In other cases, the consent is taken for granted, and there is no control in such cases in the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at all, unless some other question arising, it becomes necessary for the company to get its crossing confirmed; and it is only after the railway has once been constructed with the consent of the municipality or that consent having been taken for granted, that by the occurrence of some circumstances such as conflicting interests, the matter comes before the Privy

Council at all. Now the change we propose to make is this: We say that a railway cannot be built, even if the municipal authorities consent, across or along a public highway unless the approval of the Railway Committee is first obtained; so that it will not be a question of depending upon the municipal authority for the safeguard which they have never insisted on having down to the present time, but it will be a question of providing that a railway company shall not make the crossing until they come before the Railway Committee, where we will have an opportunity of hearing all the contentions made and when we will have the advice of our own engineer, and thus be able to see that the public interests are guarded. I do not think that the Railway Committee is so inaccessible or so expensive a tribunal in cases of this kind as the hon. member for Muskoka has suggested. I have sat upon it in two cases which were presented in relation to railway crossings, one being the case in Toronto, which the hon. member for Muskoka has mentioned. In that case, representations were made by the mayor on one side, and on the other side by the counsel for the railway company, and I do not think that any witnesses were examined. I do not think that the discussion occupied half an hour, and I am sure that the expenses incurred did not reach \$40. In half an hour a decision was made that gates should be put upon the crossing, and I understand that that decision is being carried out. If it is not, under the provisions of this Bill, it can be very speedily enforced, because an order of the Railway Committee will be made a rule of court, and be made very compulsory by summary proceedings. Only one or two other cases have occurred in which the Railway Committee have been asked to intervene, either by the municipalities or any other person, as regards gates across highways, and in those cases the gates have been ordered to be put up; but, generally speaking, the difficulty has not been in consequence of the expense of the committee or the difficulty of getting it to meet, or the cost of its proceedings, because its proceedings are very inexpensive, but it is owing to the utter negligence of the municipal authorities, which are far more under the influence of the railway corporations than the Railway Committee can possibly be, in bringing that matter before that committee at all. In the first place we have to be careful that we do not give a control to the municipal authorities, which will be absolutely arbitrary, and, in the next place, we must provide that some better and more independent authority than the municipal shall have the regulation of the question before the crossing is made. However, I am at present willing to let the clause stand.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say that it would be well to provide in this Bill that at all crossings in rural sections, railway companies should be required to protect the crossings by removing trees or shrubbery, or anything of that kind that is growing up upon their land, and that prevent people approaching the crossings from seeing the approach of an engine or train. I know of some sections where the railway companies have never tried to remove the shrubbery growing up on their land, and which becomes a complete hedge, hiding the place of the crossing, especially where there is a deep cut. If this Bill would provide that in rural districts the railway companies must remove such impediments to the view, a good reform would be effected. I think there should be some provision that the railway should be required to remove anything which tends to prevent a party travelling along the line of the railway from seeing the approach of the train. I know that trees or bush grow up, and the railway company should remove them, whether they are on their own property or even on private property, so that parties who are crossing the track should have an opportunity to see the train when it is approaching the crossing. I know of several cases in my own county where

the shrubbery has grown to such an extent that it hides the train, and in several cases it has caused a loss of life.

On section 191,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Am I to understand that the company is to be made liable only if it does not make provision for the passing of farmers' carts over the railway? Very frequently it is found better to make the crossing under the railway, but there seems to be no provision for that.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will insert the words which will make it read "under or over the same."

On section 193,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand the object of this section is to have means adopted which are found necessary for the protection of trains crossing bridges. It is proposed to have the floor of the bridge so constructed and maintained as to be a closed floor instead of there being large open spaces, so that if a locomotive is derailed it cannot crush down between the sleepers. It is also proposed to have a V shaped block next to the rail in order to prevent cars striking against the bridge. It is a technical matter, and the importance of it will be seen by every one.

Mr. SHANLY. I quite agree that this is a technical matter and I think the sub-section had better be omitted. We are proposing to insert a specification in this section, but we may get a better system before long. It will be quite sufficient if it is provided that the trains shall not run on a bridge unless such bridge is approved by the Minister. The sub-section will simply complicate the matter and may lead to trouble.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so. The sub-section is all right at this moment; but a better system might be discovered afterwards, and the plans might then be varied as improvements are made.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it is meant to be enforced against all railways after six months?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it gives six months to enable the companies to conform to the provision.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have drawn the following clause to cover the point:

"No company shall run its trains on any bridge unless such bridge is constructed and maintained with the safeguards approved by the Minister. This section shall not apply to any bridge already constructed until six months after the bringing of this Act into force."

On section 194,

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Some further provisions should be made in regard to the fencing of railways. There is a provision already for fencing against adjoining proprietors, and section 196 provides certain penalties for neglect in such cases. In Ontario, municipalities have power to permit the running at large of cattle upon public highways. The railways are constructed in certain portions of my county without having any fences erected along the line for long distances and no cattle guards at the public highway crossing, and some of the municipalities where the road is not fenced have authorised a by-law permitting cattle to run at large on the highways. In many instances these cattle stray on the railway track and are killed, partly because of the non-fencing of the track and partly because of the non-construction of cattle-guards at the public highway crossings. I know that instances occurred in my county during last summer where a large number of cattle were killed belonging to people who could not afford the loss. When compensation was applied for the companies sheltered themselves behind the common law, which provides that as the cattle were on the railway line at the time they were killed the owners were not entitled

Mr. McMULLEN.

to compensation. What I want to provide for, if it can be provided for, is to make some provision in cases where municipalities have passed by-laws permitting the run of cattle on the highways, that the railway companies shall be required to maintain their fences and cattle-guards, and if they do not do that they shall be liable to damage for cattle killed when they may have strayed on the track from the public highway.

Mr. BARRON. The member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) anticipated me in the very point which I was about to raise. I have had some experience of this very matter in my riding, and at the present time I am asked to bring an action by people whose cattle have been killed by reason of escaping off land over which they had a right to be and to pasture under the by-law of the municipality allowing them to run at large. I rather fear that under the law as it is those people who have lost their cattle will have no remedy. We know it is only as against the adjoining property that the railroad has got to fence, and they have already refused to fence in many instances except in so far as to protect the cattle escaping from the farm of the particular men who wish to have an action brought. It seems to me that sections 194 and 195 are somewhat defective, because section 195 refers to the fencing mentioned in 194 and says that "such fencing shall be done within three months after the construction of the railroad as against the occupier." That applies to the case where the land is already occupied. Section B applies to the case where it is not already occupied and it requires the railway company to fence it within three months after it is occupied. There is no means of giving an occupier any remedy in law for not fencing unless the occupier first of all gives notice requiring the railway company to fence. I do not think that is right. I think that the occupier of land should have an action of damages without first of all giving the railroad company notice to fence.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not quite comprehend where the difficulty arises. As I understand the member for North Renfrew, he takes the case of the railway crossing which the company has neglected properly to fence, and cattle are killed at the railway crossing. If they had escaped from the owner's property to the highway and had been destroyed for want of proper fencing of the railway, the company of course would be liable, but the company sets up a defence that they are killed on the railway crossing having first escaped from their owner's property and being wrongfully on the highway, and that although the company were wrong in not having those fences up, the cattle were wrong in being there. I would refer the hon. member to section 200 which requires them to fence the crossings.

Mr. LISTER. It is not the case of farm crossings at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that.

Mr. LISTER. As the law now is all the railway company is bound to do is to fence against adjoining owners. The difficulty arises where they have not fenced as against the adjoining owners and where cattle belonging to people, owned by persons other than the adjoining owners, escape on the railway track over on fenced land. What I learned from my hon. friend is: If the municipality allows those cattle to be free commoners and enacts a by-law by which they cease to be trespassers allowing them to run over on enclosed lands, then if the company has neglected to fence they should be held responsible in the same way as if they are owners of the adjoining land. Of course, the law, so far as crossings are concerned, is plain enough.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Though the law expressly requires railway companies to put on cattle-guards on the level crossings, and if they do not and if cattle stray on the tracks, or even on the crossings, and get upon the railway line, from the fact of there being no cattle-guards, then the de-

fence is set up that those cattle are trespassers, and although they are there by the law of the municipality, that they have no right to be on the public highway. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) contends with us that the railway company should be bound to fence against the trespassing of those cattle on their line. I think it is a manifest duty that they owe to the public in every populated portion of the country that they should fence their lines. What I want to get into this law, if I can, is a provision that will require them to do so, and if they neglect their manifest duty, that they should be made to suffer.

Mr. WATSON. This is a very important point, and especially important in Manitoba and the North-West. A great many farmers there have suffered loss on account of fences not being erected along the lines of railway, and by cattle being killed upon the track off their own property, just as the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and the member for Renfrew (Mr. White) have explained. These cattle do not get on to the crossings, but the railroad running through a section of a prairie country on which cattle are allowed to run at large, they get on the railway track where the company does not fence the track, and the result is that numbers of cattle are killed, and the settler whose cattle are destroyed, finds it almost impossible to receive compensation. I hope the Minister will amend the law in such a manner as will compel the railroad company to fence the railroad through the cities or municipalities, and to protect cattle where they are allowed to run at large. It is the duty of the railroad company to protect their lines and the Government should insist upon it. Of course, I quite understand that when a railroad runs through twenty or thirty miles of unsettled country, it would be harsh to ask the companies to fence those lands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In a thickly settled country you want fences?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, and if the land is not occupied and the farmer is allowed to have his cattle run at large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They ought not to allow them to run at large; it is very dangerous to life.

Mr. WATSON. It would be almost impossible to compel a man to fence his cattle in. It is much more reasonable to say that the railway company should fence the railway track.

Mr. SHANLY. There is one view in the case that my hon. friends from Renfrew (Mr. White) and Lambton (Mr. Lister) have not touched upon. My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) seems to be particularly careful of the lives of cattle, but he should remember that in this free commoner business the lives of people travelling by trains are in peril by cattle being allowed to run at large. While I am entirely in favor of railway companies providing proper cattle-guards, I think it should be insisted upon by some law or other that cattle in a populous and settled country should not be allowed to run at large. No matter how good the cattle-guards may be even where high fences are constructed, you will occasionally find places where the cattle will get on the railway, if they are allowed to roam at large; and it is much more important to consider the danger to the people in the trains where the cattle are killed than the cattle themselves.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is very important that the quality of the fence should be considered, because if the fence is not of such a quality as to prevent cattle and other animals getting through, and on to the track, loss of life may occur from the trains coming into collision with them. Many of the railways have fences that are wholly inadequate to prevent cattle, sheep and pigs from getting through them. For instance, many of the fences consist of wire hung on posts

twelve or fourteen feet apart, and frequently there is no boards on the top of the posts, so that the animals can easily make their way over or through the wires. It is a great hardship to farmers and to people living in towns to prevent their cattle running at large. In many towns there are commons, and the municipal by-laws permit the cattle to run at large, and sometimes the cattle get on the station grounds, owing to the station grounds not being enclosed. I know of a case in which a cow was killed by getting on to the station grounds, and the company declined to pay for the cow on the grounds that she was running at large. If there is anything in the contention that a cow coming in contact with a train is liable to throw the train off and destroy human life, it is of vital importance that the company should not be allowed to neglect to construct such fences as will prevent cattle getting on the track. The quality of the fence is not sufficiently laid down in the Bill. If the railway company erect a wire fence, it should be compelled to place a board on the top of the posts, and if the company neglects to construct a proper fence, it should be held responsible for the accidents which occur in consequence. I know of a number of cases in which cattle got through improperly constructed fences and were killed, and their owners were not compensated, on some pretext or other. It is impossible for a farmer to go to law against a railway company, for the company appeals and appeals, and on some technical ground the farmer is defeated. It is the duty of this House to have the fence well defined in this Act. That is apart from the other question. I want to see human life protected, and in order that it should be protected the railway companies should be compelled to erect good fences which cattle will not be able to pass through, and thus throw the train off the track and endanger human life.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). In the Province of New Brunswick there is this difficulty, not in the cultivated portions, but in the woods. The farmers in the spring turn the cattle in the woods, and they get on the railway in spite of every precaution. If the cattle are to be allowed to run at large, the company would have to fence its road from one end to the other. Then, in some portions of the Province the occupiers of land do not want the railway fenced, because the fence takes up a large portion of land, and they prefer to crop it close up to the track. We have to consider the life of the public in these cases, and if the cattle are allowed to stray on highways in proximity to a railway, it is almost impossible to run a railway without some accidents occurring; and the question is whether in the interest of the public, cattle should not be prevented from running on highways which cross railroads. How can you make a company responsible in cases where the occupiers prefer not to have the land fenced? There should be consideration for the railway as well as the cattle in these cases.

Mr. McNEILL. I think if it is possible to keep the cattle off the line over all the rest of its course, they can be kept off the line so far as the highways are concerned. There is no doubt that in many parts of the country which are partially settled, it is of great importance to the settlers that they should have the opportunity of turning their cattle into the woods and along the roadsides, and it seems to me that it is a piece of almost high-handed tyranny on the part of railway companies to refuse to take the trouble of having the highway guarded against cattle in those districts as well as in other parts of the country.

Mr. SHANLY. How are you going to secure the highway if the cattle are running.

Mr. McNEIL. By cattle-guards. As my hon. friend will see, the point that the hon. member for Renfrew has made is this, that there are cases where these cattle-guards are not as well constructed as they ought to be and where

there are none at all, and the cattle straying from the roads on to the railways are killed.

Mr. SHANLY. If the cattle are running at large, they may be killed actually on the railway line. The cattle-guard may be perfect, and still the cattle may be collected on the highways at the crossing and there be killed, and perhaps kill the railway passengers.

Mr. McNEILL. Of course it is possible that they may get on the road and stand just on the crossing, but that is very unusual. It is generally when the cattle get on the line and are collected in places within the fences and cannot get away, that accidents occur. When the cattle are standing on the highway at the crossing and a train comes along, all they have to do is to walk out of the way, and that they do. As soon as the engineer sees the cattle he blows his whistle, and they move on. It is not on the crossings that accidents occur, but it is on the line through the crossings not being fenced.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is in the cut.

Mr. McNEILL. It is in the cut and along the line. It is most important an arrangement of this kind should be made. I must emphasise again my statement that it is of the greatest possible importance, in sparsely settled districts, that farmers should have the benefit of their cattle feeding in the woods and along the roads, and I do not see why they should be prevented having this benefit, simply because railway companies do not choose to be at the expense of fencing their lines as they should.

Mr. MITCHELL. You can easily see the difference between the gentlemen who represent the population and wealth of cities, such as the hon. member for the city and county of St. John, and gentlemen who represent rural constituencies like the hon. member for North Bruce. I happen to represent a constituency which is a mixture of rural and urban, and I have had a good deal of experience in the matter of cattle being killed on railways. I must say I entirely differ from the hon. member for the city and company of St. John (Mr. Weldon), and I agree in the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who so ably represents the British Empire when he speaks on that subject, and who in this case is representing the farmers. I suppose I have had occasion to plead before the Railway Department of this country as often and get as little as almost any member of this House, and I have heard these legal objections raised there which have been raised by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had occasion to ask for compensation for cattle, horses, colts and cows killed on the Intercolonial Railway, and the only animal I ever got paid for was the widow Murphy's cow after a long and arduous fight. I believe it is the duty of railway companies and of the Government which owns a railway to fence their lines both in settled districts and in districts which are only comparatively settled. In the latter the farmers have to allow their cattle to feed upon the unoccupied territory of their neighbors, and the hon. member for North Bruce has correctly represented the condition of things in relation to that matter. I will just say to the representative of the Intercolonial Railway that it would be very well if the Government will keep the fences in repair after they had put them up. As the chief manager of that enterprise is in the House, I hope he will see that the fences in the county of Northumberland are better maintained than they have been for some time past. There ought to be some provision in this Bill by which railway proprietors, whether corporations or governments, should be compelled to fence, not only through thickly settled districts but also through partially settled districts, especially as in the latter the farmers must utilise their unenclosed land to pasture their cattle during the summer.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. EDGAR. There seems to be two points on which this discussion has taken place. One is the necessity of fencing a railway from the adjoining land. Now there is a very distinct and good provision for that in the first part of section 94; then, the other point is the necessity of having sufficient cattle-guards at all highway crossings to prevent the cattle getting upon the railways from the highways. That is provided for by sub-section *b* of section 194, in very clear terms, I think.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). But if the railway company does not put them in, what then?

Mr. EDGAR. Those two provisions seem to be clear and sufficient as to those two purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The fences should be made higher.

Mr. EDGAR. Apart from that, there are those two provisions. Now, however, how are they enforced? I would like the hon. the Minister of Justice to explain section 195. Is it in his view necessary that the adjoining proprietor should give in all cases six months' notice in writing to the railway before the railway is liable for not fencing. I cannot make out from that section whether it is necessary that the notice should be given, and whether the delays referred to in the first part *a* and *b*, render the railway liable without a notice in writing. I think section 13 of the old Act renders it necessary that notice in writing should be given before the railway company is liable, because the old Act mentions these delays, and then it says "and after the company has been so required to give notice." I observe that in this section the draftsman of the Bill has left out the word "and," so that it does not seem to require that the notice is necessary in writing in addition to the delay. I think it would be a most scandalous thing if that were allowed, that no railway company should be liable for damages to the adjoining proprietor if his cattle were killed, unless he had given six months' notice. I am glad to see that this Bill appears to change that provision, and I hope the committee will accept it so far. But, supposing that improvement is made, how is the remedy to be enforced? The railway is liable, but it is only liable to the occupants of the land in respect to which the fences are defective, and the occupants, as in cases that have been mentioned, of all other land through which cattle may stray on to the track, over land which does not belong to the owners of the cattle, are left without legal redress. I think that matter ought to be considered. I think, if the company is bound to make and maintain these fences, it should be liable for the loss of all cattle straying upon their track through these fences where they are defective.

Mr. WHITE. Where there are no fences erected at all, what would you do then?

Mr. EDGAR. Of course I am assuming that there are fences erected, and I think some means should be adopted in that case to make the company liable for damages.

Mr. SHANLY. You would not propose to compel the company to keep all the farm gates closed?

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad to see the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), with his great practical knowledge taking part in this discussion.

Mr. SHANLY. Supposing the cattle strayed on to the track through the carelessness of a farmer?

Mr. EDGAR. That case is not in question, because section 201 says that anyone who leaves a gate open is liable to the company for all sorts of damages, but why should the company not be forced in all cases to make a good lawful fence. I think they should be made liable for damages if they are not.

Mr. SHANLY. That is, in a settled country. You would not want them to fence round Lake Superior, for instance?

Mr. EDGAR. It must be remembered that it is not only the cattle that are lost, and it is not only the loss to the farmer which has to be considered. I think we ought to make it absolutely clear and distinct that the railway companies, in settled counties at least, must be forced by some means to keep up these fences, and I do not think that the ridiculous provisions in the former Act, requiring notice in writing to be given, should be entertained for a moment.

Mr. WHITE. Are you speaking of the Act of 1883?

Mr. EDGAR. I am speaking of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. WATSON. I would make a suggestion to the Minister of Justice to add these words in sub-section c.

"If the company is required in writing by the occupant or by the municipal county."

I think that would suit most people, and certainly most people in the west, because I would not ask the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Manitoba and the North-West Company in those portions of their line where they have to run through an unsettled country, where there is no danger of cattle straying on the track, to go to this expense, but, when municipal council is giving the power, I do not think any municipal council would act unfairly to a railway company. I know of instances where some settlers had three or four head of cattle killed. They appealed to the county court, and were awarded the value of the cattle, but the railway company appealed to a higher court, and the settlers had to stop because they had not the means to go on further. If the railway company were notified, I do not think that any one could object.

Mr. McNEILL. I think that notice should be given before the railway is constructed, or before it is completed.

Mr. SHANLY. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) is a very good one, that the maintenance of the fences should be insisted upon when the municipality desires their continuance.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am not altogether in favor of that, because there are many places where there are no organised townships, were it would not apply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree fully with the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and also with those of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). In counties where people are settling and where the settlers themselves are new, it is a necessity that their cattle should be allowed to run at large. I speak with knowledge, and even with authority on this matter, because I began life on a new farm, and everyone who knows anything in regard to farming knows that a new settler has no choice, but that his cattle must be allowed to run at large. If the railway, therefore, is not to have its track enclosed, it simply prohibits the new settler from keeping cattle at all. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), if I understood him aright, said that the same danger existed in regard to railway crossings.

Mr. SHANLY. Not to the same extent of course.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If we take the surveys which have been made in the Province of Ontario, we find that that danger is one to five hundred, and anyone who has observed the habits of cattle knows that there is nothing like a railway or a turnpike road where they will seek to lie down, to escape from flies or other nuisances; and I think the motion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) meets the difficulty as well as it is possible for this House to meet it. I think the House ought to make the safety of the people the first consideration, and it is certain that

there is no more fruitful source of accidents on railways than animals lying upon the road. I therefore hope that the Minister of Justice will adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson.)

Mr. THOMPSON. The suggestion will go further than, I think, the hon. gentleman intends. It would enable the municipal council in unsettled places, to fence on both sides of the line of railway, and I think the clause had better be allowed to stand.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think a municipal council would be unfair in dealing with a railway company. I think it would be perfectly safe to allow the council to decide as to whether there was any danger of cattle straying upon the road, and they might make arrangements with the railway company, in case of accidents, to pay the damages. But it is very annoying to a settler to know that his cattle are liable to get on a railway track, and he cannot recover damages if they are killed. I do not think there would be any injustice in asking a railway company to fence the land, when notified to do so by the owner or occupant, or by the municipal council.

Mr. WHITE. I would go somewhat further than my hon. friend. I think he will remember a discussion that took place here some five years ago in regard to fencing railways, in which I took the ground that railway companies ought to fence their roads without any notice from the adjoining proprietors; and I intend, if these clauses are allowed to stand, and when they come up again to renew that proposition, that railway companies shall be required to fence against the adjoining properties without any notice being required to do so. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly), that the protection to human life ought to be of paramount importance to this House, and I think that only strengthens the argument I have presented in favor of the proposition that railway companies should be obliged to fence their roads, not only for the purpose of protecting settlers from the loss of their cattle, but also for the protection of human life. Let me point out an instance that occurred in my county last year. In the township of Head, a considerable portion of the land was unfenced, and representations were made to the railway company by myself and by the municipal authorities, asking them to fence the road along this portion of their line, some four miles in extent, where there was a considerable settlement, but where the land is not of very rich quality, and consequently the settlers are not very well off. After we made these representations the company promised time and again that they would erect the fences; but they neglected to do it, and the consequence was that not less than 30 head of cattle were killed in that short distance, during last season, and no redress could be had from the railway company at all. When application was made for payment they replied that they did not believe they were liable, as the cattle had not strayed on the railway from the lands of the adjoining proprietors; and so these poor people, who were in the enjoyment of their rights, and were allowing their cattle to run at large, and in conformity with the by-law passed under the Municipal Act of the Province of Ontario, and who were not improperly employing the land from which the cattle strayed upon the track, were prevented from obtaining a single dollar of compensation for the damages they had suffered. No only that, but, as I have already stated, there are three or four crossings in that township, two at all events, that I am aware of, and I believe four, upon which there are no cattle-guards erected, so that if cattle strayed from the highway, at these points to which I refer, there would be nothing to prevent them from going on the track, that is, in the way of cattle-guards. So I think that some provision ought to be made to carry out the idea I suggested,

and if the Minister of Justice proposes to allow any of these clauses to stand, I would ask him to allow to stand all those clauses relating to fences, for future consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will allow them to stand.

On section 201,

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Under this section, in case for instance, a farmer had a crossing on his farm, and through the negligence of a servant, his cattle happened to get upon the track and an accident occurred, according to this section, he might be called upon to pay an enormous sum, which would ruin the unfortunate farmer, when, perhaps, he was really not personally to blame.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have adopted a provision in the Bill which entitles every farmer to a crossing, and entitles him to have gates for the passage of vehicles. Surely it is necessary, in the public interest, that he should keep these gates closed. The company cannot be expected to keep them closed, because, they are entirely for his own use. If the provision is strict against the farmer, it is so in consequence of the necessity, on his part, of exercising care to prevent accidents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend supposes the case of an accident occurring upon the railway through the negligence of the farmer's servant, in allowing the gates open. I think he desires that you should attach a sufficient penalty to the farmer, without entirely ruining him, through no fault of his own.

Mr. SHANLY. It should be remembered that the farmer's negligence may almost ruin a railway; the destruction may amount to tens of thousands of dollars, not to speak of the loss of life that might occur. It should be made a terror to farmers to leave their gates open.

Mr. WATSON. Make the penalty not less than \$20 nor more than \$500. It might be a hardship to make the farmer responsible for the whole damage.

Mr. SHANLY. That is absurd, because the farm would not pay the damage, in most cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the provision of the law at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No serious difficulties have arisen yet; no such cases have occurred.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.) We may not have had any up to the present time, but we have no guarantee that they will not occur.

Mr. McNEILL. I venture to suggest that in the present state of scientific knowledge and inventive power if a premium were offered by the Government, and probably the railway companies would be willing to join in, as it would be very advantageous to them, some invention would be made by which a flag would be allowed to drop, say, eight or ten rods from the railway crossing, as the train was coming forward. I should think by the use of electricity this might be done without much difficulty. At night this might be done by using another kind of signal such as turning a red light in place of a green one. This is a matter of such enormous importance to the public that it might be as well for the Government to take it into consideration and see if something of the kind might not be done.

On section 25,

Mr. WATSON. I would suggest that a price not to exceed a certain amount per mile, should be fixed for passenger fares. In some cases the railroads charge 4 and 5 cents per mile. I think 3 cents per mile is generally conceded to be fair.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Those rates are all subject to the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. EDGAR. Was there any limit to the rate in the old Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. EDGAR. If it is not in the general Act it is in many special cases.

Mr. WATSON. The old Act subjected it to the regulation of the Governor in Council and railroads were allowed to charge 4 or 5 cents per mile. I think we ought to fix by legislation the rate of toll not to exceed 3 cents per mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are there any rates above that?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know this year, but last year I know the Canadian Pacific Railway charged 4 and 5 cents a mile; west of Brandon 4 cents and west of Burton 5 cents.

Mr. SHANLY. The Grand Trunk rate is $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents by statute; that is to say it is two pence per mile in the original charter which is equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. WATSON. Make this $3\frac{1}{2}$ or $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents and have a limit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That might have the effect of preventing the construction of railways in many unsettled localities where they are a great benefit to the settlers.

Mr. SHANLY. It is better not to make a rate in partially settled countries like the North-West where there are few people to make the road pay. I think it is better to leave it to the Governor in Council to make the rate.

Mr. WATSON. I find that the Governor in Council legislates in the interest of railroads and not in the interest of the public.

On section 235,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This requires the company, on the demand of any person, to make known any special rates which they have given. Suppose they refuse to give the information, something is required to compel them to give it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, we will let this stand, and I will look at the Interstate Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are these clauses modelled on the Interstate Commerce Law?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 274,

Mr. HALL. I would suggest that the words "or across" should be added, because I have seen a prosecution fail on that ground.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That would be a very unreasonable regulation. If a railway runs through a man's farm, is that to prevent his crossing the track?

Mr. EDGAR. A man has to go across the track very often.

Mr. HALL. Railway companies never enforce the provision unless there is a wilful violation of the law, but there are cases in which the companies are prevented from stopping the public from crossing the track, though it is dangerous to the public themselves, and I think they should have the power to do that.

Mr. EDGAR. They have it already. They can stop trespassers on railway land.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are many cases where lands have been severed by a railway, and you would not pro-

pose to prevent persons crossing the track there. The provision the hon. gentleman suggests would be very severe.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would defeat itself by its severity.

On section 282,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think there ought to be some provision by which persons who purchase a railroad under the foreclosure of a mortgage ought to be able to become a corporation and obtain the franchises, because it is doubtful if a purchase under a deed of foreclosure passes the franchises. An Act was passed in New Brunswick last year to enable the persons who purchase under a deed of foreclosure or a deed of sale to become a corporation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is very undesirable that railway companies should be incorporated by letters patent.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This very day there is a railway to be sold, and there can be no incorporation until next year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will make a note of the point.

On section 288,

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Would it not be advisable to introduce a clause providing that parties should give notice to a railway company when they claim damages, on the same principle that notice has to be given to revenue officers? Sometimes these actions are brought on speculation. Frequently no notice is given to the railway companies, and the first thing they know a writ is served.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think parties usually try to get some compensation from the road before they bring the action.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). No, they do not. The first thing they know the writ is served. In the State of Maine a notice has got to be given to the railway, and the particulars have to be given, upon which a claim is made for damage, before the action is brought.

Mr. MASSON. I think the limitation of six months is too short. The last speaker says that often the first notice a railway company gets is the writ. That may be the case sometimes. I know cases where a railway have got the notice, and then pretending to promise a settlement, they waste time until the limitation expires, and then the company refuses a settlement, and the unfortunate man has to suffer a loss. I would suggest that the time be lengthened to a year, or that notice of action should be sufficient to prevent the limitation running. I think the object of the short limitation is to allow the company to have notice within reasonable time, while the means of obtaining evidence for their defence are available, and not allow the claim to get stale when they would be at a loss to discover evidence. I believe that to be the reason for which the limitation is so short. I think that notice in writing within six months would be sufficient, and it would then give time for negotiating a settlement.

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards the notice of action, the difficulty is that so many technicalities surround it, that practically, in four cases out of five, actions fail where notice of action is required.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). All that is needed is a simple notice to the company on the part of the claimant that he intends to bring an action, and to give some information to the company as to the particulars of the action. I know that in the State of Maine, notice is required, and if it is required here, I think it might be extended to 12 months instead of 6—so many days' notice, and then extend the time within which the action may be brought. I propose to join protection to the railway companies with further protection to the public. Six months is undoubtedly a very short time to let a suit clear a railway company.

Mr. THOMPSON. If we intend to insert a provision of this kind, it will have to be very carefully drawn, and we should let the clause stand.

On section 294,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not propose to make the employé responsible, but only the person who sells him the liquor?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the employé drinks enough to become intoxicated, he becomes guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Suppose a conductor stops at a station and goes in to take lunch, and takes a glass of beer?

Mr. THOMPSON. Spirituous or intoxicating liquors.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Beer is intoxicating.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not know that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It depends upon how much you take.

Mr. THOMPSON. If there is to be a prohibition, it must be strict, and we can only draw the line at spirituous or intoxicating liquors.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think to have perfectly sober men on a train is of very great importance. I do not see why we should not prohibit a person, when on duty, from taking it, as well as to prohibit a person from selling it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Suppose that party did not know that this man was engaged upon the road, and sells him a glass of liquor, would he then be liable for a fine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If nobody sells or gives it to him, he will not take it.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is just the same as the prohibition against selling to minors. Persons who are engaged in a business which we restrict must take the risk of violating the law.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to call attention to what I consider a very grave circumstance. In the North-West Territories we have, or had up to the time I left, conductors and brakemen running from Donald to Swift Current and from Brandon to Swift Current, and I have seen conductors dropping asleep. They had been up the best part of two days and one night on that run. This causes danger to life, for the whole train depends on the wakefulness of those men. I will not comment on the cruelty to the men. By clause 293 we declare that "every person who is intoxicated while in charge of a locomotive engine or while acting as conductor to any car or train of cars is guilty of a misdemeanor." The reason why you punish him for being intoxicated is because his intoxication unfits him to discharge his duties, and if conductors have to run from Donald to Swift Current by the time he is within 100 miles of Swift Current the average conductor will be not wakeful enough to attend to his duties.

Mr. SHANLY. What is the distance?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know the exact distance at the present moment. It will take the best part of two nights and a day, and that is too long a time for the men to be at work on duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That there and back?

Mr. DAVIN. No; direct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Surely not.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think so.

Mr. SHANLY. It must be a very slow train.

Mr. DAVIN. I believe the train leaves Donald sometime in the night and it will get into Swift Current the day

following. If the conductor has to get up in the night, get on board the train, run a whole day, and it will be night before he gets into Swift Current. I have seen the men dropping asleep. They come in and sit in the "Pullman" for a moment and their eyelids fall. I have spoken to them; I have written to Mr. Van Horne; I also sent an account of what I saw to the Railway Committee, for I think it is a serious matter.

Mr. SHANLY. How many miles a week does the company get out of them?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know. The fact is as I state it. From Brandon to Swift Current is not so long a run, but I apprehend it is too long. They leave Brandon at about half past one or two o'clock and get into Swift Current the next day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a very important question.

Mr. SHANLY. It is a question as to the number of miles a week the company get out of the men. Somebody must do the night work.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Is it the intention of the Government to embody in this consolidation the Bill introduced by Mr. McCarthy in reference to protecting railway employés?

Mr. THOMPSON. Some parts of it I propose to add when the House goes into committee again.

Mr. DAVIN. The question I apprehend is not how many hours of work you get out of them, but how many hours continuously can a man stand it. That is the real question. There cannot be the least doubt, I can assure the Government that this is required in the interest of the public, in the interests of human life, and I would say even in the interests of the railway companies, because they will one day or other have an accident and the result of that accident will cost them, by many times more than if they had adopted this regulation.

Mr. SHANLY. They have too few conductors you claim?

Mr. LANGEVIER (Quebec). On behalf of my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Mulock) who has been compelled to leave before the committee had finished their work, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the hon. member said to me that last year when several amendments were moved by him to the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets he moved the following amendment:

"Every railway company liable to redeem any such ticket, which refuses to redeem the same when so presented, shall forfeit to the holder thereof a sum equal to ten times the amount payable for its redemption, which sum shall be recoverable, at the suit of the holder against such company, in any court of competent jurisdiction."

The member for York (Mr. Mulock) tells me that that amendment was left out with a promise from the Minister of Railways that it would be incorporated in the consolidation of the Railway Act which was to be introduced this Session. I see that it is not incorporated in this Bill and he says the amendment is an important one. I do not think it has any great application in the Province of Quebec. Since some of the amendments passed last year, compelling railroad companies to redeem their own tickets when they are not used to the end, the railway companies have refused to do so, or they have placed such conditions on the redemption that it makes it practically impossible to redeem them. The result is that the value of the tickets are lost, or they are sold at a loss by those who are the buyers of them. I would not be prepared to support the amendment as proposed last year compelling railway companies which refused to redeem the tickets to pay ten times their value. I think the penalty is rather too high. We might say they would pay double the value of the ticket or some other figure. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the statement of the hon. member that there was a distinct promise made last year by the Minister of Railways that this would be incorporated in the consolidation which was to be made this year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman was mistaken about there being a distinct promise. The Minister of Railways did promise that this year there would be a consolidation Bill introduced, and stated that would be the time to consider the matter. If the amendment has been overlooked in the drafting of this Bill I will see that it is considered. In relation to what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says also I will see that that matter is considered before the House goes into committee again.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman propose to take to-morrow?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of the Bills, and then go into Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you say exactly which Bills?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say exactly now.

Mr. EDGAR. When will the House go into committee again on this Railway Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Friday).

Gov.Doc. Canada. Parliament. House of Commons
Can [Debates on reciprocity and the fisheries
P treaty. 1888].

116727

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET



